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It is clear that the tragic events at Virginia Tech and other institutions of higher education (IHEs) have brought threat assessment to the forefront of higher education literature and increased public concern for campus safety. IHEs have a profound duty to learn from the Virginia Tech tragedy and to recognize their responsibility in providing a safe environment for their students, faculty, and staff. While one cannot maintain a free and open society and eliminate the possibility that acts of random violence may occur, IHE officials and policymakers must determine how to minimize the risk that these situations may occur in the future.

This dissertation explores the extent to which public universities and community colleges in Central Texas have incorporated critical, post-Virginia Tech recommendations into their campus safety policies. The researcher analyzed the websites of thirty-two selected IHEs in Central Texas to collect data regarding the integration of those critical recommendations into their
campus safety policies and programs. This dissertation also explores how institutions succeed or fail in translating these policies into meaningful campus safety programs and services. The researcher conducted two case studies included in the policy analysis sample, The University of Texas at Dallas and Collin College. The data was collected and analyzed based on open-ended interview data to find common themes that related to managing, preventing, and responding to incidents of random mass violence.

Although the professional literature on incidents of college and university violence is increasing, little of the existing research addresses the differences between campus safety policy approaches directed to “Virginia Tech-type” incidents and those approaches directed at violence such as assault, rape, or homicide. The dissertation aims to help fill this void by focusing on certain recommendations of post Virginia Tech reports that specifically address these types of incidents precisely because they present universities with a different set problems than other campus crime.
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INTRODUCTION

In the past decade, mass shootings such as those at The Appalachian State School of Law, The University of Arizona, Virginia Polytechnic Institute (Virginia Tech), and Northern Illinois University have shocked colleges and universities. Incidents such as these raise critical concerns about gun control, privacy, emergency planning, and campus safety. Although the problem of campus safety existed before these high-profile events, a crisis or disaster, or “focus event” pushes the issue to the forefront of the public mind. George J. Busenberg defines a focus event as “sudden, unusual, and widely known events that focus public and political attention on policy issues” (Busenberg 2000, 682). These rare but salient incidents have garnered significant media coverage resulting in a surge in public safety concerns as well as changes in campus policies and procedures and federal crime reporting legislation (Reddy 2001, 157).

On the morning of April 16, 2007, Seung-Hui Cho killed thirty-two students and faculty of Virginia Tech, wounded seventeen more, and killed himself (The Virginia Tech Review Panel 2007, 1). The tragedy at Virginia Tech instantly changed how federal and state policymakers and higher education officials viewed campus safety at institutions of higher education and reinforced the fundamental responsibility for college and university leaders to address campus security and safety. This incident, along with other active shooter incidents that have occurred after the Virginia Tech tragedy, has intensified public awareness regarding campus safety and security.
The Virginia Tech incident resulted in unprecedented new attention and new practices related to campus safety and security at higher education institutions. Following that tragedy, many federal and state agencies issued substantive reports that analyzed the incident in detail and made recommendations aimed at preventing future incidents of this kind. The Governor of Virginia, Timothy M. Kaine, and the President of the United States, George W. Bush, both commissioned panels to provide recommendations designed to prevent future incidents of mass violence from occurring at institutions of higher education (IHEs). The entities each published reports that included their findings. These reports are *Mass Shootings at Virginia Tech: Report of the Review Panel* presented to Governor Timothy M. Kaine and *The Report to the President on Issues Raised by the Virginia Tech Tragedy*.

Although these reports provide numerous recommendations, the critical recommendations pertaining to IHEs include establishing a mechanism to report threats of violence, improving both crime prevention and emergency response procedures, and compliance with The Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Act Safety Policy and Campus Crime Statistics (Clery Act). “The Clery Act is intended to provide students and their families with accurate, complete, and timely information about safety on campuses so that they can make informed decisions” (U.S. Department of Education 2005, 3). Both reports and nearly all of the major reports on campus safety issued after the shootings at Virginia Tech advocated for colleges and universities to adapt the threat assessment model (McBain 2008, 2). One of the key components of the threat assessment model is to develop and train campus threat assessment teams to prevent attacks at IHEs (Randazzo and Plumber 2009, 3).
On January 8, 2011 near Tucson, Arizona, nineteen people were shot six of them fatally, at an open meeting that U.S. Representative Gabrielle Giffords was holding with constituents. Months prior to the shooting, the suspect, Jared Loughner, had displayed disturbing behaviors at Pima Community College that ultimately led the college’s threat assessment team to require that Loughner undergo an outside mental-health evaluation. Instead, Loughner withdrew from school. Even though some praise the college’s efforts to keep its campus safe, others criticize the college for not doing more to protect the public (Berzon and Eaton, 2011). In response to the mass shooting, colleges and universities across the country are reexamining their campus safety policies and procedures (Bell and Buck, 2011). Regardless of fault, the result of this incident has been increased public scrutiny regarding the accountability of IHEs to provide not only a safe campus environment, but also the responsibility to protect the public from those who exhibit a propensity for violent behavior. IHEs can learn valuable lessons from the Virginia Tech incident and other acts of random mass violence, such as the shooting in Tucson, to ensure their safety policies address present-day campus security issues.

This dissertation explores the extent to which public universities and community colleges in Central Texas have incorporated critical, post-Virginia Tech recommendations into their campus safety policies. It also explores how institutions succeed or fail in translating these policies into meaningful campus safety programs and services. The researcher collected “mixed” forms of data, including quantitative policy analysis and qualitative open-ended interview data. There is wide consensus of the advantages of mixing both quantitative and qualitative data in a single research study (Greene and Caracelli 1997; Tashakkori and Teddlie 2003, 210). While quantitative research is more focused than qualitative research, qualitative research can provide
insights not available through general quantitative studies and has become a legitimate form of inquiry in the social sciences (Tashakkori and Teddlie 2003, 192).

Incorporating the critical Virginia Tech recommendations into an institution’s campus safety policies and its campus culture involves complexities unique to the academic environment. An effective threat assessment team is largely dependent on the reports it receives from across campus to do its work. Setting up a successful campus threat assessment capacity must, therefore, include efforts to encourage the entire campus community to report threats and other concerning behavior to the team (Randazzo and Plummer 2009, 36).

Federal privacy laws such as The Federal Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) limit the disclosure of information that may help institutions intervene to protect members within its community. For example, educators often think that they can never share student information with anyone, regardless of safety concerns. “One of the greatest, and potentially fatal, misunderstandings is that the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, somehow prevents sharing information about a possibly dangerous student” (Lake 2007, 6). This lack of understanding along with and the fear of personal or professional liability, cause many educators to err on the side of caution even in situations when public safety is at risk (Davies 2007 8-15).

Colleges and universities by their nature are open-access environments in which people moving between buildings and outdoor spaces represents the open exchange of ideas, discussion, and debate (Midwestern Higher Education Compact 2008, 6). Thomas Jefferson used architecture as a metaphor for American ideology. Jefferson imagined an academic village consisting of a democratic community of scholars surrounded by open green spaces with both
residential and academic buildings. Unfortunately, these foundational attributes do not address campus crime and can hinder effective campus safety strategies.

Although the professional literature on incidents of college and university violence is increasing, little of the existing research addresses the differences between campus safety policy approaches directed to “Virginia Tech-type” incidents and those approaches directed at violence such as assault, rape, or homicide. The dissertation aims to help fill this void by focusing on certain recommendations of post Virginia Tech reports that specifically address these types of incidents precisely because they present IHEs with a different set problems than other campus crime.

One of the significant threshold problems in analyzing campus effort to prevent and respond to the type of incidents that occurred at Virginia Tech, Appalachian State, Arizona, and Northern Illinois University is the lack of a consistent definition for this type of incident. The reports issued after the Virginia Tech tragedy and scholarly work tend to use similar definitions but subtle definitional differences exist. In addition, and more important for the purposes of this study, they also generally fail to distinguish between more common campus safety threats such as assault, theft, and even homicide, and the special case of the terrorist-type incidents such as those at Virginia Tech that awakened the nation.

To assess campus safety policies, the researcher has created the definition “random mass violence” to denote “Virginia Tech type” incidents and to distinguish them from policies directed at threats of violence or danger such as assault, rape, homicide, and the like, including natural phenomena. Random mass violence must meet the following criteria: 1) the subject selects a group of institution of higher education students, employees or facilities as a target 2) the victim
group is two or more individuals 3) the subject selects one or more of the victims at random 4) the subject selects the targets prior to the incident and 5) the subject employs lethal force. Although the subject directs his or her violence toward a specific group, the apparent random selection of the victims within that group intensifies fear within the campus community and the public.

**Research Questions**

The researcher uses two research questions to guide this study of threat assessment policies at colleges and universities in Central Texas. The questions were used to glean information about the campus safety policies at institutions in the wake of recent campus violence. In this study, the following exploratory questions guide the research framework:

1. How have public universities and community colleges in Central Texas incorporated the critical post-Virginia Tech recommendations into their campus safety policies?

2. How do public universities and community colleges in Central Texas implement policies to address random mass violence?

The study addresses the first question by analyzing a sample of campus safety policies at thirty-two public universities and public community colleges in Central Texas. These include IHEs with large student enrollment, such as the University of Texas at Austin (50,995), Texas A&M University at College Station (48,702), Austin Community College (37,850), and The University of North Texas at Denton (34,781). In addition, the analysis includes smaller IHEs such as Grayson County College (4,712), Hill College (4,390), Texas A&M University Central Texas (2,188), and The University of North Texas at Dallas (2,109) (Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board 2009). The sample includes IHEs that are part of a college or university
system, such as The University of Texas System and Dallas County Community College System as well as IHEs that are independent, such as Grayson County College and Texas Woman’s University. The IHEs represented in the study are located in both rural as well as urban areas. For example, the Dallas Community College District, Tarrant County Colleges, The University of Texas at Dallas, and The University of Texas at Arlington are located in the Dallas-Fort Worth Metroplex. In contrast, Texas A&M University at Commerce, Tarleton State University, Trinity Community College and Temple College are located in rural areas. The researcher included both community colleges and public universities in the sample because each has unique characteristics and common challenges to providing a safe campus environment.

In total, the sample includes eleven public universities and twenty-one community colleges. The sample provides an admittedly non-statistically random sample of institutions. Therefore, the results are not representative of all IHEs in the United States or designed for generalization. Rather, it is exploratory research designed to stimulate new ways of thinking about colleges and universities’ responses to the threat of random mass violence and to generate further research on the appropriateness of the threat assessment model in preventing such incidents.

The researcher used random purposeful sampling within a defined geographic area, Central Texas, because it provides a diverse sample of community colleges and public universities with varying characteristics including enrollment size, urban and rural service areas, age of establishment, and budgets. Although the study is limited to a relatively small geographic area, the findings serve to generate working hypotheses for examination across Texas and to a lesser extent, across the United States. Such expanded study eagerly awaits further research.
Regarding researching question two, the researcher designed the case studies of Collin College and The University of Texas at Dallas to provide additional data on the design, implementation, communication, and evaluation of campus safety policies that address both the prevention and response to incidents of random mass violence. The researcher purposefully selected these institutions because Collin College is a multi-campus, non-residential community college; and it was the only community college included in the IHE Policy Analysis that had a threat assessment team operating within the district. In contrast, The University of Texas at Dallas is a single campus, public university that is part of a The University of Texas System that provides residential living and has a threat assessment team designed to address threats to campus safety. The unique characteristics and similarities provide a basis for comparison and analysis.

With the case studies, the researcher selected representatives directly involved in the creating, carrying out, and communication of campus safety policies that relate to assessing and responding to threats of random mass violence. The researcher selected fourteen individuals who have a defined role managing threats and who serve on each institution’s threat assessment team. The interviews include institution’s president, vice-president of student affairs, dean of students, director of counseling services, and the chief of police. To further triangulate the study to increase the credibility and validity of the results, the researcher also conducted interviews with the speaker of the faculty senate, the president of the staff council, and the president of the student government association.

This study provides a review of how the shootings at Virginia Tech on April 16, 2007 have impacted college and university campus safety policies and how IHEs have incorporated
the threat assessment model into their policies to prevent future acts of random mass violence. Chapter 1 reviews the incident at Virginia Tech, provides a detailed description of both the incident and the shooter, Seung-Hui Cho, and outlines the primary federal and state reports published following the incident. Chapter 2 summarizes the unique challenges associated with balancing public safety and individual privacy in higher education and describes key federal privacy legislation’s impact on campus safety policy development. Chapter 3 provides a historical perspective of the evolution of the threat assessment model as a tool to prevent acts of random mass violence in educational environments. Chapter 4 describes the methodology of the IHE policy analysis and the case studies used in the research study. Chapter 5 presents the data and analysis of the research study. Chapter 6 includes the researcher’s conclusions, contribution to the existing literature, and recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER 1

THE VIRGINIA TECH INCIDENT AND ITS AFTERMATH

The Virginia Tech tragedy drew immediate national attention and in the days afterward, the most sweeping news coverage so far that year, significantly more than coverage of the war in Iraq. The national news media devoted 51 percent of all news coverage during the week of April 16, 2007 to the Virginia Tech shootings and its aftermath (Pew Research Center for People and Press 2007). Although these visible incidents garner intense media exposure and overshadow more common acts of violence, active shooter situations and mass shootings on college and university campuses are rare. However, vivid stories and images can increase the perceived risk of the event occurring in the future by those who experience them.

According to Tversky and Kahneman, an event whose instances are more easily recalled will appear more frequently than an event of equal frequency whose instances are less easily recalled (1979, 264). Acts of random mass violence are vivid events that the public can recall. This can result in increased pressure to implement campus safety policies to prevent future acts of violence. Campus shootings can pose an organizational crisis for the institution. “An organizational crisis is a low-probability, high-impact event that threatens the viability of the organization and is characterized by ambiguity of cause, effect and means of resolution, as well as by a belief that decisions must be made swiftly” (Pearson and Clair 1998, 60). Leaders in higher education recognize the need for effective campus safety policies, implementation strategies, emergency response planning, and behavioral intervention. These demands, coupled
with the adherence to strict privacy laws to protect the potential assailant’s civil liberties, present clear challenges to college and university administrators and policymakers. However, even though the likelihood of an incident of random mass violence occurring at their university is extremely rare, administrators must remain vigilant in creating effective campus safety policies because the potential damages can be significant.

**The Shootings, April 16, 2007**

On Monday, April 16, 2007 Virginia Tech student, Seung-Hui Cho’s act of violent rage resulted in the deadliest campus shooting in American history. The killings occurred in two separate attacks on the campus in Blacksburg, Virginia. At 7:15 a.m., Cho shot and killed two students in a dormitory. During the initial investigation of the double homicide, the police department believed the shooting was a result of a domestic dispute and identified the female victim’s boyfriend as the only person of interest in the case. In addition to the police investigation, the Virginia Tech policy group composed of university administrators whose primary responsibility is to create and implement policies at the institution, met to compose an e-mail notice to send to the university community about the shootings. Both police and administration believed this was an isolated event. Although the policy group tried to send a campus-wide e-mail warning, they experienced technical difficulties with the alert system. Therefore, the university administration could not send an alert to the campus community about the double-homicide that occurred on campus.

Around 9:00 a.m., Cho mailed a package to NBC News in New York that contained a 1,800 word manifesto including photographs of Cho with his weapons (Windrem 2007). In his multimedia manifesto, Cho alluded to the coming massacre but mentioned no individual or the
university by name. After leaving the post office, Cho went to Norris Hall carrying a backpack with two handguns, 400 rounds of ammunition, a knife, heavy chains, and a hammer. He chained the building’s three main entrances from the inside. Chaining the doors both delayed anyone from interrupting Cho’s plan and kept victims from escaping. For the next ten to twelve minutes, Cho systematically went classroom to classroom, aisle by aisle, shooting both faculty and students. Cho returned to most of the classrooms more than once to continue shooting (The Virginia Tech Review Panel 2007, 98).

During the entire shooting spree, Cho did not utter a word. At 9:50 a.m., police used a shotgun to shoot open the only door that Cho could not chain and entered the building. Investigators believed that when Cho heard the shotgun blast it interrupted his plan and he shot himself in the head. Once Cho’s rampage had ended, he had fired 174 rounds of ammunition and killed thirty people in Norris Hall plus himself. Police found another 200 rounds of ammunition beside Cho’s body (The Virginia Tech Review Panel 2007, 104).

**The Shooter, Seung-Hui Cho**

Following the shootings, the public wanted to know what motivated Cho to carry out such a violent act against members of his campus community. Investigators began to search for ways to piece together what triggering events, pre-incident behaviors and mental health issues may provide insight about why this tragic incident occurred. Cho’s family cooperated with authorities and released a detailed description of their son’s history of mental illness (The Virginia Tech Review Panel 2009, 33).

Cho’s mental health records, along with the information obtained from a three-hour interview with his sister and parents and administrative records released by Virginia Tech,
provided a profile of Cho and a detailed history of his mental illness. By analyzing the anatomy of Cho’s mental illness, IHEs can learn how to intervene and to create policies to prevent future incidents of mass violence.

Cho was born on January 18, 1984 in Seoul, Korea. Cho’s parents described him as an excessively shy, quiet child, but he caused no problems within the family. In 1992, the family moved to the United States to pursue educational opportunities for their children. Throughout education, teachers indicated that Cho would not “interact socially, communicate verbally, or participate in group activities” (The Virginia Tech Review Panel 2009, 33).

In the middle school, Cho continued to withdraw from others and teachers met with Cho’s parents about his behavior. Responding to the teacher’s concerns, Cho received counseling at the Center for Multicultural Human Services, a mental health facility that offers services to low-income, English limited immigrants, to address his shy, introverted nature. After several psychological evaluations, medical staff diagnosed and treated Cho for selective mutism, social anxiety disorder, and major depression (The Virginia Tech Review Panel 2007, 22; The Virginia Tech Review Panel 2009, 34-35).

Following the Columbine shootings in 1999, Cho wrote a disturbing paper that expressed thoughts of suicide and homicide and stated that “he wanted to repeat Columbine” (The Virginia Tech Review Panel 2009, 35). Cho’s teacher forwarded this information to school administrators who recommended Cho be evaluated by a psychiatrist to address his issues, and after that consultation the psychiatrist diagnosed Cho with an emotional disability. Cho continued to attend weekly therapy sessions at the mental health center until he turned 18 and refused treatment. As a high school student, Cho had no behavior problems, made no violent
threats and completed high school with a 3.5 GPA from the Honors Program (The Virginia Tech Review Panel 2009, 39-40).

In 2003, Seung-Hui Cho began his college career at Virginia Tech and there was little attention drawn to him besides small disagreements with his roommates about neatness issues (The Virginia Tech Review Panel 2009, 41). However, during the fall of his junior year, Cho began to display a series of disturbing behaviors and started to become known to a growing number of individuals in the campus community for his withdrawn nature and underdeveloped communication skills. Cho’s English professor found his severe antisocial behavior and violent writings so disturbing she requested that he be removed from her class. She told university administrators that if Cho was not removed from the class, she would resign.

In response, the department chair advised Cho of an independent study alternative and strongly recommended he seek professional mental health counseling. Cho elected to take the independent study English course, but he refused to go to counseling. The department chair shared this information with college administration, the Cook Counseling Center (CCC), the Care Team and the Virginia Tech Police Department (VTPD). The Care Team, a threat assessment and behavioral intervention team, was comprised of the Dean of Student Affairs, the Director of Residence Life, the Head of Judicial Affairs, the Director of Student Health and a representative from legal counsel. The goal of the Care Team is to coordinate support services and administrative response to crises involving students and to provide case management (Virginia Tech Polytechnic Institute and State University Policy and Procedures 2010). Thinking the issue was resolved, the members of the Care Team did not refer Cho to the CCC for additional treatment (The Virginia Tech Review Panel 2009, 43).
During the next several months, three female students contacted the VTPD to report multiple disturbing contacts by Cho. These “stalking” behaviors included derogatory instant messaging from strange aliases, inappropriate phone conversations and a disguised visit to the student’s dorm room. After each incident, the VTPD told Cho not to contact those students in any way. The Care Team received no information regarding these incidents by either the VTPD or Residence Life. Apart from speeding tickets, Cho had no further contact with the police from December 2005 until the day of the killings (Shuchman 2007, 110)

In 2005, Cho threatened to commit suicide, his roommate contacted the CCC. The CCC psychologist on-call referred Cho to a public provider of behavioral health services, New River Valley Community Services Board. On arrival, a New River Valley Community Services Board psychologist evaluated Cho and determined that he was “an imminent danger to self or others.” A magistrate issued a temporary restraining order and an officer of the court transported Cho to Carilion St. Albans Psychiatric Hospital (St. Albans) for an overnight stay and a mental evaluation (The Virginia Tech Review Panel 2009, 47). A staff psychiatrist at St. Albans evaluated Cho and decided Cho was mentally ill, but he did not present an imminent danger to himself. He stated, “there is no indication of psychosis, delusions, suicidal or homicidal ideation…his insight and judgment are normal” (The Virginia Tech Review Panel 2009, 47). On the psychiatrist’s recommendation, the magistrate ruled that Cho did not present an imminent danger to himself but he released Cho under the order that he receive outpatient treatment. St. Albans released Cho and upon release he went to his first required appointment at Virginia Tech’s CCC. This was the only counseling appointment he attended. Therefore, he did not meet
the requirements the court ordered for continued outpatient care. The CCC or the Care Team took no further action to follow-up with Cho.

According to the 2009 National College Health Assessment 30.7% of the 87,105 students surveyed “felt so depressed it was difficult to function” during the past year, but only 10.1% reported a diagnosis or were receiving treatment for depression (American College Health Association 2009, 14-15). In addition, 91% of counseling directors at various types of colleges reported seeing greater numbers of students with severe psychological problems (Berzon and Eaton, 2011). The public stigma associated with mental health care has a negative social, psychological, and clinical outcome for people with mental illness (Golberstein, Einsenberg, and Gollust 2008, 396). This perception, coupled with the fear of violation of individual privacy, can inhibit individuals from seeking needed treatment for continued mental health. Thus, the problem for policymakers is to craft policies that safeguard the privacy of those seeking mental health services without creating undue risk to the rest of the campus community.

By assessing the status of Cho’s mental health both before and during the incident, law enforcement and university administration hoped to learn what triggered his deep anger toward the faculty and his fellow students at Virginia Tech. For years prior to the incident, Cho exhibited disturbing behaviors. If university administrators and faculty had shared this information with each other, perhaps the university could have intervened to lessen the likelihood of Cho’s rampage on April 16, 2007. Analyzing the incident and the anatomy of the shooter is critical to learn ways to improve campus safety policies and procedures to identify an individual who displays a propensity for violent behavior and to create effective intervention strategies to prevent an incident of mass violence.
Federal and State Reports Following Virginia Tech Incident

The severity of the incident at Virginia Tech caused significant concern among state and federal policymakers. The Governor of Virginia, Timothy M. Kaine and the President of the United States, George W. Bush, commissioned panels to analyze the wide variety of contributing factors that led to this tragic event. The primary focus of the reports was to provide recommendations to IHEs on how to recognize, prevent, and respond to potential threats of random mass violence. Together they serve as the primary source for practical steps IHEs can implement to prevent and respond to acts of random mass violence, such as the incident that occurred at Virginia Tech.


The members of the review panel included Colonel Gerald Massengill, a retired Virginia state police superintendent, who led the Commonwealth’s law enforcement response to the September 11, 2001; Dr. Marcus L. Martin, professor of emergency medicine, assistant dean of the school of medicine, and associate vice president for diversity and equity at the University of Virginia; Gordon Davies, former director of the state Council of Higher Education for Virginia; Dr. Roger L. Depue, a 20-year veteran of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the founder of The Academy Group, Incorporated, a forensic behavioral science services company providing consultation, research, and investigation of aberrant and violent behavioral problems. Additional members included Carroll Ann Ellis, M.S., director of the Fairfax County police department’s victim services division, a faculty member at the National Victim Academy, and a member of the American Society of Victimology; The Honorable Tom Ridge, former Governor of Pennsylvania and member of the U.S. House of Representatives, who was also the first U.S. Secretary of
Homeland Security; Dr. Aradhana A. Sood, professor of psychiatry and pediatrics, chair of child and adolescent psychiatry, and the medical director of the Virginia Treatment Center for Children; and The Honorable Diane Strickland, former judge of the 23rd Judicial Circuit Court in Roanoke County (The Virginia Tech Review Panel 2007, viii).

The Virginia Tech Review panel examined several issues including the life and mental health of Cho; federal and state laws related to privacy and education records; gun control legislation; the emergency response of Virginia Tech leadership, local and campus law enforcement, and emergency responders; emergency medical care by hospitals; the work of the chief medical examiner of Virginia and the services provided for surviving victims of the shootings, the families, and members of the university community (The Virginia Tech Review Panel 2009, 1). The review panel’s mission was to assess the events leading to the shooting, to evaluate how the university handled the incident, and to evaluate the collaborative efforts of other emergency response teams, such as the Blacksburg Police Department. The Governor ordered the panel to accomplish the following directives 1) determine how Seung-Hui Cho committed thirty-two murders and multiple injuries, including how he obtained his firearms and ammunition, to create a timeline of events and to learn what caused him to commit these acts of violence, 2) conduct a review of Seung-Hui Cho’s psychological condition and behavioral issues prior to and at the time of the shootings, and what potential warning signs Virginia Tech students, and faculty observed, and 3) based on these inquiries, make recommendations on appropriate measures that can be taken to improve the laws, policies, procedures, systems, and institutions of the Commonwealth of Virginia and the operation of public safety agencies, medical facilities, local agencies, universities, and mental health services delivery system.
In November 2009, the panel released an addendum to the report that includes Cho’s personal case file from the Cook Counseling Center, additions and corrections to the timeline, and additional details shared by the victims’ families. The addendum provides relevant background information that may help to address current and future campus safety concerns.

After conducting several hundred interviews, reviewing records and analyzing procedures, the panel summarized its key findings. Although the panel provided more than eighty recommendations, this paper focuses on critical recommendations that pertain to higher education campus safety policies and procedures, privacy issues, on-campus mental health services and emergency management planning (Appendix A). The panel’s report divided campus safety policy into two basic parts, crime prevention and emergency response. The first type of finding in the report identified major administrative or procedural failings leading to the events, such as failing to “connect the dots” of Cho’s highly bizarre behavior. The second finding in the report reviewed actions taken in the time of the crisis.

The panel found several problems with Virginia Tech’s ability to identify Cho’s pre-incident behaviors and to intervene to reduce the risk of potential violence. First, at various points during Cho’s college career, Virginia Tech police officers, professors, and students recognized that he was mentally troubled. However, during Cho’s junior year, he displayed many incidents that were “warnings of mental instability” and although various individuals and departments within the university knew about each of these incidents, the university did not intervene effectively (The Virginia Tech Review Panel 2009, 2). Second, university officials in judicial affairs, the cook counseling center, the Virginia Tech police department, the dean of students office and others failed to communicate with each other. Because no one had a
comprehensive profile of Cho or had responsibility in overseeing his care, Virginia Tech could not connect the dots to assess the threat he posed.

The Virginia Tech Review Panel found that widespread confusion on what federal and state privacy laws that often results in individuals withholding information regarding those that pose a potential threat to safety. Third, the Cook Counseling Center and the Care Team, a behavioral intervention team whose primary mission is to identify individuals who may pose a potential threat to their personal safety or the safety of others, failed to provide the needed support services to Cho. The panel concluded the system failed because of lack of resources, incorrect interpretation of privacy laws and overall “passivity” regarding Cho’s disturbing behaviors (The Virginia Tech Review Panel 2009, 2).

