

The University of North Carolina
Campus Safety Task Force
Report to the President



November 2007

Table of Contents:

UNC Campus Safety Task Force Report.....	Tab 1
Task Force Report Appendices	Tab 2
○ Appendix 1: Sub-Committees.	
○ Appendix 2: System Survey Summary.	
Campus Safety Task Force Sub-Committee I Report.....	Tab 3
Sub-Committee I Appendices.....	Tab 4
○ Appendix 1: BCS International Violence on Campus and in the Workplace.	
○ Appendix 2: Testimony of Russ Federman to the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.	
○ Appendix 3: Appendix M of the Virginia Tech Review Panel.	
○ Appendix 4: Letter to faculty and staff from the UNCG Safety Committee.	
○ Appendix 5: Student Health Insurance Report, by John Noor.	
○ Appendix 6: Model university-wide protocols for working with faculty and staff who appear disturbed or who pose a threat, by Cynthia Brown.	
○ Appendix 7: “Evidence-Based Strategies for Preventing and Reducing College Student Substance Use,” by the National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse.	
Campus Safety Task Force Sub-Committee II Report.....	Tab 5
Sub-Committee II Appendices.....	Tab 6
○ Appendix 1: Wake County Emergency Management Memorandum of Agreement.	
○ Appendix 2: Technical Information Bulletin, by the National Communications System.	
Campus Safety Task Force Sub-Committee III Report.....	Tab 7
Campus Safety Task Force Working Group on Information Sharing Report....	Tab 8
Working Group Appendices.....	Tab 9
○ Appendix A: Sharing Information Concerning University Students When There Is a Perceived Risk of Danger to Self or Others, Summary of Applicable Law.	
○ Appendix B: Sharing Information About Students Who May Pose a Risk of Danger to Self or Others	
○ Appendix C: NACUA Notes on FERPA and Campus Safety.	
○ Appendix D: Disclosure of Information from Education Records to Parents of Students Attending Postsecondary Institutions.	
○ Appendix E: Confidentiality Policy and Client Consent.	
○ Appendix F: Working with troubled students after the Virginia Tech shootings.	
○ Appendix G: Response Protocol for a Suicide Threat/ Attempt or Other Life Threatening Behaviors.	

Introduction

On April 16, 2007, a student at Virginia Tech shot and killed 32 students and faculty members on that university's campus and injured 17 others before taking his own life. That tragedy, combined with a small number of less dramatic violent events on UNC's campuses during the 2006-07 academic year, caused President Erskine Bowles to undertake an examination of safety on UNC campuses to make sure that the University of North Carolina is doing all that it reasonable can do, consistent with the values of the University, to reduce the incidence of violent crime within the university community. In May 2007 this University Safety Task Force was created as part of that effort.

UNC is a multi-campus university consisting of sixteen university campuses and one constituent high school. UNC is home to approximately 202,000 students and 41,000 employees. UNC is committed to providing a safe learning and working environment for all of these students and employees. At the same time, one of the core values of UNC is openness, both in the sense of freedom of thought and expression and in the sense of physical openness to the people of our communities and our state. In preparing this report, the Task Force has kept in mind both UNC's commitment to diligence in providing for campus safety and its commitment to openness.

As a reference point, it is important to note that the University of North Carolina is a relatively low-crime place to live, work and study, as are most universities in the United States. According to data from the U.S. Department of Education, the Census Bureau, and the FBI, "the murder rate on college campuses was 0.28 per 100,000 people, compared with 5.5 per 100,000 nationally." *U.S. News and World Report*, April 30, 2007, p. 49. The magnitude of the Virginia Tech shootings (32 people killed) is highlighted by the fact that the total number of murders on American college campuses (approximately 4,200 institutions enrolling 16 million students) "fluctuated between 9 and 24 [per year] between 1997 and 2004." Virginia Youth Violence Project, School of Education, University of Virginia, 2007. The 2004 UNC Task Force on the Safety of the University Community found that the crime rate on UNC campuses was one-sixth of the crime rate of the State of North Carolina as a whole. UNC's individual campuses are also safe as compared to their surrounding communities. For example, according to the last available data from the FBI crime-reporting data base (2003), a person is seven times less likely to be a victim of violent crime on the campus of NC State University than in the City of Raleigh.

