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Preface

NaBITA has written extensively on Behavioral Intervention Teams (BITs), mental health crisis response and threat assessment. Over time, we have found that teams struggle to develop a policy and procedure manual. These guidelines are often labor intensive to create and BITs are often pulled to more pressing assessment and intervention needs that prevent them from investing the time and effort necessary to create such a guiding document.

Chip Reese, NaBITA’s Associate Executive Director and Assistant Vice President & Dean of Students at Columbus State University has very generously offered their manual as a sample for schools looking to build one. Many schools have taken Chip up on this generous offer. In addition, we have suggested that schools consider our writings, specifically the Book on BIT and Best BITs, for sample language to build their own manuals.

After discussing the concept with NaBITA’s advisory board, we thought it would be helpful to write a template that BITs could use as starting place to cut and paste some material into their own manual. Our process involved starting from a blank page and writing out a manual for a hypothetical college that was just starting its BIT.

There will likely be pieces in this template that you will find very useful as well as sections that may not apply to your school. We offer the material in a word document format instead of a finalized PDF to allow you to easily move around the text and create your own document for your team.
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BART was TAC

The Threat Assessment Committee (TAC) changed its name to Behavioral Assessment and Recommendation Team (BART) in August 2009.

At the conclusion of the first full year of implementation, TAC completed an internal audit and review of all policies and procedures. In addition, Dean Reese and Assistant Dean Larkin have attended several conferences throughout the year directed at higher education behavioral intervention teams. Two things have resonated loudly from their training, (1) Columbus State University is moving in the right direction with its efforts to provide a safe environment and (2) threat assessment is one element of behavioral assessment.

It was also noted during the TAC audit and review that several members of the committee had been contacted during the year with questions about “threatening behavior”. It appears that some members of the campus community have struggled with what they should or should not report as they look to make a determination of what a threat might be. These struggles may have caused some to withhold information that when melded with other like-minded reports could have a cumulative outcome for threatening behavior. Making such determinations is the purpose of the committee.

Based upon what the committee feels is sound reasoning, TAC has determined that threat assessment is but one function of this committee. Thus, the name Threat Assessment Committee has limited its effectiveness. A more accurate representation of the committee’s purpose is to assess individuals’ behavior and make a determination if a threat to self or others may be present. Additionally, it was determined that the committee’s most reasonable action during the past year has been to make recommendations to the appropriate university personnel. For this reason the word recommendation has been added to the committee’s name. Finally, the word committee has been replaced with team. The term committee denotes a certain meeting structure and authoritative hierarchy with motions, votes, and meeting minutes. During the past year this group of campus-wide representatives has operated as a team. Utilizing their expertise, each member has shared an equal voice and led the group at one time or another.

These changes have been implemented to better describe the team’s purpose and assist individuals that may struggle with making a determination for filing a report. BART will receive reports of concerning behavior from faculty, staff, and students. These reports may involve residence life, classroom, student activity, or personal behavior.
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Introduction

Colleges and universities around the country are becoming more diligent and proactive in providing a safe environment for students, faculty and staff, and visitors to their campuses. Changes in the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) have given administrators “appropriate flexibility and deference” with regard to the disclosure of educational records and information\(^1\). The U.S. Department of Education encourages schools and colleges to develop threat assessment programs and teams. These teams should include campus community members and may include non-employee members such as local police and health professionals. These non-employees can qualify as “schools officials” with “legitimate educational interest under 34 CFR § 99.31(a)(1)(i)(B). Additional the Federal Bureau of Investigation report supports the development of threat assessment teams in their report, *Mass Victimization: Promising Avenues for Prevention*\(^2\).

Columbus State University understands the climate that exists on college campuses in the post Virginia Tech shooting era. Additionally, each public institution in Georgia has been directed by the Chancellor’s office to develop a plan and select a committee to address potential threats of this nature. In response, Columbus State has established the Behavior Assessment and Recommendation Team (BART). These procedures in this manual are designed to help identify persons of concern and deescalate behaviors of students, faculty, or staff who are displaying behaviors that are concerning, disruptive, or threatening to their own or others’ health and safety or is disruptive to the educational or administrative processes of the University.

Any member of the campus community may become aware of a person of concern or situation that is causing serious anxiety, stress, or fear. It is the responsibility of faculty, staff, and students to immediately report any situation that could possibly result in harm to anyone at the University.

It must be noted, however, behavioral assessment should not be confused with crises management. A crisis may be defined where a person may pose an active or immediate risk of

---


violence to self or others. In these cases, the University Police should be contacted at 706-507-8911.

**Team Mission**

The Behavioral Assessment and Recommendation Team is dedicated to a proactive, coordinated and planned approach to the identification, prevention, assessment, management, and reduction of interpersonal and behavioral threats to the safety and wellbeing of Columbus State University students, faculty, staff and visitors.

**Team Goals**

- Provide a safe physical environment for members of the university community,
- Provide a safe emotional environment for the university community, and
- Promote peace of mind for friends and family of the university community.

**Phases of Operations:**

- **Prevention:** Through concerted efforts in marketing and educations, and by creating a culture of referrals regarding behavior for Persons of Concern (POC), BART aspires to prevent harm to self or others with appropriate interventions.
- **Data Gathering:** Data is gathered through reports to BART team, review of academic and employment records, follow up interviews, criminal history records, discussions with faculty, supervisors, family and friends, and any other means deemed appropriate and necessary.
- **Analysis:** Once submitted, the report will be forwarded to the BART chair and selected members of the Team for review. The submitted report will automatically become part of the electronic database used for active assessment of persons of concern and to generate report data.
- **Intervention:** BART will, by way of the appropriate university office or official, investigate and respond to reported behavior indicating a student, faculty, staff, or other university community member may pose a risk to self or others. Interventions are based on the NaBITA Threat Assessment Tool.
- **Follow-up:** BART may refer students, faculty, or staff members to professional counseling, make recommendation(s) for the filing of criminal charges, assign the person of concern to the case manager, or other actions deemed appropriate.
Team Membership and Responsibilities

The Behavior Assessment and Recommendation Team consists of University personnel with expertise in human resources, employee assistance, law enforcement, threat assessment, university operations, medical and mental health knowledge, and student affairs. Membership is based on the position and not the individual. The members selected here have regular contact with campus community members in some manner, which will aid in assessment of persons of concern (POC), and/or the authority to take the appropriate action, as needed. A collaborative process to assess concerning behavior will be used. Depending on the situation, additional personnel with areas of specialization or responsibility may be called upon to assist the Team. The Team may also consult other individuals as needed, such as a faculty member who has a concern about a student, a roommate, family member, local law enforcement, and/or a manager who has information concerning an employee. The BART chair will keep senior university officials advised of situations and specifically will communicate with the Assistant Vice President for University Relations, as needed.

BART has four levels of membership. Team members are critical to the functioning of the team. They are responsible to complete on-going training, attend meetings and assist with follow-up and intervention as designated by their category.

Core Members

Core Members attend every meeting and have full access to the electronic database. If a core member is unable to attend the meeting, they have a designee backup who attends. The departments they represent are crucial to BART’s function. Many core members keep records in their own departments and can share this information with the team through The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) emergency exception clause\(^3\) or when a school official has legitimate educational interest\(^4\). Each Core Members signs annual confidentiality and training

\(^3\) In some situations, school administrators may determine that it is necessary to disclose PII from a student’s education records to appropriate parties in order to address a health or safety emergency. FERPA’s health or safety emergency provision permits such disclosures when the disclosure is necessary to protect the health or safety of the student or other individuals. See 34 CFR §§ 99.31(a)(10) and 99.36 http://familypolicy.ed.gov/content/when-it-permissible-utilize-ferpa’s-health-or-safety-emergency-exception-disclosures

\(^4\) In some instances the CARE team chair may share PII with a faculty or staff member when this knowledge may be beneficial to the student in academic and social settings, which is educational in nature. 34 CFR § 99.31(a)(1). It may, however, be necessary for this shared record to be a disciplinary record. https://ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/fpco/ferpa/index.html
agreement, which addresses their responsibility to FERPA (see appendix K). The counseling department operates under state confidentiality laws for their records, while health services operate under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA)\(^5\) as they are a revenue generating department and thus a HIPAA entity.

Each team member has the ability to gather basic data on a POC in their respective area. Members have policy and practice experience, and “have the authority to take independent action when needed”\(^6\). For their Data Reporting Responsibilities, each team member brings their respective data to the BART table during the initial discussion of a POC.

Each member of BART has specific responsibilities regarding what data to bring to the table. Members will know the persons of concern (POC) on the agenda prior to each meeting. This enables members to gather the expected information from their area and report to the team. As team members are delivering their reports, care should be taken not to interrupt the speakers except for a clarification-type of question. Other members may take notes, but should remain unemotional and non-judgmental at this time.

**Dean of Students:** The Dean chairs our team and attends our meetings. If the Dean is unable to attend, the Assistant Dean presides in their absence. The Dean chairs the meeting and organizes the agenda, ensures team members attendance and assigns a risk level to each case. The Dean maintains the BART database through *Maxient*.

**Data Reporting Responsibilities:**

- Brief overview of the incident report (team members should have already read the incident report in Maxient prior to the meeting).

\(^5\) The HIPAA Privacy Rule permits a covered entity to disclose PHI, including psychotherapy notes, when the covered entity has a good faith belief that the disclosure: (1) is necessary to prevent or lessen a serious and imminent threat to the health or safety of the patient or others and (2) is to a person(s) reasonably able to prevent or lessen the threat. This may include, depending on the circumstances, disclosure to law enforcement, family members, the target of the threat, or others who the covered entity has a good faith belief can mitigate the threat. See 45 CFR § 164.512(i)(1)(i). [https://www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/fpco/doc/ferpa-hipaa-guidance.pdf](https://www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/fpco/doc/ferpa-hipaa-guidance.pdf)

• Is the POC a member of a student organization or Greek Life? Are there systemic problems associated with the organization?
• Review POC admission application: Did the POC check the box associated with a criminal history? Did the POC check the box noting having been suspended or expelled from another institution?
• Did the POC previously withdraw from school for medical reasons?
• Perform a cursory rating of the NaBITA Threat Assessment Tool (this is only a starting point based on the facts surrounding the incident report).
• Check billing information from student accounts office to include financial aid. 

NOTE: The reported incident could be associated with financial worries, such as: The POC is having difficulty paying the tuition bill and is frustrated. Working with the financial aid office to solve this problem may be all that is necessary.

**Assistant Dean of Students:** The Assistant Dean attends the team meetings and acts as the Team chair in the absence of the dean of students. The Assistant Dean on cases involving on/off campus conduct violations, criminal charges and academic disruptions. Conduct data is kept in the Maxient database and is accessible to the director during the meeting.

**Data Reporting Responsibilities:**

• Case history of POC: academic and non-academic discipline, and BART reports.
• Criminal history: Was the POC admitted to the institution with a known criminal history? Could the same type of behavior be taking place now?
• Are there reoccurring themes of behavior or possibly escalating behaviors? Is the POC well known to the student conduct office?
• In any previous cases, what was the level of assessment using the NaBITA Tool? If a behavioral baseline has been established for this POC, is the currently reported behavior in line with the assessment baseline or not?

**Office of the Provost & Faculty Representative:** The associate provost for academic affairs attends team meeting or sends their appropriate back-up and is primarily responsible for information regarding grades and academic performance. They also often serve as the primary contact in working with faculty, department chairs, and provosts.

**Data Reporting Responsibility:**

• Review POC admission application: Does the POC’s application and transcripts from other institutions match? Did the POC write in the space asking why the person wanted to attend your institution? Is there an admission essay, and if so, what does it say?
• Academic history (e.g., high school and college transcripts, and recent grades
in past terms): Are current grades consistent with what should be normally expected? Are there dips in grades with a return to normal?

- Current class attendance, participation, and demeanor: Is the POC attending? Was the person attending, but lately stopped? Does the POC take an active and constructive part in class discussions? Does the POC turn in assignments? What is the regular appearance and hygiene associated with the POC?

- Class disturbances addressed independently by the instructor: Has the instructor had any unreported issues during class or possibly on-line with the POC?

**Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs:** The AVP for Student Affairs supervises the Student Life Office (registered student organizations), Diversity Services, Career Center, Greek Life, and all aspects of Orientation. The AVP, along with their staff can identify at-risk students and be part of larger safety net to ensure that students who are struggling are identified and connected to services through BART team referrals and follow up. The AVP also serves as the BART Case Manager for certain populations.

**Data Reporting Responsibilities:**

- Is the POC involved on campus?
- Does the organization have systemic problems?
- Is there a strong student leader or faculty advisor who may be a good mentor for the POC?