The Blacksburg Police Department and the Virginia Tech Police Department (VTPD) provided prompt, effective emergency response to the shootings at West Ambler Johnson dormitory and Norris Hall. However, the VTPD erred by failing to require the policy group to issue a campus-wide notification that two people had been killed and that the campus community should be cautious and alert. The policy group failed to issue a campus notification about the dorm killings until almost two hours had elapsed. (The Virginia Tech Review Panel 2009, 2-3).

Virginia Tech’s emergency response plan identifies two key decision-making groups: the policy group and the emergency response resources group. The policy group, comprised of the president and several other vice presidents and senior officials, addresses university procedures to support emergency operations and to assess the priorities associated with specific emergency incidents, while the emergency response resources group ensures the policy group has access to the resources needed to support the emergency. The emergency response resource group is
comprised of a vice president designated to be in charge of an incident and a police official. The report *Mass Shootings at Virginia Tech: An Addendum to the Report of the Review Panel* states the university had two different emergency warning policies in effect on April 16, 2007 (2009, 4). That day university administration followed a conflicting policy that allowed the chief of police to issue a campus-wide alert. The alert system protocol precluded the police from sending an alert directly. While the VTPD had the authority to issue an alert, they lacked the ability to use the university alerting system. Only two people had the passcodes to send a message, the Associate Vice-President for Virginia Tech Relations and the Director of News and Information. Before the incident, the university administrators designed the VT Emergency Response Plan to respond to emergencies not prevent them.

The panel found many deficiencies in the campus safety policies and emergency response plan in place on April 16, 2007 and provided several university setting and security recommendations including 1) universities should do a risk analysis (threat assessment) and choose a level of security appropriate for their campus, 2) institutions of higher learning should have a threat assessment team that includes representatives from law enforcement, human resources, student and academic affairs, legal counsel, and mental health functions (The Virginia Tech Review Panel 2009, 19), 3) IHEs must have a system that links troubled students to appropriate medical and counseling services either on or off campus, and to balance the individual’s rights with the rights of all others for safety (The Virginia Tech Review Panel 2009, 53), and universities and colleges must comply with the Clery Act, which requires timely public warnings of imminent danger (The Virginia Tech Review Panel 2009, 19).
Following the release of the report, critics of how Virginia Tech handled the 2007 campus massacre were frustrated, but not surprised that the university still refused to acknowledge mistakes, despite the report that concluded officials failed promptly to warn students that a gunman was on the loose (O’Dell 2010). One victim's mother, Celeste Peterson, called for the firing of Virginia Tech’s president. Another, Suzanne Grimes, mother of wounded student Kevin Sterne, said: "I can't understand why the alarm to students wasn't sent out at 7:20 a.m. The president of the college still states that there is a misconception about the two-hour gap. I'm not sure what planet the president is on. There was a two-hour gap. If there's any misconception, it's in the president's own mind. . . . He still hasn't acknowledged responsibility for what happened, and that's why we're so angry" (Craig and Somashekhar 2007).

In response to the report findings Virginia Tech’s president, Charles Steger, stated "We respect and commend the panel for the ‘what might have happened’ scenarios. They are illustrative and useful for future actions. But nobody can say for certain what would have happened if different decisions were made. . . . It is entirely possible that this tragedy, horrific as it is, could have been worse." Stegar defended the campus police department, which the report applauded for its response to the shootings at Norris Hall. However, many criticized the police department for not ensuring that warnings were sent to the campus community after the dormitory shootings. Steger discussed future changes and expressed his sorrow, but he did not apologize to the families for the university's actions April 16, 2007. He stated, "We acted in good faith, we did the best we could and I don't think an apology is appropriate" (Esposito 2007).

Report to the President of the United States on Issues Raised by the Virginia Tech Tragedy

In the wake of the Virginia Tech incident, President George W. Bush commissioned
a panel to travel to communities across the country to meet with educators, mental health experts, law enforcement and other key state and local officials to research the broader issues raised by the Virginia Tech tragedy. The panel included Attorney General Alberto Gonzales, Department of Education Secretary Margaret Spellings, and Department of Health and Human Services Secretary Michael Leavitt. The report includes recommendations for how local, state, and federal government can help avoid such tragedies in the future. This report does not seek to investigate the specifics of the Virginia Tech tragedy itself. Instead, this report summarizes the major recurring themes heard during meetings held across the country (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services et al. 2007, 1).

State and local leaders from a wide range of sectors actively participated and provided their individual input in each of the sessions. In most states, the Governors' offices hosted the events, senior state leadership, including Governors, Lieutenant Governors, Attorneys General, and state legislators attended these events. In addition, state officials and experts from across the spectrum of the mental health, education, and law enforcement communities participated in these discussions (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services et al. 2007, 3).

Several common themes emerged from these meetings. These included the balancing individual privacy and public safety, gun control, sharing critical information to mitigate potential threats, and the provision of support services to those with mental health needs. Researchers published a summary of the lessons learned from these meetings and recommendations in the Report to the President on Issues Raised by the Virginia Tech Tragedy (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services et al. 2007, 1).
The focus of this report is the substantial obstacles IHEs face sharing critical information. One of the primary themes in the report was that IHE officials’ widespread confusion and differing interpretations about state and federal privacy laws impede appropriate information sharing regarding potential safety threats. This, along with “information silos” within IHEs and among staff, faculty, counseling services, and campus police departments, limits the sharing of critical information necessary to pre-empt a potential threat (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services et al. 2007, 7). Federal laws as well as state laws regulate how information is shared. This can be confusing and creates a culture of fear of litigation if institutions do not interpret the laws correctly.

To address these issues, the report suggests several recommendations (Appendix B). Following are the key recommendations in the report that relate to campus safety: 1) develop cultures within schools and IHEs that promote safety, trust, respect, and open communication, 2) educating and training members of the campus community to recognize warning signs, identifying responsible and appropriate individuals with whom to share concerns, and creating "risk assessment" teams to evaluate the information, assess the degree of threat, and intervene to pre-empt the threat, and 3) Establish and publicize widely a mechanism to report and respond to reported threats of violence (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services et al. 2007, 12).

Participants in the meetings stressed promoting prevention and early intervention for individuals with mental illness through early detection, referral, and treatment. In addition, they recommended creating an environment of trust, respect, and open communication to de-stigmatize mental illness and to increase the likelihood that an individual who could pose a threat to him or herself would seek help. Increased training on warning signs of mental distress and
developing clear guidelines to follow if someone is exhibiting these signs can help members of the campus community identify those who may pose a potential threat to public safety (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services et al. 2007, 12).

IHEs have a duty to learn from the Virginia Tech tragedy and to recognize their responsibility in providing a safe environment for their students, faculty, and staff. In response to violent crimes that occur on campus, the public often demands increased transparency and pressures college or university administrators to make changes to campus safety policy. While one cannot maintain an open academic environment and eliminate the possibility that acts of random violence may occur, IHE officials must determine how to minimize the possibility of future incidents while preserving the balance between individual privacy and public safety.

This chapter provides a detailed description of both the Virginia Tech incident and the shooter, Seung-Hui Cho, and outlines the primary federal and state reports published following the incident. The following chapter summarizes the unique challenges associated with balancing public safety and individual privacy in higher education and describes key federal privacy legislation’s impact on campus safety policy development.
CHAPTER 2
BALANCING PUBLIC SAFETY AND INDIVIDUAL PRIVACY
IN HIGHER EDUCATION

IHEs, despite the tragedy at Virginia Tech, have not developed a specific model for educational environments to deal with incidents of random mass violence. Nevertheless, the incident at Virginia Tech has influenced the campus safety policies at most IHEs. Furthermore, preventing low probability, high impact incidents of mass violence from occurring on college and university campuses has similarities to other areas of research such as counter terrorism efforts. The following section of this dissertation explores risk management issues associated with higher education, describes the legal responsibilities IHEs have to provide safe campus environments, and examines key federal legislation designed to balance individual privacy and campus safety.

Increased national attention to the problem of random mass violence on college campuses has prompted administrators, educational policymakers and the public to ask two central questions: “Could we have known these attacks were being planned?” and if so, “What could we precautions could have been taken to prevent them from occurring?” (Texas A&M Tell Somebody Campaign). The incident at Virginia Tech impacted not only higher education policy and federal legislation, but also it signaled a fundamental shift in the court’s interpretation of an institution of higher education’s legal responsibility to provide a safe campus community. Federal and state laws now require IHEs to have emergency response plans and crisis
communication plans. In addition, IHEs can be held liable for negligence related to acts of random mass violence. This reality has presented many challenges for administrators within academia who have little experience with risk management practices.

**Risk Management in Higher Education**

No institution can guarantee that its campus is completely safe because it cannot control the actions of all individuals at all times. However, its goal should be to provide an environment that is as safe as possible given its environmental constraints (Midwestern Higher Education Compact, 2008, 6). According to the Virginia Tech Review Panel’s Report, *Mass Shootings at Virginia Tech*, the panel recommends that IHEs conduct a risk analysis (threat assessment), choose a level of security appropriate for their campus, and determine which threats need to be considered by each institution (2009, 8). Safety is a relative concept. In reality, policymakers and administrators must decide not only their legal requirements, but also their ethical responsibilities to create a campus environment that is “safe enough” for the public and campus community. The American Council on Education stated that an institution should “marshal those forces within its control so as to provide that its students and employees are able to enjoy on campus at least that average degree of security enjoyed by similar situated citizens of the surrounding community” (1985, 18).

In the post-Virginia Tech era, colleges will no longer find sanctuary in “no duty” legal defense arguments. In the past, the public viewed on-campus tragedies as unforeseeable but not as a direct result of lack of planning by IHE officials or inadequate emergency responsiveness. After the incident at Virginia Tech, IHEs’ emergency planning, risk assessment, and crisis response efforts will be under scrutiny. Colleges must begin to ask themselves what dangers are
foreseeable, and to define what are reasonable efforts needed to provide a safe campus environment (Lake 2007, 117). IHEs try to control their legal and ethical responsibilities through strategic campus safety policies and procedures. The impact of the Virginia Tech shootings will continue to shape how colleges view threats and define the college’s role in creating a safe learning environment.

Public attention to campus crime has been heightened over the past decade because of the recent mass campus shootings and several high-profile lawsuits brought against universities about campus security issues (Bromley 2005, 6). In the incident at Virginia Tech, Cho displayed many disturbing behaviors during his tenure as a student. Some may argue Virginia Tech was grossly negligent in identifying Cho as a threat and failed to intervene that resulted in loss of 32 lives. Families of two of the students killed in the Virginia Tech filed gross negligence claims against the university, president Charles Steger, former executive vice-president James Hyatt, and three employees of the university’s counseling center. Circuit Court Judge William Alexander ruled the families presented enough facts that the university may have acted with gross negligence and that they could proceed with their case. In addition, dozens of the families of the victims have already settled with the State of Virginia regarding the Virginia Tech shootings (Ress 2010). To prove a case of negligent action against a college or university, an individual must prove the institution has a legal duty to protect its students. Because the relationship between postsecondary institutions and their students is not easy to define, courts have been reluctant to impose a general duty of protection on colleges and universities (Sokolow et al. 2008, 321).
In 1970, Donald Bradshaw, an eighteen-year-old student at Delaware Valley College, suffered life altering injuries from an automobile accident. The driver of the car was a fellow student who had become intoxicated at a picnic sponsored by the sophomore class. The picnic, although not held on the college campus, was an annual event. A faculty member, who served as the sophomore class advisor, worked with the class officers in planning the picnic and co-signed a check that used class funds that an underage student used to buy beer. Bradshaw later sued the college as well as others, claiming that it had breached its duty to protect him from unreasonable risk of harm. The court viewed the student as an adult who was responsible for his actions and the resulting effects of those actions. In *Bradshaw versus Rawlings*, the Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit stated: “the modern American college is not an insurer of the safety of its students” (*Bradshaw versus Rawlings*, 1979, 4). When a student is harmed because of his or her decision to engage in risky behaviors, this “no duty” approach seems suitable. However, what if a dangerous third-party harms an innocent student on campus (Sokolow et al. 2008, 322)?

In the past decade many court decisions have signaled the era of protectionism for colleges has ended. Legally there are four standards by which the victims of campus crime can sue IHEs. These theories include 1) a duty to warn about known risks 2) a duty to provide adequate security protection 3) a duty to screen other students and employees for dangers and (4) a duty to control student conduct (Smith 1995, 26). Bethany Jill Gross, a graduate student at Nova Southeastern University (Nova), was criminally assaulted while leaving an off-campus internship site. In 2000, Gross filed a lawsuit against Nova based on alleged negligence in assigning her to an internship location that Nova knew was unreasonably dangerous and
presented an unreasonable risk of harm. In *Nova Southeastern University, Incorporated versus Gross*, the Florida Supreme Court overwhelmingly ruled the university was negligent in its duty to warn of known risks. The court stated, "We need not go so far as to impose a general duty of supervision, as is common in the school-minor student context, to find that Nova had a duty, in this limited context, to use ordinary care in providing educational services and programs to one of its adult students" (*Nova Southeastern University versus Bethany Jill Gross*, 1998).

IHEs are no longer idyllic sanctuaries from violence and crime. To create safe campus communities, IHEs now face the modern day reality that they are both ethically and legally responsible to prepare for acts of violence. However, both preventing and responding to safety threats pose unique challenges to administrators such as adhering to privacy laws, preserving academic freedom, and addressing resistance to change.

In the weeks following the Virginia Tech tragedy, the administrators of the university came under scrutiny about the university’s response, its failure to identify the risk posed by Cho and what steps would have prevented this incident (Sokolow et al. 2008, 319). Several problems exist when applying risk management to a threat of random mass violence. The risk management model that many environments use relies on quantitative analysis of data. However, this model is difficult to apply to an assessment of random mass violence because the base rates are low and incident research is lacking.

Despite the significant increase in college enrollment, the likelihood that a student will be a victim of random mass violence is small. Based on research from the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s Uniform Crime Reporting program and records required under the Clery Act, between 2001-2005 colleges and universities reported seventy-six homicides (Fox and Savage
Most of these homicides involved acquaintance killings or disrupted drug deals, not mass random shootings (Fox and Savage 2009, 1468). In addition, over the past two decades, there have been only fourteen multiple shooting incidents on college campuses nationwide (Fox 2008).

In the monograph, “Assessing and Managing the Terrorism Threat” researchers propose employing a utilitarian qualitative risk management method to assess and manage terrorist threats (U.S. Department of Justice 2005, 2). It proposes creating a five-point scale and rubric for three primary risk assessment factors: criticality, threat, and vulnerability. Criticality explores the likely impact if an identified asset is lost or harmed by one of the unwanted events. Threat assesses how likely it is that an individual will attack those assets. Vulnerability addresses the most likely vulnerabilities the potential assailant will use to target the identified assets. The basic formula expresses the risk equation: Risk = Threat x Vulnerability x Criticality (U.S. Department of Justice 2005, 9). This model may provide a practical approach to risk management for IHEs to improve threat assessment efforts, as opposed to the purely mathematical methods of risk assessment. However, it is a daunting task for IHE officials to quantify the risk that an incident of random mass violence will occur to justify spending money to lower that risk.

The Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act

One of the most high-profile lawsuits brought against an IHE involved the rape and murder of Lehigh University freshman, Jeanne Clery, in her residence hall room. During the early morning hours of April 5, 1986, a fellow student, Joseph M. Henry, murdered Jeanne Clery in her dormitory room at Lehigh University (Lehigh) in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. Henry was a
known alcohol and drug abuser who gained access to her room by entering through three propped-open automatic locking doors. The motive for the murder was robbery and Jeanne had no previous interaction with her attacker (Gregory and Janosik 2003, 7; Janosik and Gregory 2003, 183).

Following that tragic crime, Clery’s parents sued the university based on the premise that campus administrators have a duty to protect their students from crime. During their court case, Clery’s parents learned troubling information about the university’s safety policies and procedures. During the time their daughter attended the university, it employed 12 security guards to protect its 5,400 students. Also Lehigh had been the site of thirty-eight violent offenses-including rape, robbery, and assault-in a three-year period (Gross and Fine 1990). The Clerys affirm that if they had known this information, they would have chosen to send Jeanne to a university with less criminal activity and better campus security. Lehigh University settled the case out of court for an undisclosed amount. Following the settlement, Jeanne Clery’s parents, founded Security On Campus, Incorporated, the first national, not-for-profit organization dedicated to preventing criminal violence at colleges and to helping campus victims nationwide (Gross and Fine 1990).

Eventually, the Clerys and others successfully lobbied for the passage of the “Crime Awareness and Campus Security Act of 1990” codified at 20 USC 1092 (f) as a part of the Higher Education Act of 1965. The purpose of the Act is to improve campus safety programs as well as campus police policies and procedures, to hinder postsecondary administrators’ ability to hide criminal activity, and to reduce crime (Gregory and Jonosik 2002, 21). President George
Herbert Walker Bush signed the Act on November 8, 1990 in response to increased awareness regarding campus safety among state and federal legislators during the late 1980s.

This Act is a federal law that requires IHEs to disclose timely and annual information about campus crime, security policies, and crime prevention programs. It requires IHEs who receive federal student financial aid provide timely warnings of crimes that pose a threat to campus safety. It also requires that campus security policies and crime data be collected, reported, and provided to the campus community, the public, and to the U.S. Department of Education yearly (Crime Awareness and Campus Security Act of 1990). Violators can be "fined" up to $27,500 or face other enforcement action by the U.S. Department of Education, the agency charged with enforcement of the Act (U.S. Department of Education 2005, 23; Rowe 2009, 48).

According to the Security on Campus website, the three critical requirements of the Clery Act mandate that postsecondary institutions who receive federal student financial aid 1) publish an annual report by October 1st that contains campus crime statistics for the past three years and certain security policy statements; 2) disclose crime statistics for the campus, unobstructed public areas immediately adjacent to or running through the campus, and certain non-campus facilities; and 3) provide "timely warnings" and a separate more extensive public crime log. To date, the U.S. Department of Education has declined to provide a definition of “timely reports.” However, it has advised that “timely reporting to the campus community. . . must be decided on a case-by-case basis, including factors such as the nature of the crime, the continuing danger to the campus community, and the possible risk of compromising law enforcement efforts” (American Association of State Colleges and Universities 2010, 5-7).
The public, including prospective students, are to be notified the report’s existence and provided direction on how to request a copy. Many institutions comply by using the Internet to e-mail the IHE’s community, by posting the report on the campus police department’s homepage, and by offering paper copies upon request. The report categorizes crimes into seven major categories: 1) criminal homicide, 2) sex offenses, 3) robbery, 4) aggravated assault, 5) burglary, 6) motor vehicle theft, and 7) arson. In addition, the Clery Act requires institutions to report three types of incidents if they result in either an arrest or disciplinary referral: 1) liquor law violations, 2) drug law violations, and 3) illegal weapons possession (Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act of 1998).

The Clery Act also requires institutions to notify students and employees of reported crimes and ongoing current threats by maintaining a daily crime log and issuing timely warnings. The daily crime log includes any crime that occurred on campus or is reported to the campus police. The crime log includes the nature, date, time, and general location of each crime. Campus police must add all reported and confirmed crimes to the daily log within two business days of the initial report. Unlike in the annual statistical report, there is no set list of crimes.

The Clery Act has been a controversial piece of legislation and has drawn both praise and significant criticism from the higher education community (Gregory and Janosik 2003, 763). Several problems exist regarding institutional compliance with the Clery Act. These issues include institutional reluctance to publish negative information, and a lack of guidance from the U.S. Department of Education about proper compliance procedures (Carter 2002, 24). Specifically administrators and officials believe the release of high crime statistics will have adverse affects on alumni donations and school enrollment (Griffaton 1993, 531). Much policy
debate revolves around what types of criminal activity campus law enforcement must report, which school properties and geographically close areas are included, and what academic and co-curricular programs are covered under the Clery Act (Janosik and Gregory 2003, 197).

According to a study of the International Association of College Law Enforcement, campus law enforcement officials credit the Clery Act with improving crime reporting practices and improving crime prevention programs. However, most think it has had little impact on campus crime or changing student behavior (Janosik and Gregory 2003, 183). Several researchers have examined the impact of this legislation on IHE campuses. Gerhing and Callaway found that college administrators were still unclear about compliance issues (1997, 18). Janosik and Gerhing found most students are unaware of the Clery Act, do not read the mandated reports, and do not use crime information in their personal decision-making (2003, 83).

After conducting a program review of Virginia Tech’s compliance with certain provisions of the Clery Act, the U.S. Department of Education issued a report on December 9, 2010. The report states that Virginia Tech violated the Clery Act’s timely warning provision by waiting more than two hours to notify the campus after the first two shootings in West Ambler Hall. In addition, Virginia Tech did not follow its own policy for the issuance of timely warning as published in its annual campus security reports. The Program Review Report acknowledges that what constitutes a reasonable amount of time to provide timely warning varies, depending on the crime and circumstances. However, it states that “it is not reasonable to wait two hours to issue a warning when the circumstances of a murder are not known and at a time when thousands of students and staff members are arriving on campus” (U.S. Department of Education 2010, 19). In addition, “Virginia Tech’s failure to issue timely warnings about the serious and ongoing
threat on April 16, 2007 deprived its students and employees of vital, time-sensitive information and denied them the opportunity to take adequate steps to provide for their own safety,” the report states (U.S. Department of Education 2010, 25).

According to Virginia Tech’s annual Campus Safety Report, the Virginia Tech Police Department (VTPD) had the authority to prepare and disseminate timely warnings that represented a threat to the campus community. In fact, the university’s relations office was central to the dissemination of a timely warning notice because the VTPD did not have access to the computer code necessary to send out the warning. Because the University did not notify its students, faculty, staff, or the U.S. Department of Education of the University’s office responsible to issue the warning, the reviewers determined that Virginia Tech did not comply with its own timely warning policy published in its annual campus security report (U.S. Department of Education 2010, 23-26).

Whether or not one agrees with the need or the effectiveness of the legislation, the Clery Act has increased awareness of crime and campus safety on American college campuses. The Clery Act has achieved its fundamental purpose, the reporting of campus crime. It has made IHEs accountable for creating detailed crime reporting procedures and has increased the transparency of administrator’s work, by making campus crime statistics accessible to the public. The Clery Act has fostered discussion on campus safety within the higher education community and between it and the public. Passing this legislation established the increased responsibility that colleges and universities bear in creating safe collegiate environments for students, faculty, and staff.
### Table 2.1. History of the Crime Awareness and Campus Security Act of 1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amendments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Required IHEs participating in federal student aid programs to disclose 3 years worth of campus crime statistics and security policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Changed initial collection of statistics from September 1, 1991 to August 1, 1991 and changed crime statistics reporting period from school year to calendar year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Established the Campus Sexual Assault Victims’ Bill of Rights that requires schools to provide certain basic rights to survivors of sexual assaults on campus including giving the alleged victim and the alleged assailant equal opportunity to have others present in disciplinary proceedings. Required institutions to notify alleged victims of counseling services and of their right to pursue remedies through local police as well as notify alleged victims of the alternative of changing classes and dorms to avoid their alleged assailants. Excluded campus law enforcement records from coverage under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (FERPA) Provided that disclosure of the outcome of campus disciplinary proceedings concerning sexual assault to the victim and accused is not a violation of FERPA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Added new categories to the crime statistics, an obligation to report statistics for public property in and immediately adjacent to the campus, a geographic breakdown of statistics, and a daily public crime log for schools with a police or security department. Required the Department of Education to centrally collect the crime statistics and make them publicly available. Renamed the law “The Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act” in memory of Jeanne Clery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Added notice of where public sex offender registration information about offenders on campus may be obtained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Required IHEs to have official written emergency response and evacuation procedures and include a statement that the institution will “immediately notify the campus community upon the confirmation of a significant emergency or dangerous situation involving an immediate threat to the health or safety of students or staff” on campus. Required IHEs to include emergency notification procedures and state they must issue emergency notifications &quot;without delay, and taking into account the safety of the community.&quot; The only exception is if doing so would &quot;compromise efforts to assist a victim or to contain, respond to, or otherwise mitigate the emergency&quot; Required IHEs to publish procedures on how to notify the campus community of emergencies and conduct a yearly drill to test, assess, and adjust emergency procedures. The process for determining the content of the notifications and initiating the notification system must also be disclosed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mass murders such as the Virginia Tech tragedy and similar violent events make the public ask whether the balance of individual liberty and preserving public safety is correct. However, the complex issue of promoting student mental health, privacy, and public safety has been a constant concern for college administrators, educational policymakers and local, state, and federal officials (McBain 2008, 1).

The primary federal laws that apply to students with mental health issues and how institutions treat them are subparts of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA). FERPA protects the privacy of students’ “education records” and applies to any educational agency or institution that receives funds from the U.S. Department of Education (Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974). The U.S. Department of Education broadly defines the term “education records” to include those records 1) directly related to a student, and 2) maintained by an educational agency or institution or by a party acting for the agency or institution (Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974). The Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA) Privacy Rule requires covered entities to protect individuals’ health records and other identifiable health information by establishing safeguards to protect privacy and setting limits on the disclosure of such information without patient authorization (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services et al. 2008 2; Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996).

FERPA and HIPAA have varying scopes and limits, and do not mesh smoothly. However, they can intersect in an individual student’s education records if the student has seen a
college or university mental health counselor. After the Virginia Tech shootings, university
administrators cited federal privacy laws as a reason information-sharing had not taken place
among different Virginia Tech administrative offices regarding Cho’s alarming behavior.
According to the Virginia Tech Review Panel, “The panel’s review of information privacy laws
governing mental health, law enforcement, and educational records and information revealed
widespread lack of understanding, conflicting practice, and laws that were poorly designed to
accomplish their goals…The widespread perception is that information privacy laws make it
difficult to respond effectively to troubled students” (2007, 63).

In 2009, the Department of Education changed existing FERPA regulations to provide
colleges with some discretion regarding how they protect the health and safety of students and
others. The most significant change is the health-and-safety exception. If the institution
determines a significant threat exists, it may disclose educational records to any person whose
knowledge of the information is necessary to protect the health and safety of the student or other
individuals. The institution must make a record of (1) the significant threat that formed the basis
for such disclosure and (2) the parties to whom information was disclosed (Ward 2008, 419).

Despite the recent changes to federal privacy legislation, the intricate nuances of federal
privacy law and the unspecific federal guidance on how to interpret the law, IHEs have
legitimate reasons for being conservative in interpreting the law. Unfortunately, a risk-averse
institutional policy can result in the lack of valuable information-sharing within the organization.
This can cause others to avoid intervening in a troubled individual’s life and can have potentially
lethal outcomes (McBain 2008, 4).
Higher education policymakers must create policies broad enough to address the more frequent on-campus crimes, such as underage drinking or burglary, but also prepare for incidents of random mass violence. In addition, campus safety policies must address crime prevention and response. This combined with difficulty in evaluating crime prevention policy characterized by incident prevention, creates unique challenges for college administrators and educational policymakers. Reflective thinking about threat assessment in an educational environment as well as other areas such as banking, public health, and military affairs has been developing for many years. The incident at Columbine High School, the terrorist attacks against the United States on 9/11 in 2001, other mass shootings, and the incident at Virginia Tech have provided a jump start for the application of the threat assessment model in IHEs. The process of assessing at-risk behaviors in an academic community does not occur in a vacuum. Elements of disturbing and threatening behavior tend to pervade a given student’s campus experience (i.e., interactions with staff, faculty, and other students). Staff, faculty, and students who witness apparently unconventional or bizarre student conduct on campus often ignore or dismiss it as an isolated occurrence and these observed behaviors (which often harbor an escalation of more disturbing behavior) remain unreported and untracked.

The 2007 shooting at Virginia Tech, and subsequent reports and legislation, underscore the necessity for colleges and universities to formulate proactive, coordinated, and systematic initiatives in an effort to remedy distressing behavior at its onset. The primary recommendation from the Virginia Tech reports regards threat assessment teams as pivotal in preventing incidents of random mass violence at educational institutions. Nearly all of the major reports on campus safety issued after the shootings at Virginia Tech advocated for colleges and universities to adapt
the threat assessment model. One of the key components of the threat assessment model is to develop and train campus threat assessment teams to prevent attacks at IHEs (Randazzo and Plumber 2009, 3).

