

Governor's Task Force on Campus Safety in Oregon
Recommendations and Summary
December 30, 2008

Executive Order 08-05, February 4, 2008, created the Governor's Task Force on Campus Safety in Oregon (See Appendix A). Chaired by Henry Lorenzen, former president of the State Board of Higher Education, the Task Force is composed on 15 members. It includes representatives from campus leadership, faculty, student services, security and students, as well as community members and police, fire and mental health services. Representatives were drawn from across the state and from private colleges, public universities, and community colleges. (See membership roster, Appendix B.) The Task Force met five times, on four different campuses. Its information came from task force staff, expert panels, and public testimony (see expert panel membership, Appendix C) covering the following topics:

Emergency Prevention, Planning and Response
Student Services: Early Identification of and Intervention with At-Risk Students
Federal and State Confidentiality Statutes and Information Sharing
Campus Safety Training and Resources

The Task Force reviewed summaries of information from campus safety studies in the states of Florida, Ohio, New Mexico, Kentucky, New Jersey, Missouri and Wisconsin. It also reviewed responses to campus safety surveys sent to all postsecondary educational institutions in Oregon modeled after surveys conducted by the American Association of Universities (AAU). Twenty-four institutions responded to the survey (See summary of response, Appendix D).

Emergency Prevention, Planning and Response

All postsecondary educational institutions must be prepared for a wide variety of emergencies, including fires, hazardous materials incidents, floods, storm damage, earthquakes, power outages, illness outbreaks, and threats from violent students and others. Colleges need established and practiced protocols that outline the roles and responsibilities of all campus and community members. They must frequently test and improve their preparedness. An emergency planning checklist of key elements is included in Appendix E. The checklist is drawn from recommendations developed by the National Incident Management System. Emergency response actions are guided by the goals of (1) protecting life and safety, (2) securing critical infrastructure and facilities, and (3) resuming instruction and research programs.

Effective response to an emergency requires communication systems to reach the campus community with key information, as well as systems that link emergency responders from multiple jurisdictions to each other to coordinate their responses. Oregon University System (OUS) information technology staff is implementing a multimodal emergency notification system to alert students, faculty, and staff of campus emergency situations. The system allows notice by land-line telephones, cell phones, text messaging devices, e-mail, reader boards, and public announcement devices. The vendor contract allows participation by any Oregon college or university. Several community colleges and independent colleges have chosen to participate. The Oregon Wireless Interoperability Network (OWIN) is being developed to improve inter-jurisdictional communications among police and fire agencies, the Department of Transportation

and the Department of Forestry. To use OWIN, however, colleges may need to modify their campus safety radio systems to be compatible with that system and their local emergency agencies.

Recommendations:

- All postsecondary educational institutions in Oregon should develop comprehensive emergency plans for a broad range of emergency circumstances in cooperation with all emergency responders, including fire and police agencies. They should regularly practice their emergency responses both on campus and with fire, police and other key local partners.
- Campuses need to develop and maintain effective multimodal communication tools for alerting students, faculty and staff about emergencies on campus, as well as radio systems that link campus and community responders in emergency situations.
- All campuses should plan and execute emergency response drills at least annually with faculty, students and staff in cooperation with all emergency responders including fire, police and mental health professionals.

Student Services: Early Identification of and Intervention with At-Risk Students

Data indicate that, nationally, college campuses are safer than the general community. Crime rates are lower than in the general population for all crime categories except rape/sexual assault. A national study of campuses in 2002 identified the most common campus crimes as :

- 36,000 to 48,000 sexual assaults against women
- 2,953 aggravated assaults on campus
- 1,098 cases of campus arson
- 23 campus homicides

There is a correlation between sexual assaults and substance abuse. In addition to criminal behavior, the study also identified substance abuse and mental illness as particularly important campus issues. The study identified:

- 1,400 alcohol-related deaths
- 1,088 suicides on campus

Suicide is the second leading cause of death among college youth, at seven per 100,000, compared with a suicide rate of non-college youth at 15 per 100,000. Students age 25 and over and males have higher suicide rates. A study in 2004 found that 11 percent of college women and 9 percent of college men had seriously considered suicide and that 1.3 percent had made at least one attempt. This study found that only one in five of the students who attempted suicide was on medication or in therapy.