Even though UNC's campuses are relatively safe, it is still incumbent on the university to examine its safety practices and its capacity to assure that UNC campuses are as resistant to violent crime as they reasonably can be. Thus this Task Force undertook to examine efforts that could be made to prevent crime by altering the behavior of students and employees, by being responsive to the mental health needs of the University's students and employees, by improving the campus infrastructure to make it more crime resistant, and by building campus capacity to respond appropriately if an emergency or extreme event should occur.

During its deliberations, the Task Force was keenly aware of several important tensions in promoting campus safety. First, as noted above, one of the core values of the University is openness, and suggested safety improvements must balance the value of any proposed safety improvement against this core value of academic freedom and openness.

Similarly, students and employees have a reasonable expectation of a certain degree of privacy in their lives on campus. This is particularly true of students living in university dormitories; for these students, their rented university space is their home. In the context of information sharing about students and staff who may be experiencing emotional difficulties, understanding this need for privacy is particularly important, since students and employees may not seek the help they need if they do not have a reasonable assurance that the personal information they disclose will be kept confidential. Avoiding stigmatization of students and faculty who are striving to overcome disabilities and to move forward productively with their lives is also a University value that must be honored.

Finally, the Task Force continued to recognize that UNC's campuses are very different geographically and demographically. This dramatically affects the kinds of safety threats they face. For example, rural campuses such as UNC Pembroke or Western Carolina University face very different safety challenges than do UNC Greensboro or North Carolina State University. In addition, all UNC campuses are already focused on crime prevention and campus safety, utilizing different methods that meet the needs of each particular campus. For these reasons the Task Force concluded it should not be too rigidly prescriptive. Rather, UNC should allow each campus to use its resources in the ways that are most likely to address the threats and challenges that particular campus actually faces.

Thus, the recommendations that follow establish the parameters of a safety framework -- setting out issues that each campus must address, but without establishing a detailed check list of items that each campus must mark off as done.

Just as preventing crime within the campus community presents differing challenges for different campuses, the needs are also ever changing. The processes of threat assessment, prevention, and communication and response preparation must be ongoing processes that are informed by ongoing assessment of campus and community environments and best practices that continue to evolve.

Finally, while the Task Force has made numerous specific recommendations, it is also aware that overall campus climate dramatically impacts campus safety. All campuses should bolster the institutional qualities that have proven to be effective protective factors against violence. Campus leaders must constantly work toward establishing a culture of concern and caring for other members of the campus community by teaching the values of trust and respect through open communication. These values should be clearly articulated at the highest levels of campus governance, including by the chancellors and the boards of trustees.

2007 UNC Campus Safety Task Force Members

Leslie Winner, Chair, Campus Safety Task Force

Vice President and General Counsel
University of North Carolina

Brent Barringer

Member, UNC Board of Governors

Willie Bell

Police Chief
Winston-Salem State University

Dr. Cindy Brown

Professor of Applied Criminology
Western Carolina University

Jordan Coates

Student
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Rollin Donelson

Police Chief
University of North Carolina at Greensboro

Phillip L. Dubois

Chancellor
University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Dr. Michael Felts

Professor and Director of Pre-health Professions
East Carolina University

Willie Gilchrist

Chancellor
Elizabeth City State University

Tomasi L. Larry

Student Body President
North Carolina Central University

Pat Leonard

Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs
UNC-Wilmington

Donna Payne

University Counsel
University of North Carolina at Pembroke

David Rainer, CIH, Chair, Sub-Committee II

Associate Vice Chancellor
Environmental Health and Public Safety
North Carolina State University

Peter Romary

Director, Student Legal Services
East Carolina University

Andy Snead

Professional Engineer, Design and Construction
Services
North Carolina State University

Dr. David Spano

Associate Vice Chancellor for Health Programs and
Services and Director, Counseling Center
University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Leslie Strohm

Vice Chancellor and General Counsel
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Chevella Thomas

Reconciliation-Fixed Assets Accountant
North Carolina Central University

Cindy Wallace

Chair, Sub-Committee I

Vice Chancellor, Student Development
Appalachian State University

Andy Woods

Chair, Sub-Committee III

Student
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

General Administration Staff

Kemal Atkins

Director for Academic and Student Affairs

Kathryn Bender

Counsel

Terry Feravich

Associate Vice President for Finance

Alfred Mays

Director of IR Affairs

Sam Metzler

Intern (Until August 2007)

John Noor

Intern (From August 2007)

Kimrey Rhinehardt

Vice President for Federal Relations

Process:

This report is the product of an intensive six-month process that addressed three main questions. First, what are our universities currently doing to provide a learning and working environment for students, faculty, and staff that is safe from violent crime? Second, what are the currently accepted best practices for campus safety? Lastly, based on the answers to the previous two questions, what can the University reasonably do to improve its ability to protect students, faculty and staff from being the victims of violent crime? The Task Force met every month from May through October. During this time the committee discussed a broad range of topics including: possible adjustments to FERPA and HIPPA, the adequacy of current crime-reporting data, student codes of conduct, adequacy of counseling services on our campuses, electronic door locks and other possible dormitory safety measures, and possible methods of communicating during an emergency. The Task Force also considered the federal and State of Virginia reports on the Virginia Tech tragedy. These initial discussions helped highlight the issues which needed more research and deliberation and eliminated ideas that would not be practicable or desirable for University-wide adoption.

The Task Force tackled its broad range of issues by forming three subcommittees, and the chair appointed one separate working group. Each subcommittee was charged with looking into specific issues within a broader safety theme. The subcommittees worked at Task Force meetings, as well as in between, and conducted a survey of the campuses, researched best practices within their fields, and conferred with professionals from across the campuses to make sure that they understood the realities that our University faces when dealing with safety on our campuses.

The first subcommittee's theme was student and employee behavior, with particular attention being given to areas of addressing mental health needs and identifying and evaluating potentially dangerous individuals. Subcommittee I looked at threat identification, assessment and response, alcohol abuse, counseling, anger management training, domestic violence, student conduct codes and systems, responding to troubled employees, privacy in student health and counseling, and adequacy of mental health coverage. The second subcommittee's theme was extreme events, and it looked at the specific topics of communication capacity, adequacy of campus police training, and security of facilities other than residence halls. The third subcommittee investigated crimes and safe housing and honed in on the issues of off-campus crimes, cooperation between local law enforcement, campus law enforcement, drugs and weapons; dorm/housing safety issues, as well as other issues concerning safety of faculty and staff. The three subcommittee charges and membership can be found in Task Force Appendix 2. The working group on information sharing had the most specific task, which was to investigate the issues surrounding FERPA and HIPPA. Their primary task was to provide information and recommendations on the question of information sharing regarding troubled students.

After three months of deliberation the subcommittees and working group reported out their findings to the committee as a whole. The Task Force debated each of their ideas and after long discussion established a final set of recommendations. During this process of debate and discussion, General Administration staff provided cost estimates on each of the subcommittees' recommendations. In addition, General Administration conducted a survey of the campuses to get a clearer picture of what safety measures are currently in place and what needs exist on the campuses. A summary of the results of this survey can be found in Task Force Appendix 2.

After the cost estimates and survey results were provided, the Task Force prioritized its recommendations, and now presents them in this report.

Major Themes and Concerns:

While the Task Force has adopted numerous discrete recommendations, which follow, it is helpful to focus on the themes and concerns which were continuously emphasized by the members of the Task Force during their deliberations. These themes and concerns fall into three primary categories: (1) preventing violent crime on campus; (2) building the capacity to respond to violent crime and extreme events if and when they occur; and (3) building the University's capacity to engage in safety and disaster planning in a coordinated and effective manner.

1. Preventing violent crime on campus

A. Campuses must have adequate resources to assess threatening behaviors and to treat mental health problems. Campuses must have threat assessment teams that cut across campus departments and that have members that are trained to differentiate between normal (perhaps esoteric or unusual) behavior and behavior that is an indicator of a potential threat. Once a student or employee is identified as posing a threat of harm to himself or other members of the community, the campus must have access to trained, experienced, and appropriately credentialed mental health clinicians. Each campus should also have a case worker who can assure that the student or staff member of concern follows through on recommended referrals.

B. The campus community needs crime prevention training. Not only do threat assessment teams need to be appropriately trained, as discussed above, but also faculty, residence life staff, other staff in frequent contact with students, and students themselves need to be trained to recognize the signs and indicators of potential violence, suicide and mental illness. This same group of people also needs to be trained on the protocols that establish what they should do if they observe, or believe they have observed, the signs or indicators of a potential safety threat. All members of the campus community need to know how to access emotional support and help if they individually need it or if a colleague or friend needs it.

A different kind of education that is widely needed is training in safe behaviors. Safety is a shared responsibility. For example, teaching students not to let strangers into their dormitories will be a more effective dormitory safety measure than installing more sophisticated locking systems will be.