This chapter summarizes the unique challenges associated with balancing public safety and individual privacy in higher education and describes key federal privacy legislation’s impact on campus safety policy development. The following chapter provides a historical perspective of the evolution of the threat assessment model as a tool to prevent acts of random mass violence in educational environments.
CHAPTER 3
THE THREAT ASSESSMENT MODEL

For decades the U.S. Secret Service has used a threat assessment model to prevent assassination of public officials and public figures. This model serves as the foundation for college and university policy to reduce threats of random mass violence. One of the critical recommendations in Mass Shootings at Virginia Tech: Report of the Review Panel and the Report to the President on Issues Raised by the Virginia Tech Tragedy, involves establishment of a threat assessment team to intervene and to mitigate a potential threat to campus safety. Therefore, it is important to explore the theoretical constructs of threat assessment as well as to review significant government reports that provide a conceptual framework for preventing random mass violence at IHEs.

Federal Research Studies

The Exceptional Case Study Project

In 1998, the U.S. Secret Service completed the Exceptional Case Study Project (ECSP) to create knowledge on both physical protection and protective intelligence. This is the first study designed to help law enforcement agencies to prevent an attack from occurring by gathering information about those people who intend to commit targeted violence against either an individual or group. In addition, researchers define targeted violence as “situations in which there is an identified (or identifiable) target and an identified (or identifiable) perpetrator” (Fein
and Vossekuil 1999, 332). The ECSP is a study of eighty-three people in the United States who have attacked or approached to attack a “prominent person of public status” in the United States in seventy-four separate incidents from 1949 to 1996 (Fein and Vossekuil 1999, 321).

Researchers gathered information on each incident by analyzing case files, including trial transcripts and mental health records, historical data, and by conducting subject interviews. Although researchers gathered demographic information, unlike most studies on assassinations that focus on characteristics or profiling, this study focuses on the thoughts and behaviors of the subjects before their attacks or near-attacks.

In 80 percent of the incidents, the subjects engaged in planning before committing their attack or approach. The amount of time planning varied among the subjects from several years to several weeks. Difficulty exists regarding how to determine what “triggered” the individual to move from planning to initiate the attack, but over half of the subjects had experienced a major loss or life change in the year before the described incident. In two-thirds of the incidents, regardless of the time frame planning, the subjects communicated, either implicitly or explicitly, their plans to a friend, family member, or to an individual known to the target (Fein and Vossekuil 1999, 326-327).

Although many individuals had histories of serious depression or other mental illness, fewer than 50 percent showed any symptom of mental illness just before the attack or near-lethal approaches. All could think clearly enough to organize and attempt to carry out an attack on a prominent person of public status (Fein and Vossekuil 1999, 331). Although the courts consider mental illness to decide criminal responsibility after the incident has occurred, mental illness is a less relevant factor when trying to prevent an attack (Fein and Vossekuil 1999, 331).
addition, experts describe attackers and near-attackers as social isolates who have exhibited “stalking” behaviors toward individuals in the past. Few subjects had been arrested for violent crime or for crimes that involved weapons, but many were known to have attempted to kill themselves or had suicidal ideation at some time before the incident (Fein and Vossekuil 1999, 326).

One of the key findings of the ECSP was that many attacks are potentially preventable (Fein and Vossekuil 1999, 332). Because perpetrators often engage in pre-incident patterns of thinking and behavior, those with protective responsibilities can manage the potential threat and move to prevent future attacks. It can be challenging to identify the suggestive behaviors of those who may plan or carry out targeted violence because many of those who exhibit such behavior have no intention of committing mass violence. Although the ECSP focused on public figures, others can apply this model to different defined targets, such as a specific individual, a group or category of individual, or as in targeted school violence, the school itself.

*The Safe School Initiative*

Following the shootings at Columbine High School in 1999, the U.S. Secret Service and the Department of Education began to study the thinking, planning, and other pre-incident behaviors of perpetrators of school shootings. In 2002, they published their findings in a report called the Safe School Initiative (SSI). The SSI’s objective was to identify information that existed before an attack, to analyze the information and to communicate these findings to policymakers who could create strategies to prevent school-based attacks (U.S. Secret Service and U.S. Department of Education 2002, 3). The study defined “targeted school violence” as any incident where a current or former student attacked someone at his or her school with lethal
means and where the student attacker purposefully chose his or her school as the attack location (U.S. Secret Service and U.S. Department of Education 2002, 7).

Researchers identified thirty-seven incidents of targeted school violence involving forty-one attackers that occurred in the United States from 1974 to June 2000 (U.S. Secret Service and U.S. Department of Education 2002, 8). Researchers gathered information by the analysis of investigative, school, court, and mental health records as well as interviews with ten of the perpetrators in the incidents. The report found that although no accurate profile of a perpetrator existed, most attackers engaged in some pre-attack behaviors that caused others concern or signaled a need for help. Most attackers had difficulty coping with significant loss or personal failure and had often attempted suicide. In addition, the SSI supported the ECSP findings that incidents of targeted violence were not impulsive acts and that others were aware of the attacker’s idea or plan to attack a specific target. According to the SSI, in over three-quarters of the incidents, at least one person had information that the attacker was thinking about or planning an attack (U.S. Secret Service and U.S. Department of Education 2002, 25). Taken together, these findings suggest that it may be possible to prevent some future school attacks from occurring, and the threat assessment model is an effective strategy to reduce campus violence.  

**The School Shooter: A Threat Assessment Perspective**

In 2004, researchers designed a working model for threat assessment and intervention that educators, mental health professionals, and law enforcement agencies could use and published it in the monograph *The School Shooter: A Threat Assessment Perspective*. It differs from previous behavioral-based research because it provided a framework for evaluating a threat and created a four-pronged assessment approach that defines a process to determine the
likelihood that an individual will carry out the threat. However, predicting what leads an offender to target random victims, such as Virginia Tech’s lone gunman, remains a complex, difficult challenge. Researchers created this model from concepts developed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s National Center for the Analysis of Violent Crime (NVAC), a review of eighteen school shooting cases and ideas formed at a NVAC symposium in 1999. Symposium attendees included teachers and administrators from all eighteen schools involved in the study as well as police from each investigation (Federal Bureau of Investigation and the U.S. Department of Justice 1999, 1).

In the study, researchers defined a threat as an “expression of intent to do harm or act out violently against someone or something” (Federal Bureau of Investigation and the U.S. Department of Justice 1999, 6). Unfortunately, not everyone who made a threat posed a threat. This report tried to make that distinction. It classified threats into four primary categories: a direct threat, an indirect threat, a veiled threat, or a conditional threat. A direct threat identifies a specific act against a specific target and poses an imminent and serious danger to the safety of others. This is the highest rated threat because it implies the individual has taken part in some planning. An indirect threat is ambiguous and merely suggests that a threat could occur. “If I wanted to, I could blow up this building” is an example of an indirect threat. Although it implies violence, there is no strong signal the individual has prepared to carry out the threat. A veiled threat strongly implies but does not directly threaten violence and a conditional threat warns that a violence act will happen if an individual does not meet certain demands (Federal Bureau of Investigation and the U.S. Department of Justice 1999, 7-9). Although the likelihood the individual will carry out the threat varies within each category, administrators, and law
enforcement should evaluate each case using a threat assessment model to decide how to manage the associated risk.

Individuals can use the four-pronged assessment model as a tool to assess someone who has made a threat and evaluates the risk associated with that threat. This model proposes a holistic approach that considers all aspects of the potential attacker’s life to evaluate risk. The four prongs are the individual’s personality, family dynamics, school dynamics, and social dynamics (Federal Bureau of Investigation and the U.S. Department of Justice 1999, 10). While this model may provide a basic framework for assessing risk at schools, it significantly relies on the subjective judgments of the assessors. For example, it is difficult for an individual to assess changes in a student’s personality if he or she does not know the student before he or she made the threat.


In response to the recommendations of the _Report to the President on Issues Raised by the Virginia Tech Tragedy_ released in 2007, the U.S. Department of Education, in collaboration with the U.S. Secret Service and the Department of Justice, released the preliminary findings of their research partnership in a report titled _Campus Attacks: Targeted Violence Affecting Institutions of Higher Education_. The report defines the scope of the problem of targeted violence in IHEs. The primary focus of the report is to learn from historical incidents to create a practical tool for campus administrators to identify, assess, and manage threats of violence at IHEs (U.S. Secret Service et al. 2010, 1).

The agencies researched a broad range of incidents that have affected IHEs. Because the definition of targeted violence was broad and lacked the specificity needed for the report,
researchers defined the term “directed assaults” to meet the study’s purpose. Directed assaults met the following criteria: 1) the subject(s) selected were specific and random IHE students, employees or facilities, 2) the target(s) was selected prior to the initiation of the assault or the target(s) was selected at the time of the assault based on a victim profile of pre-existing relationship, 3) the subject(s) employed or had the present ability to employ lethal force, and 4) the incident occurred between January 1, 1900 and December 31, 2008, on-campus, off-campus or in/around a campus facility within the United States (U. S. Secret Service et al. 2010, 8). Researchers identified incidents from open-source reporting from resources available on the Internet, published documents, databases, and newspaper articles; 272 incidents met the stated criteria for a directed assault (U.S. Secret Service et al. 2010, 11). The researcher submitted a request under the Freedom of Information Act and was provided a list of the descriptions of the directed assaults in this study that occurred from 1970-2008 (Appendix C).

Most of incidents occurred during the 1990s and 2000s. A possible cause for this trend may be increased student enrollment at IHEs and the extensive media coverage of directed assaults over the past decades. While analyzing demographic data is a relatively mechanical process, discovering, and measuring what motivated or triggered the attacker can be complex. To simplify the process the researchers used four broad categories: personal relations, academic performance, workplace issues, and individual stressors. The most prevalent category (33.9%) identified related to current or former personal relationships between the subject and the victim, followed by retaliation for specific actions (13.7%) (U.S. Secret Service et al. 2010, 18).

According to the report, incidents of targeted violence were a year-round issue. Therefore, administrators need to budget campus safety resources throughout the calendar year,
not just during the academic year. In the majority of the incidents, the subjects acted alone and 94 percent of those subjects were male. 20 percent of the incidents took place off-campus but targeted IHE members. This finding highlights the need for communication links between campus police and municipal law enforcement. In 75 percent of the incidents, the subject used a firearm or bladed weapon. Three primary elements influenced the attackers’ intent in target selection: these are interpersonal relationships, personal stressors, and triggering events. In nearly 75 percent of the incidents noted in this study, the offender targeted one or more specific individuals (U.S. Secret Service et al. 2010, 24).

The common theme throughout each of these reports is how law enforcement, the government, and IHEs can learn from the tragedy that occurred at Virginia Tech. Each provides recommendations to improve the existing federal and state privacy legislation, the communication structure with IHEs, and increased effectiveness in the identification and subsequent intervention of those who pose a threat to campus safety. The concept of threat assessment emerges from these three reports as they describe how to respond to incidents of targeted violence and how to prevent them. The goal of threat assessment efforts is to identify, assess, and manage persons who have the interest and ability to commit a violent attack on others.

**A Comprehensive Behavioral Intervention and Threat Assessment (CUBIT) Model**

Prior to the early 1990s, there were three basic approaches to evaluating the risk of targeted violence in IHEs: 1) profiling, 2) structured clinical assessment by a counselor or psychiatrist, and 3) automated decision making (Reddy et al. 2001, 160). Each of these approaches has limitations and some researchers argue that they are inappropriate— even harmful—
when used as a method to prevent campus-based attacks (Sokolow and Lewis 2009, 2; Borum et al 1999, 324-325; Reddy et al 2001, 169). Before the Virginia Tech incident, most experts centered their discussions of risk management practices in higher education environments and on insurance practices within these organizations. However, in the aftermath of the Virginia Tech shootings, IHE officials began to design measures to address the risks posed by individuals with a propensity for violent behavior.

One of the critical recommendations Mass Shootings at Virginia Tech: Report of the Review Panel is that IHEs establish a threat assessment team that includes representatives from law enforcement, human resources, student, and academic affairs, legal counsel, and mental health functions. Administrators should empower the team to take actions such as additional investigation, gathering background information, identification of additional dangerous warning signs, establishing a threat potential risk level (one to ten) for a case, preparing a case for hearings, and disseminating warning information (The Virginia Tech Review Panel 2009, 2). In response to this recommendation, The National Center for Higher Education Risk Management (NCHERM) developed a threat assessment model, the College and University Behavioral Intervention Team (CUBIT), to address issues related to threat identification and behavioral intervention designed for IHEs (Sokolow and Hughes 2008, 6).

The foundation of the CUBIT model is establishing a Behavioral Intervention Team composed of key university administrators including representatives from student affairs, counseling services, law enforcement, and residence life. The goal of the team is to track individuals who exhibit “red flag” behaviors and proactively intervene before a crisis arises.
Sokolow and Hughes define “red flags” as warning signals raised by student behaviors that come to the attention of the members of the campus community (2010, 7).

The model develops a rubric for classifying students in distress into specific levels of criticality, warranting various levels of escalating intervention. The classification system includes five ascending categories including mild risk, moderate risk, elevated risk, severe risk, and extreme risk. The CUBIT member who is the designated contact for that case assigns the classification level. IHE officials encourage team members to follow the guidelines for objective evaluation of threats established by the U.S. Secret Service and the Department of Education (Fein, Vossekuil and Holden 1995; Sokolow and Hughes 2008, 17). Once classified, the CUBIT deploys the intervention techniques and strategies appropriate to that level of the rubric. Information regarding the case and subsequent intervention is kept in an on-campus database to ensure proper follow-up action is taken if necessary (Sokolow and Hughes 2008, 14).

Increased national attention to the problem of random mass violence on college campuses has prompted administrators, educational policymakers and the public to ask two central questions: “Could we have known these attacks were being planned?” and if so, “What could we precautions could have been taken to prevent them from occurring?” The threat assessment model emerges from the studies outlined above as the primary tool that can prevent future incidents of random mass violence from occurring on college and university campuses. Threat assessment requires a new way of thinking. It shifts away from establishing a “profile” of a perpetrator of violence and focuses rather on the dynamic interaction among the individual, a stimulus or triggering condition, target, and the setting (Fein and Vossekuil 1995, 3; Reddy et al. 2001, 167).
College and university administrators face challenges collecting, assessing, disseminating, and acting on information about threats posed by individuals who may commit acts of random mass violence. Interpreting state and federal privacy laws and fear of litigation may hinder an institution from taking the proper measures to manage the threat. The challenge lies in preserving campus safety while also fostering academic freedom and creativity, and protecting student privacy. The lack of policy implementation research within higher education, the inability to quantify the risks or impact associated with an incident of random mass violence and state and federal privacy laws make meeting these demands challenging and complex.

Therefore, even though the likelihood of an incident of random mass violence occurring at his or her institution is extremely low, IHE officials must remain vigilant in creating effective campus safety policies because the potential damages can be significant. Each of the studies outlined above contribute to the evolution of a threat assessment model that can be applied to the higher education environment.

Practical application of the threat assessment model by IHEs is essential to successful implementation of the critical Virginia Tech reports’ recommendations. Because the tragedy at Virginia Tech instantly changed how college and university administrators, students, and parents viewed campus safety at IHEs, the information in these reports is critical to improving the safety and security of college and university campuses. This chapter provides a historical perspective of the evolution of the threat assessment model as a tool to prevent acts of random mass violence in educational environments. The following chapter describes the methodology of the IHE policy analysis and the case studies used in the research study.
CHAPTER 4

METHODOLOGY

Both the quantitative and the qualitative data gathered for this study evaluated the extent to which public universities and public community colleges in Central Texas have incorporated critical, post-Virginia Tech recommendations into their campus safety policies and explored how an institution uses the threat assessment model to translate these policies into meaningful campus safety programs and services. Two primary research questions guided this study. The researcher utilized these questions to glean information about the campus safety policies and programs at IHEs in the wake of recent campus violence. In this study, the following exploratory questions guide the research framework:

1. How have public universities and community colleges in Central Texas incorporated the critical post-Virginia Tech recommendations into their campus safety policies?

2. How do public universities and community colleges in Central Texas implement policies to address random mass violence?

This study used a mixed method exploratory research design. The researcher selected this research design because mixed methods offer strengths that offset the weaknesses of separately applied quantitative and qualitative research methods (Creswell and Clark 2007, 6).

The quantitative component involved analysis that measures the extent to which IHEs have incorporated critical recommendations from Mass Shootings at Virginia Tech: Report of the Review Panel presented to Governor Timothy M. Kaine and The Report to the President on
Issues Raised by the Virginia Tech Tragedy. The researcher analyzed the websites of thirty-two selected IHEs in Central Texas to collect data about the integration of those critical recommendations into their campus safety policies and programs. This component of the study will be referred to as the IHE policy analysis. The qualitative component involved case studies of two institutions in the IHE policy analysis sample, these case studies were based on fourteen interviews with various individuals within the institutions, the purpose being to gather subjective data concerning implementation of their policies into meaningful campus safety programs and services. The interview data was collected and analyzed to find common themes that related to managing, preventing, and responding to incidents of random mass violence.

Policy Analysis and Research Questions

Although most of the existing literature on policy implementation analysis focuses on government policies and federal agencies in charge of implementation, implementation analysis is critical to policy success in any large, complex set of institutions. In this study two important levels of implementation are analyzed: 1) the integration of the critical post Virginia Tech incident reports’ recommendations into IHE’s formal safety policies and 2) the incorporation of these policies into the working mechanisms of the IHEs’ campus cultures.

The failure of IHE officials to anticipate implementation problems that may arise during policy development may lead to failure to achieve the desired objectives, increased costs, and organizational backlash against the institution enacting the policies. Despite the importance of policy implementation analysis, no general accepted methodology exists that policymakers can easily use (Weaver 2010, 2). One explanation for this gap in the literature is that defining the
many variables needed to complete an implementation analysis is difficult- if not impossible (Van Meter and Van Horn 1975, 451).

Policy implementation encompasses those actions by individuals or groups to achieve policy objectives (Van Meter and Van Horn 1975, 447). According to Pressman and Wildavsky, “implementation should not be divorced from policy” (1973, 143). Ideally, policymakers identify the problem to be addressed, the objectives to be met, and define the implementation process during policy formulation. However, often policymakers neglect implementation analysis because they assume that once a policy has been created and implemented, the desired results of the policy expected outcomes will be achieved. Policy implementation analysis is analytically difficult. Because policy ideas are in the abstract, they are subject to a variety of contingencies, and contain many possible practical applications (Majone and Wildavsky, 1978, 113). In addition, implementation analysis of a policy that does not yet exist or is in early development, requires policymakers to extrapolate from existing evidence and translate the evidence to provide useful results (Weaver 2010, 8).

R. Kent Weaver, in the article “But Will It Work?: Implementation Analysis to Improve Government Performance,” provides a useful protocol for implementation analysis that is applicable to the higher education environment (2010, 9). To begin, IHE officials must analyze the specific implementation tasks likely to be required by a particular policy proposal. This can be challenging if the specifics of the policy have yet to be determined. Some degree of ambiguity in the policy is useful because it may be necessary to ensure a positive response from the implementing agents. Being too specific can limit the implementing agents’ ability to adapt to unforeseen developments (Van Meter and Van Horn 1975, 464; Weaver 2010, 3). However,
implementation analysis requires the identification of measurable goals and objectives since “implementation cannot succeed or fail without a goal against which to judge it” (Pressman and Wildavsky 1973, xiv).

IHE officials should then gather preliminary evidence on which implementation challenges are likely to arise in a particular policy proposal and to create the most serious barriers to successful implementation. A major focus of the implementation analysis is to conduct a realistic assessment of the financial resources, human capital, and technological capacities needed for effective implementation of programs for the proposed policy. Some IHEs may have sufficient unused resources to make the necessary changes without affecting other programs; whereas others must find new resources from another external source (Montjoy and O’Toole 1979, 466). In addition to resource and organizational capacity issues, other implementation problems include interpretation issues, coordination issues, timeline issues, and program operator issues (Weaver 2010, 14-15).

By conducting a detailed analysis of key risks, IHE officials can prepare for possible implementation challenges likely to arise in practice. Evidence gathered during this stage will take many forms, depending on the implementation task to be analyzed. For example, analyzing interpretation issues requires an analysis of the policy’s clarity of direction, language, and goals. Effective implementation requires that a policy’s objectives be understood by those individuals responsible for their achievement. Implementing agents cannot carry out objectives unless they know what is expected of them (Van Meter and Van Horn 1975, 466).

To increase institutional support among individuals responsible for carrying out the policy directives, IHE officials should report the key implementation risks with options for
changes and potential strategic responses. Organizations do not implement change; individuals within the organization implement change (McLaughlin 1987, 174). The extent to which individuals have participated in the making of a policy decision impacts their goal consensus and thus policy implementation. Participation leads to higher morale, greater commitment, and increased clarity about the change; all of which is necessary for successful implementation (Gross, Giacquinta, and Bernstein 1971, 24-29). In addition, the probability of effective implementation depends on the type of policy being considered and is most successful when the policy requires marginal change (Van Meter and Van Horn, 1975, 461). By identifying many recurring implementation problems, anticipating their occurrence, and formulating strategies to overcome potential problems, IHE officials can lessen the likelihood of unsuccessful policy implementation.

Implementation analysis moves beyond the measurement of impacts of policy to explanations for these observed outcomes. It is valuable when IHE officials focus on the effects of policies on the problems at which they are directed. However, this provides limited insight about how the policy decisions are transformed into programs or services. While impact studies typically ask “What happened?” implementation studies ask “Why did it happen this way?” (Van Meter and Van Horn 1975, 447-448). Systematic, detailed, and sustained implementation analysis alerts IHE officials to issues they can manipulate or restructure to improve the delivery of programs or services.

The Virginia Tech reports themselves incorporate many of Weaver’s suggestions for implementation analysis. This study added a different dimension to IHE’s implementation of the Virginia Tech recommendations, dividing it into two distinct parts. First, it analyzed how a
sample of IHEs has implemented specific recommendations made in the Virginia Tech reports into their safety policies. Second, this study examined the extent to which these policies have been integrated into the everyday culture of the IHEs and thus become, at least in one sense, operational.

**IHE Policy Analysis**

The first part of the study the researcher measures to what extent a sample of public universities and public community colleges in Central Texas have incorporated elements designed to reduce the threats of random mass violence into their campus safety policies. In this study, “policy” refers to formal, public, campus safety policies. The term also encompasses secondary directives, guidance, and formal organizational and structural relationships between various college and university offices, and the duties of particular individuals established by the policies. In particular, critical campus safety and emergency response recommendations emerged from the reports, *Mass Shootings at Virginia Tech: Report of the Review Panel* presented to Governor Timothy M. Kaine and *The Report to the President on Issues Raised by the Virginia Tech Tragedy*. The reports contained over 100 recommendations directed at a wide variety of entities including: local, state and federal agencies; mental health legislation; emergency medical services, IHEs, and Virginia’s Office of the Chief Medical Examiner (Appendices A and B). Approximately, fifteen of the recommendations apply to colleges and universities. However, only five critical recommendations related directly to the prevention of and response to acts of random mass violence. The researcher defines “critical” as those recommendations that provide benefit IHEs to respond and prevent future incidents of random mass violence. The five recommendations are as follows:
VT1 - Have a threat assessment team (TAT) that includes representatives from law enforcement, human resources, student and academic affairs, legal counsel, and mental health functions. IHE officials should empower the team to take actions such as additional investigation, gathering background information, identification of additional dangerous warning signs and establishing a threat potential risk level for a case.

VT2 - Establish and publicize widely a mechanism to report threats of violence.

VT3 - Design a mission statement for campus police that gives primacy to their law enforcement and crime prevention role.

VT4 - Comply with critical Clery Act requirements that include reporting of crime statistics and a timely public warning system to inform the campus community of imminent danger.

VT5 - Communicate emergency response plans to all school officials, school service workers, parents, students, and first responders.

Population

The sample for analysis includes eleven public universities and twenty-one public community colleges located in Central Texas. The researcher chose public community colleges and public universities because the two types of institutions have common challenges in providing a safe campus environment. The researcher chose this geographic region because it includes a diverse sample of public universities and public community colleges of varying location, enrollment, and governing structures (Appendix D, E and F). For example, The University of Texas at Austin, Texas A&M University at College Station, and Austin Community College combined enroll more than 137,547 students, while Tarrant County College- Trinity River, Texas A&M University Central Texas, and The University of North Texas at Dallas combined enroll less than 8,000 students (Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board). The University of Texas at Dallas, Collin College, and The University of Texas at Arlington are in the Dallas Fort Worth Metroplex, while Blinn College, McLennan Community
College, and Tarleton State University are in rural areas. The University of Texas System, Dallas County Community College System, and The Texas A&M System include several colleges and universities, while Hill College, Grayson County College, and Texas Woman’s University are independent IHEs.

Instrumentation

To conduct the analysis for this study, the researcher collected relevant data by locating and evaluating formal IHEs’ policies found on each institution’s website. For most IHEs, the website is the most widely used tool used to disseminate information to both the campus community and the public. Relevant policies were on the student services and campus police department homepages of the website. However, the researcher discovered during data collection that some IHEs did not include information about the establishment of threat assessment teams on their website. Because the establishment of threat assessment teams is such a critical component of an IHE’s safety policy, the researcher contacted representatives from both the campus police department and student services of such colleges and universities by phone, to verify whether the institution had a threat assessment team.

To compare relevant IHE policies accurately, the researcher developed a simple measuring instrument. After an initial examination of their websites, the researcher found that a simple binary “yes or no” response of evidence to an IHE’s compliance with the recommendations was inadequate. Instead a scale was developed for each of the five recommendations and points, ranging from zero to three, were assigned for various stages of compliance. Consequently, the highest score attainable was fifteen points and the lowest, zero points. To test reliability of the evaluation instrument, ten individuals tested the IHE Policy
Analysis evaluation instrument by evaluating the websites of a sample of institutions and the results were consistent with the researcher’s analysis.

The researcher developed a rationale for the point allocation for each recommendation. For VT1, the researcher determined if the IHE had a threat assessment team (TAT). If so, the IHE received one point. The researcher measured the threat assessment teams’ utility by determining if it had a stated purpose with established process guidelines. For example, an IHE that had a TAT without a stated mission or purpose would score two points, while an IHE that had a stated mission or purpose with process guidelines would receive three points.

Most institutions had a police department to maintain campus safety. However, VT2 states that IHEs should establish and “publicize widely” the mechanisms to report threats of violence. Because the website serves as the primary tool to disseminate information to the campus community and the public, the researcher scored each IHE by the number of links on their website designed to report potential threats to safety.

VT3 addresses not only the traditional law enforcement role of campus police departments, but also their crime prevention role. The recommendation states the mission statement of campus police departments recognize this dual purpose. If an IHE’s campus police department had a mission statement, it received one point. If an IHE’s police department had a mission statement that referenced its law enforcement role only, it received two points. However, if the mission statement of the campus police department referenced both its law enforcement and crime prevention role, it received the highest score, three points.

Although the Clery Act includes many legal requirements for IHEs, for the purpose of this study the researcher focused on two primary areas of compliance: 1) the reporting of crime
statistics and 2) the establishment of a timely public warning system to inform the campus community of an imminent danger (VT4). The researcher chose these areas because the primary requirement of the Clery Act mandates IHEs that receive federal funding to disclose annual information about campus crime and security policies. In 2008, as a response to the Virginia Tech incident, President George W. Bush amended the Act requiring all IHEs have a timely public warning system to inform the campus community of an imminent danger. If an IHE did not comply with these requirements by providing the information on their website, the IHE received zero points. If the IHE reported its annual campus crime statistics, the IHE received one point. If the IHE reported its annual campus crime statistics, had a public warning system with one method to timely warn of imminent danger, the IHE received two points. However, if the IHE reported campus crime statistics and their public warning system included with multiple methods to timely warn of imminent danger, the IHE received three points.