Ten percent or more of college students suffer from a major mental illness such as depression, bipolar disorder, schizophrenia or from substance dependence. The student services and mental health professionals who testified to the task force recommended that campuses foster an accepting and positive environment that recognizes the high level of frequency of mental illness and substance abuse problems in this age group and establishes a culture that supports seeking treatment when needed. In addition, it is critical to ensure that treatment is easily available and

that possible “gatekeepers” (teachers, advisors, etc.) are trained in how to identify and refer individuals who may need help.

Only a tiny fraction of those with mental illness or substance abuse present a danger to themselves or others, while some individuals who present a threat have no diagnosable condition. Members of the campus community need to be trained to recognize individuals of concern and how to report the concern to an appropriate referral and response process. Several campuses have cross-functional teams (e.g., representatives from campus safety, student services, resident halls, and faculty) that assess threats to self and others, and initiate appropriate interventions. The teams have a variety of titles, such as Critical Incident Response Team (CIRT), Student At Risk Response Team (SARRT), Behavioral Intervention Team (BIT), and Student Success Team (SST). The teams review reports of noticeable changes in an individual’s functioning, expressions of despair or violence, stalking, harassing, or other inappropriate behaviors. It is important that these teams be trained to assess the level of threat actually presented in a particular situation.

Recommendations:

- Each campus should establish protocols to help identify students and others on campus who could pose a risk of harm to themselves or others.
- Campuses should establish cross-functional assessment and intervention teams that meet regularly and as needed to identify students or staff who appear to pose a risk of harm to themselves or others.
- Teams should receive training in evidence-based practice for effective identification and intervention of at-risk students.
- Each postsecondary education institution should review its current staffing model to assure that student counseling and mental health services necessary to meet student needs are available.
- The entire campus community, particularly faculty and residence hall staff, should receive training on how to identify persons who may need help and how to make appropriate referrals.
- Training and campus communications should send a positive, non-stigmatizing message about seeking mental health and substance abuse counseling.
- Campuses should focus efforts to reduce the incidence of sexual assault and rape through effective education, treatment, investigation, adjudication, and disposition policies and programs.

Oregon’s college campuses differ widely in size, physical characteristics and student populations. Student services staff at independent colleges and smaller public universities and community colleges generally have broader responsibilities than their counterparts at larger schools. Sometimes, staff at smaller institutions can and do know almost all the students and other staff personally. At larger universities and community colleges, specialization of services and functions creates added challenges in making connections with students and assessing risks.

Recommendation:

- Regardless of size, campus student services staff should communicate each term with their constituencies clearly and consistently on risk assessment policies and practices.

Federal and State Confidentiality Statutes and Information Sharing

The federal Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) governs the privacy and protection of students' education records. The records covered by the act include information that contains personally identifiable information maintained by an educational institution. Generally, students must authorize, in writing, the disclosure of education records, specifying what may be disclosed, the purpose for the disclosure, and the entity to which they may be disclosed. However, the act contains several exceptions, including responding to subpoenas and sharing information with appropriate recipients to protect the health or safety of the student or other individuals. The federal Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) protects personally identifiable information related to health care. HIPAA contains exceptions for records that are covered by FERPA. Like FERPA, HIPAA also contains exceptions for emergency situations.

The U.S. Department of Education, Family Compliance Office is responsible for enforcing FERPA, while the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Civil Rights, is responsible for enforcing HIPAA. Neither federal statute gives individuals the right to sue if disclosure provisions are violated. However, an Oregon law, ORS. 30.864, does grant a private right of action for the reckless disclosure of personally identifiable information from a student's education record.

The Oregon Department of Justice is considering a legislative concept that would provide protection from civil or criminal liability for persons who disclose information in good faith to prevent a health or safety emergency. It also plans to propose an amendment to Oregon statutes to allow parents of dependent college students access to educational records without the permission of the student, thereby aligning Oregon law with FERPA.