C. Universities must provide faculty and staff with clear guidance concerning what kinds of student information may, and should, be shared. There is much confusion about what restrictions federal and state laws place on the ability of university administrators and faculty to share information about students of concern to them. In fact, these laws place few restrictions on necessary communication among faculty and administrators. In addition, these laws provide appropriate means to communicate with parents, sometimes by obtaining the student's informed consent, or without the student's consent when circumstances suggest that doing so is necessary to protect the safety of the student or others or if the student is a tax dependent of the parent. The Task Force has

recommended one change to State law to enable clinicians to communicate when necessary to protect personal safety. In addition, the Task Force has prepared a user-friendly guide to information-sharing on campus which can be used to educate the campus community on this issue.

- D. Student alcohol and drug abuse are among the greatest threats to campus safety.** Fights, accidents, overdoses, sexual violence, and other crimes that result from alcohol and drug abuse lead to many more UNC student injuries and deaths than do random shooters or other forms of violent crime. UNC campuses must use research-based methods to address campus cultures of alcohol and drug abuse and to change these self-destructive student behaviors.
- E. UNC should develop and utilize safety standards for use in building design for both dormitories and other university buildings.** While teaching safe behaviors may be more important than tightening the physical infrastructure of the campus, there is significant knowledge about building designs that will make campus environments more resistant to crime. The University should develop these safety design standards and then use them in all future new construction and major renovations. The cost of these design features should be included in construction budgets, and the cost of maintaining these features should be included in building operation costs.
- F. UNC needs to focus more attention on the workplace safety aspect of campus safety.** Much of this Task Force's effort was focused on student safety or on student-generated threats to campus safety. The University should follow up with further consideration of appropriate steps to decrease the likelihood of workplace violence, to address issues of fitness for duty of faculty and staff, and to provide the campuses with guidance concerning the use of pre-employment criminal background checks and required post-employment reporting of criminal charges and convictions.

2. Being prepared to respond to crimes and safety emergencies

- A. All campuses should engage in all-hazards emergency planning.** While this Task Force has focused on threats to safety caused by criminal and violent behavior, the uniformly recognized best practice is to do all hazards safety planning. This would include not only violent crimes, but also weather emergencies, environmental hazards, such as from toxic materials, threats from infectious disease, terrorism, and other foreseeable threats to the safety of the campus community. This planning should include developing appropriate memoranda of understanding with other emergency responders and community resources, training in the federal Incident Command System, and practicing the plan through use of tabletop exercises. All but two campuses have an all-hazards Emergency Operations Plan. These plans must not, however, be static documents. Their revision, and training of personnel on their implementation, must be continuous.
- B. Students, faculty and staff must be trained on how to respond to reasonably foreseeable kinds of safety emergencies.**

- C. Each campus must develop an emergency notification and communications plan that fits the unique circumstances of that campus and that has sufficient redundancy to address the limitations of technology.** These plans must use a variety of techniques to provide for communication with key university administrators and with the campus community as a whole. For example, sirens provide a very limited amount of information to a very broad range of people. In contrast, cell phone text messaging provides more detailed information, but cellular communication capacity is likely to become overloaded very quickly during an emergency. Most UNC campuses have purchased a license to use the PIER emergency communication system, but each participating campus needs to develop the capacity to implement and fully utilize that system.
- D. Each campus must have an adequately credentialed, trained and equipped campus police force.** The Task Force recommends that all UNC campus police forces be accredited. This is among the highest priorities for both crime prevention and having the capacity to respond to crime. Accreditation will assure that the campus police department is not only appropriately trained, staffed, and equipped, but also that it has developed and implemented appropriate procedures for responding to the foreseeable kinds of incidents on campus. In addition, budgeting of pay for campus police officers must be at market rates to enable campuses to attract and retain experienced, credentialed officers. UNC also needs to convene the campus police chiefs on a regular basis to enable them to address problems collectively and share solutions they have individually developed.

3. Coordinating safety and disaster prevention and response efforts

Both at General Administration and on many campuses, safety and disaster prevention and response and recovery efforts have been disjointed and erratic. At Virginia Tech, as on many UNC campuses, there was full communication and coordination between the campus police, student affairs, and academic affairs. The chancellor at every constituent institution should assure that the campus has adequate expertise to implement campus safety efforts and adequate coordination of and accountability for safety and disaster prevention, preparedness, response and recovery efforts including the administration of the Campus Safety Plan, the Emergency Operations Plan and the Threat Assessment Team.