**Chief of Police:** Our campus has a sworn police department and the chief attends each meeting. If the chief is unable to attend the duly selected back-up attends. The chief provides liaison communications with local and federal law enforcement agencies, consults on BART team cases that have court or law enforcement elements and assists with interventions on campus requiring police. Police records are kept separate from student conduct and BART team records.

**Data Reporting Responsibilities:**

- Criminal history: Could the same type of behavior be taking place now?
- Police contact and reports: There may be a report with no charges of which only the police are aware. The POC may be a repeat witness to events; this may bring into question if the person is actually part of that problem. Has the POC been a recent victim of a crime?
Social Media: Are posts by the POC dark or concerning? Do they have threatening statements or overtones? Who are the POC’s “friends” and what do they post? What groups, activities, etc., does the POC like? Are there writings on social media that could possibly be evaluated using the VARW²?

Director of Counseling: The director of counseling attends the meetings and sends the assistant director of counseling if they are unable to attend. The counseling director receives information from the team to ensure collaborative communication and consults on issues of mental health, crisis and disruptive/dangerous behavior. The counseling center director keeps privileged medical treatment records in Titanium. These records are protected by state confidently law and information is only shared with BART when the student signs permission through a specific release of information or the expanded informed consent document (Appendix A).

Data Reporting Responsibilities:

- The team member from the counseling center most likely will not share any knowledge of a particular POC unless a release has been signed or there has been a public incident, such as suicide attempt in the resident halls. The counseling representative may be able to speak professionally to the public knowledge of an event.
- Counselors may also be able to share professional insight in a general sense, such as recalling a similar situation when working at another institution.
- Counselors may assist by educating the team about certain disorders that present in the POC based on observable behaviors being described by other team members at the meeting.

Director of Residential Life: The director of residential life attends the meetings and the assistant director of residential life attends if the director is unable to attend. They offer insight into residential life students, after-hours emergencies and targeted intervention with Resident Advisors (RAs) and Resident Directors (RDs).

Data Reporting Responsibilities:

- Professional staff’s reflections on the latest face-to-face encounter with the POC. Upon receiving an incident report, it is important to have someone talk to the POC, even if it is a casual conversation.
- Room condition: Does residence life have a vehicle for conducting a room inspection? Is the POC clean to the point of OCD? Is the room a health hazard? Are there pictures or posters of concern (e.g., depicting guns, death, or destruction)?
• Roommates’ impression of the POC: Care should be taken in obtaining this information as to not violate FERPA.
• Recent room changes: Does the POC have difficulty making friends? Is the POC intentionally creating a roommate conflict to drive others away to get a private room?
• Recent maintenance requests: Are these request considered normal? Is there more than what would be considered normal wear and tear?

Human Resources & Title IX Coordinator: The Director of Human Resources is a Core Members and speaks to issues related to reports concerning faculty or staff member. The Director for Human Resources also serves as the Title IX Coordinator with Columbus State University. The Assistant Director attends in the Director’s absence. Depending on the need for privacy, the HR director may work with a smaller sub-set of BART to assess and develop intervention strategies for the faculty or staff in distress.

Data Reporting Responsibilities:
• If the POC is an employee, personnel files may indicate a criminal history, letters of correction or reprimand, letters of accommodation, complaints from others employees, appeals, or grievances filed.
• Criminal history: Was the POC hired with a known criminal history? Could the same type of behavior be taking place now?
• Determines any overlap with between BART and Title IX situations.

Case Manager: The case manager position with the University also rests with the Dean of Students. Many times a case will be assigned to another member of BART for management purposes and this CORE member is responsible for reporting progress to the Dean of Students.

Data Reporting Responsibilities:
• If the POC is currently in the case management program, the Case Management Coordinator should have a good bit of data to share.
• Have goals been discussed and established with the POC? If so, what is the progress?
• The Case Manager could offer an additional NaBITA Threat Assessment Tool rating or SIVRA-35 assessment, as needed.

Inner Circle Members
Inner Circle Members are invited to each meeting but serve in departments that are not as critical to BART as the Core members. If inner circle members are unable to attend a meeting,
there is not a backup person who represents them. They do have access to the electronic database. Each of the Inner Circle Members uses Maxient’s *Watch List* function. This enables them to be notified by an automatic email when a report is filed concerning a person under their care. The Inner Circle Member may contact the chair and/or attend the BART meeting to offer information and guidance regarding the POC.

- **The Center for Accommodation & Access, Director:** The Director offers guidance on issues of academic and residential accommodations. If they are unable to attend a meeting, they send reports or useful information forward to the chair of BART. Records in the CAA office are protected under FERPA.

- **Student Health Center, Director:** The health center director collaborates with the BART on students having medical emergencies, mental health challenges (outside counselling services) and other health related concerns. Information in the health center is protected by state confidentiality law based on the licensure of the doctors and nurses and under HIPAA. Information is only shared with BART when the student signs permission through a specific release of information or if the information falls under the HIPAA emergency exception.

- **Athletics, Assistant Director:** Given the high number of students involved in athletics on campus, BART works collaboratively with the athletic department, coaches and team captains to train them in mental health first aid, suicide awareness and how to work with students who are struggling. The Assistant Athletic Director attends most BART meetings and handles case load responsibilities for the Case Management program for athletics.

**Middle Circle Members**

Middle Circle Members serve BART in a consultant capacity. They are invited in for cases that related to their specific content area and do not attend meetings regularly. They do not have access the electronic database.

- **General Counsel:** The general counsel attends meetings when an issue presents a legal concern where the general counsel’s expertise is essential to the case at hand. The
general counsel does not have access to the *Maxient* database and is invited to stay at the meeting just for the portion covering the specific case at hand.

**Outer Circle Members**
Outer Circle Members do not attend meetings or have access to the database. These team members function as the eyes and ears to share reports with the team. These members also receive additional training when it comes to intervention and management of students, faculty and staff. The training includes NaBITA’s PASS suicide gatekeeper program as well as their mental health awareness and intervention program.

- **First year experience faculty:** BART identifies several faculty members who work as part of the first-year experience program. This semester long course teaches students to avoid some of the common pitfalls in the college experience such as procrastinating, poor social life/academic balance, losing contact with home/family, and poor study habits. These faculty are given additional training and are often utilized by BART to help connect students to on-campus support resources.

- **Orientation Leaders:** One of the first people new students meet on campus are the group leaders during orientation events in the summer and January. These leaders receive training on basic mental health first aid, suicide prevention, group communication, leadership and study skills. These leaders work with the BART to share information and help connect students to care.

- **Resident Assistants and Resident Life Coordinators:** Our University has a robust residential life program involving professional staff (hall directors or RLCs) and student advisors (RAs). Both groups are trained in conflict resolution and mediation skills as well as mental health crisis de-escalation. Residential life staff serve to identify at-risk behaviors as they occur in the halls and assist with interventions.
Team Logistics

The team meets biweekly on Thursday.

While each meeting can be adjusted by the chair and the BART membership, generally speaking, the first 15-30 minutes of the meeting are spent reviewing previous cases, obtaining updates and assigning action items to team members. The remaining meeting time is spent going around the room and soliciting information regarding cases from each team members. Team members should review the active case agenda in Maxient each day (see Appendix L – D2T). When addressing new cases the meeting flow is respectful of the Three Phase Process, which is at the heart of BART: 1) gather and present data; 2) apply a rubric/analyze data; and (3) implement an appropriate intervention.

Meetings are not rushed. The sixty-minute time frame and commitment to bi-weekly meetings reflects BART’s commitment to spending the time necessary to review cases thoroughly and without rushing to conclusion. It is Chair’s responsibility to keep the team on task with this simple yet crucial process flow. To accomplish this, the Chair will utilize the De-Escalation Decision Tree (D2T) (see appendix L). Extra time in meetings is dedicated to discussing current community concerns, reviewing policy or tabletop exercises.

Types of Meetings
BART conducts business by three means:

Preliminary Response Meeting
Once a report is received, a preliminary response meeting may be conducted by the BART Chair and team member(s) having administrative responsibility for the person of concern. Other appropriate BART team members may be consulted and included during this initial evaluation, as needed. These team members will investigate for the submitted report and, if appropriate,
convene BART team for an Emergency Meeting. Otherwise, these findings will be reported at the regular team meeting, as described above.

**Initial Evaluation may include:**
1. Review of BART database;
2. Review of student’s disciplinary record with the dean of students or review employee’s records under the custody of the chief human resources officer;
3. Interviews to determine the existence of corroborating evidence;
4. Other relevant information as deemed appropriate to ensure the safety of the university community.

**NOTE 1:** All referrals should be considered against the backdrop of the NaBITA Threat Assessment Tool\(^7\).

**NOTE 2:** It may be determined by the Chair or other Team Members that the person of concern should be evaluated by the SIRVA-35\(^8\) assessment tool or by professional mental health personnel.

**Regular Team Meeting**
Described above, these meetings occur every other week and are designed to review on-going cases, make appropriate recommendations with new cases, and provide regular opportunities for training. Training may be scheduled or provided at regular meetings in quiet times and include tabletop exercises, discussion of current topics in the news, reading assignments, and webinars. Other trainings should include attending conferences and opportunities during the summer.

**Case review will include:**
1. Briefing on the Preliminary Response Meeting by the BART Chair or designee;
2. Review of documentation, interviews, and other relevant information;
3. General discussion guided by the D2T (see appendix L), and
4. Recommendations by the Team for appropriate intervention(s).

---


\(^8\) The SIVRA-35 is an informal, structured set of items for those who work in higher education to use with individuals who may pose a risk or threat to the community. The SIVRA-35 is not designed as a psychological test and it is not designed to assess suicidal students. For more information go to: https://nabita.org/resources/sivra-35/.
Critical Incident Response Meeting (CIR)
In the event a student attempts or commits suicide, there is an apparent threat or danger to the campus or community members, or an event has occurred which may require the immediate attention of BART, a CIR meeting may be called by the Chair. This should not be confused with an active crisis, which is managed by the University Police. Any actions or recommendation of a CIR should be reviewed at the next Regular Team Meeting.

Team Outputs:
The Behavior Intervention Team is responsible for:

1. Developing and implementation of educational and training programs for all members of the University community with regard to behavioral assessment. This should include publications and promotional materials designed to create awareness, understanding, and participation with BART.

2. Maintaining a current web site, which is easily accessible from the university’s home page and other relevant departmental pages. This site should include the full BART document, links to informational and educational sites, and instructions for filing a referral to the Behavior Intervention Team.

3. Receiving, coordinating, and assessing referrals received from faculty, staff, students, and others regarding persons of concern.

4. Reviewing applications for admission to the University of students who indicated they have a criminal record or currently have charges pending; or students who were suspended or expelled from a previously attended college or university. This will be accomplished by means of a BART subcommittee with the dean of students, chief of police, and admission office [see appendix M].

5. Reviewing applications for readmission to the University of students who were suspended for disciplinary reasons or involuntarily administratively withdrawn from the University. These applications will be brought to the attention of BART by the dean of students.

6. Reviewing applications for readmission to the University of student who received a medical/hardship withdrawal. This will be accomplished by means of a BART
subcommittee with the dean of students, directors of the Counseling Center, Student Health Center, and the Center for Accessibility and Access. This process is in place to provide transitional assistance to the student who voluntarily withdrew from the University. This readmission process should in no way be in conflict with ADA regulations, or state and Federal laws.

7. Provide an annual report to the Vice President for Student Affairs.

**Data Management:**

Once submitted, a report to the team will be electronically forwarded to the BART chair and selected members of the team for review. The report will become part of the *Maxient* database used for assessment of persons of concern and to generate report data.

*Maxient* allows BART team members to review referrals, dispositions of academic and non-academic misconduct, and identify patterns of behavior. BART team members are informed as they join the team and reminded during regular trainings that many of these records are very dynamic in nature. What the team believes to be true today may change as a situation unfolds. Much care should be taken not to form judgments or use the information in decision making outside of BART.

In addition, none of the data may be distributed or viewed by personnel outside the core or inner circle membership of the team without first consulting with the Chair. Making notes in cases files is limited core and inner circle members of the team. (Refer to appendix K)

**Team Communication and Silo Reduction**

BART members (core and inner circle) receive training to address barriers to effective communication. The team operates more effectively when there is a sense of trust and connection among the members. This trust and connection is developed through on-going conversations, frequent meetings, trainings and discussions when tensions exist. The chair of the team watches over communication trends to ensure problems are identified early and addressed.
This includes areas such as:

1. **Leave your position at the door**: Team members are encouraged to operate on equal footing when it comes to conversations. BART avoids hierarchy or shutting down conversations based on staff positions. Conversations are egalitarian and each team member is encouraged to talk and share their perspectives.

2. **Stay in your lane**: While conversation is encouraged, it is just as important that members stay in their lane. This refers to the idea that team members should be careful speaking beyond their level of expertise. Conduct staff should not review psych reports and law enforcement should not be discussing the appropriateness of a therapy animal accommodation on campus. This is a balance, however, as BART values a diversity of perspectives. This diversity of opinion is set against the backdrop of respect for each other’s area of expertise.