Testimony to the task force revealed that Oregon college communities are confused by the multiple laws that govern record confidentiality and disclosure. The Ohio Attorney General has prepared a two-page summary of state and federal information-sharing laws as a quick reference guide for Ohio college campuses. Oregon State University, like many colleges in Oregon and throughout the United States, has prepared a FERPA training guide for its campus

Recommendations:

- The Oregon Legislature should adopt the recommendations of the National Association of Attorneys' General in conforming state statutes to FERPA and HIPAA.
- All campus personnel should receive regular training about information sharing laws, with special emphasis on the Department of Education's current regulations regarding information sharing.

- The Oregon Attorney General should develop clear and concise reference guides for college campuses regarding student records confidentiality and disclosure.
- Oregon postsecondary institutions should develop protocols and tools to exchange information about individuals who pose safety concerns as they transfer between educational institutions.

Campus Safety Training and Resources

Campus public safety officers receive training from many providers, and the scope of that training varies widely. The Department of Public Safety Standards and Training (DPSST) provides a 5-6 week training program for campus safety personnel when there are a sufficient number of participants to make the program economically feasible. ORS 352.385 (2) requires DPSST to train special campus security officers at the expense of the State Board of Higher Education. DPSST will conduct trainings when there are sufficient registrations for the program.

DPSST training for law enforcement personnel is funded through fines and assessments based on citations and arrests made by police officers. Although some campus safety officers write citations that contribute to this funding base, statutes require campuses in the Oregon University System (OUS) to directly fund the training provided for their campus safety officers.

DPSST surveyed OUS campus safety staff to determine their primary duties; from this job task analysis, DPSST then developed the current training curriculum in concert with campuses to address their specific needs.

Program cost and time away from campus were identified as barriers to schools participating in the DPSST targeted training program. Representatives of several community colleges and independent colleges told the Task Force that they have developed partnerships with local law enforcement agencies and send their security staff to local reserve officer training programs to minimize cost and time off campus.

Recommendations:

- Campus safety personnel at all Oregon postsecondary institutions should receive initial training specific to their duties, and continued training to periodically update and improve skills. All campus safety officers should receive the DPSST six-week training program or its equivalent.
- Oregon's postsecondary systems should develop campus safety officer training funding mechanisms that encourage, rather than discourage participation.
- Campuses should develop methods to allow campus safety officers to earn college credit for training for campus safety officers.
- Postsecondary institutions should convene an annual meeting and develop web-based discussion group tools to exchange knowledge about best practices related to campus safety.

The number and type of campus safety staff varies greatly among Oregon's post-secondary campuses. Oregon State University, for example, employs both campus safety officers and contracts for sworn police officer services from the Oregon State Police. The University of Oregon contracts with the City of Eugene Police Department for police officers in addition to having its own campus security personnel. The more common approach is for each campus, whether community colleges or private or public colleges and universities, to employ campus safety officers.

Each institution determines the level of resources and staffing for its campus. The resource allocation models that distribute funding from state appropriations for the OUS and the community colleges are based on student enrollment patterns. Colleges that allocate greater resources to campus safety and student services do so by funding other campus programs and services at a lower level.

Campus security representatives voiced strong opinions about continuing to permit each campus to identify and provide the security services that best meet the needs of that campus. The Task Force did not address the issue of access to lethal weapons by institution employees. Other service models (e.g. those found at OSU and UO) allow for armed officers through contracts with existing law enforcement agencies.

Recommendation:

- Each postsecondary education institution should review its current staffing model to assure that sufficient campus security services are available to meet campus needs.

Post-secondary institutions must be able to rely on public law enforcement resources in several circumstances. For example, city streets pass through some campuses. Some campuses are in urban areas where boundaries between the campus and the city are not clear or even overlap. In emergencies such as natural disasters or serious disturbances even campuses that are otherwise fairly well insulated from the surrounding community depend on public law enforcement. Response times can be slow and law enforcement personnel may not be familiar with the campus to which they are called.

Current statutory language (ORS 352.385) permits campus safety officers to arrest or cite individuals for criminal violations; the Task Force heard from several campus safety representatives that many situations would be more appropriately cited as a violation instead.