In addition, the 2008 amendments required IHEs to include written emergency response plans (ERP) in their annual report to the U.S. Department of Education. While the Clery Act does not require these plans be publicly available, VT5 addresses the communication of emergency response plans to all school officials, school service workers, parents, students, and first responders. Therefore, an IHE may reference their emergency response plan on their website but not publically disseminate the information. Because the institution’s website is the primary communication resource for the campus community, the researcher measured the level of communication of the emergency response plans by their accessibility on the website. If an IHE did not have an ERP on its website, it received zero points. If the IHE website referenced its ERP, it received one point. If the ERP is publically available on the website, the IHE
received two points. If the IHEs’ ERP was publically available and was detailed and comprehensive, it received a score of three points.

Table 4.1. IHE Policy Analysis Evaluation Instrument

| VT1 | Have a threat assessment team (TAT) that includes representatives from law enforcement, human resources, student and academic affairs, legal counsel, and mental health functions. | 0 pts. Does not have a TAT  
1 pt. Has a TAT  
2 pts. TAT has stated mission/purpose  
3 pts. TAT has stated mission/purpose with process guidelines |
| VT2 | Establish and publicize widely a mechanism to report threats of violence. | 0 pts. Does not have an established process to report or respond to threats  
1 pt. Has one link on website to report potential threats  
2 pts. Has more than one link on website to report potential threats  
3 pts. Has more than one link on website to report potential threats and link is easily accessible |
| VT3 | Design a mission statement for campus police that gives primacy to their law enforcement and crime prevention role. | 0 pts. Does not have mission statement  
1 pt. Has a mission statement  
2 pts. Has a mission statement that references law enforcement role  
3 pts. Has a mission statement that references law enforcement and crime prevention role |
| VT4 | Comply with critical Clery Act requirements that include reporting of crime statistics and a timely public warning system to inform campus community of an imminent danger. | 0 pts. Does not comply with either critical requirement of Clery Act  
1 pt. Reports campus crime statistics  
2 pts. Reports campus crime statistics and has a public warning system with one method to timely warn of imminent danger  
3 pts. Reports campus crime statistics and has public warning system with multiple methods to timely warn of imminent danger |
| VT5 | Communicate emergency response plans (ERP) to all school officials, school service workers, parents, students, and first responders. | 0 pts. No ERP on website  
1 pt. Website references ERP  
2 pts. ERP is publically available  
3 pts. ERP is publically available is detailed and comprehensive |
Case Studies

The second part of this study provides a “street-level” perspective to campus safety policy development and strategies designed to mitigate the threat of random mass violence. To provide an in-depth understanding of campus safety policies, the researcher conducted case studies of two IHEs in the Dallas-Fort Worth Metroplex. The researcher selected officials at both IHEs directly involved in creating, carrying out, and communicating campus safety policies that relate to assessing and responding to threats of random mass violence. The researcher selected individuals who have a defined role managing threats and who serve on each institution’s threat assessment team. The interviews included each institution’s president, vice president of student affairs, dean of students, director of counseling services and the chief of police. To triangulate the study to increase the credibility and validity of the results, the researcher also conducted interviews with a faculty member who is the speaker of the academic senate, the president of the staff council, and a student who is the president of the student government association.

The University of Texas at Dallas

The University of Texas at Dallas (UTD) is a public university located in Dallas County and is one of nine universities included in the University of Texas system. The university was established in 1969 to create educational opportunities in science and technology in North Texas. By law, UTD offered only graduate degrees until 1975, when the addition of juniors and seniors helped boost enrollment from 408 to 3,333 students. In 1990, the university admitted its first freshman class of one-hundred students (The University of Texas at Dallas Narrative). In the fall of 2010, UTD had an enrollment of more than 17,000 graduate and undergraduate students.
The governing structure of UTD includes a president, an executive vice president and provost, a senior vice president for business affairs, a vice president for student affairs, a vice president for communications, a vice president of information resources, a vice president for public affairs, and a vice president for research (The University of Texas at Dallas Administrative Structure).

The Board of Regents, the governing body for The University of Texas System (UT System), is composed of nine members who are appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the Senate. The chancellor is the chief executive officer of the UT System. The chancellor reports to and is responsible to the Board of Regents. The chancellor has direct line responsibility for all aspects of the UT System's operations (The University of Texas at Austin).

In response to the incident at Virginia Tech, in 2008, UTD established the Behavior Assessment and Intervention Team (BAIT) “to review behavioral incidents and ensure a systematic response to students whose behavior may be disruptive or harmful to themselves or the UT Dallas community and to assist in promoting the health, safety, and welfare of students and other members of the UT Dallas community” (The University of Texas at Dallas BAIT). The BAIT Procedures Flow Chart provides a detailed description of the protocols used by the committee to mitigate potential threats to campus safety (Appendix G). The team reports to the vice president for student affairs. Its core members comprise the assistant vice president for student affairs, the dean of students, the dean of undergraduate education and dean of graduate education, the director of the women’s center, the director of the student counseling center, the director of the student health center, and the chief of police.

Specifically, the charge of the team is to access situations involving a student who poses
a potential risk of harm to persons or property in the university community, to coordinate the university’s response to a violent, threatening, or significantly disruptive student; to develop a specific strategy to manage the threatening or disruptive behavior, and to make recommendations to responsible university officials on appropriate action consistent with university policy and procedure statements and with state and federal law. However, courses of action recommended to departments are for consultation only. Therefore, official minutes and meeting records that contain identifying names or other identifying data are not maintained. Recommended courses of action are not binding and do not carry the force of university policy (The University of Texas at Dallas BAIT).

*Collin College*

Collin College (Collin) is a multi-campus, public community college located in Collin County that includes the northern suburbs of Dallas, Texas. Since offering its first classes at area high schools in 1985, Collin College has expanded to serve more than 51,000 credit and continuing education students each year at locations in Plano, McKinney, Frisco, Allen, and Rockwall. Collin is the only public college in the county and offers more than 100 degrees and certificates in a wide range of disciplines (Collin College About Us).

Collin College is led by a nine-member, elected Board of Trustees along with the district president. The leadership team is led by a district president, a district senior vice president of academic affairs and student development, and a district vice president of administrative services/chief financial officer. Additional members of the leadership team include three vice presidents/provosts, one for each campus, a vice president of academic and institutional effectiveness, a vice president of student development, a vice president of organizational
effectiveness and human resources, and an executive director of college and public relations (Collin College Administration).

Established in 2008, Collin College’s threat assessment team, the Strategies of Behavior Intervention Committee (SOBI), has designed a process that reflects the best practices for reporting, assessing, responding, and assisting students who may display various levels of distressed, disruptive, disturbed, and unregulated behavior. SOBI is a permanent committee that meets on a regular basis, and has as part of its function the tracking of “red flag” behaviors long before a crisis arises. SOBI consists of the dean of students and the associate dean of students, who have authority over student conduct, as well as the associate dean of counseling/career services. Members of SOBI also include the chief of police, the director of the disabilities office and a faculty representative. At this time, SOBI does not review or respond to concerns of disturbing behavior of faculty or staff, only students (Collin College SOBI).

SOBI’s mission states that the Committee will “respond to disruptive, distressed, and threatening conduct in order to thwart and redirect behavior that might otherwise undermine instruction and negatively impact student learning” (Collin College SOBI). SOBI, functioning at its best, may bring to light lesser disruptive or distressed behaviors that may allow support and intervention earlier, before a crisis would require a response. SOBI actions are not a substitute for disciplinary procedures and SOBI refers reports of Code of Conduct violations directly for disciplinary intervention. The SOBI Procedures Flowchart provides a detailed description of the protocols used by the committee to mitigate potential threats to campus safety (Appendix H). SOBI monitors reports that come in via the red flag database and initiate a process based upon
five levels of risk—ranging from mild to extreme. Each level has a series of action steps based upon the appraisal of risk referenced in the Threat Assessment Rubric (Appendix I).

Collin College’s Threat Assessment Decision Tree (Appendix J) is based on the National Center for Higher Education Risk Management’s (NCHERM) College and University Behavioral Team (CUBIT) model of threat assessment. The CUBIT model develops a rubric for classifying students in distress into specific levels of criticality, warranting various levels of escalating intervention. Once classified, the CUBIT deploys the intervention techniques and strategies appropriate to that level of the rubric. Information regarding the case and subsequent intervention is kept in an on-campus database, called Maxient, to ensure proper follow-up action is taken if necessary (Sokolow and Hughes 2008, 14).

Instrumentation

The researcher collected qualitative data face-to-face, semi-structured, informal interviews with representatives from areas within the institution that have a direct link to the development, communication, implementation, or evaluation of campus safety policies that address the threat of random mass violence. The interviews were conducted using a set protocol to insure consistent information could be collected from each interviewee. The researcher designed the protocol to include open-ended questions designed to invite interviewees to expand on their answers and to provide the researcher the flexibility to ask relevant follow-up questions to gather additional data (Appendix K). At both institutions the researcher interviewed the president, the vice president for student affairs, the dean of students, the director of counseling services, the chief of police, the speaker of the faculty senate, the president of the staff council, and the president of the student government association.
Research Design Limitations

This study has several limitations. The first limitation involves data being collected from thirty-two colleges and universities. Because this study investigated implementation analysis at a small number of institutions, the findings may not fully represent the practices of all colleges and universities. Because the colleges and universities are from one region within Texas and the case studies are from one area, the Dallas-Fort Worth Metroplex, it is possible that IHEs within the state differ dramatically from other areas in the country and the findings do not represent a larger population.

A second limitation involves the perspectives of the respondents at each college or university. A portion of this study is qualitative hypothesis-generating research that involves collecting interview data from research participants concerning a phenomenon of interest, and using what they say to develop hypotheses (Auerbach and Silverstein 2003, 5-8). Some have criticized the use of qualitative research stating it lacks reliability and validity that decreases the credibility of the research design (LeCompte and Goetz 1982, 33-37). In qualitative research, “validity and reliability are concerns that can be approached through careful attention to a study’s conceptualization and the way in which the data were collected, analyzed, and interpreted, and the way in which the findings are presented” (Merriam, 1998, 199-200). In addition, case studies generate an abundance of data, which can be difficult to analyze. Critics have difficulty in accepting generalizations based on a small sample, but a large amount of information (Yin 2003, 10-11).

A third limitation in this study is timing. When this study was conducted, the perspectives of the interviewees may have been influenced by the current events and campus
culture that existed at the moment of each interview; a culture that will likely be different because of events yet unseen. A fourth limitation is the researcher is currently employed at Collin College. This may contribute to bias and a reluctance to report findings unfavorable toward the institution that would decrease the quality of the data and subsequent findings.

This chapter describes the methodology of the IHE policy analysis and the case studies used in the research study. The following chapter presents the data and analysis of the IHE policy analysis and the case studies of The University of Texas at Dallas and Collin College.
CHAPTER 5
ANALYSIS

This section reports the analysis and findings of the study. First, the researcher will describe the results of analysis of IHE policies that address the five recommendations of the Virginia Tech reports. This analysis is based on data collected by the researcher from eleven public universities and twenty-one public community colleges in Central Texas. The researcher found a wide variety of IHE campus safety policies within the sample. Some IHEs had policies clearly designed to help them address incidents of random mass violence and had established threat assessment teams whose utility had been proven by recent incidents; whereas other IHEs had virtually no threat assessment program other than those that provide minimum compliance of the Clery Act.

In addition, the researcher will describe the findings from the two case studies of The University of Texas at Dallas and Collin College. The case analysis is based on fourteen interviews with IHE officials directly involved in creating, carrying out, and communicating campus safety policies that relate to assessing and responding to threats of random mass violence as well as interviews with faculty, staff, and students from the IHE. The IHE officials represent varying levels within the administrative structure, differing roles within the institution, and offer unique perspectives on campus safety. While individuals in the sample had differing points of view regarding their institution’s campus safety policies several common themes emerged repeatedly.
Results of the IHE Policy Analysis

After reviewing the data, some initial observations stand out. First, a wide variance is seen between community colleges and public universities’ implementation of the five critical Virginia Tech recommendations. Out of the fifteen possible points attainable from the IHE Policy Evaluation Instrument, public universities included in the sample averaged twelve points, while community colleges averaged eight points. Second, both community colleges and universities scored higher in recommendations four and five—those related to response to an incident of random mass violence—than for recommendations one, two, and three related to prevention of such incidents.

Table 5.1. IHE Policy Analysis Findings (Community Colleges)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Colleges (CC)</th>
<th>VT1</th>
<th>VT2</th>
<th>VT3</th>
<th>VT4</th>
<th>VT5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austin Community College - Austin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blinn College - Brenham</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookhaven College - Farmers Branch</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Valley College - Lancaster</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collin College - Plano</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastfield College - Mesquite</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Centro College - Dallas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grayson County College - Denison</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill College - Hillsboro</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLennan Community College - Waco</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View College - Dallas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central Texas College - Gainesville</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lake College - Irving</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richland College - Dallas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant County College Northeast - Hurst</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant County College Northwest - Fort Worth</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant County College South - Fort Worth</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant County College Southeast - Arlington</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple College - Temple</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Valley Community College - Athens</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Score: 8
Table 5.2. IHE Policy Analysis Findings (Universities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Universities (UNI)</th>
<th>VT1</th>
<th>VT2</th>
<th>VT3</th>
<th>VT4</th>
<th>VT5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tarleton State University - Stephenville</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University - College Station</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University at Commerce</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University Central Texas - Killeen</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas State University-San Marcos</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Woman’s University - Denton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Texas at Austin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Texas at Arlington</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Texas at Dallas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Texas - Denton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Texas at Dallas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Score</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VT1 – Have a threat assessment team (TAT) that includes representatives from law enforcement, human resources, student and academic affairs, legal counsel, and mental health functions. The team should be empowered to take actions such as additional investigation, gathering background information, identification of additional dangerous warning signs and establishing a threat potential risk level for a case.**

Nearly all of the major reports on campus safety issued after the shootings at Virginia Tech advocated for colleges and universities to adapt the threat assessment model (Randazzo and Plumber 2009, 3). A key component of the threat assessment model includes the development and training of campus threat assessment teams to prevent attacks at IHEs (Randazzo and Plumber 2009, 3). The widest variation between community colleges and universities in the study involved the establishment of threat assessment teams to mitigate potential threats of random mass violence. Of the twenty-one community colleges included in the IHE Policy Analysis, only one community college, Collin College, has a systemic, operating threat assessment team. In contrast, more than 80 percent of the public universities in the study have
established threat assessment teams. In response to a recent campus incident where the college administrators locked down the campus because of a potential threat, Richland College, a college in the Dallas County Community College District, is developing a threat assessment team. However, at the time of the research study, the institution had a stated mission but no process guidelines, and the team was not operating on campus.

In contrast, nine of the eleven public universities in the study had functioning threat assessment teams. Public universities are more likely to have residential student housing than community colleges so it may be that university officials have established proactive campus safety initiatives, such as threat assessment teams, to address the risk of random mass violence. In addition, the transient population of community colleges along with their open student enrollment policies may provide additional obstacles to tracking and monitoring students with disturbing behaviors.

Three of the public universities in this study are a part of the UT System that requires that each university establish a behavioral assessment team intended to be a centralized referral system for issues dealing with student behavioral problems. The goal is to ensure a coordinated and systematic response to behavioral incidents and assist in protecting the health, safety, and welfare of all members of the UT community. The purpose is to serve as a resource for faculty, staff, and students to address the needs of students experiencing significant behavioral disturbances, to recommend collaborative and purposeful interventions, and to assist members of the university community concerns regarding students are experiencing emotional distress or psychological difficulties. However, if a university employee observes disturbing staff or faculty
behaviors, University officials encourage that he or she contact the human resources department to report the incident (The University of Texas at Austin Emergency Notification Policy).

According to the University of Texas at Austin’s 2010 Emergency Management Plan members of the behavioral assessment team include representatives from international student services, the office of the president, the counseling and mental health center, university health services, the office of the dean of students, the office of the provost, the division of housing and food, and the university police department. Although the UT system requires the establishment of a behavioral assessment team and defines its purpose, each university in the system has ability to implement the team as needed to meet the needs of each specific campus community (The University of Texas at Austin).

For example, The University of Texas at Arlington (UTA) positions its Behavior Intervention Team (BIT) as one of many support services available to students and highlights its mission to support student success. The BIT website describes the team as “a network of professionals from across campus committed to a caring, confidential program of identification, intervention and response in order to provide our students with the greatest chance of success” (The University of Texas at Arlington Behavior Intervention Team).

According to The University of Texas at Dallas’ (UTD) Behavior Assessment and Intervention Team (BAIT) website, the team is “committed to providing a learning environment that is conducive for students to develop to their fullest potential.” The primary focus of the committee is to “review behavioral incidents and ensure a systematic response to students whose behavior may be disruptive” (The University of Texas at Dallas Behavior Assessment and Intervention Team). Upon evaluation of the reported circumstance, UTA’s BIT has the authority
to “determine an appropriate plan of action of the student,” however UTD’s BAIT policy states “the purpose of the team meetings is to provide consultation only” and not to provide a plan of action (The University of Texas at Dallas Behavior Assessment and Intervention Team). By establishing a general policy at a system level, university administration can determine what approach will enhance campus community participation and support as well as effective procedures that benefit the individual institution.

Texas Woman’s (TWU) threat assessment policy outlines the procedures for referral, evaluation, and appropriate intervention from students displaying disruptive behavior. TWU’s Behavioral Assessment Team (BAT) not only develops strategies to deal with violence, threats, and disruptive behavior, but also serves as a review team for cases referred by the associate vice president of student life (Texas Woman’s University Behavioral Assessment Team). Unlike other threat assessment teams, the campus community does not interact directly with members of the BAT team by reporting threats or potential threats of campus safety but rather the team serves a support role to university administration. University officials encourage all members of the university community to report potential threats or disturbing behaviors to the associate vice president of student life or to complete a student life incident report. The associate vice president of student life will convene the BAT to initiate an investigation. Based on the investigation the team provides one of the following recommendations: no further action is needed; additional information should be gathered to evaluate the threat; disciplinary action should be initiated; or case should be referred to the legal system to begin criminal proceedings (Texas Woman’s University Behavioral Assessment Team).
Two universities that did not have threat assessment teams: Texas A&M University-Central Texas, part of the Texas A&M University System, and The University of North Texas at Dallas, part of The University of North Texas System. Both institutions have the lowest enrollment of the public universities within the sample (less than 2,200 students each) and have been public universities for less than two years (Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board).

VT2 – Establish and publicize widely a mechanism to report threats of violence.

All institutions included in the study, excluding Central Texas College, establish the campus police or safety department as the primary contact to report threats of violence, criminal activity, or disturbing behavior on campus. Central Texas does not have a campus police department and, therefore, directs the campus community to contact the municipal police department to report threats or criminal activity. When individuals dial 911 from campus phones, the system connects them directly to the campus police department (North Central Texas Student Handbook). However, The University of Texas at Dallas has an inter-local agreement with the Richardson Police Department’s Communication Center. The Center is established as a Public Safety Answering Point and initially screens 911 calls originating from UT Dallas campus to determine the need for fire or EMS response. Once the dispatcher determines the call is for police services, it transfers to the UT Dallas Police Department (The University of Texas at Dallas Annual Security Report 2010).

The campus police department’s primary responsibility is to provide a safe, secure campus environment for its students, staff, and faculty. However, the findings regarding this recommendation not only measure the establishment of a campus safety or police department to
respond to threats of violence, but also the availability and accessibility of this information to members of the campus community.

Overall, universities received higher scores than community colleges on executing this recommendation and applying a more proactive approach to reporting potential threats to campus safety. Most universities have many links on the university website to campus safety information and clear protocol for reporting and responding to potential threats. In addition, most provide multiple ways to contact the police including phone, e-mail, and online reporting forms. In comparison to community colleges, less variation exists regarding the accessibility and ease of finding the necessary contact information on the public universities’ websites. Four universities (Tarleton State University, Texas A&M University, Texas Woman’s University, and The University of Texas at Austin) had more than one link on their websites to report potential threats, and the links were easily accessible to users. The University of Texas at Austin, Collin College, and Mountain View College are the only institutions in the study to have a direct link to the campus police department on the institution’s homepage. All other institutions require individuals to navigate through several links to access information on how to report threats of violence.

While most public universities have established the campus safety department to be the initial point of contact to report potential threats of violence, few integrate their threat assessment team reporting structure into their campus safety communications plan. For example, the website for Tarleton State University, The University of Texas at Austin and Texas A&M University in College Station directs members of the campus community to report emergencies that require an immediate response to the campus police department. However, the University’s
website directs campus community members to report non-urgent situations to the threat assessment team or to complete an online form sent to police department (Texas Woman’s University Threat Assessment Policy). This approach differs from other public universities’ campus safety communication plans because it establishes the threat assessment team as a viable option to report threats and thus legitimizes the relationship between law enforcement and student affairs within the institution.

In an effort to enhance existing threat assessment programs and processes, relating to dealing with troubled or at-risk faculty, staff, and students, the University has created the Special Situations Team and launched the “Tell Somebody” campaign (Texas A&M University Special Situations Team). The Special Situations Team is the university’s threat assessment team whose charge is to assess circumstances, enhance communication, and initiate appropriate responses to specific behavioral problems displayed by students or staff that may involve threats to the safety and security of the university community (Texas A&M University Special Situations Team).

The goal of the “Tell Somebody” internal marketing campaign to encourage campus community members to report any disturbing behaviors they observe and to create a campus culture that encourages individuals to be aware of their surroundings by proactively reporting potential threats to campus safety. Components of the communications plan include creating a website to inform individuals about the Special Situations Team and its processes, (http://tellsomebody.tamu.edu), sending university-wide e-mails encouraging individuals to “tell somebody” when they observe any concerning behavior, providing information about the campaign at new student and employee orientations, and posting flyers on campus billboards.
Individuals may report potential threats or disturbing behavior using the online report that offers the option of anonymity or contacting one of the team members listed on the website. Once an individual submits a report online, a copy is e-mailed to the entire team for appropriate review and action. In addition to representatives from various departments within the university, the Chief of the University Police Department serves on the Special Situations Team (Texas A&M University Special Situations Team).

Several links to the Texas A&M University Police Department exist throughout the University’s website. Although a link does not exist directly from the homepage, one can easily access the information by navigating through the “services” tab located on the homepage (Texas A&M University Police Department). The police department’s homepage provides several links to reporting contact information including the police department’s online reporting form, as well as the Tell Somebody online reporting form. The cohesive message throughout the University’s website is if an individual is in an emergency situation that requires medical, psychological or police services to contact the police immediately. However, by providing other reporting alternatives for non-emergency situations, such as the Tell Somebody report, the university fosters enhanced communication within the campus community by reinforcing the message to “tell somebody” when an individual observes any irregular student, staff, or faculty behavior (Texas A&M University “Tell Somebody” Report).

Most community colleges in the study have one link on their website to the police department that in many cases is difficult to locate. Once individuals locate the police department’s webpage, most community colleges provide general contact information, but few
have statements directing individuals regarding how to report a potential threat and, once reported, what response will be taken.

For example, Grayson County College, a community college in Denison, has a College Public Safety Office webpage; the website does not direct individuals to contact the office to report potential threats of violence or criminal activity (Grayson County College Campus Safety). While this may be an implied function of the police department, the lack of clarity could contribute to uncertainty regarding who to contact, what activities to report, and how the police will respond to the incident. Grayson County College’s homepage has a “quick links” menu that allows individuals a direct link to departments within the college such as financial aid, student life, and testing services. However, the public safety office is not included in this menu. To find contact information for the department one must conduct a specific keyword search of “campus safety” or “police” in the “Search GCC” website index or click on the “College Resources” tab to access a list of campus departments (Grayson County College Resources).

The public safety office webpage includes general contact information but does not highlight its law enforcement or crime prevention role on campus. The responsibilities listed on the top of the Public Safety webpage are “regulating traffic and parking on campus and for issuing parking permits; monitoring weather conditions at the college and assist in activation of the weather alert sirens when a tornado is sighted; and rendering assistance on vehicle lock-outs, boosting of dead vehicle batteries, and assisting with flat tires” (Grayson County College Campus Safety). In addition, the researcher was unable to find a link on the institution’s website to an intranet that may be available to faculty, staff, or students. Grayson County College serves as an example of the majority of community colleges included in the study. While the majority
of colleges include campus safety information on their institution’s website, the lack of clearly communicated procedures and protocol to respond to threats of violence can result in confusion within the campus community on when and what to report.

The only community college in the study that successfully implemented this recommendation was Eastfield College. Eastfield College, a member of the Dallas County Community College District, has several easily accessible links to the Eastfield Campus Police Department (EFCPD) homepage, defines the Police Department’s response mechanism, and clarifies how individuals can report potential threats to campus safety (Eastfield College Police Department). The EFCPD is responsible for reporting, investigating, and disseminating information on all offenses, incidents, threats, and emergency situations to the appropriate college authorities or an outside agency. Individuals can access the Police Department homepage by using the website index or by visiting the “About” tab located on Eastfield College’s homepage (Eastfield College About Us). The webpage provides various options for individuals to report potential threats or emergencies. These options include calling the EFCPD, physically visiting the EFCPD office, requesting assistance from a uniformed police officer, using police emergency call boxes located throughout campus, or reporting potential threats anonymously using the online contact form on the web (Eastfield College Police Contact Form).

The EFCPD has and also publicizes an established mechanism to respond to reports of criminal activity or threats of violence. The webpage states that “EFCPD will immediately dispatch an officer to investigate…responses include but are not limited to: dispatch of one or more uniformed officers; investigation of all reports; arrest and filing of charges and/or referrals through the internal judicial system, depending on the circumstances of the offense; and victim
referral to assistance organizations” (Eastfield College Police Department). In addition, the investigations division is assigned to conduct follow-up investigations on confirmed threats and file criminal cases, if applicable, on all offenses reported to the department. The division is responsible for reporting, investigating, and disseminating information on all offenses, incidents, injuries, and emergency situations to the appropriate college authorities or outside agency (Eastfield Investigations Division).

VT3 – Design a mission statement for campus police that gives primacy to their law enforcement and crime prevention role.

All institutions in the study -with the exception of North Central Texas College (NCTC) and Texas A&M University-Central Texas- have campus safety or campus police departments. Because NCTC does not operate its own campus police department, college administration work closely with community police departments regarding any reported crimes at the college and employ a private security service that hires off-duty municipal police officers and county sheriff’s deputies to provide campus safety services (North Central Texas Student Handbook). Texas A&M University-Central Texas (formerly Tarleton-Central Texas) became a stand-alone university on May 27, 2009. Because of its previous relationship with Tarleton State University, Texas A&M University-Central Texas uses the Tarleton State University Police Department to provide safety and security to its campus (Texas A&M University-Central Texas Parking and Traffic Regulations). Because neither of the above institutions have a campus police department, they do not have mission statements that can be analyzed in this study.

All university and the majority of community college police departments and employ at least one commissioned Texas Peace Officer. Texas Peace Officers or Police Officers are Texas Commission on Law Enforcement (TCLEOSE) certified that enables them to exercise the duties
and powers provided by the Texas Code of Criminal Procedure and are authorized to enforce the Texas Motor Vehicle Code and The Texas Penal Code (Texas Commission on Law Enforcement). Several community colleges have a combination of security officers and Texas Police Officers to perform campus safety responsibilities. The only exception is Hill College, a community college in Waco that has a security department responsible for enforcing college safety policy, but does not employ a Texas Peace Officer (Hill College Security Department).