In addition, there is an ongoing need in General Administration to support the campuses in their crime prevention and safety and disaster planning efforts, including providing ongoing training, reviewing various campus plans, developing model policies and protocols, and providing coordination with State agencies. In each of these areas, professional expertise and consistency and integration of effort are needed. Thus, in addition to adopting the subcommittee recommendations, the full Task Force makes the following recommendation:

Task Force Recommendation #1: In order for General Administration to provide consistent, coordinated, professional assistance to the campuses, the Task Force recommends that the Board of Governors establish the position of Associate Vice President for Safety and Emergency Operations within the UNC General Administration.

Conclusion

While UNC cannot eliminate violent crime on its campuses, its campuses can and must be diligent and smart about the efforts they make to prevent these crimes and to be able to respond to them in a way that minimizes their impact when they happen. UNC's campuses are very different, and that means that each one will have to decide how to address its unique set of threats. The Task Force believes that if the recommendations that follow are implemented, UNC's campuses will be safer places for its students and employees to learn, teach, work and live.

Task Force Recommendations:

Note: Recommendations are not in priority order. They are divided into short, medium, and long term recommendations, but, within each group, they appear in the order in which they were listed in their respective subcommittee reports.

Short Term: ASAP or by August 2008

Task Force Recommendation 1: In order for the General Administration to provide consistent, coordinated, professional assistance to the campuses, the Task Force recommends that the Board of Governors establish the position of Associate Vice President for Safety and Emergency Operations within the UNC General Administration.

Recurring Cost: \$180,000

Non-Recurring Cost: \$10,000

Recommendation I-1: All campuses shall establish a trained threat assessment team that at a minimum includes representatives from the Counseling Center, campus police, academic affairs, residence life and the office of the Dean of Students, or an equivalent officer. UNC General Administration should sponsor University-wide training for teams from all constituent institutions.

Recurring Cost: \$124,000

Recommendation I-2: All campuses shall establish a protocol for identifying and responding to students who potentially pose a threat to themselves or others.

Recurring Cost: \$544,500 (for case managers)

Non-Recurring: \$90,000

Recommendation I-3: All campuses shall develop a comprehensive program to educate faculty, staff, and students about how best to recognize signs and known indicators of violence, suicide, and mental illness, and collaborate with institutional resources available to assist with these situations.

Recommendation III-7: Faculty and staff need to know how to find campus resources for psychological problems and issues.

No Cost¹

Recommendation I-4: All campuses shall educate community members on issues related to privacy of educational and medical/psychological records, including clarification of policies related to FERPA, HIPAA, and state laws.

Recommendation IS-1: Campus administrators and health professionals should be provided accurate information about the laws governing information sharing.

Recurring Cost: \$34,000

¹ For the purposes of these recommendations “No Cost” means no cost, no additional cost, or cost can be absorbed by using current University resources.

Recommendation I-5: All campuses should develop a policy for the involuntary withdrawal of students who demonstrate through their behavior that they potentially pose a threat to themselves or others, but who may not have otherwise violated the campus Code of Conduct.

No Cost

Recommendation I-9: Each chancellor shall review the campus administrative structure to assure that the campus has adequate expertise to implement campus safety efforts and adequate coordination of and accountability for safety and disaster prevention, preparedness, response and recovery efforts, including the administration of the Campus Safety Plan, the Emergency Operations Plan and the Threat Assessment Team.

Recurring Cost: \$1,912,400 (16 new positions)

Non-Recurring Cost: \$80,000

Recommendation II-1: Each campus should have and keep current an all-hazards, risk-based Emergency Operations Plan (EOP).

Recommendation II-9B: Every UNC Campus Police Department should meet baseline proficiency standards. Minimal standards include: written "all hazard" plan for responding to critical incidents such as natural and man-made disasters, civil disturbances, mass arrests, bomb threats, hostage/barricaded persons situations, acts of terrorism and other unusual incidents. The plan should follow the standard Incident Command System Protocol.

No Cost

Recommendation II-3: Each campus should assure key personnel are trained in Incident Command.

Recurring Cost: \$25,000

Recommendation II-4: All campuses must conduct scheduled tabletop exercises at least two times per year.