Recommendation:

- Each postsecondary education institution should develop and maintain a close working relationship with the law enforcement agencies that serve its area.
- Campus emergency plans should be created in cooperation with relevant state and local law enforcement agencies; memoranda of understanding should be created and reviewed regularly so that all parties understand their roles and responsibilities in a campus emergency.
- Amend ORS 352.385 to add violation authority to the duties of campus safety officers.

Appreciation

The Task Force wishes to thank all of the interested parties and subject experts who shared their knowledge and experience at the Task Force meetings and Portland State University, Oregon State University, Chemeketa Community College, and George Fox College for hosting the Task Force meetings. Project support was also provided on the survey and secondary research by Lucinda Norris, a Willamette University student; Bridget Burns, an OUS Chancellor's Office Policy Advisor; and Endi Hartigan and Melanie Bennett, OUS Chancellor's Office Communications staff.

Appendix
Table of Contents

- A. Executive Order No. 08-05, Governor's Task Force on Campus Safety
- B. Governor's Task Force on Campus Safety Members
- C. Campus Safety Expert Panelists
- D. Oregon Campus Safety Survey Responses
- E. Recommended Campus Safety Guidelines

Appendix A. EXECUTIVE ORDER NO. 08-05

GOVERNOR'S TASK FORCE ON CAMPUS SAFETY IN OREGON

Oregon's universities and community colleges are institutions that provide free and open access to instructors, administrators, students and visitors. The open nature of higher education campuses provides the foundation for a rich learning environment. In promoting such freedom and openness, it is incumbent upon the State to take all reasonable precautions to protect the safety and welfare of all persons who visit university and community college campuses.

Campus safety depends on the close cooperation and coordination of faculty, campus administrators, students, law enforcement personnel and mental health officials. It is critical to prevent or address dangerous situations before they result in tragedy. Oregon campuses must have appropriately equipped and trained emergency responders available and prepared. In addition, emergency responders and law enforcement personnel from multiple jurisdictions must have a framework of established procedures for coordination in order to ensure an effective response to any emergency.

Oregon universities and colleges and those who work to ensure their security could benefit from a broad analysis of safety and security on college campuses.

NOW THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY DIRECTED AND ORDERED:

1. The Governor's Task Force on Campus Safety (the "Task Force") is established.
2. The Task Force shall be comprised of no more than 15 members appointed by the Governor.
3. To improve safety, security and coordinated crisis response on Oregon university and community college campuses, the Task Force shall review and identify necessary improvements to:
 - a. Methods of notification during emergency situations;
 - b. Training of law enforcement officials and first responders to crisis situations;
 - c. Communication and collaboration among education, mental health, law enforcement, fire and emergency management agencies;

EXECUTIVE ORDER NO. 08-05
PAGE TWO

- d. Techniques for identifying students and others who pose a risk to campus safety and procedures for sharing information about such individuals among mental health, education and law enforcement officials to the extent allowed by law and with appropriate privacy safeguards, and
- e. Treatment options for students with mental health concerns.

4. The Governor will appoint a chair of the Task Force. The chair shall establish an agenda for the Task Force and provide leadership and direction for the Task Force.

5. A quorum for Task Force meetings shall consist of a majority of the appointed members. The Task Force shall strive to operate by consensus; however, the Task Force may approve measures and make recommendations based on an affirmative vote of a majority of members appointed to the Task Force.

6. The Task Force shall provide a final report to the Governor's Office, the Oregon State Board of Education and the Oregon State Board of Higher Education no later than June 30, 2008.

7. The Office of the Governor shall staff the Task Force with assistance from the Oregon University System and the Oregon Department of Community Colleges and Workforce Development. If the Task Force requires assistance of any other State agency, then such agency shall provide assistance to the Task Force upon request.

8. The members of the Task Force shall receive no compensation for their activities as members of the Task Force, but may be reimbursed for travel expenses incurred in attending Task Force business pursuant to ORS 292.495(2) and subject to availability of funds.

9. This Order expires on June 30, 2008.

Done at Salem, Oregon, this 4th day of February, 2008.