3. **Devil’s Advocate**: BART avoids coming to decisions based on superficial concord. Diverse perspectives and “what if” scenarios should be essential to vetting the quality of an assessment and the likelihood of a successful intervention. This does not mean outright discord and harmful debate and disagreement, but rather giving space at the table to alternative viewpoints.

4. **Forest for the Trees**: BART encourages team members to have vigorous discussions related to cases. These discussions should challenge conventional thinking and stress logic and solution focused interventions. Team members are strongly encouraged to see each case as just that, a single event, and not to allow past frustrations or disagreements to shade future discussions. BART works best when each member has a clear voice, without carrying grudges or outside departmental conflicts.

In terms of silo reduction, each department wrestles with the privacy (and sometimes privilege) of its information and when and how it can appropriately be shared with the team. Most departments within the core and inner circle of the team keep records based on FERPA and have wide latitude to share information that has a potential emergency quality to the data.
At the heart of this policy is the challenge between respecting the privacy and needs of the individual against the safety of the community. There will always be an appropriate tension between these extremes. This issue is more pressing for our counseling and student health centers, who keep records that fall under state confidently law and HIPAA, which have a higher standard in terms of what can be released.

Both student health and counseling centers have requirements to share information when there is an imminent risk of suicide or harm to others. This is discussed in state law and scope of practice for mental health clinicians, doctors and nurse and other medical providers. The more challenging issue arises when BART is discussing a student that is known to student health and/or the counseling center and the privileged information kept within those departments would be useful for the team to guide its assessment and intervention, but does not meet the standard for release.

To this end, the counseling center has adopted an expanded informed consent document that permits disclosure of information to BART at a standard lower than imminent risk or Tarasoff⁹ or harm to others. This is described in the expanded informed consent document included in Appendix A. The student health center does not use the same document and instead decides based on the severity of the circumstances in each case whether the director of health can share information with the team based on HIPAA’s emergency exception clause.

**Nurturing the Referral Source:**

Cultures of reporting do not exist in a vacuum. The members of campus communities and those who interact with BART possess critical information about at-risk persons of concern, as well as those who may be becoming “at risk.” One of the challenges for BART is to activate, create, and operate channels of communication that allow for a flow of information from those

---

⁹ As of 2012, 33 states have adopted a mandatory duty to protect for mental health professionals in statute or common law, 11 states have a permissive duty, and six states are described as having no statutes or case law offering guidance.⁹⁰ A duty to warn or protect is mandated and codified in legislative statutes of 23 states, while the duty is not codified in a statute but is present in the common law supported by precedent in 10 states.

who have it to those who need it – BART team members. Creating and nurturing the channels will help to empower information flow, but BART must also reach out to the campus and related community to teach what concerning behavior looks like, what baseline behaviors are (and thus what deviations look like), and what to do with reports when concerning behavior is observed or suspected.

To this end, once a report is received from the community through *Maxient*, the report receives an auto-responder message:

> “Thank you for submitting a report. This matter has been routed to the appropriate staff and will be followed up on shortly. If you have any questions or if new information or concerns arise, please contact our office at 706-507-8730. If this is an emergency, call the University Police at 706-507-8911.”

Many times the chair will reach out to the referring source by telephone or a face-to-face conversation. This is done to: 1) ask how the referrer is doing personally with regard to the report; there are in some instances trauma associated with making a report and it is important to care for the reporter, 2) confirm the details of the report; the reporter may have missed relevant details and clarification is needed to discover the observed behaviors, and 3) ask the reporter to partner with you as a continuing observer, as BART implements certain interventions to assist the POC.

Other communications are tailored for specific situations and approved by the BART chair. There are times when the team should consider bringing the reporter (faculty/staff) onboard to assist in the intervention process. FERPA gives BART latitude to enlist the faculty or staff member as an aid to assist the student. While this helps nurture the referral source and keep the faculty/staff more connected to the team, it also provides a collaborative approach to intervention and case management.
Approach to Marketing

BART recognizes that educating the community about what to report to the team is one of the most essential aspects of having a successful and effective team. Driving the multi-faceted marketing strategy is a list of concerns the team needs community members to report. This list of these concerns is included in Appendix B.

It is the responsibility of faculty, staff, and students to immediately report any situation that could possibly result in harm to anyone at the university. Any member of the campus community may become aware of a troubling person or situation that is causing serious anxiety, stress, or fear. However, behavioral assessment should not be confused with crisis management. A crisis may be defined where a person may pose an active or immediate risk of violence to self or others. In these cases, the university police should be contacted at 706-507-8911.

While all CORE members receive real-time emails as BART reports are filed, after hour reports that come to BART are triaged by the chair of the team during the evenings, weekends and school closures. If the report indicates a more serious concern (moderate/elevated or above on the NaBITA tool) then the BART Chair notifies the appropriate team members to assess and mitigate the risk.

When developing marketing content for BART, the following information is a priority to communicate through all the various outlets:

- **What to report:** BART breaks down the Disruptive and Dangerous list to share with the community what they should report to the team. It is stressed that this reporting is not punitive, but instead designed to better connect students to services. BART is not the student conduct office and reports should be helping the person of concern, not getting them into trouble.

- **How to contact us:** There are many ways to contact the team. Ideally, community members would fill out the Maxient reporting form. This is ideal because it notifies team
members quickly and the information can be easily triaged or followed-up on and recorded. BART recognizes that community members will have different levels of comfort when they share information. BART is committed to allowing the community to report through the website, phone number, stopping by or calling the office of BART team members or through anonymous reporting with the University Police’s Silent Witness Program.

- **Who is on the team:** Community members have different levels of comfort sharing information with the team. Since gathering information is one of the most essential team functions, BART acknowledges that some students, faculty and staff will always be more comfortable approaching a BART team member directly to make a report. Members of the team are clearly communicated to the community.

The following outlines key areas for BART team advertising to the campus community.

- **Web:** BART maintains a web presence to educate those in the community about the team. The website URL created by UITS is https://sa.columbusstate.edu/bart.php. Additionally, BART has provided a list of search terms to the UITS to improve access from the main college website. The website contains the following information: how to make a report, who is on the team, basic intervention skills and advice for faculty/staff, a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) section, a downloadable faculty class guide of disruptive vs. dangerous behaviors, a link to sharing a report, phone number and emails for BART

- **Brochure:** BART has a brochure in a printed form as well as a PDF that it makes available during training events and orientation. The brochure describes the team’s mission, what behaviors to report, who is on the team and links to the website. A copy of the brochure is included in Appendix C.

- **Posters:** BART is creating several posters to support a normative marketing campaign to overcome the stigma or obstacles the community may have reporting information to the team. Examples of these posters are included in Appendix D.
• **PowerPoint**: BART has a PowerPoint slide roadshow which was developed as a structured aid to go along with a half-hour talk on BART and what information the team is seeking from the community. This PowerPoint is used during classroom presentations, orientation events, and talks with faculty departments, staff offices, residential life and athletics.

• **The BART app**: A BART icon and link to the web page can be found on the CSU Mobile app.

• **Logo**: BART is developing a logo to improve the community’s ability to identify the team’s marketing information and to create consistency among the various ways the team communicates with the college community.
Approach to Training

BART is dedicated to the continuous improvement of the team through research and training. The goal is for the team to develop and maintain a culture of learning and dedication to finding new information and building on existing best practices.

The team should conduct at least one tabletop exercise each semester to discuss the assessment and intervention response to hypothetical scenarios. These are drawn from the books *Ending Campus Violence, Best BITS, The Prevention and Management of Mental Health Emergencies* and the Magna publication *Tabletop Exercises for Threat Assessment Teams* and the Paperclip Communication publication *Campus Mental Health Case Studies, current events and/or old cases*.

- Each team member must receive the directed training by the institutional BART chair upon joining the team.
- Each team member is encouraged to participate in at least one of the following:
  - NaBITA two-day Best Practice certification course
  - NaBITA two-day Foundations certification course
  - Attend the NaBITA annual conference
- Additional training is encouraged, such as:
  - NaBITA two-day Case Management and Intervention Course
  - Attending Higher Education Case Management Association Roundtable (HECMA)
  - Attending Association of Student Conduct Administrators Conference or Institute (ASCA)
  - Attending national or regional conference for the Association of Threat Assessment Professionals (ATAP)
- BART also looks at potential to bring in experts from these groups to consult or train locally on campus.
Documentation and Records

BART keeps records in the *Maxient*. Records at the meeting are entered primarily by the BART chairperson or assistant chair to ensure consistency in the record creation. Core and inner circle members also have access to the *Maxient* database to update cases.

Records are kept for a minimum of five years in the *Maxient* database unless there is a pressing issue that necessitates the note to be kept longer. This is done at the discretion of the chairperson of BART.

Records are to be kept secure and team members are expected to keep records safely firewalled and protected. Records should not be transmitted by email with identifying student, faculty or staff information. Records should not be kept on unsecure USB or thumb drives. Information kept on laptop and computer systems should be kept under password protection. No BART information in Maxient can be discussed, viewed, or disseminated with non-BART members without the consent of the BART chair.

Record Request

In the event the student requests to see their *Maxient* records, they will be made available within one week to the student with full consideration given to FERPA regarding other students’ records. A printed copy of their record will be presented to them at no cost. The chair of BART (or their designee) will review the records with the student prior to them leaving with the records.
Threat Assessment Rubrics

The team utilizes several risk rubrics to provide research based, objective categories to drive intervention decisions. All cases are given a risk rating on the NaBITA Threat Assessment Tool of mild, moderate, elevated, severe or extreme. Cases that have concerning writing content will be reviewed with the Violence Risk Assessment of the Written Word (VRAW²). Cases that are elevated on the hostility and violence scale of the NaBITA Threat Assessment tool are considered for the SIVRA-35. When a student displays strong religious, political or social justice beliefs and there is a concern they may use threats, intimidation or violence to meet their ideological ends, the Radicalization Risk Rubric (R³) may be used.

NaBITA Threat Assessment Tool

The NaBITA Threat assessment tool was created in 2009 and updated in 2014 as a broad triage process to rate mental health concerns (distress, disturbance, dysregulation/decompensation), hostility and violence risks (hardening, contentious debate, action not words, images and coalitions, loss of face to target, threat strategies, limited destructive blows, fragmentation of the enemy, plunging together into the abyss) and the generalized risk rubric (mild, moderate, elevated, severe and extreme).

The NABITA threat assessment tool provides a triage capacity to identify and classify risks over a broad set of concerns. The strength of this triage measure is in its ability to look broadly at a wide variety of risks to guide intervention decisions of a BIT. This expansive nature makes it not as helpful to assess the specific risks in detail.

The Violence Risk Assessment of the Written Word (VRAW²)

The VRAW² was created in 2015 following increasing number of cases where college students shared concerning written communication through social media, creative writing classes and over email. The VRAW² offers five factors (Fixation and Focus, Hierarchical Thematic Content, Action and Time Imperative, Pre-Attack Planning and Injustice Collecting) that are then scored to provide a mild, moderate, elevated, severe and extreme level of risk in line with NaBITA Tool.
The VRAW\textsuperscript{2} has aided teams to focus more objectively on the literature related to threat assessment when assessing threatening or concerning writing. While this has been helpful, it is a small subset of the overall type of assessment needed to accurately rate the risk of violence. The VRAW\textsuperscript{2} provides teams with a better footing when making decisions about intervention related to written concerns, but it lacks a focus on terrorism and extremist thought.

**The Structured Interview for Violence Risk Assessment (SIVRA-35)**

The SIVRA-35 was created in 2012 as an expert system. It is a structured set of items useful for those staff and faculty who work in higher education to use with individuals who may pose a threat to the community. The SIVRA-35 is a guided structured interview useful for classifying risk into low, moderate, and high categories based on the threat and violence risk assessment literature.

The SVIRA-35 was designed to address targeted and strategic violence that was occurring more frequently on college campuses such as the Virginia Tech massacre, Northern Illinois University shooting, Umpqua College shooting and Santa Monica College shooting and by enrolled or recently enrolled college students in at non-campus locations such as James Holmes and Jared Loughner.

**The Radicalization Risk Rubric (R\textsuperscript{3})**

Campus Behavioral Intervention and Threat Assessment Teams have become increasingly concerned with how to identify the potential for radicalization of students, faculty, and staff. Radicalism and extremism should be viewed on a continuum, from critical or counter-culture thinking to seeing violence as a reasonable pathway to bring about a desired change. The Radicalization Risk Rubric seeks to provide campus teams with an understanding of what to look for to identify and intervene with at-risk individuals who have radical thoughts and behaviors that are escalating to extremist violence and terrorism.
Team Interventions
The Behavior Assessment and Recommendation Team receives reports of concerning behaviors involving students, faculty, staff, and non-campus community members. Once the NaBITA threat assessment tool produces a risk rating of mild, moderate, elevated, severe or extreme, BART decides the type of intervention for the POC that matches the assessment of risk. BART will make that recommendation to the appropriate university official. The authority to take the recommended action or implement the intervention rest with the Core Member’s official capacity at the university.