Of the thirty community colleges and universities with police departments, half the community colleges did not have a mission statement for their campus police department, while only one university, The University of North Texas at Dallas did not have a mission statement for its police department (The University of North Texas at Dallas Security). The majority of the police departments that did have mission statements referenced their role in law enforcement but not crime prevention. Perhaps, this is because the majority of campus police officers time involves traditional law enforcement functions such as traffic patrol on or around campus, and responding to calls for service.

Some institutions implicitly reference their role in crime prevention, while others explicitly state crime prevention within their mission statement. For example, Austin Community College’s police mission statement states the department acts “to deter crime” (Police Mission). Also The University of Texas at Dallas police department mission statement states that “all personnel are dedicated to excellence in upholding and enforcing the law and managing risks to ensure the safety of students, faculty, staff and guests at UT Dallas” (Police Mission). While Richland College employs a direct crime prevention approach in its Police Department’s mission statement, “It is the philosophy of Richland College to prevent crimes
rather than react to them after they occur” (Police Mission). Some larger universities have separate crime prevention departments within the institution’s police department.

It should be noted that many public universities that did not reference their crime prevention role in the mission statement for their police department have established crime prevention units. For example, the mission of The University of Texas at Austin Crime Prevention Unit is “to reduce the incidence of crimes against persons and property on the UT Austin campus through public education” (The University of Texas at Austin Crime Prevention Unit). They accomplish this mission by disseminating information through crime prevention programs to students, faculty, and staff and offering tactical communication courses for university staff. However, this analysis focuses on the general mission statement for the police department as referenced in the Virginia Tech recommendations.

VT 4 and VT5. These recommendations address components of The Clery Act. According to The Clery Act, in addition to submitting an annual campus safety report to the U.S. Department of Education, every postsecondary institution that receives federal student financial aid must: 1) disclose crime statistics for the campus, unobstructed public areas immediately adjacent to or running through the campus, and certain non-campus facilities including Greek housing and remote classrooms; 2) provide "timely warnings" of ongoing threats to the campus community; and 3) publish procedures on how to notify the campus community of emergencies (Carter 2002, 22). The researcher analyzed the implementation of the VT4 recommendation by accessing campus crime statistics and verifying the availability of a public warning system with multiple notification capabilities to timely warn the campus community of safety threats.
According to the 2008 Amendments, the Clery Act requires colleges and universities, both those with and without on-campus student residential facilities, to have emergency response and evacuation procedures in place. Institutions must also for the first time disclose a summary of these procedures in their annual security report (ASR) that is to be disclosed to students and employees on campus (The Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act of 1998). Institutions can meet the distribution requirement by posting the report on an Internet site (or an institution’s intranet) that is reasonably accessible to enrolled students and to employees. However, the institution must properly notify the campus community of its availability online and offer to provide a paper copy of the report on request.

The recommendations from the Virginia Tech reports recommend broader distribution of emergency response to include parents as well as first responders. The researcher analyzed the implementation of the VT5 recommendation by both the accessibility of the plan on the institution’s website as well as the comprehensiveness and detail of the emergency plan.

VT4 – Comply with critical Clery Act requirements that include the reporting of crime statistics and establishing a timely warning system to inform the campus community of imminent danger.

All community colleges and public universities included in this study complied with both critical requirements of The Clery Act. Although The Clery Act does not require institutions to post crime statistics on the Internet, many institutions comply by providing the information on the college or university’s webpage, as confirmed in this study. The majority of institutions provide campus crime statistics on their campus police department website, although Tarleton State University provides a direct link to its annual campus safety report from the university’s homepage. This increased sensitivity to the accessibility of this information could be in response to the U.S. Department of Education’s ruling that Tarleton State failed to provide an accurate
reporting of crime statistics. In 2009, the university was found guilty of underreporting the
number of sexual assaults, burglaries, and drug-related crimes on and near the campus from

All institutions in this study use emergency notification and incident communication
systems to issue “timely warnings” of threats to campus safety. Many colleges and universities
recognize the need for a multilayered Emergency Notification System (ENS) or Mass
Notification System (MNS). Instead of relying on just one technology to communicate critical
information in an emergency, multiple communication channels to reach the entire campus
community as well as target the appropriate segments with specific instructions as required in
The Clery Act. These third-party systems can allow campus police or administration the ability
to communicate with the entire campus in minutes via several contact methods, such as text
messaging, cell phones, smart phones, e-mail, instant messaging, and social media.

A recent example of the utility of an emergency notification system occurred at The
University of Texas at Austin campus. On September 28, 2010, a University of Texas at Austin
(UT Austin) student ran down the street adjacent to campus shooting an AK-47 into the air, ran
into a library on campus, and shot himself. While it was not the gunman’s intention to kill
anyone besides himself, the concern that it could be the beginning of a mass shooting resulted in
an emergency lock down of the campus. Therefore, communicating to the campus population
was critical during the incident. On that day, administrators used various communication tools to
tell students, faculty, and staff they should lockdown and to take shelter at their current location;
these tools included text alerts, e-mail, sirens, loudspeakers, TV announcement, 1-800 numbers,
website postings, pagers, computer pop-ups and social media, such as Facebook and Twitter.
According to UT Austin’s Emergency Notification Policy, a student’s cell phone number is part of the emergency notification protocol in case the university needs to contact the student via text message about critical incidents on campus. The university requires students to keep their primary cell phone information current. Students who fail to update this information have holds placed on their record that keep them from registering for classes (The University of Texas at Austin’s Emergency Notification Policy).

The University contracts with a third-party vendor that provides the technological ability to send text messages to members of the campus community. Within five minutes from the initial call to UT Austin’s police department reporting the incident on September 29, 2010 at 8:12 a.m., an emergency alert text was sent using a layered mass notification system. In the 30 minutes from the time of the incident, sirens, and loudspeakers sounded every 10 minutes telling everyone on campus to take shelter at their current location. UTPD posted an announcement on Facebook and updated UT Austin’s Twitter page; two text alert messages were sent out. The vice-president of operations sent out a campus-wide e-mail. Administrators displayed information about the emergency on closed-circuit televisions on campus and posted a summary of the emergency on UT Austin’s homepage; classes for the rest of the day were canceled. Five text alerts were sent to 54,000 people for a total of more than 250,000 messages (Gray 2010b).

Even institutions with smaller enrollments and significantly less budgetary resources have Emergency Notification Systems (ENS). Hill College is an independent community college located in Hillsboro that has a student enrollment of less than 4,500 students. Its ENS, Rebel Alert, enables administrators to send out emergency notifications via voice or text message to up to six phone numbers and two e-mail addresses per student or employee. While some
institutions have voluntary enrollment in the system, Hill College automatically registers
students and employees for this service using current contact information the institution has on
file for the individual (Hill College Rebel Alert).

VT5 – Communicate emergency response plans to the campus community.

The majority of institutions included in this study provided detailed, comprehensive
emergency response plans on their institution’s website. Two community colleges (North
Central Texas College, Trinity Valley Community College) and one university (The University
of Texas at Dallas) did not reference or provide a campus emergency plan on their website. This
does not imply that these institutions are in violation of the recent amendments to The Clery Act
because they may have included the emergency plan in their annual security report submitted to
the U.S. Department of Education or may have it available on the institution’s intranet, and may
provide this report only to individuals who request it. This study uses an institution’s website as
the primary tool used to disseminate critical information to the campus community. Therefore,
these institutions do not widely communicate their emergency response plans by failing to have
the information accessible on their institution’s website.

Temple College provides its Master Emergency Management Plan in its entirety in the
“Faculty and Staff” link on the college’s website. The purpose of the plan is to provide
guidelines, procedures, and instructions for “mitigating against, preparing for, responding to, and
recovering from incidents that occur on college property” (Temple College Master Emergency
Plan). “Mitigation” references the efforts to eliminate hazards, reduce the possibility of hazards,
or lesson the consequences of unavoidable hazards. “Preparedness” activities develop response
capabilities needed to respond to an emergency. “Response” consists of actions taken following
an incident to resolve the situation while minimizing injury, loss of life, or property damage. “Recovery” involves short-term efforts to restore vital services and provide long-term efforts focused to restore normalcy (Temple College Master Emergency Management Plan).

The plan defines the roles and responsibilities of emergency management Temple College. While the college president is responsible to the Board of Trustees for the leadership and management of the emergency management program, the chief of police provides day-to-day leadership and coordination of the college’s emergency management efforts. To accomplish this purpose, the plan establishes an emergency management committee to describe how officials distribute emergency information to the campus community and to define a color-coded system to classify potential threats to campus safety. It provides a detailed description of command, control, and communication responses during the emergency as well as recovery efforts such as counseling and post-incident review (Temple College Master Emergency Plan).

**Case Studies Results**

Throughout the interviews with IHE officials, faculty, staff and student representatives, four themes emerged. These themes include 1) definitional issues of threat assessment teams, 2) preparation for threats of random mass violence, 3) information silos regarding campus safety programs, and 4) organizational communication of campus safety policies. Themes one and two address the first research question, how public universities and community colleges have incorporated critical post-Virginia Tech recommendations into their campus safety policies. Themes three and four address the second research question- how public universities and community colleges implement policies to address random mass violence.
Although these are themes correspond to the five critical recommendations, they differ because the interviewees did not view their individual roles through the lens of those recommendations. The five critical recommendations of the Virginia Tech reports relate to an institution’s response to an incident of random mass violence as well as the prevention of such incidents. The VT recommendations emphasize the development of a threat assessment team as critical to campus safety policies, address the balance of implementing prevention and response safety programs, and highlight the importance of communicating these initiatives to the campus community. The themes explored in the case study analysis describe practical issues both institutions face in providing a safe campus community. The issues include defining the IHE officials’ roles in campus safety, implementation issues of threat assessment teams and safety programs designed to reduce the threat of random mass violence, and—perhaps the most important issue—communicating those campus safety policies within the institution.

*Theme 1 Definitional Issues of Threat Assessment Teams*

The incident at Virginia Tech and other recent mass shootings, and subsequent reports and legislation, underscore the necessity for colleges and universities to formulate proactive initiatives, such as threat assessment teams, to identify disturbing behavior at its onset and to prevent random mass violence.

None of the four top administrators (vice presidents and presidents) mentioned the establishment of threat assessment teams as a primary component of the institution’s campus safety policies. Neither did they reference them as a direct response to reducing the threat of mass random violence in the post-Virginia Tech era. Neither chiefs of police at each institution, who both serve as members of the threat assessment team, referenced threat assessment teams
during the entire interview. The president of the faculty senate described the purpose of his institution’s threat assessment as “the beginning of the process of communication, and setting up the sense of both responsibility and freedom to talk about these things, and to worry about student behavior and each other’s behavior.”

For example, a vice president of student affairs stated “We don’t want people to think we (threat assessment team) are a committee that is going to keep the campus safe and secure like the police would. That’s not who we are. We are not going to stop something from happening. So we don’t want people across campus to think that the threat assessment team is going to keep us safe and prevent a Virginia Tech… I don’t think we (the institution) have done much on the prevention side (of violence).” In addition, she described the role of Student Affairs in providing a safe campus community as “minimal in reality.”

A director of counseling described his institution’s threat assessment as “in some ways superfluous and redundant some might say, because we (departments within the institution) already do all of these things. I think we are still figuring out what its (threat assessment team) purpose and goals are above what we do independently.” In contrast another director of counseling described her institution’s threat assessment team as the primary tool used to prevent acts of violence on campus stating “we want people to notice things early, report them so we can get the students helped way before it reaches the act of violence.”

A general awareness of threat assessment teams existed among faculty and staff representatives. Two faculty members and one staff member identified the establishment of threat assessment teams as a response to the incident at Virginia Tech. One faculty member viewed the establishment of his or her threat assessment team as “more of a response to the
Governor’s report, and it’s an administrative maneuver…faculty do not serve on the threat assessment team.” While one staff member stated that the institution has made “great strides in identifying students that may be a threat” she notes that “for everyone that we identify we probably have several slipping through the crack that may never be reported to the threat assessment team.”

In contrast, when asked to describe the programs and policies designed to prevent random mass violence, a staff member responded “we don’t have anything here for prevention. I wouldn’t know what it is.” Neither of the students who serve as the presidents of student government were aware of his or her institution’s threat assessment teams, and this could be because both institutions referral process for their threat assessment team is faculty or staff reporting students who exhibit disturbing behaviors.

Even though the primary recommendation from the Virginia Tech reports and subsequent research regard the threat assessment teams as pivotal in preventing incidents of random mass violence at educational institutions, the majority of individuals interviewed for the case studies failed to recognize the preventative purpose of threat assessment teams. Both Collin College and The University of Texas at Dallas have implemented threat assessment teams in response to the incident at Virginia Tech. However, confusion exists regarding the purpose of the team as well as the role it plays in the overall campus safety strategy within the institution. The foundational construct of an effective threat assessment team is the ability and willingness of campus community members to share information regarding disturbing behaviors and potentially violent pre-incident behaviors exhibited by individuals.
Confusion exists about the laws that govern the sharing of information and legal restrictions on the ability to share information about a person who may be a threat to self or to others. For example, a vice president of student affairs noted that names of students are not shared with the threat assessment team due to privacy laws. While a dean of students at the same institution stated that he provides personal information to individuals in various departments regarding students who may pose a threat to campus safety. Federal laws that may affect information sharing practices, such as the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) Privacy Rule and the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) and many state privacy laws and regulations also affect how individuals interpret information sharing. In some situations, state laws and regulations are more restrictive than federal laws (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services et. al 2007, 7). “One of the greatest, and potentially fatal, misunderstandings is that the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, or (FERPA), somehow prevents sharing information about a possibly dangerous student” (Lake 2007, 6).

Theme 2 Preparation for Threats of Random Mass Violence

Related to the institutions’ preparation for threats of random mass violence, all of the interviewees referenced crime prevention through environmental design. Crime prevention through environmental design stresses the importance of creating well-protected, defensible space. For example, a president and a faculty member indicated an increase in the hiring of police officers as a direct initiative to prevent and respond to potential threats of random mass violence. A dean of students stated, “I think the most beneficial thing we have done since Virginia Tech is to include the police department in all of our communications, because they see things totally different.” Both chiefs of police indicated that their institution has increased
training and equipment for their police departments as well as partnering with city police departments to enhance campus safety. No institution can guarantee that its campus is completely safe because it cannot control the actions of all individuals at all times. However, its goal should be to provide an environment that is as safe as possible given its environmental constraints (Midwestern Higher Education Compact, 2008, 6).

Colleges and universities by their nature are open-access environments in which people move between buildings and outdoor spaces, so perhaps college administrators and policymakers should implore a layered approach to campus safety, beginning with highly trained campus police officers, appropriate implementation of security technology, systemic threat assessment protocols, and crime prevention through environmental design.

Also related to preparation for threats of random mass violence, two interviewees (both students) indicated the implementation of a campus alert system to inform the campus community of threats via e-mail, text, or by using social media. One of the students said “we have campus e-mail alerts, text messaging, local and campus media…we also have indoor and outdoor warning systems.”

In addition, several interviewees referenced an increase in a general awareness and increased discussion regarding the threat of random mass violence. Both interviewee groups from The University of Texas at Dallas and Collin College addressed an increase in campus safety after the Virginia Tech incident. A president noted, “We’ve just had a tremendous increase in awareness, and (not only) a great sensitivity for the need for fast response, but also a practical realization that if we lock down the campus for every potential threat in the world that would be silly.” A dean of students noted “That (Virginia Tech) showed us a lot and showed us systems
we didn’t have in place…that incident has caused us (IHEs) to rethink the way we do things and communicate and how we respond to incidents on campus.”

When asked how her institution has responded to the threat of random mass violence, one president of the staff council stated, “I know there is a lot of discussion about it. I think most colleges are talking more about it and deciding if it did happen what they would do about it.” Another president of the staff council stated, “I think we have a knee jerk reaction to immediately creating things, and then as we create these policies or procedures that we are going to follow, we forget to do the follow through and the training for the people who are going to implement it and the people who are affected by the policies.” Similarly a chief of police noted “Anytime you have a disaster you see people tend to over react on a temporary basis. You know they start up all these programs and then down the road you don’t even hear from some of those departments who were made up. Sometimes you can committee and policy things to death and you can create more problems by having too many policies.”

Also related to prevention, the study findings show that both community colleges and public universities place greater emphasis on emergency response rather than prevention efforts for an incident of random mass violence. The Clery Act requires colleges and universities to disclose certain timely and annual information about campus crime and security policies. Most institutions comply with the legal requirements of the Clery Act, but significant criticism exists within the higher education community regarding the effectiveness of the Act in preventing acts of campus violence (Gregory and Janosik 2003, 763).

Institutions that receive federal funding must publish an annual report that includes campus crime statistics and to describe the institution’s emergency response plan that provides a
"timely warning" to the campus community regarding threats to campus safety. Also colleges and universities must provide a description of crime prevention programs; the primary focus of this legislation is response to, not the prevention of, acts of campus violence. Perhaps in the future, the Act will be amended to include increased emphasis on preventing campus violence, specifically acts of random mass violence, to address the public’s growing concern regarding this issue. However, the findings of this study confirm that IHEs emphasize emergency response over prevention. IHE officials focus on fulfilling legislative requirements enacted by the Clery Act rather than prevention efforts not currently mandated by law.

Theme 3 Information Silos Regarding Campus Safety Programs

The presidents, the directors of counseling services, the dean of students, and the chief of police had an acute understanding of his or her role in providing a safe campus community. For example, both presidents recognized they “have ultimate accountability for campus safety” and “have a critical role in security.” The directors of counseling services described their roles as “providing expertise on mental health, emotional issues, and the behaviors that can cause or be associated with violence” and “playing a vital role in terms of campus safety because we are a place where students go when they have suicidal or homicidal crisis or personal problems that may lead them to acting out in violent ways.”

Both deans of students viewed enforcing the Student Code of Conduct as his or her primary role in campus safety. In addition, a dean of students stated “That’s where the dean of students’ office is like the educating arm of our safety plan, if we actually had a formal safety plan, which we do not.” The chiefs of police stated their role in providing a safe campus community is “to provide a safe environment for students, faculty and staff to achieve their
academic and professional goals.” The vice presidents of student affairs were broad in their interpretation of his or her role in campus safety. For example, one vice president saw student affairs’ role in providing a safe campus community as “minimal” and the other vice president explained her role as twofold “to support and provide resources.” However, the vice president from Collin College expressed her role as more “hands on”, whereas the vice president from The University of Texas at Dallas described a “clear distinction” between her role and the role of the police department. A president stated that he has “a critical role in security” and referenced examples of crime prevention through environmental design such as hiring a police force, providing equipment to the police department, establishing an emergency alert system, and continuing to fund campus safety initiatives. He stated that “funding is prioritization” and “budgets reflect your institution’s priorities.”

The findings of this study confirm that "information silos" exist within educational institutions and among educational staff, mental health providers, and public safety officials that impede appropriate information sharing. Information silos occur when a lack of communication between organizational departments exists (Goh 2002, 25). Although each interviewee understood his or her individual role in campus safety, they lacked their connection to the comprehensive campus safety strategy.

Following the Virginia Tech shootings, an investigative report by the state of Virginia, as well as an investigative report by Virginia Tech both addressed this issue. “Despite their different missions, both reports reached some similar conclusions, calling for better sharing of information about troubled students (Fischer and Wilson, 2007). At various points during Seung-Hui Cho's college career, Virginia Tech police officers, professors, and students
recognized that he was mentally troubled and exhibited disturbing behaviors, but no one had a comprehensive assessment of the threat Cho posed to the campus community because information sharing within the institution was limited.

*Theme 4 - Organizational Communication of Campus Safety Policies*

Related to the institution’s comprehensive campus safety policies, when the researcher asked interviewees to describe the components of their institution’s campus safety plan, responses included “I have no idea;” “Not exactly sure;” “Well we have some in place, but I am not exactly sure if they work, and we have had some bad administrative decisions in actually using it;” and “There is not to my understanding a set policy.” The president of a student government association stated “I think it’s more when something happens, that’s when people find out what the policy is. Before that, there really is no communication.”

The presidents provided a broad description of their strategic approaches to providing a safe campus community but did not reference stated policies. For example, one president stated “three key pieces” guide the institution’s approach to campus safety. The first piece is “preparation and training at all levels.” The police department provides training by using mock table top exercises and scenarios. The second piece is “communication” and the president described the institution’s strategy as “to be as proactive as possible” to inform the campus community of potential threats to safety. The third piece is the “interface between the law enforcement of our campus and the law enforcement of the community.” When asked “Where does one access the institution’s campus safety policies?” most interviewees stated they would go to the institution’s website. However, when asked specifically where the policies were on the website, the answers varied from “they are infused throughout the website” to referencing the
police department webpage to using the website’s search engine located on the homepage. A vice president of student affairs stated “In terms of all the policies and all of that…I don’t know” and a faculty member responded “I don’t know exactly how to answer that question.” A chief of police stated he would access the policies by contacting the institution’s department of environmental health and safety office because they are “responsible for emergency management.”

The communication of campus safety policies to the general campus population was poor. While representatives from various constituencies within the institution knew their institution had campus safety policies, few knew where to access the information. Throughout the study, several administrators, faculty, staff, and students indicated that there is some confusion regarding the details and subsequent communication of his or her institution’s campus safety policies. Disparate interpretations of which departments are primarily responsible for the development, communication, and evaluation of campus safety policies serve as an indicator that various campus departments may view themselves as distinct entities that work separately from other entities.

This chapter reported the analysis and findings of the study, specifically describing the results of analysis of IHE policies that address the five recommendations of the Virginia Tech reports. In addition, this chapter described the findings from the two case studies of The University of Texas at Dallas and Collin College. The following chapter includes the researcher’s conclusions, contribution to the existing literature, and recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER 6
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

Two research questions guided this study of threat assessment policies at colleges and universities in Central Texas. The questions uncover information about the campus safety policies at institutions in the wake of recent campus violence. In this study, the following exploratory questions guided the research framework: 1) How have public universities and community colleges in central Texas incorporated the critical post-Virginia Tech recommendations into their campus safety policies? and 2) How do public universities and community colleges in central Texas implement policies to address random mass violence? By combining the findings from the IHE Policy Analysis and the case studies, the researcher draws several conclusions derived from the research questions.

First, nearly all of the major reports on campus safety issued after the shootings at Virginia Tech advocated for colleges and universities to adopt the threat assessment model to prevent future attacks of random mass violence. One of the primary components of the threat assessment model is creating threat assessment teams (Randazzo and Plumber 2009, 3). However, the findings of this study suggest a large variance between community colleges and public universities’ implementation of threat assessment teams to mitigate the threat of random mass violence. Of the twenty-one community colleges included in the IHE Policy Analysis, only one community college, Collin College, has a systematic, operating threat assessment team. In
contrast, over eighty percent of the public universities in the study have established threat assessment teams. Many factors can contribute to this variance. The lack of student housing at community colleges could lessen the immediacy of implementing threat assessment teams. In addition, the location of many community colleges is in rural geographic areas with lower student enrollment. Overall, IHEs officials may not know the practical steps to implement the threat assessment model into existing campus safety policies. However, the result of recent mass shootings, such as shootings that occurred at Representative Gabrielle Gifford’s political rally in Tucson, Arizona, has been increased public scrutiny regarding the accountability of all IHEs, specifically community colleges, to provide not only a safe campus environment, but also the responsibility to protect the public from those who exhibit a propensity for violent behavior.

Second, public universities in Central Texas have exhibited substantial compliance with the key recommendations of the two primary post-Virginia Tech reports, but many community colleges have failed to integrate them into their campus safety policies. On average universities scored higher on the IHE Policy Analysis than community colleges. More important, however, the case study analysis suggests that universities and community colleges, even those that have adopted the threat assessment model into their campus safety policies, have not created a working mechanism for effective implementation of campus safety polices. In addition, the case studies indicate weaknesses in the working mechanisms of the campus safety policies IHE officials established to prevent and respond to incidents of random mass violence. The appropriate structures are in place (e.g. threat assessment teams) but the various offices from campus police departments to higher levels of IHE departments, including the president’s office, do not recognize or understand their roles in the implementation of those policies.
Third, although all IHEs have some form of campus safety policies, the campus community is not aware of those policies and significant confusion exists regarding how to access them. The case study analysis suggests, while the tragic events at Virginia Tech and other IHEs have brought campus safety issues to the forefront for IHE faculty, staff, and students, a clear disconnect exists regarding translating these policies into meaningful campus safety programs and services. Effective campus safety policy implementation requires that the policy be understood by those individuals responsible for carrying it out. It is impossible to develop cultures within IHEs that promote campus safety, if representative groups from all levels within the institution are unaware of the campus safety policies and unable to access them if needed.

The findings of this study suggest that although many universities have adopted principles of the threat assessment model, specifically threat assessment teams, the integration of these proactive measures to mitigate the risk of random mass violence remains incomplete. This is consistent with the research of Paul DiMaggio’s and Walter Powell’s organizational theory of institutional isomorphism in which they seek to explore the homogeneity within organizations, rather than variation (1983, 148). Coercive isomorphism occurs when organizations experience both formal and informal pressures by other organizations and cultural expectations in the society within which the organization functions (DiMaggio and Powell 1983, 150). IHEs may feel persuaded to adopt campus safety policies that are similar to other IHEs to avoid public scrutiny, regardless of their effectiveness. This theory could explain why even IHEs that had progressive campus safety policies to address the threat of random mass violence, contained individuals at all levels within the organization who had little knowledge of those policies or the clearly defined purposes for why they existed.
It is important to note that institutional isomorphic processes can be expected to proceed with implementation with the absence of institutional commitment to accomplish their intended results (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983, 153). In many cases organizations are rewarded for being similar to institutions in their field. None of this proves that conformist organizations do what they do more efficiently than other institutions that used a less traditional approach (DiMaggio and Powell 1983, 154).

Although the professional literature on incidents of college and university violence is increasing, most of the existing research does not address the different campus safety policy approaches, if they exist, between a “Virginia Tech-type” incident and other incidents of violence such as assault, rape, or homicide. The researcher has contributed to the existing literature on this topic by creating a definition of “random mass violence” to encompass “Virginia Tech-type” incidents. Random mass violence must meet the following criteria: 1) the subject selects a group of institution of higher education students, employees or facilities as a target 2) the victim group comprises two or more individuals 3) one or more of the victims is/are selected at random by the attacker 4) the targets are selected prior to the incident and 5) the subject employs lethal force. Although the subject directs his or her violence toward a specific group, the apparent random selection of the victims within that group intensifies fear within the campus community and the general public.

Although the professional literature on incidents of college and university violence is increasing, most of the existing research does not address the different campus safety policy approaches, if they exist, between a “Virginia Tech-type” incident and other incidents of violence such as assault, rape, or homicide. The researcher has contributed to the existing
literature on this topic by creating a definition of “random mass violence” to encompass “Virginia Tech-type” incidents. Random mass violence must meet the following criteria: 1) the subject selects a group of institution of higher education students, employees or facilities as a target 2) the victim group comprises two or more individuals 3) one or more of the victims is/are selected at random by the attacker 4) the targets are selected prior to the incident and 5) the subject employs lethal force. Although the subject directs his or her violence toward a specific group, the apparent random selection of the victims within that group intensifies fear within the campus community and the general public.