Appendix B. Governor’s Task Force on Campus Safety Members

Chair— Henry Lorenzen, Past President, State Board of Higher Education

Administration— Rita Cavin, President of Linn Benton Community College

Campus Safety—Jack Rogers, OSU, Director of Public Safety
Ross Stout, Director of Willamette University Campus Safety

Classified Staff Representative—Greg Marks, SEIU member and PSU Campus Safety

Community College Faculty—Patricia Antoine, Chemeketa Community College

Four-Year College Faculty—Jacqueline Temple, Portland State University

Notification Systems—Curt Pederson, Chancellor’s Office

Student Services—Joe Holliday, OIT Vice President for Student Affairs

Community College Student—Emily Smith, Mount Hood Community College

Four-Year College Student— Jason Alves, University of Oregon

Emergency Services—Margueritte Hickman, City of Ashland Division Chief

Police Department—Robert Lehner, City of Eugene Police Chief

Community Mental Health—Tamara Sale, Mid-Valley Behavioral Health Care Network

Citizen-At-Large—Susan Leeson, retired Oregon Supreme Court Justice

Appendix C. Campus Safety Expert Panelists

Notification/Confidentiality

Ryan Hagemann – OUS Chancellor’s Office

Christine Chute – Assistant Attorney General, Dept. of Justice

Student Services – On and Off Campus

Tamara Sale – MVBHC Network Early Assessment Team

Donna Noonan – State Suicide Prevention Office

John VanDreal – Salem-Keizer Schools Threat Assessment Student Services

Joe Holliday – OIT-VP, Student Affairs

Paul Myers – U of Portland - Director, Health, Counseling, & Disability Services

Pat Martin – Mt. Hood CC-Dean, Student Success

Campus Communications/Notification Systems

Curt Pederson, OUS/OSU

Sharon Blanton, PSU

Eric Rodriguez, SOU

Jon Dolan, OSU

Ken Goodwin, PCC

Krista Dillon, UO

Emergency Planning Processes

Margueritte Hickman, Ashland Fire and Rescue

Ross Stout, Willamette University

Jack Rogers, OSU

Sharon King, Linn Benton Community College

Gary Grainger, OHSU

Jay Carey, WOU

Emergency Communication Systems/Interoperability

Lindsay Ball, OWIN Project Director

Kevin Williams, UO

Ken Goodwin, Portland Community College

Harold Burke-Sievers, University of Portland

Kathleen Vos, Lane Community College

Emergency Recovery Processes

Greg Hamann, President, Clatsop Community College (Storm Damages)

Joanne Truesdell, President, Clackamas Community College (Threatening Student)

Matt Rodgers, OSU Disaster Recovery

Campus Safety Officer Roles and Training

Greg Marks, PSU

Harold Burke-Sievers, Univ. of Portland

Kevin Williams, UO

Mike Zilber, WOU

Ken Goodwin, PCC

Krista Bows, UO

David Kerry, WOU

Ed Guy, OIT

Kevin Sheane, OHSU

Mike Soto, PSU

Robert Lehner, Eugene PD

Jack Rogers, OSU

Appendix D. Oregon Campus Safety Survey

A survey conducted by the Association of American Universities (AAU) in August 2007 was adapted for use as an assessment tool of campus safety issues in Oregon. This survey was sent to all postsecondary colleges in Oregon in May 2008. Respondents to the survey include 12 private institutions, four universities in the Oregon University System and eight community colleges.

In the tables below, the Oregon survey responses are compared to those of the 42 responses from AAU institutions where comparable questions occurred.

How does your institution identify students who pose a risk of harm to themselves or others?

	Oregon Survey		AAU Survey
	#	%	%
Rely on gatekeepers such as faculty/staff and RA's to report	22	39	86
Regular staff/faculty/ administration meetings to discuss problem	8	14	12
Informal or situational meetings to discuss problem student	19	34	17
Other	7	13	21

Other Responses

- ✓ The Student Success team meets weekly to discuss at-risk students.
- ✓ Mini-CIRT Team (Critical Incident Response Team), Counseling and Psychological Services referrals, Law Enforcement Reports, Dean of Student Life reviews, Web info. Received by e-mail reporting means.
- ✓ We have a student of concern process that includes training of all college staff to help in identifying students of concern and directing services to them.
- ✓ 1. Cooperation with local police. 2. Monitor alcohol and drug infractions.
- ✓ Information from admissions personnel; application questions; background checks for professional students about to seek licensure, etc.
- ✓ Advisors and Counseling staff.
- ✓ Information is passed from local K-12 schools.