Recommendations
BART may recommend some or all of the following;

1. Recommendations to appropriate university personnel in-line with the interventions associated with the NaBITA Threat Assessment Tool.

2. Recommendations to appropriate university personnel that may include, but are not limited to the actions or sanctions consistent with the Student Handbook, Faculty Handbook, and Staff Handbook. In addition, BART may recommend that a student, faculty, or staff member receive a professional mental health assessment, or other actions deemed appropriate;

3. Assign appropriate university personnel to the POC of the incident for follow-up and observation through the case management program;

4. Recommend that the proper authority notify, within FERPA guidelines, the parents, guardians and/or next-of-kin;

5. Recommendations to appropriate university personnel regarding conditions of consideration for an individual to return as an active member of the campus community. This may include requiring internal or external psychological evaluations of the individual in question; or

NOTE 1: Action on any recommendation(s) is the responsibility of the appropriate university personnel. It is expected that this individual report back to BART as to the disposition of the incident. If the Team’s recommendation(s) is not followed an explanation should be provided.
NOTE 2: The BART chair or designee will be responsible for making notations to the files concerning recommendations, actions taken, and disposition of each report filed.

NOTE 3: Nothing in this document is intended to abridge any employee’s rights under established contracts, or state or federal law.

End of the Year Report

The Behavior Assessment and Recommendation Team will provide the Vice President for Student Affairs with an annual review and report during the regular cycle of institutional annual assessment. The report will consist of a campus-wide qualitative survey of BART to include comments related to program awareness, ease of electronic submission, and on-going education and training opportunities. The qualitative survey will be delivered to the campus community via campus email utilizing the QualTrics format and can be found under Appendix I.

In addition, a quantitative analysis will be conducted for the current and two previous years. The Team members will also participate in a self-study and review by way of NaBITA’s CORE Q¹⁰ Team Assessment Tool. The results of the Core Q¹⁰ are combined with demographic and statistical data kept throughout the year to analyze trends and accurately reflect the team’s operations.

The BART database will be reviewed with the possibility of some reports being purged.
Appendix A: Expanded Informed Consent

Eligibility
Counseling services are available to all currently enrolled part-time and full-time undergraduate and graduate students at the University. Consultation services are also available for faculty and staff.

Intake Interview
All students are scheduled for an initial intake interview with a Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) clinician. The purpose of the intake interview is to gather information about a student’s concerns, background information, pressures that may impact current problems, and goals for counseling. Frequently, the intake counselor is the person assigned to work with the student in weekly sessions.

Counseling Sessions
The CAPS uses a brief counseling model. Brief counseling has several important features: (a) the focus is on identifying specific and attainable goals, (b) attention is given primarily to the present rather than the past, and (c) both counselor and client are active in the process. For those who may require more intensive work, the CAPS can provide referral options that are available locally. A counseling session is typically 45-60 minutes in length and sessions are commonly scheduled once weekly. Clients who arrive late for their appointment will have a reduced amount of time in their session or may be required to reschedule.

Session Limits
The CAPS provides short-term counseling to discuss any personal concerns students may be facing and works with students to develop new ways of resolving problems. Most problems are resolved within eight sessions or less. There is no limit on the number of sessions a student can meet with their counselor, though a student may require more intensive or specialized treatment than the CAPS can provide. In that case, the counselor will assist the student in finding a local treatment provider who can better meet their particular needs.

Confidentiality
CAPS will release information from counseling sessions to outside parties only at the request of the client. Records are confidential and will not leave the CAPS unless there is an emergency. CAPS records are not kept as part of the educational record. We will not answer questions about any client from parents, family, friends, significant other, professors, employer or anyone else outside of the CAPS staff.

Parents and guardians are not contacted unless we have permission from the client or if there is a risk to the client’s safety (ie: suicide risk/attempt, emergency room evaluation and/or a threat to themselves or others.) If there is a risk, information may only be shared that aids in obtaining ongoing care and ensuring safety. In rare cases where there is a risk to the student or the community, the CAPS reserves the right to notify the Vice President of Student Affairs.
and/or Campus Police, especially if the student is an active danger to themselves and/or to others.

**Record Storage**
Counseling records and individual documents are maintained electronically on Titanium®, are password protected and accessible by CAPS staff only. Client records will be kept for *at least* seven (7) years after the date of the last contact with our department.

**Testing Data**
Raw data, such as answer sheets and test booklets, are protected by copyright and may only be released to trained clinicians. Assessment and testing data are provided in summary form and explained during the follow-up session.

**Graduate Assistants and Interns**
Graduate assistants and interns are actively receiving intensive training and often work with a small number of clients, allowing them to review and focus on treatment. Occasionally they may ask for a client’s permission to record a counseling session through audio and/or video. This is optional and clients would be asked to sign a release prior to the recorded session. Both audio and videotapes are erased after they are used in training the graduate student who recorded them.

**Email**
Email communication with members of the CAPS staff should be used in scheduling appointments only. We recognize the importance of email but, because it is not a secure medium of communication and our staff does not maintain 24-hour access to their email, it will not be used to discuss on-going treatment issues.

**Groups**
Some clients may also benefit from group counseling and we strive to offer a variety of support groups every semester. For most groups there is no limit to the number of sessions a student may attend at the CAPS.

**Initial Session Guidelines**
CAPS is committed to providing the best possible care to our clients. We are also a training facility for psychologists, counselors, and social workers. As a result you may meet with more than one staff member during your initial session. The staff members are bound by confidentiality, which means that what is said in session remains in session. There are a few exceptions to this rule:
1. Plans to harm self
2. Plans to harm specific others
3. Permission provided by the client
4. Abuse of a child, adult, or elderly person
At the end of the initial session you will be assigned to one therapist who will meet with you on an on-going basis. If you have any questions, you are encouraged to ask them during the initial session.

**Client Rights**
- Review credentials of all CAPS staff members including but not limited to: education, experience and professional counseling certification and licensure(s)
- Request a particular counselor; male or female
- Terminate the counseling relationship at any time
- Have your conversations treated confidentially and be informed of any limitations on confidentiality in the counseling relationship
- Ask questions about the counseling techniques and strategies used by a counselor
- Participate in setting goals and evaluating progress toward them

**Client Responsibilities**
- Please arrive on time for your counseling session appointment
- If unable to keep an appointment, call our office to cancel at least 24 hours in advance
- Actively participate in counseling by asking questions and staying involved

I, _____________________________, a student at the University, agree to make every effort to keep ALL of my scheduled counseling appointments. If, due to illness or emergency, I am unable to attend my session, I will call CAPS to cancel the appointment, making every effort to give at least 24 hours’ notice. If I have multiple missed appointments, I am aware that limits may be imposed on counseling services available to me.

I have read and understand the above information and I have had the opportunity to ask questions about it. I know agree to begin counseling treatment.

_________________________________  _______________________
Student Signature                        Date

_________________________________  _______________________
Witness Signature                      Date
Appendix B: Disruptive and Dangerous Behaviors

Examples of Disruptive Behaviors

- Taking/making calls, texting, using smart phones for social media, etc.
- Students misuse technology in the classroom. Sneaking text messages from beneath the desk or having a laptop open to Facebook™ or other social media site during a lecture.
- Frequent interruption of professor while talking and asking of non-relevant, off-topic questions.
- Inappropriate or overly revealing clothing in classroom, including extremely sexually provocative clothes, pajamas or sleepwear in the classroom.
- Crosstalk or carrying on side conversations while the professor is speaking.
- Interruptions such as frequent use of the restroom, smoke breaks, etc.
- Poor personal hygiene that leads to a classroom disruption or lack of focus.
- Use of alcohol or other substances in class. Attending class while under the influence of alcohol or other drugs.
- Entitled or disrespectful talk to professor or other students.
- Arguing grades or “grade grubbing” for extra points after the professor requests the student to stop.
- Eating or consuming beverages in class without permission (or against the class norms).
- Showing up to class in strange clothing (dressed in military gear, Halloween costumes when it is not Halloween, etc.)
- Reading magazines, newspapers (yes, they still read them, although usually the campus one), books or studying for other classes/doing other homework.

Examples of Dangerous Behaviors

- Racist or otherwise fixed (not just expressed once to press a button) thoughts such as “Women should be barefoot and pregnant,” “Gays are an abomination to God and should be punished,” “Muslims are all terrorists and should be wiped off the earth.”
- Bullying behavior focused on students in the classroom.
- Direct communicated threat to professor or another student such as: “I am going to kick your ass” or “If you say that again, I will end you.”
- Prolonged non-verbal passive aggressive behavior such as sitting with arms crossed, glaring or staring at professor, refusal to speak or respond to questions or directives.
- Self-injurious behavior such as cutting or burning self during class, or exposing previously unexposed self-injuries.
- Physical assault such as pushing, shoving or punching.
- Throwing objects or slamming doors.
- Storming out of the classroom when upset.
- Conversations that are designed to upset other students such as descriptions of weapons, killing or death.
- Psychotic, delusional or rambling speech.
- Arrogant or rude talk to professor or other students.
- Objectifying language that depersonalizes the professor or other students.
Examples of Disruptive Behaviors Online

- Student post non-relevant spam or unrelated personal advertising material in the forum discussion board.
- Frequent interruption of the professors questions, threaded discussion posts with non-relevant comments or off topic personal discussions.
- Inappropriate or overly revealing pictures shared with members of the online community through the profile.
- Choosing a screenname or profile name that is offensive to others such as Smokingthedope420@university.edu or assman69@university.edu.
- Posting or making comments while drunk or intoxicated. Attending online class discussions or lectures while under the influence of alcohol or other drugs.
- Arrogant, entitled, rude or disrespectful emails or messages to professor or other students.
- Arguing grades or “grade grubbing” for extra points after the professor requests the student to stop.
- Inciting other students to argue with the professor over grades or other assessment related expectations.

Examples of Dangerous Behaviors Online

- Racist or otherwise fixated thoughts such as “Gays should be stoned like back in bible times,” “Men should go back to playing football and stop thinking so hard. Leave the mental heavy lifting to the ladies in the class,” “Muslims and Mormons are cults and should be wiped off the planet,” and others posted to the discussion boards to troll for a response or to incite an electronic “riot.”
- Bullying and teasing behavior through messages, emails or online hazing.
- Direct communicated threat to professor or another student such as: “I am going to kick your ass” or “If you say that again, I will end you.”
- Prolonged passive aggressive behavior such as constant disagreement with everyone and everything in class, challenging the professor’s credentials, refusal to respond questions or directives.
- Mentioning of self-injurious behavior such as cutting or burning self or suicidal thoughts or intentions in online posts.
- Threats of physical assault such as pushing, shoving or punching.
- Threats of online assaults like hacking a website, sharing personal information or pictures online without permission.
- Conversations that are designed to upset other students such as descriptions of weapons, killing or death.
- Psychotic, delusional or rambling speech in posts.
- Arrogant, entitled, rude or disrespectful messages to professor or other students.
- Objectifying language that depersonalizes the professor or other students.
Appendix C: BART Team Brochure

How Do I Submit a Report?

When submitting a written report to the BART Reporting System you should:

1. Go to www.columbusstate.edu/
2. In the upper right section, see the Select a Site: drop down menu
3. Select Behavioral Assessment and Recommendation Team
4. Click on Submit Report

Individual may choose to submit an anonymous report by:

1. Go to www.columbusstate.edu/
2. In the upper right section, see the Select a Site: drop down menu
3. Select Campus Police
4. Click on Silent Witness

Individuals may call a BART member directly to submit a verbal report. Simply tell the Team Member what you observed or heard, and explain why this concerns you.

When submitting a report to the Counseling Center you should:

1. Call the Counseling Center at 706-507-8740, or
2. Submit a "Referral Form" at: http://counsel.columbusstate.edu/inf ormation.php

BART Membership

Chip Reese, Asst. Vice President & Dean of Students: 706-507-8730
Dana Larkin, Asst. Dean of Students: 706-507-8333
Chief Mark Lott, University Police: 706-507-8911
Glenn Stokes, Assistant Provost for Academic Judicial Affairs: 706-507-8965
Adrienne Craig, Asst. Vice President for Student Affairs: 706-507-8730
Dan Rose, Director Counseling Center: 706-507-8740
Laurie Jones, Dir. for Human Resources & Title IX Coordinator: 706-507-8920
Sarah Secoy, Director Residence Life: 706-507-8710

Columbus State University is committed to helping end sexual violence. For more information about the about the Federal guidelines and resources regarding sexual violence, visit: sa.columbusstate.edu/dos/
Why is Behavior Assessment Necessary?