Recurring Cost: \$10,000

Recommendation II-5: Each UNC campus must adopt an emergency notification and communication-goal statement and adopt best practices that ensure the effective dissemination of emergency and crisis information to targeted populations in an organized and timely fashion. In support of this recommendation each UNC campus must:

- A. Identify the technical limitations of their notification and communication strategy and regularly test notification and communication systems.
- B. Implement programs to regularly update campus constituents about emergency notification and communication practices.

- C. Establish systems to be able to track and communicate with affiliated faculty, students and staff who may disperse during or after a campus emergency. In addition, families should be encouraged to establish a family communications plan.

Cost Examples:

PIER – Recurring Cost: \$85,000

PIER – Non-Recurring Cost: \$312,000

Siren System – Non-Recurring Cost: \$1,899,000

Recommendation II-12: UNC General Administration should host a “summit” meeting of Campus Police Chiefs on a regularly scheduled basis to include an annual review of Clery Act changes.

Recommendation III-3: The campus Police Chiefs should convene to discuss pertinent safety issues.

No Cost

Recommendation III-1: Each campus must develop a written plan to provide for safety in student housing. Campuses within UNC provide different kinds of dormitory security depending upon the location, size, and type of the facility. One size of security does not fit all. Rather, each campus needs to examine its current safety systems in light of the patterns of crime on that campus and the safety threats facing its particular dormitories and then make an educated and thoughtful choice about what changes, additions and improvements need to be made.

Surveillance Cameras – Non-Recurring Cost: \$1,656,000

Recommendation III-5: Each campus should develop a written plan for communicating emergency procedures to all students, faculty and staff.

Recommendation II-6: In addition to complying with best practices and federal requirements concerning physical building security devices, campuses must recognize, acknowledge, and understand the limitations of security technology systems and provide education and training to modify human behavior to enhance building security. The UNC-General Administration should develop a resource library of effective training devices and methods for university students and employees.

Recurring Cost: \$25,000

Non-Recurring Cost: \$0

Recommendation III-6: UNC should develop a University-wide consensus and issue uniform guidelines concerning the use of criminal background checks for employees and concerning requirements of self-reporting of crimes by faculty, staff and students.

No Cost

Recommendation IS- 2: A campus safety resource and information website should be created and housed on the General Administration server.

No Cost

Recommendation IS-3: Parents should be given information annually about how to become “tax qualified” for purposes of access to their student’s education records.

No Cost

Recommendation IS-4: University mental health professionals should be encouraged to consider involving parents in the student’s treatment more often, either with the student’s consent or when otherwise legally permissible, but only when, in the professional’s judgment, such involvement would do more good than harm.

No Cost

Recommendation IS-5: The Board of Governors should seek the addition to Chapter 116 of the General Statutes of language:

- (a) permitting University health professionals to share information about a troubled student with others whose knowledge would decrease the risk of harm when, in the professional’s judgment, there is a substantial risk of harm to the health or safety of the student or another individual.
- (b) providing qualified immunity from liability and protection from discipline by licensing bodies when the mental health professional shares such information in the exercise of his/her professional judgment and in good faith.

No Cost

Recommendation II-9A: Every UNC Campus Police Department should meet baseline proficiency standards. Minimal standards include:

- A. Accreditation by the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies, Inc. (CALEA) or a comparable association such as IACLEA.

Recurring Cost: \$404,700

Non-Recurring Cost: \$136,200

Recommendation II-11: The building reserve model that allocates Operating & Maintenance monies for campus police officers needs to be adjusted to accommodate actual starting salaries of campus police.

Recurring Cost: \$471,000

Medium Term: by August 2009

Recommendation I-6A: All campuses shall provide adequate resources for assessment and treatment of mental health issues on campus. These resources shall include counseling centers that meet appropriate standards of accreditation, including staff who are experienced and

credentialed clinicians, and whose policies ensure prompt access to services, de-stigmatize help-seeking, and offer culturally-appropriate modes of treatment.

Initial accreditation:

Recurring Cost: \$1,585,500

Non-Recurring Cost: \$420,000

Enhancements:

Recurring Cost: \$212,800

Non-Recurring Cost: \$275,000

Recommendation I-6B: All campuses should assure that all students have adequate health insurance and that campus-provided student health insurance has adequate coverage for supplemental mental health services.

Cost in student fees to be determined.