How does your institution identify staff and faculty who pose a risk of harm to themselves or others?

	Oregon Survey	
	#	%
Rely on gatekeepers such as faculty/staff and RA's to report	16	37
Regular staff/faculty/ administration meetings to discuss problem	9	21
Informal or situational meetings to discuss problem student	14	33
Other	4	9

Other Responses

- ✓ With the help of supervisors and concerned colleagues.

- ✓ Mini-CIRT Team meetings, Distressed and Disturbed Student presentations by Dean of Student Life staff, law enforcement members, counseling and psychological services staff.
- ✓ Same as the response to the previous process.
- ✓ Cooperation with local police.

Do you provide training for resident assistants, faculty, and staff to help them identify individuals who may pose harm to themselves or others?

	Oregon Survey		AAU Survey*
	#	%	%
Yes	17	68	8
No	8	32	12

* Question responses were worded in another format.

In Oregon, the responding schools indicated that faculty (12 schools), staff (15 schools), administration (14 schools), resident advisors (15 schools), and teaching assistants (4 schools) were given this type of training. Other groups who were identified as receiving training include students' parents, student leaders, Greek advisors, library staff, front-line office staff (1 school), the Counselors Threat Assessment team (1 school), counselors and public safety officers (1 school) and part-time employees (1 school).

How does your institution address the behavior of students who are disruptive, pose a significant potential risk of harm, or are engaged in or actively threatening violence?

	Oregon Survey		AAU Survey
	#	%	%
Referral to counseling services	20	15	81
Referral to off-site care	16	12	45
Removal from campus	20	15	43
Conference to decide actions on a case-by-case basis	24	18	33
Referral to Judicial Committee	13	10	21
Joint counseling/mediation with student and others affected	18	14	5
Protective custody/police involvement	14	11	12
Cannot force student into counseling	5	4	7
Other	2	2	

Other Responses

- ✓ Mini-CIRT team meetings, law enforcement intervention, referral to counseling and psychological services, exclusion of former and/or non-enrolled students, parental contact, registration holds, referral to Dean of Student Life.
- ✓ Bar from campus.

How does your institution address the behavior of faculty and staff who are disruptive, pose a significant potential risk of harm, or are engaged in or actively threatening violence?

	Oregon Survey		AAU Survey
	#	%	%
Referral to counseling services	17	17	50 (EAP)
Referral to off-site care	13	13	21 (Ins.)
Removal from campus	15	15	7
Conference to decide actions on a case-by-case basis	21	21	
Paid leave	14	14	5
Protective custody/police involvement	11	11	5
Will typically not know if employee has mental health problems	7	7	2
Other	3	3	

Does your institution require mental health treatment for students as a condition of active status for those whose documented behavior indicates that they may be a threat?

	Oregon Survey		AAU Survey*
	#	%	%
Formally	10	40	62
Informally	7	28	5
No	8	32	33

How does your institution ensure that students are able to receive mental health services?

	Oregon Survey	
	#	%
Referral to counseling services	22	19
Referral to off-site care	19	16
Removal from campus	12	10
Conference to decide actions on a case-by-case basis	20	17
Referral to Judicial Committee	8	7
Joint counseling/mediation with student and others affected	13	11
Protective custody/police involvement	12	10
Cannot force student into counseling	9	8
Other	2	2

Other Responses

- ✓ Referral to Counseling and Psychological Services, parent notifications, registration holds.
- ✓ We currently have a suicide prevention grant that assists in this process.

How does your institution ensure that faculty and staff are able to receive mental health services?

	Oregon Survey		AAU Survey
	#	%	%
Referral to counseling services	21	23	50 (EAP)
Referral to off-site care	17	19	21 (Ins.)
Removal from campus	6	7	
Conference to decide actions on a case-by-case basis	18	20	
Paid leave	13	14	
Protective custody/police involvement	8	9	
Will typically not know if employee has mental health problems	6	7	
Other	1	1	

Other Response

- ✓ We currently have a suicide prevention grant that assists in this process.