In the post Virginia Tech shooting era, colleges and universities around the country are becoming more diligent and proactive in providing a safe environment for students, faculty, staff, and visitors to their campuses. Changes in the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) have given administrators “appropriate flexibility and deference” with regard to the disclosure of educational records and information in emergency situations (Federal Register, 2008).

Columbus State University understands the climate that exists on college campuses. Additionally, each public institution in Georgia has been directed by the Chancellor’s office to develop a plan and select a committee to address potential threats of this nature. In response, Columbus State University has established the Behavior Assessment and Recommendation Team (BART) to serve as an additional measure for campus safety. That having been stated, it must be understood that even with the best intentions, situations may arise that are unforeseen by any member of the university community. BART will operate in some instances with very limited information while exercising due diligence to protect the university community and the individual.

BART - Mission Statement

The Behavior Assessment and Recommendation Team is dedicated to a proactive, coordinated and planned approach to the identification, prevention, assessment, management, and reduction of interpersonal and behavioral threats to the safety and well-being of Columbus State University students, faculty, staff, and visitors.

BART Goals

- Provide a safe physical environment for members of the university community
- Provide a safe emotional environment for the university community
- Promote peace of mind for friends and family of the university community

Campus Members Responsibilities

It is the responsibility of faculty, staff, and students to immediately report any situation that could possibly result in harm to anyone at the university. These reports may be directed to the Behavior Assessment and Recommendation Team or the Counseling Center. If there is an active or immediate risk of violence to self or others, University Police should be contacted at 706-507-8911.

Report to BART Behaviors Such As:

- Violent fantasy content
- Anger problems
- Fascination with weapons and accoutrements
- Homicidal ideation
- Stalking
- Non-compliance or disciplinary matters
- Academic misconduct and dishonesty
- Interest in previous shooting situations
- Victim/martyr self-concept
- Strangeness and aberrant behavior
- Paranoia
- Violence and cruelty
- Acting out
- Recent police contact
- Mental health history related to dangerousness
- Unusual interest in police, military, terrorist activities and materials
- Use of drugs and / or alcohol
- Suicidal ideation
- Speaking or writing that seems bizarre

Report to Counseling Center Student Behaviors Such As:

- Anxious, depressed or overwhelmed
- Prolonged and significant difficulty with the demands of college
- Test, math, or writing anxiety
- Pattern of relationship problems
- Loner
- Expressionless face / anhedonia
Appendix D: BART Team Posters*

*(An example from our friends at University of Anchorage at Alaska)*
Appendix E: BART Team Logo*

*(An example from our friends at University of Rochester)*
Appendix F: Suggested Training Schedule

December: Table Top exercises chosen from
- A BIT Response to a Non-Community Member Threat: A Tabletop Exercise of the Charleston, SC Shooting (JBIT 2015)
- Ending Campus Violence: New Approaches to Prevention
- COPS: Campus Threat Assessment Case Studies
- Campus Mental Health Case Studies Binder

January: NaBITA online training
- Addressing Microaggression and Cultural Issues on the BIT
- Issues of Gender Violence in LGBT Communities
- Generational Diversity: Managing Across Generations
- Addressing Risk Management in Study Abroad Programs

February: Documentation online training/30 min audio essentials from NaBITA
- Should I Write this Down? BIT Documentation Do’s and Don’ts
- BIT and Case Management Notes: 101
- How to Write Good Case Notes: An Essential Skill for BIT Members, Case Managers and Counselors (audio essentials)

March: Addressing Communication (read/watch online training)
- Title IX meets BIT: Handling Gender-Based Complaints through Campus Collaborations (NaBITA mini-panel 2015)
- The Role of Mental Health Professionals on the BIT (webinar)
- Counseling and Conduct: Working Together (webinar)
- Title IX and BITs (webinar)

April: Mental Health (read and discuss)
- The Prevention and Management of Mental Health Emergencies An Examination of Institutional Approaches to Students Who Exhibit Suicidal Behaviors (JBIT 2015)
- A Behavioral Intervention Team at a Two-Year College: Responding to a Case of Suicidal Idea on (JBIT 2015)
- Mental Health First Aid (MHFA): A First-Hand Look at Why You Should Consider this Training for Your Campus Community (JBIT 2015)
- Making the Call: Parental Notification of Suicidal Students (NaBITA 2015 mini-paper)

May: Self-care and team care (watch online training or read article)
- Who’s Minding the Shop? Attending to the Well-Being of the Team (JBIT 2014)
- Fighting Mid-Semester Burnout and Stress (online training)
- How To Manage, Supervise & Energize Difficult Staff : A Proactive Approach (online training)

June: Threat Assessment (Selected reading and discussion)
- Harm to Others: The Assessment and Treatment of Dangerousness
- Threat Assessment: A Risk Management Approach
- International Handbook of Threat Assessment
- Threat Assessment & Management Strategies: Identifying the Howlers and Hunters
- ATAP RAGE-V
- School Shooters on College Campuses (JBIT 2013)
- A Comparative Analysis of Threat and Risk Assessment Measures (JBIT 2013)
- Elliot Rodger: An Analysis (JBIT 2014)
- A Resource for The Research of School Shooters (JBIT 2014)
- Costuming, Misogyny, & Objectification on as Risk Factors in Targeted Violence (JBIT 2014)
- Violence Risk Assessment of the Written Word (VRAW2) (JBIT 2015)
- The Enigma of Adam Lanza’s Mind and Motivations for Murder (JBIT 2015)

**July: Marketing and Advertising the BIT (watch NaBITA webinar or read articles)**
- How to Advertise your BIT (webinar)
- Addressing Disruptive and Dangerous Student Behavior in the Classroom (webinar)
- Training Front Office Staff to Identify, Report and Manage Disruptive and Dangerous Behavior (webinar)
- A Faculty Guide to Addressing Disruptive and Dangerous Behavior (read chapter)
- The Branding of a BIT: From Idea to Image (JBIT 2013)
- Bring your BIT from Behind the Curtain with a Good Marketing Plan (JBIT 2014)

**August: Student Death (watch NaBITA webinar or listen to audio essentials)**
- Post-vention and Suicide Response (webinar)
- Responding to a Student Death (webinar)
- Responding to a Student Death: A Campus Guide (audio essentials)

**September: Assessment and Quality Assurance**
- Core Q10 White Paper (NaBITA 2014)
- Core Q10 Assessment of BIT
- Behavioral Intervention Teams and End-of-Semester Reporting (JBIT 2014)
- Lessons from Four Schools: Beta Testing the Core Q10 (JBIT 2014)

**October: Conduct and BIT Training (watch and discuss videos)**
- Brittany & Sorority Sisters: Assessing a Written Threat (18 mins)
- Effie & Prof. Thompson: A Case of Classroom Disruption (40 mins)
- Patrick & Officer Miles: Run-in with Law Enforcement (17 mins)

**November: Broad Training topics (read articles/books or watch video)**
- Window into BIT (67 minute video and discussion)
- Book on BIT
- Jed Foundation Balancing Safety and Support on Campus
- Threat Assessment in the Campus Setting: NaBITA 2014 Whitepaper
- Who’s on the Team: Mission, Membership and Movement (NaBITA 2015 Whitepaper)
Appendix G: Informed Consent for Risk/Threat Assessment

The college works to assist students who have been considered a potential risk to himself or herself or the community. Our department provides qualified, local, reasonably priced assessments, evaluations and treatment. After the initial evaluation is completed, treatment plans can be developed to meet the individual’s specific on or off campus needs (often determined in conjunction with campus student conduct or BART). Our services are offered to students to make the process easier and less expensive than off-campus alternatives. In some cases, our department may need to refer an individual to an off-campus setting. This could happen if the situation is deemed beyond our scope of practice or our department was unable to devote resources away from its primary role of counseling, education and wellness.

Eligibility
Risk assessments are available to students referred by the student conduct office or the campus BART team. There is no cost to students.

Initial Interview
All students are scheduled for an initial intake interview with an evaluator. The purpose of the initial interview is to gather information about the current incident, the student’s concerns, background information, pressures that may impact current problems, and to explain the risk assessment process.

Meeting
The initial meeting may last from 30-90 minutes with a follow up meeting scheduled as needed. Follow up meetings are often scheduled to complete testing, gather more information and to clarify information given during the first interview.

Confidentiality
The evaluator will release information from the meetings to outside parties only at the request of the student. Records are confidential and will not leave the department unless there is an emergency. We will not answer questions about any student from parents, family, friends, significant other, professors, employer or anyone else outside of the office conducting the risk assessment without expressed permission of the student.

We are committed to providing the best possible risk assessment to our students. The person conducting the risk assessment is bound by confidentiality, which means that what is said during the meetings remains confidential. There are a few exceptions to this rule:

5. Plans to harm self or specific others
6. Permission provided by the client
7. Abuse of a child, adult, or elderly person

You are encouraged to ask any questions about the informed consent or risk assessment process during the initial meeting and as you review this document. The risk assessment process requires the student to allow the evaluator to share information with the referral source when the evaluation is complete. Information is first reviewed and shared with the student prior to the information being shared with the referral source (BART Team, student conduct, police). By signing this document, you give permission for this information to be shared with the office or person making the referral.
Record Storage
Records and individual documents are maintained electronically. They are password protected and accessible by the person completing risk assessment. Records will be kept for at least seven (7) years after the date of the last contact with our department.

Testing Data
Raw data, such as answer sheets and test booklets, are protected by copyright and may only be released to trained clinicians. Assessment and testing data are provided in summary form and explained during the follow-up session.

Email
Email communication with the person conducting the risk assessment should be used in scheduling appointments only. We recognize the importance of email but, because it is not a secure medium of communication and our staff does not maintain 24-hour access to their email, it will not be used to discuss on-going treatment issues.

Student Rights & Responsibilities
• I understand I have the right to review credentials of staff members including but not limited to: education, experience and professional counseling certification and licensure(s).
• I understand I can terminate the relationship at any time (though this termination will be shared with the referral source).
• I will arrive on time for my meetings.
• If unable to keep an appointment, I will call the office at least 24 hours in advance.
• I will actively participate in the process by asking questions and staying involved.

I, _____________________________, a student at the University, agree to make every effort to keep all my scheduled appointments. If I have missed appointments, I am aware that limits may be imposed on services available and this will be shared with the referral source. I have read and understand the above information and I have had the opportunity to ask questions.

_________________________________  ________________
Student Signature                     Date

_________________________________  ________________
Witness Signature                    Date
Appendix H: CORE Q\textsuperscript{10} Team Audit

The CORE-Q\textsuperscript{10} Checklist\textsuperscript{10} was developed by NaBITA\textsuperscript{11}. Columbus State University is one of several colleges participating in the beta testing. The following documents are provided to assist those conducting an internal audit of their Behavioral Intervention Teams (BIT). The checklist is divided into ten categories to match the ten key core qualities of the BIT. The reviewer enters a 0 to indicate “yes” the particular item in question is present on the BIT. A score of 1 is entered to represent the item is in progress of being addressed within the next few weeks. A score of 2 is entered to represent the item is not present. Scores are summed in much the same way as gold. Higher scores indicate a greater level of concern. Lower scores indicate the team is close to the ideal goal.

Each item also allows for the reviewer to write a narrative summary related to the item in question. With multiple items for each section and a varying weight for each, the overall score sheds only some light on the BITs functioning (Van Brunt et al., 2013).

Columbus State University’s CORE-Q\textsuperscript{10} Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Quality</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Team Traits</th>
<th>Silo</th>
<th>Marketing</th>
<th>Referral</th>
<th>Data Collecting</th>
<th>Record Manage</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Risk Rubric</th>
<th>Quality Assurance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The percentage is calculated by: 1- (score/possible)

Findings: Overall score: 89.10 For the purposes of assessment and planning with the Behavioral Assessment and Recommendation Team (BART) at Columbus State University, any of the CORE-Q\textsuperscript{10} items at or below 90% will receive special attention from the Team during training and development in the coming year. As more institutions utilize this tool and NaBITA establishes norms for teams in relation to institutional size, age of the team, and budget and training recommendations, BART will look to the CORE-Q\textsuperscript{10} as both a guide for development and benchmarking.