Since virtually no research exists on the implementation of the critical recommendations of the primary VT reports, this study fills this void by focusing on those recommendations that specifically address these types of incidents because they present IHEs with unique problems than other campus crime. In addition, it provides an analysis of how campus safety policies succeed or fail in being integrated into the campus community by providing in-depth exploratory case studies within two institutions that have a proactive safety response to the threat of random mass violence. This data serves as a foundation for future empirical research.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

The findings of this study reveal there are differences among community colleges and public universities regarding the establishment of threat assessment teams as a necessary component of their campus safety policies. However, a statistically significant study of IHEs within a broader geographic region or national level would confirm the findings of this study. In addition, there is an opportunity to investigate the resources available to IHEs on a federal, state, or local level to establish threat assessment teams to prevent incidents of random mass violence.
Throughout the study, several college administrators indicated that confusion exists concerning the purpose and practical application of threat assessment principles within their campus safety policies and programs. An area for further research is to determine best practices for generating involvement of faculty and students in the successful implementation of a threat assessment team. In addition, further research is needed to examine the appropriateness of implementing the threat assessment model to educational environments given the federal and state laws that may affect information sharing practices, such as the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA).

Incorporating the critical VT recommendations into an IHE’s campus safety policies and its campus culture involves complexities unique to the academic environment. An effective threat assessment team is largely dependent on the reports it receives from across campus to do its work. Setting up a successful campus threat assessment capacity must, therefore, include efforts to encourage the entire campus community to report threats and other concerning behavior to the team (Randazzo and Plummer 2009, 36). The culture within higher education often a decentralized and fragmented in which individuals are closely tied with professional identity as opposed to institutional culture.

However, IHEs have a profound duty to learn from the Virginia Tech tragedy, to explore ways to adapt threat assessment principles within the higher education environment, and to recognize their responsibility in providing a safe environment for their students, faculty, and staff. While one cannot eliminate the possibility that acts of random violence may occur, IHE officials and policymakers must determine how to minimize the possibility that these situations may occur in the future.
APPENDIX A

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM MASS SHOOTINGS AT VIRGINIA TECH: THE REPORT FROM THE REVIEW PANEL PRESENTED TO GOVENOR TIMOTHY M. KAIN – AUGUST 30TH, 2007

Emergency Planning

1. Universities should do a risk analysis (threat assessment) and then choose a level of security appropriate for their campus, how far to go in safeguarding campuses, and from which threats, need to be considered by each institution.

2. Virginia Tech should update and enhance its Emergency Response Plan and bring it into compliance with federal and state guidelines.

3. Virginia Tech and other institutions of higher learning should have a threat assessment team that includes representatives from law enforcement, human resources, student and academic affairs, legal counsel, and mental health functions. The team should be empowered to take actions, gathering background information, identification of additional dangerous warning signs, establishing a threat potential risk level (1 to 10) for a case, preparing a case for hearings (for instance, commitment hearings), and disseminating warning information.

4. Students, faculty, and staff should be trained annually about responding to various emergencies and about the notification systems that will be used.

5. Universities and colleges must comply with the Clery Act, which requires timely public warnings of imminent danger. “Timely” should be defined clearly in the federal law.

Campus Alerting

6. Campus emergency communications systems must have multiple means of sharing information.

7. In an emergency, immediate messages must be sent to the campus community that provide clear information on the nature of the emergency and actions to be taken. The initial messages should be followed by update messages as more information becomes known.
8. Campus police as well as administration officials should have the authority and capability to send an emergency message. Schools without a police department or senior security official must designate someone able to make a quick decision without convening a committee.

**Police Role and Training**

9. The head of campus police should be a member of a threat assessment team as well as the emergency response team for the university. In some cases where there is a security department but not a police department, the security head may be appropriate.

10. Campus police must report directly to the senior operations officer responsible for emergency decision making. They should be part of the policy team deciding on emergency planning.

11. Campus police must train for active shooters (as did the Virginia Tech Police Department).

12. The mission statement of campus police should give primacy to their law enforcement and crime prevention role.

**Virginia Mental Health Legislation**

13. Va. Code 37.2-808 (H) and (I) and 37.2-814 (A) should be amended to extend the time periods for temporary detention to permit more thorough mental health evaluations.

14. Va. Code 37.2-809 should be amended to authorize magistrates to issue temporary detention orders based upon evaluations conducted by emergency physicians trained to perform emergency psychiatric evaluations.

15. The criteria for involuntary commitment in Va. Code 37.2-817(B) should be modified in order to promote more consistent application of the standard and to allow involuntary treatment in a broader range of cases involving severe mental illness.

16. The number and capacity of secure crisis stabilization units should be expanded where needed in Virginia to ensure that individuals who are subject to a temporary detention order do not need to wait for an available bed.

17. The role and responsibilities of the independent evaluator in the commitment process should be clarified and steps taken to assure that the necessary reports and collateral information are assembled before the independent evaluator conducts the evaluation.

18. The following documents should be presented at the commitment hearing: The complete evaluation of the treating physician, including collateral information; reports of any lab and toxicology tests conducted; reports of prior psychiatric history and all admission forms and nurse’s notes.
19. The Virginia Code should be amended to require the presence of the pre-screener or other CSB representative at all commitment hearings and to provide adequate resources to facilitate CSB compliance.

20. The independent evaluator, if not present in person, and treating physician should be available where possible if needed for questioning during the hearing.

21. The Virginia Health Records Privacy statute should be amended to provide a safe harbor provision which would protect health entities and providers from liability or loss of funding when they disclose information in connection with evaluations and commitment hearings conducted under Virginia Code 37.2-814 et seq.

22. Virginia Health Records Privacy and Va. Code 37.2-814 et seq. should be amended to ensure that all entities involved with treatment have full authority to share records with each other and all persons involved in the involuntary commitment process while providing the legal safeguards needed to prevent unwarranted breaches of confidentiality.

23. Virginia Code 37.2-817(C) should be amended to clarify—the need for specificity in involuntary outpatient orders; the appropriate recipients of certified copies of orders; the party responsible for certifying copies of orders; the party responsible for reporting noncompliance with outpatient orders and to whom noncompliance is reported; the mechanism for returning the noncompliant person to court; the sanction(s) to be imposed on the noncompliant person who does not pose an imminent danger to himself or others; the respective responsibilities of the detaining facility, the CSB, and the outpatient treatment provider in assuring effective implementation of involuntary outpatient treatment orders.

24. The Virginia Health Records Privacy statute should be clarified to expressly authorize treatment providers to report noncompliance with involuntary outpatient orders.

Information Privacy Laws
25. Accurate guidance should be developed by the attorney general of Virginia regarding the application of information privacy laws to the behavior of troubled students. The guidance should clearly explain what information can be shared by concerned organizations and individuals about troubled students.

26. Privacy laws should be revised to include “safe harbor” provisions. The provisions should insulate a person or organization from liability (or loss of funding) for making a disclosure with a good faith belief that the disclosure was necessary to protect the health, safety, or welfare of the person involved or members of the general public.

27. The following amendments to FERPA should be considered: FERPA should explicitly explain how it applies to medical records held for treatment purposes.
28. The Department of Education should allow more flexibility in FERPA’s “emergency” exception. As currently drafted, FERPA contains an exception that allows for release of records in an emergency, when disclosure is necessary to protect the health or safety of either the student or other people.

29. Schools should ensure that law enforcement and medical staff (and others as necessary) are designated as school officials with an educational interest in school records. This FERPA-related change does not require amendment to law or regulation.

30. The Commonwealth of Virginia Commission on Mental Health Reform should study whether the result of a commitment hearing (whether the subject was voluntarily committed, involuntarily committed, committed to outpatient therapy, or released) should also be publicly available despite an individual’s request for confidentiality.

31. The national higher education associations should develop best practice protocols and associated training for information sharing.

**Gun Purchases and Campus Policies**

32. All states should report information necessary to conduct federal background checks on gun purchases.

33. Virginia should require background checks for all firearms sales, including those gun shows.

34. Anyone found to be a danger to themselves or others by a court-ordered review should be entered in the Central Criminal Records Exchange database regardless of whether they voluntarily agreed to treatment.

35. The existing attorney general’s opinion regarding the authority of universities and colleges to ban guns on campus should be clarified immediately.

36. The Virginia General Assembly should adopt legislation in the 2008 session clearly establishing the right of every institution of higher education in the Commonwealth to regulate the possession of firearms on campus if it so desires. The panel recommends that guns be banned on campus grounds and in buildings unless mandated by law.

37. Universities and colleges should make clear in their literature what their policy is regarding weapons on campus.

**Double Homicide at West Ambler Johnson**

38. In the preliminary stages of an investigation, the police should resist focusing on a single theory and communicating that to decision makers.

39. All key facts should be included in an alerting message, and it should be disseminated as quickly as possible, with explicit information.
40. Recipients of emergency messages should be urged to inform others.

41. Universities should have multiple communication systems, including some not dependent on high technology. Do not assume that 21st century communications may survive an attack or natural disaster or power failure.

42. Plans for canceling classes or closing the campus should be included in the university’s emergency operations plan.

Mass Shooting at Norris Hall
43. Campus police everywhere should train with local police departments on response to active shooters and other emergencies.

44. Dispatchers should be cautious when giving advice or instructions by phone to people in a shooting or facing other threats without knowing the situation.

45. Police should escort survivors out of buildings, where circumstances and manpower permit.

46. Schools should check the hardware on exterior doors to ensure that they are not subject to being chained shut.

47. Take bomb threats seriously. Students and staff should report them immediately, even if most do turn out to be false alarms.

Emergency Medical Services
48. Montgomery County, VA should develop a countywide emergency medical services, fire, and law enforcement communications center to address the issues of interoperability and economies of scale.

49. A unified command post should be established and operated based on the National Incident Management System Incident Command System model.

50. Emergency personnel should use the National Incident Management System procedures for nomenclature, resource typing and utilization, communications, and unified command.

51. An emergency operations center must be activated early during a mass casualty incident.

52. Regional disaster drills should be held on an annual basis. The drills should include hospitals, the Regional Hospital Coordinating Center, all appropriate public safety and state agencies, and the medical examiner’s office. They should be followed by a formal post-incident evaluation.
53. To improve multi-casualty incident management, the Western Virginia Emergency Medical Services Council should review/revise the Multi-Casualty Incident Medical Control and the Regional Hospital Coordinating Center functions.

54. Triage tags, patient care reports, or standardized Incident Command System forms must be completed accurately and retained after a multi-casualty incident.

55. Hospitalists, when available, should assist with emergency department patient dispositions in preparing for a multi-casualty incident patient surge.

56. Under no circumstances should the deceased be transported under emergency conditions. It benefits no one and increases the likelihood of hurting others.

57. Critical incident stress management and psychological services should continue to be available to EMS providers as needed.

**Office of the Chief Medical Examiner**

58. The chief medical examiner should not be one of the staff performing the postmortem exams in mass casualty events; the chief medical examiner should be managing the overall response.

59. The Office of the Chief Medical Examiner (OCME) should work along with law enforcement, Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS), chaplains, Department of Homeland Security, and other authorized entities in developing protocols and training to create a more responsive family assistance center (FAC).

60. The OCME and Virginia State Police in concert with FAC personnel should ensure that family members of the deceased are afforded prompt and sensitive notification of the death of a family member when possible and provide briefings regarding any delays.

61. Training should be developed for FAC, law enforcement, OCME, medical and mental health professionals, and others regarding the impact of crime and intervention for victim survivors.

62. OCME and FAC personnel should ensure that a media expert is available to manage media requests effectively and that victims are not inundated that may increase their stress.

63. The Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services should mandate training for law enforcement officers on death notifications.

64. The OCME should participate in disaster or national security drills and exercises to plan and train for effects of a mass fatality situation on ME operations.

65. The Virginia Department of Health should continuously recruit board-certified forensic pathologists and other specialty positions to fill vacancies within the OCME.
66. The Virginia Department of Health should have several public information officers trained and well versed in OCME operations and in victims’ services. When needed, they should be made available to the OCME for the duration of the event.

67. Funding to train and credential volunteer staff, such as the group from the Virginia Funeral Director’s Association, should be made available in order to utilize their talents.

68. The Commonwealth should amend its Emergency Operations Plan to include an emergency support function for mass fatality operations and family assistance.

69. Emergency management plans should include a section on victim services that addresses the significant impact of homicide and other disaster-caused deaths on survivors and the role of victim service providers in the overall plan.

70. Universities and colleges should ensure that they have adequate plans to stand up a joint information center with a public information officer and adequate staff during major incidents on campus.

71. When a family assistance center is created after a criminal mass casualty event, victim advocates should be called immediately to assist the victims and their families.

72. Regularly scheduled briefings should be provided to victims’ families as to the status of the investigation, the identification process, and the procedures for retrieving the deceased.

73. Because of the extensive physical and emotional impact of this incident, both short- and long-term counseling should be made available to first responders, students, staff, faculty members, university leaders, and the staff of The Inn at Virginia Tech.

74. Training in crisis management is needed at universities and colleges.

75. Law enforcement agencies should ensure that they have a victim services section or identified individual trained and skilled to respond directly and immediately to the needs of victims of crime from within the department.

76. It is important that the state’s Victims Services Section work to ensure that victims are linked with local victim assistance professionals for ongoing help related to their needs.

77. Since all crime is local, the response to emergencies caused by crime should start with a local plan that is linked to the wider community.

78. Universities and colleges should create a victim assistance capability either in house or through linkages to county-based professional victim assistance providers for victims of crime.
79. In order to advance public safety and meet public needs, Virginia’s colleges and universities need to work together as a coordinated system of state-supported institutions.

APPENDIX B

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT ON ISSUES RAISED BY THE VIRGINIA TECH TRAGEDY – JUNE 13, 2007

Recommended State and Local Action

1. Increase information sharing and collaboration among state and local communities, educators, mental health officials, and law enforcement to detect, intervene, and respond to potential incidents of violence in schools and other venues.

2. Provide accurate information to help ensure that family members, educational administrators, mental health providers, and other appropriate persons understand when and how they are legally entitled to share and receive information about mental illness, particularly where college and youth are involved, for the protection and well being of the student and the community.

3. Along with reviewing federal laws that may apply, clarify and promote wider understanding about how state law limits or allows the sharing of information about individuals who may pose a danger to themselves or others, and examine state law to determine if legislative or regulatory changes are needed to achieve the appropriate balance of privacy and security.

4. Prioritize and address legal and financial barriers to submitting all relevant disqualifying information to the NICS and other crucial inter-agency information sharing systems to prevent individuals who are prohibited from possessing firearms by federal or state law from acquiring firearms from federally licensed firearms dealers.

5. The U.S. Department of Education should ensure that its emergency management grantees have clear guidance on the sharing of information to educational records and FERPA.

6. Federal agencies should continue to work together, and with states and appropriate partners, to improve, expand, coordinate, and disseminate information and best practices in behavioral analysis, threat assessments, and emergency preparedness, for colleges and universities.

7. The U.S. Department of Education, in collaboration with the U.S. Secret Service and the Department of Justice, should explore research of targeted violence in IHEs and continue to share existing threat assessment methodology with interested institutions.
8. Develop cultures within schools and IHEs that promote safety, trust, respect, and open communication.

9. Educate and train parents, teachers, and students to recognize warning signs and known indicators of violence and mental illness and to alert those who can provide for safety and treatment.

10. Establish and publicize widely a mechanism to report and respond to reported threats of violence.

11. Evaluate state and local community mental health systems to ensure their adequacy in providing a full array and continuum of services, including mental health services for students, and in providing meaningful choices among treatment options.

12. Integrate mental health screening, treatment, and referral with primary health care.

13. Review emergency services and commitment laws to ensure the standards are clear, appropriate, and strike the proper balance among liberty, safety for the individual and the community, and appropriate treatment.

14. Where a legal ruling mandates a course of treatment, make sure that systems are in place to ensure thorough follow-up.

15. Integrate comprehensive all-hazards emergency management planning for schools into overall local and state emergency planning.

16. Institute regular practice of emergency management response plans and revise them as issues arise and circumstances change.

17. Communicate emergency management plans to all school officials, school service workers, parents, students, and first responders.

18. Develop a clear communication plan and tools to communicate rapidly with students and parents to alert them when an emergency occurs. Utilize technology to improve notification, communication, and security systems.

19. Ensure of law enforcement through enhanced professionalism of campus police forces and joint training with federal, state, and local law enforcement.

20. Be prepared to provide both immediate and longer term mental health support following an event, and evaluate events and the response to them in order to gather lessons learned and implement corrective measures.
Recommended Federal Action

21. The U.S. Departments of Health and Human Services and Education should develop additional guidance that clarifies how information can be shared legally under HIPAA and FERPA and disseminate it to the mental health, education, and law enforcement communities.

22. The U.S. Department of Education should ensure that parents and school officials understand how and when post-secondary institutions can share information on college students with parents.

23. The U.S. Departments of Education and Health and Human Services should consider whether further actions are needed to balance more appropriately the interests of safety, privacy, and treatment implicated by FERPA and HIPAA.

24. The U.S. Department of Justice, through the FBI and ATF, should reiterate the scope and requirements of federal firearms laws, including guidance on the federal firearms prohibitions in the Gun Control Act of 1968 and how to provide information to the NICS on persons whose receipt of a firearm would violate state or federal law.

25. The U.S. Department of Justice, through the FBI and ATF, should continue to encourage state and federal agencies to provide all appropriate information to the NICS so that required background checks are thorough and complete.

26. The U.S. Department of Justice should work with states to provide appropriate guidance on policies and procedures that would ensure that relevant and complete information is available for background checks.

27. The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services should work through the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's (CDC) Academic Centers of Excellence on Youth Violence Prevention and collaborate with the U.S. Department of Education to identify opportunities to expand CDC's "Choose Respect" initiative so that it includes efforts to develop healthy school climates and prevent violence in schools.

28. The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services should include a focus on college students in its mental health public education campaign to encourage young people to support their friends who are experiencing mental health problems.

29. The U.S. Departments of Education, Health and Human Services, and Justice should continue to work together and with states and local communities to improve and expand their collaboration on their "Safe Schools/Healthy Students" program.

30. The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services should convene the directors of state mental health, substance abuse, and Medicaid agencies and constituent organizations to explore ways to expand and better coordinate delivery of evidence-based practices and community-based care to adults and children with mental and substance use disorders.
31. The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services should examine current strategies for implementing innovative technologies in the mental health field to enhance service capacity, through such means as telemedicine, electronic health records, health information technology, and electronic decision support tools in health care.

32. The interagency Federal Executive Steering Committee on Mental Health led by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services should promote federal agency collaboration to support innovations in mental health services and supports for school aged children and young adults in primary care and specialty mental health settings using evidence-based programs and innovative technologies.

33. The U.S. Department of Education should review its information regarding emergency management planning to ensure it addresses the needs of IHEs and then disseminate it widely.

34. The U.S. Departments of Education, Homeland Security, and Justice should collaborate and be proactive in helping state, local, and campus law enforcement receive desired training and making them aware of federal resources on behavioral analysis, active shooter training, and other research and analysis relevant to preparedness and response.

35. The U.S. Departments of Homeland Security and Justice, jointly and separately, and in collaboration with the U.S. Department of Education, should consider programs to be used to facilitate joint training exercises for state, local, and campus law enforcement.

36. The U.S. Departments of Health and Human Services and Homeland Security should examine their community preparedness grants to state and local communities, which include an emphasis on early detection of hazards through information sharing, to clarify the grants that are available for the prevention of and preparedness for violence in schools, offices, and public places.

APPENDIX C  LISTING OF DIRECTED ASSAULTS FROM 1970-2008

4 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 21
Non-affiliated subject who was a student at another IHE entered the church at a Catholic university and fatally shot caretaker. He then began smashing statues, pews, and windows, the exited and shot at passerby, wounding four. He was then killed by police.

1/12/1972 – Texas Tech University – Lubbock, TX
0 injured, 2 killed – Subject’s Age: 57
Janitor fatally shot fellow janitor and graduate student/teaching assistant in a basement hallway. Subject, with a history of mental illness, had argued with the student six months earlier when he refused to let him in his office, having locked himself out.

2/8/1972 – Oregon State University – Corvallis, OR
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 17
Student fatally stabbed fellow student in her dorm room. Student suffered bullying in high school. Judge convicted him of man slaughter, stating he committed the murder while suffering “an extreme emotional disturbance.” Others believed he was a stalker.

0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: unknown
Non-affiliated subject and student fatally stabbed another student as he walked across campus. The two perpetrators, who were black, were looking for any white person to attack on campus.

6/18/1973 – Long Island University – C.W. Post Campus – Brookville, NY
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 25
Non-affiliated subject, who frequented the campus and local discos, was walking on campus when he saw a female student, followed her to her dorm, pushed her inside, raped her, and then fatally stabbed her 21 times. Subject has a history of attacking/raping women.

8/22/1973 – Phoenix College – Phoenix, AZ
1 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 37
Upset over comment victim (student) made to him, student threatened to get a gun to kill him. Though victim told security of threat, subject retrieved a gun, fatally shot him, and injured another in front of hundreds of students at registration in gym.

10/8/1973 – University of Wisconsin, Rock County – Janesville, WI
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 28
Non-affiliated subject fatally shot his former wife as she walked across the campus parking lot. He had been upset over the limited contact he was allowed with his daughter, and had gotten jealous the night before when he met a male friend of the victim.

1 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 27
Former student attacked his first victim (student), nearly killing her, in her off campus home. He then became one of the most notorious serial killers in the U.S. Eight of the attacks (3 injured, 8 killed) originated on or near IHE campuses.

3/11/1974 – Brigham Young University – Provo, UT
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 23
Student fatally shot his friend (student) in remote location off campus. 33 years later, DNA linked the subject to the killing. He was also suspected of rapes that occurred near campus at the time.

11/7/1974 – Wagner College – Staten Island, NY
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 27
IHE library employee who had dated a nursing student twice, accosted her as she walked between buildings on campus, fatally stabbing her. Subject had history of mental illness.

12/2/1974 – San Diego State University – San Diego, CA
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 21
Student was strangled and fatally stabbed by a non-affiliated subject to whom she was introduced by a dorm mate. Reports indicate that the incident was an attempted rape resulting in murder. It is unknown how he got into the dorm room.

3/23/1975 – Ventura College – Ventura, CA
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 19
Reportedly wanting to kill a campus police officer for a year, a non-affiliated subject (son of an instructor on campus) lured an officer from his car and fatally shot him as he was on patrol on campus.

4/5/1975 – University of Houston – Houston, TX
2 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 25
Upset over failing doctoral exam, student shot/wounded assistant professor from the review committee and a student bystander. He had threatened the professor two days prior, pistol taken from him by campus police, but not arrested. He tried to kill self after incident.

7/12/1976 – California State University, Fullerton (CSUF) – Fullerton, CA
9 injured, 7 killed – Subject’s Age: 36
Affected by delusional thoughts and hallucinations, campus custodian went on shooting spree in college library, killing seven and injuring nine employees.
1/1/1977 – Michigan State University – East Lansing, MI
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 23
Upset after broken engagement two days earlier, student killed fellow student after New Year’s Eve when the two got together just as friends. Subject later killed three women (one student, one employee, 1 non-affiliated), as they resembled his first victim. Serial killer case.

4/26/1977 – University of California, Davis – Davis, CA
0 injured, 2 killed – Subject’s Age: 34
After hearing messages from television to kill three people and self, student went to apartment of fellow student he knew from Arab club and fatally shot him and his roommate. He then went to another apartment, tried to shoot third student. When police came, he tried to commit suicide.

5/12/1977 – Texas Eastern University – Tyler, TX
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 29
Upset after a disappointing grade, student fatally shot professor seven times in the doorway to his office on campus.

9/26/1977 – Fullerton Community College – Fullerton, CA
1 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 22
Distraught over pressure to perform from his parents, student shot his apartment manager when he knocked on his door, then grabbed his guns and went to campus. He entered a classroom, shot an aide, tried to shoot another student, before killing himself.

1978 – Lehigh University – Bethlehem, PA
1 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: unknown
Student attacked roommate with hammer as he slept in retaliation for the roommate allegedly bombarding him with alpha waves that would turn him into a woman.

8/18/1978 – Stanford University – Stanford, CA
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 41
Upset over being told he would not get his mathematics doctorate after nineteen years, student targeted the department’s assistant chairman, killing him with a hammer in his office.

2/9/1979 – Strayer College – Annandale, VA
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 27
Student fatally shot his roommate (student) in their off-campus apartment after a struggle. The subject reportedly wanted to spend time in the room alone.

9/3/1979 – University of the Pacific – Stockton, CA
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 18
Student fatally shot his former girlfriend (student) after she agreed to meet him for the last time. Subject had enrolled in the college after the victim did and had stalked/threatened her as she tried to make him understand it was over.
10/6/1979 – University of South Carolina – Columbia, SC
5 injured, 2 killed – Subject’s Age: 19
Student entered a frat sponsored party at a dorm and opened fire. After shooting five, he left and shot two more outside on the walkway, resulting in two killed and five injured. Prosecutors allege subject was upset over $2 cover for a frat party he attended two weeks prior.

12/4/1979 – Kennedy-King Community College – Chicago, IL
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 37
Upset over victim (student) refusing to date him, former police officer (not affil with the IHE), entered a classroom and fatally shot the victim before killing himself. One month prior, he had been arrested for firing shots at her car.

12/18/1979 – Washington State University – Pullman, WA
6 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 18
Former boyfriend (non-affiliated subject) of student stalked her when she moved to college. He tried to get her back, but when she refused, he took a bomb into her dorm. It detonates (unknown if intentionally) and kills self and wounds six others.

0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 24
Upset over receiving an incomplete in course, subject argued with professor and fatally shot him in his campus office.

1/12/1980 - DePaul University – Chicago, IL
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 24
Student manager of the tennis team fatally stabbed a tennis star outside of the dorm, possibly out of jealousy, as the star had an athletic scholarship and the subject did not.

3/26/1980 – Ferris State University – Big Rapids, MI
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 20
Two days after receiving a failing grade, accounting student (son of associate dean), entered classroom and fatally shot his accounting instructor in front of classroom of thirty students.

6/24/1980 – University of Wisconsin – Madison, WI
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 27
Graduate student on parole for various brutal attacks on women, raped and strangled a fellow student/friend in her off campus apartment.

10/18/1980 – Texas A&M University – College Station, TX
1 injured, 1 killed – Student’s Age: 19
Non-affiliated subject called to set up meeting with former girlfriend (student) as campus chapel, where he shot and wounded her and killed himself. They had broken up one month earlier.
2 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 23
Non-affiliated subject abducted three cheerleaders from campus gymnasium parking lot, drove them to a quarry. After raping and killing one, other two escaped.

1/27/1981 – University of Arkansas – Fayetteville, AR
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 19
Student entered sorority house with a shotgun, held over 100 women hostage, threatening to shoot. He had reportedly been rejected by one of the women and tried to talk to her again during the incident. Police responded, ultimately killing the subject.

4/17/1981 – University of Michigan – Ann Arbor, MI
1 injured, 2 killed – Subject’s Age: 20
Upset over failing grades and possible second dismissal from IHE, student tossed firebomb in dorm hall and opened fire on students as they evacuated. Two students killed (at least one was intended as name found on notepad in his dorm room).

5/8/1981 – Texas A&M University – College Station, TX
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 20
Thinking he was a Soviet spy trying to kill him, student stabbed his roommate forty-eight ties. Location and details are unclear.

5/12/1981 – Cornell University – Ithaca, NY
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 21
Student raped and strangled a fellow student with whom he may have attended class. The subject then committed a series of rapes in multiple states after graduation and killed six more women to become a serial rapist/killer.

10/23/1981 – Florida A&M University – Tallahassee, FL
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: unknown
Student raped and killed fellow student in her dorm room. Though suspected early on, he was identified as the subject a month later when he attempted suicide, his roommate called police and evidence was found in his campus trailer.

2/1/1982 – Cleveland State University – Cleveland, OH
0 injured, 3 killed: Subject’s Age: 31
Neo-Nazi former student carried out a series of attacks and killings on the CSU campus, specifically targeting Jewish and Black victims. A total of three people killed, one was uninjured in an attempted shooting.