Do you maintain information about mental health and dangerous behavior in a single location?

	Oregon Survey	
	#	%
Formally	8	32
Informally	5	20
No	12	48

Absent changes in federal privacy and related laws, does your institution plan to change its policies or procedures for dealing with mental health problems?

	Oregon Survey		AAU Survey
	#	%	%
No	4	16	24
Routine review	5	20	17
Currently reviewing policies/procedures	7	28	21
Providing more training	3	12	7
Improving communications	2	8	5
Standardizing policies/ procedures across campuses	3	12	2
Other	1	4	
Did not specify			24

Does your campus have a safety and security plan?

	Oregon Survey	
	#	%
Yes	24	96
No	1	4

Has it (the safety and security plan) been reviewed and updated since April 2007?

	Oregon Survey	
	#	%
Yes	21	91
No	2	9

Who provides leadership for public safety planning for your institution?

Twenty-one campuses responded to this question; of these responses, 16 listed a single individual and five listed two or more individuals as responsible for public safety leadership. Sixteen of the campuses listed a campus safety official as either the sole staff person as this leader, or as a member of leadership team. Four campuses listed an individual who had a more general or academic leadership role on campus.

In an emergency, who is responsible for making decisions about the university’s response?

	Oregon Survey		AAU Survey
	#	%	%
Public Safety	15	20	29
President	22	29	21
Emergency Response Team	15	20	21
Varies by Emergency	15	20	21
First on Scene	5	7	2
Other	4	5	2

Other responses included:

- ✓ Threat response group.
- ✓ Vice president for finance and administration.
- ✓ After normal working hours, library staff.

Does your institution have a crisis management team?

	Oregon Survey		AAU Survey
	#	%	%
Yes	22	88	86
No	3	12	14

What training to do team members receive?

	Oregon Survey		AAU Survey
	#	%	%
NIMS/ICS	8	12	36
Regular Exercise/ Discussions	17	25	43
Regular Training	10	15	21
Self-trained	8	12	7
Police Training	6	9	7
Experience with Past Emergencies	15	22	5
No Training as Such	3	4	5
Other	1	1	5

The single “Other” response indicated that their campus was in the process of developing full campus training for Administration and support staff.

Are procedures in place to mobilize the support required during a crisis, including vital staff, mental health personnel, communications staff, and facility operational staff?

	Oregon Survey	
	#	%
Yes	22	88
No	3	12

What community resources are included in your safety and security plan?

	Oregon Survey	
	#	%
Local Law Enforcement	23	27
State Law Enforcement	11	13
Hospital	13	15
Community Mental Health Services	13	15
Fire and Emergency Response	23	27
Other	3	4

Other resources listed included local emergency management, the county health department, the city public works department, and the National Guard County CSEPP.

Do campus authorities and emergency team members have a clear understanding of relevant laws?

	Oregon Survey	
	#	%
Yes	13	54
No	2	8
Don't Know	9	38

How do you test your institution's emergency-response systems?

	Oregon Survey		AAU Survey
	#	%	%
Tabletop Drills	20	54	45
Real-time Drills	11	31	52
Other	4	11	5

Other responses indicated that they did regional drills or were in the process of refining their plans.

Do you have protocols for both internal and external communications with all who need to know, including students, faculty, staff, administrators, safety officials, hospitals, and media?

	Oregon Survey	
	#	%
Yes	20	83
No	4	17

Communications protocols are in place for:

	Oregon Survey	
	#	%
Students	18	16
Faculty	19	17
Staff/Administrators	20	17
Resident Advisors	14	12
Safety Officials	14	12
Hospitals	9	8
Media	17	15
Other	4	3

Other responses included:

- ✓ Local emergency management.
- ✓ OSU Crisis Communications Plan, OSU Disaster Management Plan.
- ✓ We have staff phone tree for campus closures if all other media is out of service.
- ✓ Local Police and Fire.
- ✓ Airport flight path.