#1 Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Narrative Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Described in mission and purpose section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Does the statement address the scope of the team?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Described in mission and purpose section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Does the statement identify the community members the team works with?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Described in mission and purpose section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Does the statement outline the following phases of operation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention education</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data gathering</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{10} CORE-Q\textsuperscript{10} Checklist: Beta-testing of a tool in development and has not yet been released by NaBITA.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Under team mission/purpose section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Under team mission/purpose section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Under team mission/purpose section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Does the team have a written manual?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>BART Team Policy and Procedure Manual, 2017 Last revised: July 1, 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Does the manual include:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission/purpose statement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, under team mission/purpose section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of team membership</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, under team membership section in manual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting frequency and plan for slow times</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, under team logistics section in manual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training plan to address campus referrals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, described under threat assessment rubric section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outline behaviors reported to the team</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>See appendix B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of how team take referrals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, described under threat assessment rubric section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing plan to solicit referrals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, described in approach to marketing section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of website</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, described in approach to marketing section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview of data collection and storage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, under team logistics section in manual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Template for meeting outline</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, template for meetings can be found in Appendix J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of risk rubric</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, described in the threat assessment rubric section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of when to use assessments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, described in the threat assessment rubric section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal communication and releases</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, described in team membership section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of team training plan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, described in approach to training section</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0= yes, 1= in progress, 2= not present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#2 Team Traits</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Narrative Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Team size over four and under 12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, described in team members, current team size (core and inner circle) is 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Team has enough members to effectively meet and process referral request</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, described in team membership section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Team has enough members to meet regularly and does not cancel meetings for other obligations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Described in logistics section. Team cancels under 9% of meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Team does not have too many members that prevents open communication</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Described in team members, current team size (core and inner circle) is 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Team has a leader</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Described in team membership. BART team chair is the Dean of Students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2. Team can bring together different personalities and expertise</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Diverse membership described in team membership section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Team leader has the time, energy and focus to coordinate and drive the team’s mission</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Ability has been demonstrated. Dean of Students attends frequent trainings and is dedicated to BART's continual improvement and open communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Team leader has the respect of the campus community</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Ability has been demonstrated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Team leader has outstanding communication skills</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Ability has been demonstrated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.2 Team leader is dedicated to the training mission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Narrative Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>BART team chair creates and follows training schedule detailed in approach to training and Appendix F.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.3 Team has rationale for meeting frequency based on training and needs of community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Narrative Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, described in logistics section.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.3 Team meets weekly for 1-2 hours or (at minimum) twice a month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Narrative Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, described in logistics section. Team meets weekly for 90 minutes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.3 Team cancels less than 20% of meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Narrative Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, 9% in 2017. Described in team logistics section.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.4 Team has core members that include Dean of Students, Counseling and Conduct staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Narrative Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, described in team membership section.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.4 Team includes at least two of the following: residential life (if applicable), athletics, student activities, health services, legal, human resources or academic affairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Narrative Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, described in team membership section.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### #3 Siloed Communication Addressed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Narrative Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, discussed in team communication and silo reduction section.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.1 Team has plan to address siloed communication on campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Narrative Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, discussed in team communication and silo reduction and team membership sections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.1 There has been a specific discussion of how counseling can share information with the team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Narrative Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, discussed in team communication and silo reduction and team membership sections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.1 Forms and release of information have been developed to foster communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Narrative Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, discussed in team communication and silo reduction and team membership sections. Example form in Appendix A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.1 The team has addressed FERPA, HIPAA and state confidentiality standards through training and policy discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Narrative Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, discussed in team communication and silo reduction and team membership sections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.1 When referring out to psychological or threat assessment there is an adequate sharing of information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Narrative Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, discussed in team communication and silo reduction, threat assessment rubrics and team interventions sections.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.1 The team has identified potential obstacles to sharing information and has a plan to address these information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Narrative Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, discussed in team communication and silo reduction section.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 0= yes, 1= in progress, 2= not present

### #4 Education and Marketing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Narrative Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, listed in Appendix B.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.1 Behaviors of concerns listed in policy manual and used for training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Narrative Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, listed in Appendix B.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.1 Behaviors include both in-class and outside of the classroom categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Narrative Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, listed in Appendix B.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.1 The list includes disruptive behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Narrative Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, listed in Appendix B.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.1 The list includes dangerous behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Narrative Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, listed in Appendix B.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.1 The list includes mental health problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Narrative Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, listed in Appendix B.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.1 The team has identified potential obstacles to sharing information and has a plan to address these information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Narrative Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, discussed in team communication and silo reduction section.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.1 The list includes both face-face and online student behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Narrative Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, listed in Appendix B.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.2 The team has developed a website

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Narrative Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, described in approach to marketing. Website can be accessed at <a href="http://www.ourcollege.edu/care">www.ourcollege.edu/care</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5 Nurturing the Referral Source</td>
<td>Score 0, 1, 2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Does the team identify the stakeholders that should report to the BIT?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Does the team identify faculty?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Does the team identify staff?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Does the team identify student leaders (such as team captains, residence life staff and club advisors?)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Does the team have a plan to train and educate the community about how to report?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Does the team have a plan to train and educate the community about what the BIT does?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Does the team share with the community how to make a report to the team?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Does the team provide training to the community on identifying at-risk behaviors?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Does the team have a policy on how information can be shared back with the referral source given FERPA, HIPAA and confidentiality concern?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Is there a sample script of an email, letter or phone call that is shared back to the referral source?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Does this message contain information encouraging the referral source to share information again if the situation changes?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Does this message get sent out regularly to those who share a referral with the team?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 = yes, 1 = in progress, 2 = not present
#6 Data Collecting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score 0, 1, 2*</th>
<th>Narrative Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Does the team have a plan to collect data from the community in terms of referrals?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Does this plan include the ability for community members to post an anonymous or semi-anonymous report?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Does the team seek referrals from a wide variety of communication mediums?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can they report by email or online form?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can the community report by phone?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can they report by personal visit to BIT member?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a plan for after-hours reports that include an immediate response?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Is the data from the multiple reporting sources recorded in a centralized manner to prevent accidental loss?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Is there a policy related to the security of information shared and kept in computerized files?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Does the policy manual or team training address the challenges of privacy when using email communication?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0= yes, 1= in progress, 2= not present

#7 Record Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score 0, 1, 2*</th>
<th>Narrative Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Does the team have a computer system to keep track of BIT records?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Does this record system provide easy data entry and access to data?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Does the BIT member have the ability to search the database to recover information?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Does the BIT team member have the ability to search the database with robust keywords and narratives?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 Does the IT department support the security of the data system? Do they coordinate with any third party vendors (where applicable)?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Refer to Appendix B, page 59
| 7.3 Does the team protect against other security risks related to USB drives and laptops? | 0 | Yes, described in the team logistics and documentation and records sections. |
| 7.4 Is the data recorded accurately for each student who comes in contact with the team? | 0 | Yes, described in the team logistics and documentation and records sections. |
| 7.4 Does the record include Date, Name, ID #, residence hall, student status? | 0 | Yes, described in the team logistics and documentation and records sections. |
| 7.4 Does the data include presenting issues and relevant history (or references to other charts)? | 0 | Yes, described in the team logistics and documentation and records sections. |
| 7.4 Does the record include details about which offices will be involved in the assessment and follow up plan? | 0 | Yes, described in the team logistics and documentation and records sections. |

0= yes, 1= in progress, 2= not present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#8 Team Training</th>
<th>Score 0, 1, 2*</th>
<th>Narrative Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1 Does the team leader have a dedication to training and educating the BIT members?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, described in the approach to training section. The Chair of BART is responsible for the training schedule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1 Does the BIT have a budget set aside for training during the year?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, described in approach to training and team logistics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1 Does the team have tabletop exercises to use as training tools?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, described in the approach to training section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1 Does the team complete at least two tabletop exercises each semester?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, described in the approach to training section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2 Do team members have the opportunity to attend at least one of the four conferences (ACCA, ASCA, NaBITA, ATAP)?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, described in the approach to training section and the team membership section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2 Has the team participated in at least one online training a semester?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, described in the approach to training section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3 Has the team explored the potential for an outside expert or consultant to train the BIT in the past year?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, described in the approach to training section.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0= yes, 1= in progress, 2= not present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#9 Risk Rubric</th>
<th>Score 0, 1, 2*</th>
<th>Narrative Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.1 Does the team have a risk rubric to categorize threat and risk to the campus?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, described in the threat assessment rubric section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1 Does the risk rubric have attached action items to each of the levels to guide team decision-making?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, described in the threat assessment rubric section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1 Is the rubric used consistently with the BIT?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, described in the threat assessment rubric section and the team intervention section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1 Is the rubric used objectively with the BIT?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, described in the threat assessment rubric section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1 Is the rubric designed specifically for higher education settings?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, described in the threat assessment rubric section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1 Does the rubric indicate at what point the team should use a psychological assessment?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, described in the threat assessment rubric and the team intervention sections.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.1 Does the rubric indicate at what point the team should use a threat assessment?
0  Yes, described in the threat assessment rubric and the team intervention sections.

9.1 Does the rubric address both mental health disorders and violence/aggression?
0  Yes, described in the threat assessment rubric and the team intervention sections.

9.1 Is the rubric accessible to all team members (not just those with advanced psychological training)?
0  Yes, described in the threat assessment rubric and the team intervention sections.

0= yes, 1= in progress, 2= not present

#10 Quality Assurance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Narrative Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0, 1, 2*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 10.1 Is there a commitment by the team to assess its on-going functioning to find areas of improvement? | 0  Yes, discussed in the quality assurance section. |

| 10.1 Does the team look for ways to improve internal team communication? | 0  Yes, discussed in communication and silo reduction. |

| 10.1 Does the team look for ways to improve communication between the team and the overall campus community? | 0  Yes, discussed in the approach to marketing section. |

| 10.1 Does the team discuss process issues related to applying the risk rubric and developing an action plan? | 0  Yes, discussed in the threat assessment rubric. |

| 10.1 Does the team address on-going obstacles among team members or departments? | 0  Yes, discussed in the communication and silo reduction. |

| 10.1 Does the team avoid rushing through meeting for the sake of finishing rather than fully exploring cases? | 0  Yes, discussed in team logistics and communication and silo reduction section. |

| 10.1 Does the team address "elephant in the room" issues that prevent smooth communication? | 0  Always. The chair is open from the first day a new Team member joins and reminds member often not to wear their emotions on their sleeve, not to be offended, or allow institutional hierarchy around the table to effect judgment or their participation during a meeting. |

| 10.1 Does the team use quiet times to address training issues? | 0  Yes, discussed in the approach to training section. |

| 10.2 Does the team generate end of semester reports? | 0  Yes, discussed quality assurance section. |

| 10.2 Do these end of semester reports create data that is then used to improve team functions? | 0  Yes, discussed quality assurance section. |

| 10.3 Does the team compare cases based on how they originally presented to the current rating of the case risk follow the intervention? | 0  Yes, discussed quality assurance section. |

0= yes, 1= in progress, 2= not present
Appendix I: End of Year Report

BART Survey

Q1 The Behavior Assessment and Recommendation Team (BART) engages in proactive and collaborative approaches to identify, assess, and mitigate risks associated with students, faculty, staff and visitors exhibiting concerning behaviors or thoughts. By partnering with members of the community, BART strives to promote individual student, faculty and staff wellbeing and success while prioritizing community safety. With this in mind, please take a few minutes to help BART to better serve the university community.

Q21 Classification
- Students - Freshman (1)
- Students - Sophomore (2)
- Students - Junior (3)
- Students - Senior (4)
- Graduate (5)
- Staff Less than 2 years (6)
- Staff 2-5 years (7)
- Staff 6-10 years (8)
- Staff 11 and up years (9)
- Faculty less than 2 years (10)
- Faculty 2-5 years (11)
- Faculty 6-10 years (12)
- Faculty 11 and up years (13)

Q2 Gender
- Male (1)
- Female (2)

Q3 Race
- American Indian or Alaska Native (1)
- Asian (2)
- Black or African American (3)
- Hispanic or Latino (4)
- Two or More Races (5)
- White (6)
- Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (7)
- International (8)
- Unknown (9)
Q4 Given that I have an understanding of recent targeted violent acts in educational settings around the country, such as campus shootings, I feel safe on the campus of our University.
- Strongly Agree (1)
- Agree (2)
- Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)
- Disagree (4)
- Strongly Disagree (5)

Q5 Because of recent targeted violent acts in educational setting around the country, such as campus shootings, my awareness of other peoples' behavior has increased.
- Strongly Agree (1)
- Agree (2)
- Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)
- Disagree (4)
- Strongly Disagree (5)

Q6 I am aware of the safety programs that our University offers to me.
- Strongly Agree (1)
- Agree (2)
- Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)
- Disagree (4)
- Strongly Disagree (5)

Q7 Other than the introduction to this survey, I am not aware of BART or its purpose at our University.
- Strongly Agree (1)
- Agree (2)
- Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)
- Disagree (4)
- Strongly Disagree (5)

Q9 I have attended a presentation concerning BART.
- Strongly Agree (1)
- Agree (2)
- Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)
- Disagree (4)
- Strongly Disagree (5)

Q11 I have received an email or written material concerning BART.
- Yes (1)
- No (2)
Q13 I would like to receive information on BART.
- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Q15 I know how to file a BART report.
- Strongly Agree (1)
- Agree (2)
- Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)
- Disagree (4)
- Strongly Disagree (5)

Q16 I have filed a BART report.
- Yes (1)
- No (2)

If No Is Selected, Then Skip to Q20

Q17 A member of BART responded to me quickly after filing my report.
- Strongly Agree (1)
- Agree (2)
- Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)
- Disagree (4)
- Strongly Disagree (5)

Q18 I feel that my report was taken seriously and handled professionally
- Strongly Agree (1)
- Agree (2)
- Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)
- Disagree (4)
- Strongly Disagree (5)

Q19 Having BART adds a level of safety on campus.
- Strongly Agree (1)
- Agree (2)
- Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)
- Disagree (4)
- Strongly Disagree (5)

Q20 Please share any comments you have concerning campus safety or the Behavior Intervention Team.
Appendix J: Annual Confidentiality and Training Agreement

Behavior Intervention Team
Annual Confidentiality and Training Agreement

I, _____________________________ understand that Columbus State University has established BART to assist in addressing situations where students, faculty, or staff are displaying behaviors that are concerning, disruptive, or threatening in nature that could potentially impede their own or others’ ability to function successfully or safely. These policies and procedures are designed to help identify persons whose behaviors potentially endanger their own or others’ health and safety or is disruptive to the educational or administrative processes of the university.