4/5/1982 – Garland County Community College – Hot Springs, AR
0 injured, 2 killed – Subject’s Age: 25
While arguing with professor during class over tardiness, grades, and incomplete homework, subject took out gun, shot and killed the professor and fellow student, took another student hostage, eventually being chased down by police.

4/12/1982 – San Francisco City College – San Francisco, CA
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 28
Former student entered psychology professor’s office and fatally shot him before eight witnesses. Professor had received threats from him in the past and others in the IHE were ware.

1 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: unknown
Former employee entered campus library, shot and wounded the director of libraries in his office, went to nearby conference and fired a shot at his former supervisor, missing. He had been fired from the library three months prior.

12/17/1983 – Cornell University - Ithaca, NY
0 injured, 2 killed – Subject’s Age: 26
Non-affiliated subject entered dorm to see acquaintance with whom he was obsessed. While in room, he took seven students hostage, released five, but shot and killed the student acquaintance and roommate. He drove off, shot self in head, but survived. He had stalked/harassed the victim.

1/27/1984 – Purdue University – Calumet – Hammond, IN
1 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 26
After arguing over a “D” he received in his class, student shot calculus professor in the chest while in his office and ran. Professor survived.

4/18/1984 – University of South Carolina – Columbia, SC
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 37
Former professor who lost his job two years prior, entered office of IHE president with a student hostage, demanding his job back. The president was not in office at the time and after a short standoff with police, he killed himself.

10/21/1984 – Indiana University – Bloomington, IN
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 23
Upset over fight the night before, student returned to frat house and set fire to it, killing one student.

11/9/1984 – Slippery Rock University – Slippery Rock, PA
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 23
Former student went to former girlfriend’s off campus apartment to talk about their breakup, which as “in the process.” They argued, he fatally shot her and then himself.
11/12/1984 – University of Oregon – Eugene, OR
1 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 19
Student still living on campus staged sniper attack at university stadium, he randomly shooting sixty-seven rounds. Killed one, wounded one, and then killed himself.

11/30/1984 – Drexel University – Philadelphia, PA
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 35
University security guard with foot fetish attacked and killed a female student studying alone in a basement computer room.

4/10/1985 – Purdue University – Calumet – Hammond, IN
1 injured, 0 killed – Student’s Age: unknown
Student got into her car in campus parking lot after class and found estranged husband (non-affiliated) in back. He then kidnapped her at gunpoint and tried to take her away. When police spotted her in car, he shot her five times and killed self. Student survived.

5/14/1985 – San Francisco State University – San Francisco, CA
0 injured, 0 killed – Student’s Age: 51
Neo-Nazi (non-affiliated subject) targeting area Black and Jewish entities placed a bomb in the IHE classroom schedule to be used for a Black Studies Lecture. Pipe bomb discovered before detonation.

9/11/1985 – George C. Wallace State Community College – Selma, AL
2 injured, 1 killed – Student’s Age: 28
Former student entered classroom of community college, shot and killed his former wife before surrendering. He also injured two others (one shot, the other beaten).

10/10/1985 – Columbia University – New York, NY
1 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 20
Non-affiliated subject was staying in dorm with a friend when he entered the room of female student, stacked and attempted to rape her. When she fought back, he stabbed her several times.

11/15/1985 – Concord College – Athens, WV
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: unknown
Student shot fellow student after history of conflict dating back a year. Subject had attacked him physically in past and stalked him. Reason for conflict is unclear.

1/18/1986 – Saddleback College – Mission Viejo, CA
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: unknown
Non-affiliated student drove around looking for someone to attack, saw a sign for the college, went to dark parking lot to find a victim. He stabbed her forty-one times.

2/14/1986 – Western New England College – Springfield, MA
1 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 21
Obsessed with trying to date a fellow student, subject tried to abduct her, shooting and wounding her in the college parking lot as she tried to drive off.

4/5/1986 – Lehigh University – Bethlehem, PA
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 22
Student viciously raped and murdered a female student in her dorm room, later claiming to have been under the influence.

8/12/1986 – New York College of Technology – New York, NY
4 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 29
Upset over missing financial aid check for $700+, student bought two guns out of state, returned home and went on campus killing spree. He began in lab building where he worked- killing one, then went to financial aid building-injuring three, then third building- injuring one.

8/29/1986 – Clarkson University -Potsdam, NY
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 23
Non-affiliated subject attempted to rape and brutally attacked a female student as she walked across campus. Two campus guards saw the two on the ground and walked away as they thought they were a consensual couple. Victim died later of her injuries.

11/5/1986 – St. Clair County Community College – Port Huron, MI
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 23
Non-affiliated subject fatally shot student in campus parking lot as he exited his car. The victim was engaged to the subject’s former girlfriend, whom he had stopped dating six months prior. Subject had allegedly threatened the victim.

12/10/1986 – University of Kentucky – Lexington, KY
2 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 25
Fired janitor entered campus building heavily armed, dressed as a ninja, took former boss hostage, and fired randomly out the window. One employee shot in the leg and boss hit by debris from shot fired near his head when help captive. Subject subdued by police.

2/4/1987 – California State University, Northridge – Northridge, CA
0 injured, 1 killed –Subject’s Age: 25
Master’s student in danger of being dropped from the program after receiving a low grade fatally shot an associate professor in a stairwell on campus after an argument regarding the grade. He then shot and killed himself.

2/6/1987 – Oregon State University – Corvallis, OR
0 injured, 0 killed –Subject’s Age: 49
Enamored with IHE employee’s wife, non-affiliated subject tried to kill the employee by tricking him into carrying a pipe bomb in a briefcase into his work at the IHE’s computer center. Others were involved in the conspiracy, hired by the subject.
7/25/1989 – University of Washington – Seattle, WA
0 injured, 2 killed – Subject’s Age: 24
Non-affiliated subject (former boyfriend) of student tracked her down from another state, confronted her in a parking lot as she walked with a male friend. When she would not go with him, subject shot and killed them both. He used a private investigator to find her.

9/1/1989 – University of Florida School of Medicine – Gainesville, FL
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 41
Upset over being told his graduate studies would be terminated after seven years; student went to home of his professor (the chair of the committee deciding his status) and fatally shot him.

10/7/1989 – Syracuse University – Syracuse, NY
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age 32
University janitor fatally shot his supervisor on campus in a maintenance office at close range with a shotgun. Subject did not provide a motive, expressing no animosity.

12/5/1989 – University of North Florida – Jacksonville, FL
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 22
Student became obsessed with a male student, stalking him. After a history of threats, she was suspended from the IHE, but later allowed to return. Soon after she shot and killed him in a classroom.

2/19/1990 – University of California, Los Angeles Medical Center – Los Angeles, CA
1 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 18
University medical center employee upset after being suspended, waited at his former office to shoot supervisor as she got of car. He injured her and killed a former co-worker.

2/27/1990 – Oklahoma City University - Oklahoma City, OK
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 22
Graduate student fatally shot fellow student after arguing over subject’s former boyfriend, whom the victim was dating. Subject kidnapped the victim from her off campus apartment and drove her to secluded road to kill her.

5/15/1990 – Montana State University – Bozeman, MN
0 injured, 2 killed – Subject’s Age: 19
Student shot and killed two other freshmen in dorm after he got drunk. He allegedly believed one had vandalized his truck, while the other, who just happened to be there, had teased him about appearing homosexual.

5/18/1990 – Carroll College – Helena, MT
1 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 34
Unemployed ranch hand (non-affiliated subject) entered campus cafeteria and shot two employees sitting in a group on their coffee break. Though no specific motive was revealed, he was drunk and had been asked to leave the IHE chapel just prior.
8/30/1990 – Catholic University of America – Washington, DC
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 59
Former temporary employee, approached housekeeper in dorm parking lot, opened fire, killing her. Police believe it was over a personal matter.

9/8/1990 – Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania – Lock Haven, PA
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 19
College junior found strangled in his dorm room days after moving out of off-campus apartment he shared with his boyfriend (fellow student). Incident ruled murder-suicide after boyfriend committed suicide.

2/20/1991 – Purdue University – West Lafayette, IN
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 59
A recently fired custodian entered the post office of his former supervisor and fatally shot her before putting down the gun and waiting for police.

5/7/1991 – Hutson-Tillotson College – Austin, TX
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 18
Four days after an argument at a dance, student fatally stabbed another student. Subject had threatened the victim with a shotgun earlier, which was reported to administration before the actual killing.

6/17/1991 – Dartmouth College – Hanover, NH
0 injured, 2 killed – Subject’s Age: 32
Non-affiliated subject hacked his girlfriend and her roommate to death with an ax he hid in the campus leased apartment days before. The attack was spurred by her refusal of his marriage proposal.

7/25/1991 – Long Beach City College – Long Beach, CA
1 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 47
Non-affiliated brother of college employee lured him to a campus parking lot by calling to say his car had a flat tire. When victim went to fix it, his brother shot him four times. The two were engaged in a family dispute over inheritance.

9/18/1991 – The University of Texas – Austin, TX
0 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 24
Former student, who had withdrawn from classes the day before, entered the outer office of the IHE president with revolver, intending to demand his resignation. Struggle with office, shot fired, no injuries. Target was not there at the time.

11/1/1991 – University of Iowa – Iowa City, IA
1 injured, 5 killed – Subject’s Age: 28
Upset over a series of perceived academic and professional failures, former student enters two building on campus, shooting and killing five people, wounding another, before killing self. Victims included his advisor and faculty.

**12/12/1991 – Kent State University – Kent, OH**
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 35
Former student (graduated six years prior) shot a janitor and graduate student in two separate incidents a month and a half apart on campus before being shot and killed by campus police weeks after second shooting. Unknown motive.

**1/26/1992 – University of Toledo – Toledo, OH**
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 22
Campus police officer pulled over a nursing student whom he did not know, drove her to a deserted campus parking lot, removed her clothing and shot her fourteen times. He stated at trial that he did not know why he did it.

**4/23/1992 – Indiana University – Bloomington, IN**
0 injured, 2 killed – Subject’s Age: 28
Non-affiliated subject appeared at the dorm room of former girlfriend after history of threatening phone calls. He fatally shot the girlfriend and a student who came to her aid. He then fled, killing himself off campus. They had broken up approximately four months prior.

**8/25/1992 – University of California, Berkeley – Berkeley, CA**
0 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 19
Non-affiliated subject broke into the home of chancellor with a machete. As a protestor wanting to protect a local park, she wanted to kill the chancellor, but was killed by police. She arrest one year prior for having explosives and list of names.

**11/29/1992 – Loyola Marymount University – Los Angeles, CA**
0 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 28
Former student sent poisoned candy to student who had spurned his advances and who he had harassed. Victim turned it over to police. Subject was thrown out of IHE for the stalking. Subject also sent package to student in NY.

4 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 28
Non-affiliated subject sent poisoned candy to exchange student who had spurned his advances when they knew each other in Belgium. She shared the candy with roommates, all four hospitalized. Subject also sent package to student in CA (see above).

**12/14/1992 – Simon’s Rock College of Bard – Great Barrington, MA**
4 injured, 2 killed – Subject’s Age: 18
Socially isolated student, who did not adjust well to the liberal college environment, went on a
shooting spree on campus injuring four, killing one. He surrendered when his rifle jammed. Described as quiet, but known to vent hatred for Jews, Blacks and gays.

4/6/1993 – University of Alaska, Anchorage – Anchorage, AK
1 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 39
IHE office manager’s former husband (non-affiliated subject) confronted her in parking lot on campus after harassing and threatening her for months. Police responded and her husband shot her, critically wounding her and then killed himself.

7/8/1993 – Weber State University – Ogden, UT
3 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 28
Student opened fire at an IHE grievance hearing held in the campus student union, injuring three people, including a fellow student and co-worker who filed the grievance concerning subject’s harassment of his wife.

9/21/1993 – Old Dominion University – Norfolk, VA
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 26
Non-affiliated subject, who convinced a fraternity he was a member and was allowed to live in the course, killed a female student he was dating. He had a reputation as a ladies’ man and aggressive “frat boy” and had a history of abusing women.

10/10/1993 – Dixie College – St. George, UT
0 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 16
Non-affiliated subject detonated a pipe-bomb outside dorm of two black students. Though no injuries were reported the building was “severely damaged.” The incident was racially motivated.

11/4/1993 – Lee College – Cleveland, TN
18 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 19
Non-affiliated subject, who wanted revenge against students for turning his in for another crime, with the assistance of two friends and one acquaintance, set fire to a dorm, causing 18 injuries.

11/29/1993 – Mid-Florida Technical Institute – Orlando, FL
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 45
Student, who wanted to have an affair with a married fellow student, fatally shot her and himself in a campus parking lot when she refused his advances.

3/7/1994 – San Francisco State University – San Francisco, CA
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 22
Upset over a breakup several months prior, student fatally shot his former girlfriend (student) in her campus dorm. He had argued with her about the breakup in the past and had been asking to see her for several days before she agreed to meet with him.
5/29/1994 – University of California, Riverside – Riverside, CA
6 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 49
Non-affiliated subject shot and injured a guest speaker from the Nation of Islam (NOI), who was appearing on campus at the invitation of a student group. Fired into crowd, injuring others. Subject was a defrocked minister of NOI.

7/17/1994 – University of Kentucky – Lexington, KY
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 21
After holding a grudge against victim for three years for getting him blackballed by a fraternity, student went to the target’s home and fatally shot him.

9/30/1994 – Texas A&M University – College Station, TX
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 22
Student with a history of burglarizing victim’s home, attempting to date her (possibly stalking her), entered her home, tortured and killed her, then set her on fire. He also abducted, but failed to kill her roommate.

12/13/1994 – Sequoia Institute – Fremont, CA
5 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 24
Student arrived on campus an hour late for class, entered building and pulled out a hatchet swinging it at students in the hall, injured five. He told authorities he heard voices the day of the attack and his mother stated he was under a lot of pressure.

12/14/1994 – State University of New York – Albany, NY
2 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 26
Upset over government computer chip in his brain and tracking device in his penis, student stormed classroom and held hostages, demanding to talk to authorities about this plot. Students overtook him, two injured.

1995 – University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee – Milwaukee, WI
1 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: unknown
Subject of unknown affiliation to IHE stabbed a student as he/she slept on a coach in the student union. Subject told police he was a slave to evil. Five years later, subject became stalker of a tennis star.

2/11/1995 – Bangor Theological Seminary – Bangor, ME
1 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 50
Student, who had problems with alcohol and paranoia, shot and injured a fellow student/former friend in her IHE owned apartment for reporting his alcoholism to his boss at a non-affiliated medical center. He then shot and killed himself.

2/12/1995 – Middlesex Community Technical College – Middletown, CT
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 26
Community college security guard raped and killed the widow of a professor. The widow had
come in on Sunday to collect late husband’s belongings. Possibly random sexually motivated
attack.

2/16/1995 – Cuyahoga Community College – Warrensville Heights, OH
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 21
Non-affiliated subject obsessed with married student whom he tutored in math, confronted her on
campus and killed her, then himself. He had a history of harassing, stalking, and threatening her
and her family.

2/22/1995 – Quinnipiac College – Hamden, CT
1 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 49
College administrator’s husband stabbed an English professor in the men’s room in campus
student center for reportedly having an affair with his wife. Victim survived.

3/9/1995 – Northwestern University – Evanston, IL
1 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 45
Former research assistant, who was fired approximately seven years prior, tracked down former
boss at current IHE, shooting him in the parking lot. Subject sent threatening letter to provost of
former IHE approximately two months prior. Day after, he went to dean at former IHE and shot
self.

3/28/1995 – Carroll Community College – Westminster, MD
1 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 48
Non-affiliated subject stabbed and beat his former girlfriend, a custodian at a community college,
in a stairwell on campus.

4/13/1995 – Florida A&M University – Tallahassee, FL
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 19
Student fatally stabbed a fellow student in dorm room. The two had been friends since high
school. No clear motive related.

5/28/1995 – Harvard University – Cambridge, MA
1 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 20
Upset over roommate revealing intent to room with others the following year, student stabbed
her roommate in dorm forty-five times and injured roommate’s visiting friend. Subject
reportedly had reached out for help prior to the attack. She then hanged herself.

6/15/1995 – Shelton State Community College – Tuscaloosa, AL
1 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 28
Upset over broken romance with former girlfriend (student), non-affiliated subject showed up
before her English class was to start, argued with her, and shot her as she stood in the doorway to
the class. He then killed self later at home of estranged wife.
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 37
Non-affiliated subject, who was recently fired from his job, shot and killed his estranged wife (student) in campus parking lot after she refused to halt divorce proceedings. He also fired shot at another student’s car as she drove into lot.

0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 32
Non-affiliated subject, who had a history of stalking and abusing his estranged wife, shot and killed her on-campus where she worked. He then killed himself. She had filed for divorce approximately four months earlier.

10/31/1995 – University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign – Champaign, IL
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 29
Student attacked an IHE computer programmer in parking lot, dragged her to basement in building, then raped and strangled her. Two hours later he stepped in front of a train, killing himself. Motive unclear. Possibly random sexually motivated attack.

3/30/1996 – Pittsburg State University – Pittsburg, KS
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 40
Student (parolee) stalked, raped, and killed fellow nursing student who was his neighbor in an off-campus apartment. Though it is unclear how they met, the college had reported the subject to authorities for falling grades, slacking attendance, and drugs.

4/10/1996 – Johns Hopkins University - Baltimore, MD
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 22
Upset over losing his friendship with target, student confronted him on campus, fatally shooting him. Subject had a history of harassing the target, of which the IHE was aware, and had informed the dean of his intended presence on campus that day.

4/13/1996 – University of Miami – Miami, FL
0 injured, 2 killed – Subject’s Age: 23
Non-affiliated subject broke into the on-campus apartment of a student who was in a relationship with his non-affiliated former girlfriend. He then beat both the student and his former girlfriend to death.

5/28/1996 – Clark College – Vancouver, WA
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 43
Allegedly in retaliation for the practical jokes instructor played on him, a student abducted his instructor after flagging him down at an intersection, forced him to drive to a forest and stabbed him to death.

6/8/1996 – University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill – Chapel Hill, NC
0 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 19
Student broke into fraternity house where her former boyfriend lived and set fire to a couch. Eight people were in the house, including her former boyfriend. No injuries.

6/11/1996 – University of Minnesota, Twin Cities Campus – Minneapolis, MN
0 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 36
A former employee, who had resigned five years prior entered office of IHE president, fired a shot into the ceiling. She claimed she wanted to talk to him about harassment she suffered while an employee, having had an affair with her boss at the time. No injuries.

8/12/1996 – Rowan College – Glassboro, NJ
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 27
Upset over girlfriend (student) breaking up with him ten days prior, non-affiliated subject arranged to meet her on campus to return items. Once there, he fatally shot her, then himself. Subject had a history of abusing the victim and recent suicide attempts.

8/15/1996 – San Diego State University – San Diego, CA
0 injured, 3 killed – Subject’s Age: 36
Upset over belief he was being bogged down with work unrelated to his project, accusations of cheating, and poor evaluation on thesis, student entered lab/class for thesis rebut, walked to where he hid gun and fatally shot three professors on the thesis defense committee.

8/26/1996 – University of Texas, San Antonio – San Antonio, TX
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 25
Non-affiliated subject killed his former boyfriend; the head of library catalog department, in his office in the campus library one month after the victim broke up with him.

9/17/1996 – Pennsylvania State University – University Park, PA
1 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 19
Recent mental patient and high school dropout not affiliated with university, walked to campus with intention of killing self, but went on sniper-style shooting spree instead, killing one student, injuring another. Two others found bullets in their backpacks.

9/24/1996 – University of Northern Colorado – Greeley, CO
1 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 18
Upset over break-up two weeks prior, non-affiliated subject shot his three roommates than drove 400 miles to ex’s campus, took her and four others hostage, shooting the girlfriend in the foot. Subject shot by sniper.

10/12/1996 – James Madison University – Harrisonburg, VA
0 injured, 2 killed – Subject’s Age: 23
Former student with history of harassing his former girlfriend and her new boyfriend (students) traveled from FL and killed both in the boyfriend’s off campus apartment. They had broken up at least five months prior.
10/16/1996 – Purdue University – West Lafayette, IN
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 18
Purdue residence hall counselor was shot to death by freshmen after he informed police of seeing cocaine in the freshman’s dorm. Subject then killed himself.

7/10/1997 – Palm Beach Community College – Lake Worth, FL
1 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 25
Non-affiliated subject went to the campus to kill himself in front of his ex-girlfriend (student), but instead stabbed her in the parking lot.

7/12/1997 – Metropolitan Community College – East St. Louis, IL
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 39
Faculty member was found stabbed in his campus office. One of the transients (non-affiliated) he was known to take in and pleads guilty to the killing. Subject had history of alcohol and drug addiction, specific motive unknown.

9/23/1997 – University of Michigan – Ann Arbor, MI
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 26
Non-affiliated subject stabbed his girlfriend (student), chasing her from her apartment (IHE owned) and finally killing her in a campus parking lot. He was then fatally shot by police.

10/23/1997 – West Virginia University – Morgantown, WV
1 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 20
Three weeks prior, former student’s girlfriend broke up with him; he then traveled seventy miles from his college to her college and shot her new boyfriend (student), whom he knew, in his dorm room. He then shot and killed himself.

10/27/1997 – Michigan State University – East Lansing, MI
1 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 19
Student stabbed girlfriend (student) in campus owned apartment. When 911 responded, he cut his own neck, but survived two hour standoff.

10/28/1997 – Wright State University – Dayton, OH
2 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 27
Former student attacked his former girlfriend and her new boyfriend (both students) as they walked out of the campus library. Both victims were stabbed, but survived.

1/13/1998 – University of Nevada, Reno – Reno, NV
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 27
Apparently wanting to kill a cop, non-affiliated subject stalked IHE police officer before attacking him with a hatchet, striking him over twenty times, as he sat in his squad car on campus, filling out paperwork.
1/15/1998 – Loma Linda University Medical Center – Loma Linda, CA
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 34
Hours after being fired as a parking-lot guard at university hospital, subject shot and killed his supervisor in the parking lot as he left for lunch. Subject had a history of filing grievances and claimed numerous incidents of harassment by employers.

0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 20
Months after his girlfriend (student) broke up with him to see others, student strangled her in his off campus apartment when she came over to pick up a birthday card he had for her. They had dated since high school, and he had followed her to college.

0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 23
Non-affiliated subject slashed the throat of his former girlfriend (student) in her IHE apartment to prove his love for his new girlfriend. The apartment is located on campus.

0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 18
Student killed fellow student in dorm, striking her repeatedly with a brick. Motive unclear from reports. May be based on delusion. Subject and victim had just met before the attack.

8/2/1998 – Northern Arizona University – Flagstaff, AZ
1 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 20
Non-affiliated subject entered off-campus apartment of student and shot her as she slept on the couch. The attack was in retaliation for earlier fight(s) between subject’s friends and the victim’s boyfriend (IHE football player). Other implicated in conspiracy.

0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 55
Computer analyst who resigned days earlier entered campus office (in the computer center) of former supervisor, fatally shooting him and then himself.

9/19/1998 – Bard College – Annandale-on-Hudson, NY
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 24
Upset over recent breakup with student girlfriend, former student slashed her throat, killing her as they stood in the church parking lot up the street from the IHE. He claimed they had been talking about getting back together.

12/10/1998 – Wayne State University – Detroit, MI
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 48
Two days after finding out he had failed a doctoral exam, subject entered classroom of his professor/mentor and fatally shot him.
2/7/1999 – Southwest Texas State University – San Marcos, TX
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 21
Former student, who was earlier thrown out of a frat party, returned to the frat house later, entered the house and killed a pledge that happened to be sleeping in the living room by beating him to death. Killed self the following day.

3/24/1999 – Modesto Junior College – East Campus – Modesto, CA
1 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 25
Former student fired shot in a campus building, missing two students, and later injured a student sitting in the campus courtyard. Subject also involved in similar incident on different campus (see below).

3/25/1999 – California State University, Stanislaus – Turlock, CA
1 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 25
Non-affiliated subject fired a shot in a campus building, grazing the arm of a female visiting her father (a professor) on campus. Subject also involved in similar incident on different campus (see above).

7/11/1999 – University of Central Florida – Orlando, FL
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 21
Student killed his cousin (student) in their off campus apartment then hid the body for nine days while he fled to India. Reports indicated they had argued over the victim’s social life, staying out late, and may have wanted a romantic relationship.

8/31/1999 – Florida A&M University – Tallahassee, FL
0 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 41
Former vending machine filler detonated two homemade bombs in restrooms of an IHE administration office and classroom building. The attacks were racially motivated and caused minimal damage with no injuries. 400 students withdrew in aftermath.

Kalamazoo College – Kalamazoo, MI
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 20
Upset over seeing his former girlfriend (student) with another guy at a dance, student asked to talk to her in his dorm room the next night. She agreed. After arguing, he fatally shot her, and then killed himself. They had broken up months prior.

10/27/1999 – Florida International University – Miami, FL
1 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 21
Reportedly after engaging in a disagreement, student stabbed and wounded fellow student in his dorm room. The two were reported to be friends.

1/24/2000 – Louisiana State University – Baton Rouge, LA
1 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 21
Student stabbed interim dean and professor at his home after he received a letter from his office asking him to discuss a disciplinary matter. The student had forged two grade correction reports and had been caught.

2/5/2000 – Columbia University – New York, NY
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 22
After arguing with his girlfriend (fellow student) over break up, student fatally stabbed her in her dorm room. Hours later he killed himself by jumping in front of a subway train.

2/7/2000 – Westchester Community College – Valhalla, NY
1 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 19
Non-affiliated subject with a history of harassing his former girlfriend (student) confronted her in a classroom hallway, threatening suicide. After arguing, he shot and wounded her, then ran across campus and killed self. They had broken up months earlier.

4/18/2000 – Prairie View A&M University – Prairie View, TX
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 24
Non-affiliated subject fatally shot his former girlfriend (student) as they walked across campus parking lot. When confronted by officers, he shot and killed himself. They had broken up several months prior.

5/10/2000 – Seton Hall University – South Orange, NJ
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 24
Non-affiliated subject stalked/abused his former girlfriend (student) before abducting her from sidewalk alongside campus, taking her to his apartment, shooting them both. Bystanders ran to campus security guard who refused to call 911, telling them to go to the police department.

0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 42
Upset over impending dismissal, medical resident fatally shot his supervisor in his office at the health services building, and then killed self. Subject planned his suicide in front of his enemy, to protect his family honor.

8/21/2000 – Vermilion Community College – Ely, MN
1 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 20
After arguing about who was going to take the lower bunk, on-campus apartment roommate shot the other after he struck him. They were high school football teammates who started on the community college football team ten days earlier.

8/28/2000 – University of Arkansas – Fayetteville, AR
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 36
Upset over being thrown out of a doctoral program, student entered office of academic advisor, shot and killed him then killed self when police responded.
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 20
Student killed two other students in dorm on two separate occasions allegedly during robberies; however the nature of the killings appeared more than just robberies. He was convicted of premeditated murder.

1 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: unknown
Student and his non-affiliated brother shot and wounded a fellow student outside of a dorm. The subject believed the victim had stolen his car four days earlier and had broken into his dorm room and beat him up with friends three hours before the shooting.

4/25/2001 – Hofstra University – Hempstead, NY
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 23
Student lured fellow student and friend from his dorm room to a motel, where he proceeded to kill and dismember him. Motive and relationship are unclear; however some reported that subject made sexual advances toward the victim, who refused them.

5/17/2001 – Pacific Lutheran University – Tacoma, WA
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 55
Non-affiliated subject, who stalked a professor for years after twenty-nine years of no contact, decided to kill himself and kill someone else, not the professor. He fatally shot an IHE professor at random outside a dorm, and then killed himself, leaving a note.