Who is responsible during and after a crisis for deciding how and when to contact students, faculty, staff, parents, government officials, the surrounding community, the media, and others?

	Oregon Survey		AAU Survey
	#	%	%
Crisis Response Team	13	15	28
Incident Commander	14	16	17
President	20	23	
Public Affairs	12	14	14
Communications	7	8	7
Public Safety in conjunction with Administration	10	11	2
Depends on the Emergency	9	10	10
Other	2	2	21

The one respondent who indicated their “Other” response identified a combination of the Vice Presidents for Finance and Administration and Student Affairs in conjunction with the Dean of Students.

On the following questions please answer how your institution communicates with its various constituencies in an emergency.

	Oregon Survey						AAU Survey
	Students		Faculty/Staff		Emergency Responders		All
	#	%	#	%	#	%	%
Email	23	14	24	15	14	13	90
College Website	23	14	22	14	12	11	71
Designated Emergency Website	8	5	8	5	5	5	
PA System	2	1	2	1	0	0	50
Text Messages	9	6	10	6	6	5	50
Voice Mail	12	8	15	9	10	9	33
Phone Alert Systems	13	8	15	9	15	14	40
Campus Radio	3	2	2	1	2	2	40
Campus TV	1	1	1	1	0	0	31
Outside/Local Media	15	9	15	9	5	5	24
Signs/Bulletin Boards	7	4	6	4	1	1	10
Sirens	5	3	3	2	1	1	7
Voice Alarm	2	1	2	1	1	1	2
Door to Door	13	8	12	7	5	5	12
FAX	1	1	2	1	1	1	2
Paging	3	2	3	2	2	2	10
Cell Phone Alerts	8	5	8	5	10	9	26
Two-way Radios	11	7	10	6	13	12	29
Other	1	1	1	1	7	6	

Other responses for students indicated:

- ✓ Code Red System for the City of Pendleton.

Other responses for emergency responders indicated:

- ✓ Phone call (three responses).
- ✓ Telephone 911.
- ✓ Telephone and external alarm.

Does your institution have a plan for institutional continuity in case of an emergency?

	Oregon Survey		AAU Survey
	#	%	%
Yes	7	29	83
Yes, in certain cases	8	33	12
No, but preparing one	9	37	5

Does your institution have a developed plan to return essential staff and personnel to campus?

	Oregon Survey	
	#	%
Yes	12	52
Yes, in certain cases	5	22
No, but preparing one	6	25

Are resources available to address emotional, physical and other human needs following an incident?

	Oregon Survey	
	#	%
Yes	9	38
Yes, but limited	9	38
Currently developing resources	3	13
No	3	13

Appendix E. Recommended Campus Safety Guidelines (draft)

- The campus has an updated safety and security plan.
- Protocols are in place to address the behavior of students, faculty, staff and guests who are disruptive or pose a significant potential risk of harm.
- The campus has emergency response plans in place to address critical life threatening events ranging from "active shooter scenarios" to hazardous material spills, major fires, severe/extreme weather conditions, flooding, natural gas leaks, pandemic emergencies, etc.
- Faculty, staff and students know how to identify and what to do if someone poses a risk of harm to self or others.
- Campus authorities have a clear understanding of relevant laws.
- Campus authorities have a working relationship/arrangement with local law enforcement.
- Responses to actual or potential threats are coordinated with on and off campus safety forces.
- Protocols are established for both internal and external communications with all who need to know, including students, faculty, staff, administrators, safety officials, hospitals, and media.
- Procedures are in place to mobilize support required during a crisis and the recovery period, including vital staff, mental health personnel, communications staff, and facility operational staff.
- A plan is in place for business continuity and resumption/ recovery.
- Resources are available to address emotional, physical, and other human needs following an incident.
- Plans are developed to return essential staff and personnel to campus. Essential personnel remain available during a crisis and return to the incident command site if they are away during a crisis.
- The campus has an "active shooter" response plan and has practiced using it.
- Campus has developed a plan to aid international students in relocation during campus safety incidents.

- All staff is trained on FERPA and HIPPA.
- A regularly scheduled committee is in place to monitor students in distress.
- Appropriate training is provided for safety personnel.