Please initial each statement below

___ I understand the mission, goals, policies, and procedures of BART, and agree to participate in meetings and training to the best of my ability.

___ I understand that all records associated with BART are subject to FERPA:

Information from the education records of a student may be disclosed to University officials with a legitimate educational interest. A school official is a person employed by the University in an administrative, supervisory, academic or research, or support staff position (including law enforcement unit personnel and health staff); a person or company with whom the University has contracted such as an attorney, auditor, or collection agent; a person or a student serving on an official committee such as a disciplinary or grievance committee, or assisting another school official in performing his or her tasks. A University official has a legitimate educational interest if the official needs to review an education record in order to fulfill his or her professional responsibility.

___ I understand that many of the records are dynamic in nature and may not have been resolved, adjudicated or otherwise completed at the time I view them. As such, much care should be taken not to form judgments or use this information in decision making, without first checking with the Office of the Dean of Students.

___ I understand that none of the BART records can be viewed, shared, or discussed with any non-BART member, due to their dynamic nature.

___ I understand that any requests by a non-BART member to view or print a BART record must be made to, and approved by the Office of the Dean of Students, as some information may need to be redacted for non-BART consumption to comply with FERPA.

Signed (BART Member): _______________________________

Date: ______________________
Appendix K – Procedure for Applicants with Criminal History

Applicant with Criminal History
Admission Review Process

Question on the University application
3. Have you ever been convicted of any criminal offense other than a traffic violation or do you have charges pending? 

Yes ☐ No ☐

**YES**

1. Admissions Office sends the student a letter explaining the process and a Criminal Background Form to sign and return.
2. When the form is returned, University Police runs the criminal history and delivers the report to Admissions.
3. Dean of Students, Chief of Police, Admissions Office representative (BART sub-committee) review each:
   a. Crimes against person (violence)
   b. Drugs (sales, distribution, manufacturing)
   c. Any charges pending
   d. Multiple offenses
   e. Current probation or parole
   f. Omission of information on application or giving false information
   g. Length of time from last conviction or incarceration

**Approved**
Admissions Office sends letter of acceptance, if other criteria are met.

**Denied**
Admissions Office sends denial letter with directions to call Chief of Police with any questions.

Applicant Calls Chief of Police (Appeal / Explanation)

**Applicant does not provide any new information or a compelling explanation for consideration.**

**Denied Decision Stands**

**Applicant provides new information or a compelling explanation not given during the initial consideration. The BART sub-committee will review the new information and render a decision.**

**Denied - Chief of Police communicates the decision with the applicant.**

**Approved – the Admissions Office communicates with the applicant and sends letter of acceptance, if other criteria are met.**
Dear STUDENT,

The admissions application you submitted to XXXX University has been reviewed, along with supporting documents such as your criminal history and/or disciplinary record from a previous school. Your application for admission has been denied.

If you have additional information that may not have been considered or questions regarding the process, you may contact Chief XXXX with the University Police Department (xxx-xxx-xxxx). This new information will be considered by the University upon receiving it.

Otherwise, you may reapply to the University in one year. You should be prepared to document what you have been doing during the last year which could provide you a favorable admissions review. This may include, but is not limited to:

- Evidence of solid employment.
- Evidence of academic success, which might include technical college or other types of credits that may or may not transfer to XXXX State as academic credit.
- Letters of support from your employer, minister, or non-family member with whom you have had close contact with during this period and indicate they are aware of your situation.
- Depending on your situation, show evidence of mental health counseling, drug rehabilitation, or specific program completion records such as anger management training.
- If you are on parole or probation, a letter from your court assigned officer indicating that you have been compliant during the past year.

We understand that each situation is unique. Because of this, the list above is simply a starting point for a continuing conversation with students who wish to reapply. As with every applicant, we want you to succeed; however, there are times when the answer is “not now”.

If you are serious about being reconsidered for enrollment at XXXX University, let me encourage you to contact Chief XXXXX and start the conversation.

Scincerely,

Name
Director of Admissions
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CORE-Q10 CHECKLIST:

ASSESSMENT OF A BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTION TEAM

INTRODUCTION

The National Behavioral Intervention Team Association (NaBITA) was founded on the goal of providing teams clear guidance in developing the most efficacious and efficient approach to addressing potential crisis events on campus and on preventing the onset or escalation of violence. With the introduction of the NaBITA Risk Rubric in 2007, certification trainings for Behavioral Intervention Teams that began in 2010, the publication of dozens of table top scenarios, a large scale survey of BITs from across the country in 2012, and the development of the Structured Interview of Violence Risk Assessment (SIVRA-35), NaBITA is now turning its focus to providing the higher education community with clear guidelines and templates to assess the functionality of their teams.

The request for an assessment methodology was a frequent theme during the annual NaBITA conference in November 2012. Providing a set of standards for teams to compare against and to strive towards has long been a discussion between the authors. Following the results of the 2012 survey and the development of a three-day BIT Best Practices Certification course, NaBITA’s next goal became the development of a set of clear assessment standards and an assessment methodology for teams to use in establishing a baseline of their current performance and in identification of future team improvements.

Assessment and program evaluation are well-established constructs and processes in the higher education and business world. It’s our goal to bring together the best of these theoretical constructs to guide the processes of these teams and to provide their communities with an accurate, accessible, and useful methods to review campus BIT team creation, demographics, mission, record keeping, and analytic decision making processes.

The assessment of a BIT provides four major opportunities for the team. First, the assessment process and subsequent results provide the community with evidence concerning how the team fits with national standards and best practices, as well as how the team’s process keeps the community safe. Second, it’s our belief that good assessment and sharing of results with the decision makers at your institution creates an opportunity to secure additional funding to leverage support for your campus BIT. Third, assessment provides the BIT with the ability to identify areas of weakness so that future resources and training opportunities can be focused on improving those areas. Finally, it’s likely in coming years we will see a more formal set of expectations for BITs in terms of team demographics and functionality. The functionality expectations may concern formalization of the analytic decision making processes used by BITs and development of practical action steps in the management of at-risk students. NaBITA remains committed to providing its members and the larger higher education community with quality research and information for the purpose of helping create safer campus environments. While locks, cameras, and safety programs are helpful in providing a safe environment on college campuses, it’s the human intelligence information gathering from those in contact with the individual in the midst of an aggression escalation that are the best tools campus community members have at their disposal. Behavioral Intervention Teams provide a method for collecting and analyzing information, and for identifying and monitoring persons of concern. It’s our belief that all institutions of higher education should develop, train, and support (and assess!) Behavioral Intervention Teams on their campuses.
WHY ASSESS?
Four Reasons:

1. Improve Community Confidence
Our campus communities have charged our students of concern, threat assessment, behavioral intervention, and risk assessment teams to identify and manage at-risk student behavior on our campuses, for the purpose of preventing more extreme violence. By following national best practices in the fields of behavioral intervention and threat assessment, this paper provides a framework of comparison for college or university teams. Additionally, the paper contains key suggestions for teams in development of core competencies in ten areas. By addressing each of these core competencies, BITs gain the ability to share clear demographic and operational data that demonstrates how the BIT functions and seeks to address potential violence on campus.

The communication of a plan to assess and improve a BIT provides the community with reassurance that the individual team is taking its charge seriously. It demonstrates team effectiveness in terms of managing cases and in developing clear and actionable plans to move forward. Assessment (and the dissemination of the assessment results) of the BIT demonstrates a commitment to transparency and to improving team efficacy.

2. Secure Increased Funding Allocation
While perhaps a more pragmatic rationale for assessment, the demonstration of effectiveness and identification of areas for improvement are two factors that are required to successfully request increases in funding for a program. A quality assessment provides a BIT with a well-organized collection of data to better form an argument for increases in budget for team leadership, training, staff positions, advertising and marketing expenses, conference attendance, and software platforms. Higher education administrators historically respond well to funding requests where the requesting department has accurate data that demonstrates the effectiveness of its operations in line with national trends. A successful budget request demonstrates current efficacy along with the identification of areas of improvements within the department. While not the only goal of BIT assessment, the ability to more effectively request increases in funding is aided by a quality assessment.

3. Locate Areas for Improvement
The most pressing argument for BIT assessment is the ability to identify areas of weakness and to develop a clear action plan for moving forward to address potential gaps. While not intended as a harsh analysis of a team’s failings, developing an assessment is critical because it helps a team better understand areas of potential shortage or blind spots. NaBITA is often called in to ascertain how well the team functioned in a situation where violence already occurred. This “Monday morning quarterbacking” is useful in identifying areas of improvement for the team to help prevent future lapses or risk.

Vastly more proactive and important though, is identifying gaps in a BIT’s operation prior to the occurrence of violence on campus. This white paper is an investment in assisting teams to develop a better preventative focus on their operations to get out ahead of possible gaps in team function. Data related to national BIT formation and operations needs to be in the hands of individual teams in order to assist them in evaluating against national norms and in the location of areas for improvement.

4. Anticipate Future Assessment Requirements
While creating and training leaders in the field of risk and threat assessment in higher education, NaBITA also keeps an eye focused on the horizon to determine what might be happening three, five, or even ten years in the future. One reason the authors believe in the importance of BIT assessment is the very real likelihood of regulation by various legislators in the future. Following almost every campus attack, we see state and local legislators faced with the question of developing laws and policies to prevent future violence.

One of the places to which we hope these legislators will turn is NaBITA as a nationally recognized leader in developing training and policy to keep schools safe. By developing this set of standards and recommendations for an assessment process, we hope to get out ahead of the curve and take a leadership position within higher
education. It is our belief that higher education professionals are better equipped than legislators to analyze and to create standards for behavioral intervention, risk, and threat assessment.

**Ten Core Qualities of a BIT**
The following are the ten core qualities that are essential to the assessment of behavioral intervention teams. These concepts are pulled from existing surveys (Van Brunt, Sokolow, Lewis, & Schuster, 2012; Gamm, Mardis, & Sullivan, 2011; Campus Safety and Security Project, 2009) and research related to BITs (HEMHA, 2012; Van Brunt, 2012; Eells & Rockland-Miller, 2011; Sokolow, Lewis, Manzon, Schuster, Byrnes, & Van Brunt, 2011; Deisinger, Randazzo, O’Neill, & Savage, 2008), as well as the practical expertise of the authors based on their experience serving on their home campus teams or consulting with hundreds of BiTs across the country.

The ten qualities are briefly explored in this whitepaper. In terms of using these ten core qualities in an assessment of BIT, teams are encouraged to explore these concepts further in the book CORE-Q10 Checklist: Assessment of a Behavioral Intervention Team (BIT) available from www.nabita.org.
Core 1: POLICY

- **Description:** Developing a clear sense of policy and procedures for a BIT is an essential task for any institute of higher education. A clear sense of direction and order of operations separates teams that are simply reactive to crisis events on campus from those who are thoughtful and strategic in their approach to proactively identifying risk and in following this risk through analysis, intervention, and follow-up. A quality policy allows for a team to create a starting place for a structured and well-thought out approach to prevention, intervention, and management while providing opportunities for analysis, critique, and improvement to a team’s effectiveness and efficiency.

- **Areas of Assessment:** Mission/purpose statement (statement of scope, identify community, phases of operations), and manual.

Core 2: TEAM TRAITS

- **Description:** There are several core traits that are important to the team. These include leadership, team size, meeting frequency, and team membership. Teams should be strategic and intentional in making decisions about these traits, as opposed to allowing circumstances or outside constituencies to dictate these items.