5/29/2001 – University of Portland – Portland, OR
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 27
Former student, who had burglarized other dorm rooms two months prior, sexually assaulted and strangled another student in her dorm room during the spring break. They may have been acquaintances.

6/12/2001 – Eastern Illinois University – Charleston, IL
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 25
Student raped, strangled and mutilated fellow student in her off campus apartment. Though they did not know each other, subject lived across the street in same complex and reportedly had viewed her profile on-line, mentioning her to others by name.

8/2/2001 – Purdue University – West Lafayette, IN
0 injured, 2 killed – Subject’s Age: 27
Graduate student went to campus apartment of student, killing her and her visiting sister with a hammer and a knife. Subject thought fellow students were out to steal his research and poison him. He had come to the apartment two weeks prior to kill her. He committed suicide three years later.
8/27/2001 – University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill – Chapel Hill, NC
0 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 37
Former student planted a pipe bomb on campus. It was detonated by bomb techs. He was also charged with detonating a bomb in his office at Spring Corporation. Motive for the bomb on campus was unclear.

1 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 29
After completing a suspension for threatening a professor over a failing grade, former student entered office of the dean of students to demand reinstatement. When refused, he attacked the dean with a steak knife, injuring him. Had a history of visits.

10/11/2001 – Rutgers University – Newark, NJ
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 34
Student, who had stalked former girlfriend whom he met at the university, ultimately stabbed and killed her in her car after class in jealous rage. She was engaged to another at the time. Subject claimed command hallucinations to kill. He attempted suicide after.

1/16/2002 – Appalachian School of Law – Grundy, VA
3 injured, 3 killed – Subject’s Age: 43
Having received dismissal notice days before, a student entered the offices of dean and professor, fatally shooting both. He then descended the stairs to the student lounge, opened fire on students, killing one and wounding three more.

1/18/2002 – Broward Community College – Davie, FL
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 23
Non-affiliated subject confronted his former girlfriend (student) on campus four months after their breakup. After they argued, he fatally shot her and then killed himself.

2/2/2002 – West Virginia University – Morgantown, WV
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 21
Student fatally shot fellow student outside victim’s off campus apartment as he was upset over the victim’s friendship with his girlfriend. He had threatened the victim in the past.

4/12/2002 – Atlantic Technical Center – Coconut Creek, FL
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 24
Non-affiliated subject fatally shot his former girlfriend (student) in campus parking lot as she got out of her car. Subject was known stalker and arrangements had been made for the victim including campus security escorts. They had broken up seven months prior.

4/14/2002 – Fairleigh Dickinson University – Madison, NJ
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 19
Non-affiliated subject choked and killed his former high school sweetheart (student) in her dorm room after a failed attempt to convince her to take him back.

4/28/2002 – Polytechnic University – Brooklyn, NY
1 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 27
Student/teaching assistant stabbed fellow student and former girlfriend in campus building after finding out that she had been cheating on him when they were together. He then locked himself in his office and shot himself. They had broken up two months prior.

6/21/2002 – Texas Woman’s University – Denton, TX
0 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 40
Non-affiliated subject entered an administration building on campus with his young son and confronted his former wife, a university employee. He fired a shot, without causing injuries, and then held his son hostage before releasing him and killing himself.

10/12/2002 0 North Carolina State University – Raleigh, NC
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 49
Student was allegedly infatuated with fellow student when he approached her on campus tennis courts and fatally shot her, then killed himself. Though they knew each other and may have had online disagreement, no indication of a close connection.

10/28/2002 – University of Arizona, College of Nursing – Tucson, AZ
0 injured, 3 killed – Subject’s Age: 41
Failing nursing student entered campus building and sought three instructors (one in her office, two in a classroom), killing them before killing himself.

11/4/2002 – University of Cincinnati – Cincinnati, OH
0 injured, 2 killed – Subject’s Age: 23
Upset over breakup the night before, student fatally shot his former girlfriend and her friend (both students) in the condo she shared with her brother. Subject then killed himself.

12/7/2002 – Buffalo State College – Buffalo, NY
1 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 20
Student, who was planning to drop out of IHE after academic probation, used an accelerant to start a fire in his dorm. One student injured. He claimed it was an accident; however, investigators believed it was intentional.

2/1/2003 – Temple University – Philadelphia, PA
1 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 21
Former student shot and injured his former girlfriend (student/employee of IHE) as she worked security at a front desk in the campus administration/classroom building. He then shot and killed himself.
4/7/2003 – Louisiana Technical College – Natchitoches, LA
1 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 22
Student entered classroom of his former instructor, fatally shot one student while another was injured by bullet fragment. Subject believed one of the victims owed him $200. Other reports stated subject expressed paranoia in weeks before the incident.

4/25/2003 – University of Maryland – College Park – College Park, MD
1 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 21
After stalking former girlfriend on/off campus, non-affiliated subject blocked her into a parking space on campus, walked up to window, spoke to her, and then shot her. Though she survived, he killed himself. They had broken up approximately one month prior.

5/4/2003 – Western Kentucky University – Bowling Green, KY
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 20
Non-affiliated subject met a female student at a frat party. Hours later, he attacked her in her dorm room, raped her, and set her on fire. Possible random sexually motivated attack.

5/9/2003 – Case Western Reserve University – Cleveland, OH
2 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 62
Former student/employee forcibly entered campus building after firing outside. Once inside, he fatally shot one student, wounded another as well as a professor. He allegedly was seeking out a computer lab tech whom he had sued for hacking his website.

6/12/2003 – Baylor University – Waco, TX
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 21
Student fatally shot his roommate/teammate/friend as they practiced shooting their newly purchased guns off-campus, allegedly after hearing voices saying he was Jesus and the victim was going to kill him.

9/16/2003 – Colby College – Waterville, ME
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 47
Non-affiliated subject went to college parking lot looking for a woman to attack, acting out his fantasy. When he saw the victim walking to her car, he kidnapped her, took her off-campus, raping and killing her.

2 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 26
Rejected applicant to community college entered a classroom in the campus administration building with a pistol and a butcher’s knife, took hostages, shooting and wounding two. Standoff with police ended in his death. He had left a suicide note at his sister’s house.

10/22/2003 – Daytona Beach Community College – Daytona Beach, FL
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 37
Non-affiliated subject tracked down student, with whom he was reportedly having an affair, at the IHE parking lot, and fatally shot her. He then killed himself.

12/1/2003 – Suffolk County Community College – Brentwood, NY
1 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 23
During a class lecture, student took a knife and stabbed his adjunct marketing instructor. No motive identified, but subject had been released from mental facility, though CIA and FBI were after him, and his family feared he would be violent.

12/8/2003 – Central Carolina Community College – Sanford, NC
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 31
Student who was trying to end the relationship was abducted from campus gym in front of witnesses by her boyfriend (non-affiliated subject), taken to the woods, and fatally shot. Subject then killed himself.

1/1/2004 – University of Florida – Gainesville, FL
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 25
Graduate student was stabbed thirty times in his on-campus apartment. His best friend and one-time roommate was charged. The motive was unclear from reports.

2/16/2004 – California State University, Los Angeles – Los Angeles, CA
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 38
Former student, who had worked for a psychology professor at a test center, stalked her, went to her house, stabbed and decapitated her. He then stripped his clothing and ran in front of a truck on the highway, killing himself.

3/1/2004 – Maharishi University of Management – Fairfield, IA
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 24
Student fatally stabbed fellow student in dining hall after stabbing another with pen. After first attack, dean of men took subject to his campus apartment to monitor him, but left him alone. He left and killed other student. Motive unclear.

3/29/2004 – Howard Community College – Columbia, MD
1 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 29
As campus security guard reported to work, her estranged boyfriend (non-affiliated subject) stabbed her in the main entrance to a campus building having chased her from her car. Two weeks prior, victim accused subject in court papers of rape and death threats.

4/29/2004 – University of Texas at Austin – Austin, TX
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 22
Graduate student fatally stabbed his music professor over 200 times after driving her home. He believed she was being controlled by a computer chip in her brain.
5/5/2004 – University of North Carolina, Wilmington – Wilmington, NC
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 28
Student stalked and harassed fellow student who lived in same dorm and attended classes together. Victim told her mother and dorm RA about her concerns. Subject eventually lured her to his room, raped, and killed her. While in police custody, he killed himself.

5/7/2004 – University of Louisiana – Lafayette – Lafayette, LA
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 25
Graduate student stabbed friend/fellow student ninety-seven times in her dorm room. Possibly motivated by rejected advances as victim was headed to China to married to another.

0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 28
Two months after breakup, former student planned killing of former girlfriend (student) and others. He stalked her, eventually fatally shot her. IHE suspended him prior for lying on application about arrest history. Days after incident, he killed himself when police stopped him.

8/14/2004 – University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences – Little Rock, AR
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 28
Third-year medical student fatally stabbed his wife, a chief neurosurgery resident at the IHE’s teaching hospital, four dozen times in their off campus home. He then went to the campus dorm and jumped from a window to his death. The two were secretly married.

0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 26
Former medical student on leave from the IHE for extreme changes in behavior stalked a fellow student who was an acquaintance, before assaulting her with a baseball bat off campus, causing her death.

12/25/2004 – Purdue University – West Lafayette, IN
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 28
Student stabbed her husband (student) in their on-campus apartment. IHE forced her to withdraw; eight months later she fatally shot him in their off-campus apartment and placed his body parts in the trunk of her car, left it at the airport as she fled to China.

1/6/2005 – LaGuardia Community College – Long Island City, NY
2 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 46
Janitor shot and wounded fellow janitor. He then took another IHE janitor (female) to his apartment and raped her. After a fourteen hour standoff, subject was killed. Subject was interested in the female janitor and though the other janitor was flirting with her.

6/27/2005 – Central Connecticut State University – New Britain, CT
1 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 22
Upset over breakup three months prior, student went to off campus home of his former girlfriend (student) and stabbed her repeatedly, stabbing himself when police arrived. Both survived. Subject had history of stalking/harassing the victim.

8/23/2005 – Bowling Green State University – Bowling Green, OH
1 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 18
Student, who was hearing voices thought there were cameras in her dorm room, attacked her roommate with a hot clothes iron, causing significant injuries. She had been removed from the room for one night due to the voices, but did not receive psychiatric help.

10/8/2005 – Taylor University – Fort Wayne, IN
0 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 20
Student, part-time IHE security guard, set fire to a dorm with intentions of gaining attention as campus security. He had made several 911 calls days prior for the same reason.

11/10/2005 – Bethesda Christian University – Anaheim, CA
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 28
Student fatally stabbed her husband (student) in their off campus apartment after the two argued over returning to Korea. The subject, who was intoxicated, wanted to return, while the victim did not.

11/13/2005 – University of Mississippi – Oxford, MS
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 22
Student fatally stabbed his girlfriend (student) in his off-campus apartment, then failed to report the days as the body decomposed in his closet. He claimed it was a mutual suicide pact he could not fulfill. He was convicted.

11/15/2005 – Johnson and Wales University - North Miami, FL
1 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 21
Hours after returning to his off campus apartment, student fatally shot his friend (student) and wounded another (former student), then killed himself. The three had arrived laughing, talking amicably, but witnesses heard arguing just prior to the shots.

12/22/2005 – University of Massachusetts, Lowell – Lowell, MA
1 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 22
Student followed professor home to talk about failing grade and stabbed/injured her in her front yard. Subject feared he would flunk out of school and be deported to his native India.

1/25/2006 – Old Dominion University – Norfolk, VA
1 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 20
Non-affiliated subject shot former boyfriend (student) of his current girlfriend (student) as he entered a campus housing unit. The girlfriend had reportedly asked the subject to punch the victim after the victim allegedly insulted her.
3/3/2006 – University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill – Chapel Hill, NC
9 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 22
Recent graduate drove a rented Jeep into group of nine students at a popular gathering place on campus. He wanted to avenge killing of Muslims around the world and expected to die in the attack. No serious injuries were reported.

5/28/2006 – University of Alabama, Huntsville – Huntsville, AL
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 45
Associate professor strangled his wife (IHE employee) off campus and tossed her body into the river. Couple had history of domestic violence, which allegedly began after subject lost a bid to become chair of physic department and began affair with an assistant.

6/3/2006 – University of Toledo – Toledo, OH
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 21
After returning from a date, student fatally shot his girlfriend (student) in his off campus apartment after she tried to break up with him. He then killed himself.

7/16/2006 – University of Wyoming – Laramie, WY
1 injured, 2 killed – Subject’s Age: 19
Student fatally stabbed one other student and fatally shot another the morning after a party was held at the home he rented near campus with four other roommates. He also assaulted another student, who escaped, before the subject killed himself.

8/24/2006 – Loyola College – Timonium, MD
0 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 25
Upset over dismissal from Master’s program, former student set fire to a professor’s home. Professor and his two children were uninjured. Subject had a history of harassing other professors and had a prior dismissal that was overturned.

9/2/2006 – Shepherd University – Shepherdstown, VA
0 injured, 2 killed – Subject’s Age: 49
Father traveled to IHE and fatally shot his two sons (both students) in the parking lot, then killed himself. Mentally ill subject thought his one son was going to be kidnapped and tortured and he wanted to save him from that pain.

12/13/2006 – Eastern Michigan University – Ypsilanti, MI
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 20
Student entered open dorm room and tried to rape, then murdered fellow student. Subject claimed he only intended to steal things.

4/2/2007 – University of Washington – Seattle, WA
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 41
IHE researcher was fatally shot in her office by her non-affiliated former boyfriend after extensive stalking of which her colleagues, supervisor, and campus police were aware. Subject then killed himself. Incident took place over a month after they broke up.

**4/16/2007 – Virginia Tech University – Blacksburg, VA**
17 injured, 32 killed – Subject’s Age: 23
Student went on shooting rampage in residence halls and classrooms, killing thirty-two and wounding seventeen (some from gunfire, others from attempting to escape). Subject then killed self.

**5/4/2007 – Keene State College – Keene, NH**
1 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 20
Student shot/wounded his roommate (student) in their off campus apartment. Subject had been joking with the victim using a BB gun, when the situation escalated and he grabbed his rifle, shooting him in the buttocks. When the police arrived, the subject killed himself.

**8/27/2007 – University of Colorado – Boulder, CO**
1 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 39
Former university food service worker stabbed a student on campus and threatened to detonate a bomb using his cell phone. When police responded, he started stabbing himself. In a prior assault on a stranger in 2001, he identified himself to police as Dylan Klebold, a Columbine High School shooter.

**9/5/2007 – University of Arizona – Tucson, AZ**
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 18
Student stabbed and killed her roommate as she slept. The week before, victim had reported to campus police that the subject had stolen her ID, SSN card, and $500 from her bank account.

**9/21/2007 – Delaware State University – Dover, DE**
1 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 18
Minutes after confrontation with other student, subject (student) followed target on campus; shot at the group of friends he was with, injuring one, killing another. The confrontation traced back three days when the intended target allegedly spat on the subject.

**9/24/2007 – Ohio University – Athens, OH**
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 32
Influenced by delusions associated with mental illness, graduate student fatally stabbed his father (IHE professor) to free himself from perceived magical influence his father had over him.

**2/8/2008 – Louisiana Technical College – Baton Rouge, LA**
0 injured, 2 killed – Subject’s Age: 23
Student, who was living out of her car, entered classroom and fatally shot two fellow students, then herself. There is no information to suggest they knew each other. Other than suicide, the motive is unclear.
2/14/2008 – Northern Illinois University – DeKalb, IL
18 injured, 5 killed – Subject’s Age: 27
Former student (and student at other IHE) entered lecture hall and fatally shot five students and injured eighteen before killing himself. No specific motive identified.

3/4/2008 – Auburn University – Auburn, AL
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 23
Non-affiliated subject kidnapped female student from campus, forced her to drive around and take her clothes off before he attempted to rape her and fatally shot her. He then drove her car back to campus and set it on fire in a parking lot.

3/9/2008 – University of Arkansas, Fayetteville – Fayetteville, AR
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 28
Upset over breakup with student girlfriend weeks prior, former student went to her off campus apartment and fatally stabbed her. He had a recent history of stalking and harassing her.

4/18/2008 – Indiana University – Purdue University at Fort Wayne – Fort Wayne, IN
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 36
Mother of a student fatally stabbed her daughter’s roommate (student). The mother did not like how the victim talked about her daughter the night before. When daughter left, subject argued with the roommate, stabbed her, and threw hot water and a pan at her.

7/24/2008 – South Mountain Community College – Phoenix, AZ
3 injured, 0 killed – Subject’s Age: 22
Former student shot and wounded three people (one former student, 2 unknown affiliated) in a campus computer room. The subject and one of the victims had long standing dispute that originated off campus. When they started arguing, subject pulled gun and fired.

10/13/2008 – Northeast Lakeview College – Live Oak, TX
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 62
Part-time librarian fatally shot fellow full-time librarian after finding out the target received a new position the subject thought he deserved. Target went to management and was unsatisfied by their response.

12/5/2008 – Chadron State College – Chadron, NE
0 injured, 1 killed – Subject’s Age: 25
Student fatally stabbed his roommate (student) fifty times in the off-campus residence they shared. He broke into two other homes, confronting the couple with two knives, before being chased down by police. Motive unclear, but possible drug use reported.

APPENDIX D

MAP OF NORTH CENTRAL TEXAS REGION

North Central Texas Region
11 public universities
21 community colleges
APPENDIX E
PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES AND COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Central Texas Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austin Community College ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blinn College ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookhaven College ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Valley College ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collin College ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastfield College ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Centro College ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grayson County College ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill College ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLennan Community College ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View College ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central Texas College ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lake College ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richland College ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarleton State University ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant County College – Northeast ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant County College – Northwest ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant County College - South ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant County College - Southeast ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant County College – Trinity River ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple College▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University - Commerce ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University - Central Texas ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas State University - San Marcos ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Woman’s University ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Texas at Arlington ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Texas at Austin ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Texas at Dallas ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Valley Community College ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Texas at Dallas ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Texas ●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

● Texas Public University (11)
▲ Texas Community College (21)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The University of Texas at Austin - Austin</td>
<td>UNI</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td>50,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University - College Station</td>
<td>UNI</td>
<td>TAMU</td>
<td>48,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin Community College - Austin</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
<td>37,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Texas - Denton</td>
<td>UNI</td>
<td>UNT</td>
<td>34,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas State University-San Marcos</td>
<td>UNI</td>
<td>TSU</td>
<td>30,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Texas at Arlington - Arlington</td>
<td>UNI</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td>28,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collin College - Plano</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>DCCCD</td>
<td>15,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blinn College - Brenham</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
<td>16,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richland College - Dallas</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>DCCCD</td>
<td>15,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Texas at Dallas - Dallas</td>
<td>UNI</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td>15,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant County College Northeast - Hurst</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>TCC</td>
<td>14,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Woman's University - Denton</td>
<td>UNI</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant County College Southeast - Arlington</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>TCC</td>
<td>12,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant County College South - Fort Worth</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>TCC</td>
<td>10,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant County College Northwest - Fort Worth</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>TCC</td>
<td>10,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lake College - Irving</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>DCCCD</td>
<td>10,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastfield College - Mesquite</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>DCCCD</td>
<td>10,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookhaven College - Farmers Branch</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>DCCCD</td>
<td>10,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Centro College - Dallas</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>DCCCD</td>
<td>9,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLennan Community College - Waco</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University at Commerce - Commerce</td>
<td>UNI</td>
<td>TAMU</td>
<td>9,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Texas College - Gainesville</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarleton State University - Stephenville</td>
<td>UNI</td>
<td>TAMU</td>
<td>8,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View College - Dallas</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>DCCCD</td>
<td>7,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Valley Community College - Athens</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple College - Temple</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Valley College - Lancaster</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>DCCCD</td>
<td>5,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grayson County College - Denison</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill College - Hillsboro</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant County College Trinity River - Fort Worth</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>TCC</td>
<td>3,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University Central Texas - Killeen</td>
<td>UNI</td>
<td>TAMU</td>
<td>2,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Texas at Dallas - Dallas</td>
<td>UNI</td>
<td>UNT</td>
<td>2,109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

BAIT PROCEDURES FLOW CHART

- Is the student's behavior an immediate threat to self and/or others? NO
  - Does the student's behavior threaten to disrupt authorized activities or damage property? NO
    - Has the student allegedly broken a law? NO
      - Is the student exhibiting unhealthy psychological behavior, showing apparent impaired behavior, or not acting like himself/herself? NO
        - Has the student allegedly violated institutional rule? NO
          - Is there a process within the department or office to resolve the situation? NO
            - Contact BAIT Chair (972-883-6863) or another member of BAIT directly
              - BAIT Chair will evaluate the situation, consult with other team members and determine what further steps are required.
                - Does the situation involve more than one department? YES
                  - Appropriate members of BAIT meet
                    - Is a coordinated plan of action needed? YES
                      - BAIT develops a coordinated strategy, assigns a situation contact, who implements the strategy
                        - Has the situation been successfully resolved? YES
                          - BAIT representative documents actions, decisions, and resolution in central location
                          - BAIT provides department head/senior with suggested strategy for internal resolution or appropriate referral
                        - Situation is assigned to an individual to monitor/resolve
                          - After situation is resolved, appropriate data is logged in a central location
                          - BAIT reconvenes to develop new strategy and repeat implementation process
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAIT
                          - CAN REFER TO BAI
APPENDIX H

SOBI PROCEDURES FLOW CHART

Receive Referral

Conduct initial Review/Investigation

Imminent Situation?

Yes

Campus Police 972.578.5555 or 911

No

Conduct Triage

Concern?

No

Close & Document Case

Yes

Conduct Full Inquiry

Make Assessments

Poses a Threat?

No

Develop & Implement Management Plan

In Need of Help?

No

Implement Referral or Assistance Plan

Yes

Refer & Follow-up

Close & Document Case

Close & Document Case
APPENDIX I

SOBI THREAT ASSESSMENT RUBRIC

COLLIN COLLEGE

SOBI Threat Assessment Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severe Risk</th>
<th>Mental &amp; Behavioral Health</th>
<th>Severe Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observed Behavior</td>
<td>[Items listed]</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat may be repeated or shared with multiple reporters</td>
<td>[Items listed]</td>
<td>Dean of Students Office referral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information about threat or threat itself is consistent, plausible or includes specific detail of an event (e.g., time, place, etc.)</td>
<td>[Items listed]</td>
<td>Parent/guardian notification obligatory unless contraindicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat likely to be repeated with consistency (may try to convince listener they are serious)</td>
<td>[Items listed]</td>
<td>Evaluate emergency notification to others (FERPA/HPAA/Clery Act)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content of threat suggests threatener may carry it out (e.g., reference to weapons, means, target)</td>
<td>[Items listed]</td>
<td>Recommend immediate temporary suspension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatener may appear detached</td>
<td>[Items listed]</td>
<td>Possible liaison with local police to compare red flags</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Require mandatory threat assessment by (date)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consider voluntary/ involuntary medical withdrawal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Law enforcement response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other referral:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extreme Risk</th>
<th>Mental &amp; Behavioral Health</th>
<th>Extreme Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observed Behavior</td>
<td>[Items listed]</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat made or present</td>
<td>[Items listed]</td>
<td>Dean of Students Office referral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat is concrete (specific &amp; direct)</td>
<td>[Items listed]</td>
<td>Parent/guardian notification obligatory unless contraindicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat is likely to be repeated or shared with multiple reporters</td>
<td>[Items listed]</td>
<td>Initiate emergency notification to others (FERPA/HPAA/Clery Act)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information about threat or threat itself is consistent, plausible or includes specific detail of an event (e.g., time, place, etc.), often with steps already taken</td>
<td>[Items listed]</td>
<td>Immediate temporary suspension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat may be repeated with consistency</td>
<td>[Items listed]</td>
<td>Possible liaison with local police to compare red flags</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content of threat suggests threatener will carry it out (e.g., reference to weapons, means, target)</td>
<td>[Items listed]</td>
<td>Initiate voluntary/involuntary medical withdrawal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatener may appear detached</td>
<td>[Items listed]</td>
<td>Law enforcement response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If student defuses from extreme to severe, consider eligibility for mandatory threat assessment by (date)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


NCHERM And Center for Aggression Management 2001, AM65 (levels 1-5) Observables are objective, culturally neutral and measurable indicators that empirically describe an emerging aggressor. To learn more, contact the Center for Aggression Management, [www.Agrogressmanagement.com](http://www.Agroressmanagement.com).
APPENDIX J

SOBI THREAT ASSESSMENT DECISION TREE

COLLIN COLLEGE THREAT ASSESSMENT DECISION TREE

**IF YOU OBSERVE THIS BEHAVIOR:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mild Risk</th>
<th>Moderate Risk</th>
<th>Severe/Extreme Risk</th>
<th>Imminent Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Disruptive or concerning behavior
  - Abusive language/profanity
  - Lack of cooperation or argumentative
- Negative attitude to rules
- Sexual comments, gestures, innuendos
- Emotionally erratic
- Possession/consumption of drugs/alcohol
- No or veiled threat made or present
- Conduct doesn’t violate Code of Conduct necessary to end behavior

- More involved or repeated disruption
- Behavior more concerning
  - Apparent lack of social norms
- Attempts to instigate fights
- Open defiance of rules
- Violent tendency against them
- Violent notes sent to others
- Possible threat made or present
- Expressions of violence
- Comments about weapons
- Threat is vague & indirect, no evidence of plan

- Disturbed or advancing to dysregulation
- Serious danger present
- Threat made or present and includes detailed plan
- Physical assault
- Intense anger
- Suicidal ideation
- Over threat to harm/kill others
- May appear detached, dazed, vacant, eerily calm

- Assault of any type
- Threat to harm/kill others with ability to carry it out
- Any type of criminal behavior
- Possessing/showing a weapon
- Medical emergency (e.g., exhibits signs of overdose, tissue damage, vomiting, loses consciousness)
- Suicide attempt
- Verbal abuse/screaming
- Throwing item(s), hitting, kicking
- Destruction of property

**RESPOND IN THIS MANNER:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mild Risk</th>
<th>Moderate Risk</th>
<th>Severe/Extreme Risk</th>
<th>Imminent Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Talk to student about what you observe
- Rerereate expectations for classroom conduct
- Outline consequences if behavior persists
- Document observations and interactions
- ACCESS Office consultation/referral
- Counseling Services consultation/referral
- Dean of Students Office consultation (advocacy)
- SOBI Referral

- Talk to student about what you observe
- Rerereate expectations for classroom conduct
- Outline consequences if behavior persists
- Document observations and interactions
- ACCESS Office consultation/referral
- Counseling Services consultation/referral
- Dean of Students Office consultation (advocacy)
- SOBI Referral

- Dean of Students Office Incident Report
- SCBI Referral
- Police report

- Dial 972-788-5555 or x5555 immediately and report incident to Campus Police
- If incident occurs off campus, dial 911 immediately and report incident to dispatcher

APPENDIX K

CASE STUDY INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

1) What is your department’s role in providing a safe campus community?

2) What are the challenges your department faces in regard to campus safety?

3) What are the primary components of your institution’s campus safety policies and implementation strategies?

4) How has your institution responded to the threat of mass random violence in the post-Virginia Tech era?

5) How are the institution’s campus safety policies carried out, communicated, and evaluated?

6) Who/What group decides if a threatening incident exists?
   - What criteria do they use to determine an appropriate level of risk exists?
   - Who/What group determines what information is shared and with whom?
   - How are decisions made regarding the plan of action?

7) How do you think the institution’s campus safety policies and programs address both the prevention and response to a threat of random mass violence?

8) How do you think the existing campus safety policies could be improved?

9) Where does one access the institution’s campus safety policies? If on the website, where?
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