Recommendation I-7: Campuses shall establish Memoranda of Understanding with local health and mental health agencies, particularly local psychiatric hospitals and other mental health facilities, to ensure continuity of care and adequate communication between agencies.

No Cost

Recommendation I-8: Each campus shall establish a protocol for and commit resources to working with faculty and staff who potentially pose a threat themselves or others and also should implement measures to minimize workplace violence.

Additional cost not currently known.

Recommendation I-10: A single University-wide theme and logo should be provided to safety efforts, initiatives and materials produced across UNC. Campuses should be allowed to develop their own materials or modify the logo to reflect campus colors, mascots, etc.

Recurring Cost: \$32,000

Non-Recurring Cost: \$20,000

Recommendation I-11: Every campus shall develop a comprehensive program to reduce harm associated with alcohol and drug abuse among students. These programs shall be grounded in research and reflect attempts to change the culture of alcohol and substance abuse on campus and in the community.

Training cost incorporated in I-1.

Recommendation II-2: All UNC campuses should have a written Memorandum of Agreement/Memorandum of Understanding (MOA/MOU) with each local emergency agency that could possibly be involved with an emergency response to the campus. Currently, each campus has an MOU with the police department in the municipality where the university is located. Some campuses have more extensive agreements with other agencies in their area.

Recommendation II-9E: Every UNC Campus Police Department should meet baseline proficiency standards. Minimal standards include:

E: Having mutual aid agreements with local area law enforcement agencies. Each police department should have a multi-jurisdictional training plan that is exercised on a regular basis.

No Cost

Recommendation II-7: Campus construction and renovation budgets should include the cost of procuring and installing building security systems, and building operating budgets must provide ongoing funding for operation and maintenance of security systems and devices.

Cost to be incorporated in construction and renovation budgets.

Recommendations II-9C&D: Every UNC Campus Police Department should meet baseline proficiency standards. Minimal standards include:

- C. Conduct a workload assessment at least every three years and present their findings to their local administration. Staffing for university police departments should be based upon documented workload assessments.
- D. Conduct, at least every three years, a campus community attitude survey on safety and their police department.

No Cost

Recommendation II-9F: Having an interoperable radio system that is capable to communicating with all area responders VIPER is a communications system which is being implemented across the state and will give users interoperable capabilities with any other Local Emergency Responders (LER) in the area. This coverage is currently available in areas in and around all of our universities except ASU, NCSA, WCU, and WSSU. Costs to become a member of the VIPER network are only limited to the expense of a radio which can access the system.

Non-Recurring Cost: \$472,000

Recommendation II-10: The North Carolina Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators (NCACLEA) should work with the North Carolina Justice Academy (NCJA) to develop a campus law enforcement training course, as well as an effective method of delivering the training.

No Cost

Recommendation III-2: All residence hall advisors should be trained concerning their role and responsibilities if they become aware of the presence of illegal drugs or drug dealing in a residence hall. Training courses for campus police should include a unit on effective and legal techniques for detecting and confiscating illegal drugs on campus, and in particular, in dormitories.

No Cost

Recommendation III-4: Each campus should encourage safety in privately owned and operated student dormitory-style housing.

No Cost

Long Term: by August 2011

Recommendation II-8: Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) techniques should be utilized in the design of new buildings. UNC General Administration should establish a standard set of building design security guidelines for new construction and significant building renovations.

Non-Recurring Cost: \$35,000

Task Force Budget Priorities:

Note: Items 1-10 are in priority order. Item 11 is an unranked aggregation of items that cost less than \$100,000 per item.

- 1) Recommendation I-2: All campuses shall establish a protocol for identifying and responding to students who potentially pose a threat to themselves or others.

Recurring Cost: \$544,500 (for case managers)

Non-Recurring Cost: \$90,000

- 2) Recommendation II-11: The building reserve model that allocates Operating & Maintenance monies for campus police officers needs to be adjusted to accommodate actual starting salaries of campus police.

Recurring Cost: \$471,000

- 3) Recommendation I-6A: All campuses shall provide adequate resources for assessment and treatment of mental health issues on campus.

- These resources shall include counseling centers that meet appropriate standards of accreditation, including staff who are experienced and credentialed clinicians, and whose policies ensure prompt access to services, de-stigmatize help-seeking, and offer culturally-appropriate modes of treatment.

Initial accreditation:

Recurring Cost: \$1,585,500

Non-Recurring Cost: \$420,000

Enhancements:

Recurring Cost: \$212,800

Non-Recurring Cost: \$275,000

- 4) Recommendation II-9A: Every UNC Campus Police Department should meet baseline proficiency standards. Minimal standards include:

- A. Accreditation by the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies, Inc. (CALEA) or a comparable association such as IACLEA.

Recurring Cost: \$404,700

Non-Recurring Cost: \$136,200

- 5) Task Force Recommendation:

UNC-General Administration should establish an Associate Vice President for Safety and Emergency Operations.

Recurring Cost: \$180,000

Non-Recurring Cost: \$10,000

- 6) Recommendation I-1: All campuses shall establish a trained threat assessment team that at a minimum will include representatives from the Counseling Center, campus police, academic affairs, residence life and the office of the Dean of Students, or an equivalent officer. UNC General Administration should sponsor a University-wide training for teams from all constituent institutions.

Recurring Cost: \$124,000

- 7) Recommendation I-9: Each chancellor shall review the campus administrative structure to assure that the campus has adequate expertise to implement campus safety efforts and adequate coordination of and accountability for safety and disaster prevention, preparedness, response and recovery efforts, including the administration of the Campus Safety Plan, the Emergency Operations Plan and the Threat Assessment Team.

Recurring Cost: \$1,912,400 (16 new positions)

Non-Recurring Cost: \$80,000

- 8) Recommendation II-5: Each UNC campus must adopt an emergency notification and communication-goal statement and adopt best practices that ensure the effective dissemination of emergency and crisis information to targeted populations in an organized and timely fashion. In support of this recommendation each UNC campus must:

- A. Identify the technical limitations of their notification and communication strategy and regularly test notification and communication systems.
- B. Implement programs to regularly update campus constituents about emergency notification and communication practices.
- C. Establish systems to be able to track and communicate with affiliated faculty, students and staff who may disperse during or after a campus emergency. In addition, families should be encouraged to establish a family communications plan.

Cost Examples:

PIER – Recurring Cost: \$85,000

PIER – Non-Recurring Cost: \$312,000

Siren System – Non-Recurring Cost: \$1,899,000

- 9) Recommendation III-1: Each campus must develop a written plan to provide for safety in student housing. Campuses within UNC provide different kinds of dormitory security depending upon the location, size, and type of the facility. One size of security does not fit all. Rather, each campus needs to examine its current safety systems in light of the patterns of crime on that campus and the safety threats facing its particular dormitories and then make an educated and thoughtful choice about what changes, additions and improvements need to be made.

Surveillance Cameras – Non-Recurring Cost: \$1,656,000

- 10) Recommendation II-9F: Having an interoperable radio system that is capable of communicating with all area responders VIPER is a communications system which is being implemented across the state and will give users interoperable capabilities with any other Local Emergency Responders (LER) in the area.

Non-Recurring Cost: \$472,000

11) Unranked Lower Cost Priorities:

- a.) Recommendation I-4: All campuses shall educate community members on issues related to privacy of educational and medical/psychological records, including clarification of policies related to FERPA, HIPAA, and state laws.

Recommendation IS-1: Campus administrators and health professionals should be provided accurate information about the laws governing information sharing.

Recurring Cost: \$34,000

- b.) Recommendation III-5: Each campus should develop a written plan for communicating emergency procedures to all students, faculty and staff.

Recommendation II-6: Comply with best practices and federal requirements concerning physical building security devices. The UNC-General Administration should develop a resource library of effective training devices and methods for university students and employees.

Recurring Cost: \$25,000

- c.) Recommendation I-10: A single University-wide theme and logo should be provided to safety efforts, initiatives and materials produced across UNC.

Recurring Cost: \$32,000

Non-Recurring Cost: \$20,000

- d.) Recommendation II-3: Each campus should assure key personnel are trained in incident Command.

Recurring Cost: \$25,000

- e.) Recommendation II-4: All campuses must conduct scheduled tabletop exercises at least two times per year.

Recurring Cost: \$10,000

- f.) Recommendation II-8: Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) techniques should be utilized in the design of new buildings. UNC General Administration should establish a standard set of building design security guidelines for new construction and significant building renovations.

Non-Recurring Cost: \$35,000

Totals for Low Cost Priorities:

Total Recurring: \$126,000

Total Non-Recurring: \$55,000

Totals for all Task Force Priorities

Total Recurring: \$ 5,645,900

Total Non-Recurring: \$5,405,200