- **Areas of Assessment:** Team size, leadership, meeting frequency, and team membership.

Core 3: SILO COMMUNICATION ADDRESSED

- **Description:** One of the key lessons following the 2007 Virginia Tech tragedy was the importance of avoiding siloed communication. This business and marketing concept, known as the “the silo effect” traditionally refers to a lack of coordination and integration between departments; thus, inadvertently failing to support each other. In higher education, we understand the silo effect as the isolation among departments that prevents cooperation and sharing of key information useful to address potential threats.

- **Areas of Assessment:** Silo communication (plan, discussion of counseling limitations, forms and releases, FERPA/HIPAA and confidentiality laws, threat assessment sharing, obstacle identification).

Core 4: EDUCATION AND MARKETING

- **Description:** A team can be set up and put together like a well-designed sports car, but it won’t be going anywhere without some gas in the tank. The gas here is the information we get from across campus. The gas stations are education and marketing to the community about what kind of behaviors should trigger a phone call, email, or direct report to a BIT member. To assume the community already has an understanding of what to report is a dangerous proposition. Many communities are confused and scared when it comes to violence on campus, and, despite efforts to educate the faculty, staff, and student leaders around what behaviors should cause concern, the message needs to be continuous and well-targeted (marketed) to the stakeholders.

- **Areas of Assessment:** List of behaviors, website, and marketing.

Core 5: NURTURING THE REFERRAL SOURCE

- **Description:** The referral source is the most essential element of a team. It’s the person calling 911 to summon the police. It’s people calling for an ambulance and fire truck when they see a fire. In the previous section, we discussed the importance of teaching the community what to report to the campus BIT. This section is dedicated to the concept of building this relationship between the BIT and community to improve communication.

- **Areas of Assessment:** Identifying the stakeholders, training, and communicating back.
Core 6: DATA COLLECTION
- **Description:** Once information is reported to the BIT, the team must keep track of the data in a way that is secure and easily searchable. Data for data’s sake is an insufficient goal for a BIT. Data must be collected and stored in a fashion that provides access to team members and which provides the ability to analyze potential patterns that exist beyond the individual team member’s memory. Simply stated, a quality data management system allows for data to be entered and stored in a way that is easily retrievable. Data must also be collected easily from stakeholders, with efforts to remove any obstacles along the way.
- **Areas of Assessment:** Anonymous reporting, multiple reporting avenues, and security.

Core 7: RECORD MANAGEMENT
- **Description:** Once the data is collected, the team must have some mechanism in place to store and retrieve the data. The storage of the data must be secure. The data itself must be accessible to the team so the data can be used to better direct decision making. Imagine the dashboard of a car. If the data presented here (gas levels, engine temperature, speed, oil pressure) was not easily accessible, it would not provide the driver with the information she or he needs to operate the car efficiently. The record management systems used by a BIT must address four key issues. These are access, pattern analysis, security, and accuracy.
- **Areas of Assessment:** Access, pattern analysis, security, and accuracy.

Core 8: TEAM TRAINING
- **Description:** A BIT team requires training in a number of critical areas if it's going to remain effective in its work. Training should address issues such as record keeping; working within FERPA, HIPAA, and state confidentiality standards; threat assessment; mental health disorders; conduct issues; and emergency response.
- **Areas of Assessment:** Tabletop exercises, conferences, and consulting.

Core 9: RISK RUBRIC
- **Description:** Central to the analysis of data coming into the BIT is utilization of risk rubrics to assist the team members in determining categories and levels of concern. These categories can be as simple as “low, moderate, and high” or as complex as a team cares to make them. The core purpose of the risk rubric is to identify the level of risk or threat the individual of concern poses, and then to develop an action plan to address the individual's behavior toward the goal of mitigating or lowering the associated risk.
- **Areas of Assessment:** Presence of rubric, action items, consistent, objective, designed for higher education, psychological assessment trigger, threat assessment trigger, addresses both mental health and violence, accessible to all team members.

Core 10: QUALITY ASSURANCE
- **Description:** There must be circularity to the assessment of the BIT. This involves seeing assessment as an ongoing process that does not have a fixed end-point. Assessing quality requires a commitment to the ever-changing nature of risk assessment and team dynamics. Team members rotate off the BIT or move on to new positions. New practices are developed to improve BIT efficacy and efficiency. Additional software and assessment tools become available. All require a quality assurance plan that is structured, scheduled, and has the appropriate time and energy dedicated to it.
- **Areas of Assessment:** Address team functionality (internal and external, process, hotspots), end of semester reports, and case outcomes.
CONCLUSION
The task force that assembled this whitepaper is dedicated to developing models of behavioral intervention and threat assessment based on adaptation of academic research, clinical studies, law enforcement reports, governmental investigations, and campus best practices. It is the authors’ goal to stimulate current interest in and concern on campuses regarding risk and threat assessment and to offer practical models for assessing behavioral intervention teams. Ultimately, the assessment model offered in this paper may enhance the ability of a college or university to better review how their BIT functions and to better foster thoughtful and timely response and avert tragedy. If you find this paper to be of use, please share it with your colleagues. Copies may be downloaded at www.nabita.org.

NaBITA -- A Membership Association for Higher Education
While visiting the NaBITA website, the authors encourage you to explore its resources and to consider becoming NaBITA members. NaBITA is a membership association, a clearinghouse for resources, and a mechanism for sharing and disseminating best practices for an emerging field. You will find that NaBITA membership is distinguished by a strong value-inclusive philosophy. NaBITA membership offers a community, a newsletter, and a listserv. NaBITA’s members receive added value through discounted and free webinars and seminars, free or discounted registration to the NaBITA Annual Conference, access to a Q&A panel of behavioral intervention experts, and behavioral intervention documentation, including a member library of more than 150 practical documents and resources on successful models, sample policies, protocols, training tools, and tabletop exercises. www.nabita.org
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CORE Q\textsuperscript{10} Checklist

The CORE Q\textsuperscript{10} checklist is provided to assist those conducting an internal audit of their BIT. The checklist is divided into ten categories to match the ten key core qualities of the BIT. The reviewer enters a 0 to indicate “yes” the particular item in question is present on the BIT. A score of 1 is entered to represent the item is in progress of being addressed within the next few weeks. A score of 2 is entered to represent the item is not present.

Scores are summed in much the same way as gold. Higher scores indicate a greater level of concern. Lower scores indicate the team is close to the ideal goal. Each item also allows for the reviewer to write a narrative summary related to the item in question.

With multiple items for each section and a varying weight for each, the overall score sheds only some light on the BITs functioning. Generally speaking, scores above 50 indicate the need for further assessment and planning. It may also be helpful to rate each individual core quality score in order to better grasp the range of performance. A sample scoring sheeting is provided below. An example of a completed CORE Q\textsuperscript{10} Checklist can be found in appendix A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Quality</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Team Traits</th>
<th>Silo</th>
<th>Marketing</th>
<th>Referral</th>
<th>Data Collecting</th>
<th>Record Manage</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Risk Rubric</th>
<th>Quality Assurance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentage is calculated by \(1- \frac{\text{score}}{\text{possible}}\)

**BIT Assessment Checklist**  
*NaBITA 2012©*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#1 Policy</th>
<th>Score 0, 1, 2*</th>
<th>Narrative Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Is there a written mission/purpose statement?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Does the statement address the scope of the team?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Does the statement identify the community members the team works with?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Does the statement outline the following phases of operation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data gathering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Follow-up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.2 Does the team have a written manual?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Does the manual include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission/purpose statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of team membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting frequency and plan for slow times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training plan to address campus referrals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outline behaviors reported to the team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of how team takes referrals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing plan to solicit referrals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview of data collection and storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Template for meeting outline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of risk rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of when to use assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal communication and releases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of team training plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0= yes, 1= in progress, 2= not present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#2 Team Traits</th>
<th>Score 0, 1, 2*</th>
<th>Narrative Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Team size over four and under 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Team has enough members to effectively meet and process referral request</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Team has enough members to meet regularly and does not cancel meetings for other obligations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2.1 Team does not have too many members that prevents open communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2.2 Team has a leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2.2. Team has the ability to bring together different personalities and expertise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2.2 Team leader has the time, energy and focus to coordinate and drive the team’s mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2.2 Team leader has the respect of the campus community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2.2 Team leader has outstanding communication skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2.2 Team leader is dedicated to the training mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2.3 Team has rationale for meeting frequency based on training and needs of community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2.3 Team meets weekly for 1-2 hours or (at minimum) twice a month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2.3 Team cancels less than 20% of meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2.4 Team has core members that include Dean of Students, Counseling and Conduct staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2.4 Team includes at least two of the following: residential life (if applicable), athletics, student activities, health services, legal, human resources or academic affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0= yes, 1= in progress, 2= not present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#3 Siloed Communication Addressed</th>
<th>Score 0, 1, 2*</th>
<th>Narrative Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#3.1 Team has plan to address siloed communication on campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3.1 There has been a specific discussion of how counseling can share information with the team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4 Education and Marketing</td>
<td>Score 0, 1, 2*</td>
<td>Narrative Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Behaviors of concerns listed in policy manual and used for training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Behaviors include both in-class and outside of the classroom categories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 The list includes disruptive behaviors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 The list includes dangerous behaviors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 The list includes mental health problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 The team has identified potential obstacles to sharing information and has a plan to address these information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 The list includes both face-face and online student behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 The team has developed a website relate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 The website includes contact phone number, team mission and contact email</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0= yes, 1= in progress, 2= not present
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.2</th>
<th>The website contains two of the following: list of behaviors to report, team membership list, online report form, FAQ about team and faculty class guide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>The team has a marketing plan to share information with faculty, staff and student leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>The team has a logo and graphic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>The marketing plan involved graphics, flyers and brochures that are shared with the community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0= yes, 1= in progress, 2= not present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#5 Nurturing the Referral Source</th>
<th>Score 0, 1, 2*</th>
<th>Narrative Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Does the team identify the stakeholders that should report to the BIT?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Does the team identify faculty?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Does the team identify staff?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Does the team identify student leaders (such as team captains, residence life staff and club advisors?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Does the team have a plan to train and educate the community about how to report?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Does the team have a plan to train and educate the community about what the BIT does?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Does the team share with the community how to make a report to the team?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Does the team provide training to the community on identifying at-risk behaviors?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Does the team have a policy on how information can be shared back with the referral source given FERPA, HIPAA and confidentiality concern?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Is there a sample script of an email, letter or phone call that is shared back to the referral source?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Does this message contain information encouraging the referral source to share information again if the situation changes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Does this message get sent out regularly to those who share a referral with the team?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0= yes, 1= in progress, 2= not present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#6 Data Collecting</th>
<th>Score 0, 1, 2*</th>
<th>Narrative Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Does the team have a plan to collect data from the community in terms of referrals?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Does this plan include the ability for community members to post an anonymous or semi-anonymous report?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Does the team seek referrals from a wide variety of communication mediums?</td>
<td>Can they report by email or online form?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can the community report by phone?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can they report by personal visit to BIT member?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is there a plan for after-hours reports that include an immediate response?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
centralized manner to prevent accidental loss?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.3 Is there a policy related to the security of information shared and kept in computerized files?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.3 Does the policy manual or team training address the challenges of privacy when using email communication?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

0= yes, 1= in progress, 2= not present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#7 Record Management</th>
<th>Score 0, 1, 2*</th>
<th>Narrative Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Does the team have a computer system to keep track of BIT records?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Does this record system provide easy data entry and access to data?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Does the BIT member have the ability to search the database to recover information?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Does the BIT team member have the ability to search the database with robust keywords and narratives?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 Does the IT department support the security of the data system? Do they coordinate with any third party vendors (where applicable)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 Does the team protect against other security risks related to USB drives and laptops?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4 Is the data recorded accurately for each student who comes in contact with the team?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4 Does the record include Date, Name, ID #, residence hall, student status?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4 Does the data include presenting issues and relevant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>#8 Team Training</strong></th>
<th><strong>Score 0, 1, 2</strong></th>
<th><strong>Narrative Details</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.1</strong> Does the team leader have a dedication to training and educating the BIT members?</td>
<td>0, 1, 2*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.1</strong> Does the BIT have a budget set aside for training during the year?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.1</strong> Does the team have tabletop exercises to use as training tools?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.1</strong> Does the team complete at least two tabletop exercises each semester?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.2</strong> Do team members have the opportunity to attend at least one of the four conferences (ACCA, ASCA, NaBITA, ATAP)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.2</strong> Has the team participated in at least one online training a semester?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.3</strong> Has the team explored the potential for an outside expert or consultant to train the BIT in the past year?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 = yes, 1 = in progress, 2 = not present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>#9 Risk Rubric</strong></th>
<th><strong>Score 0, 1, 2</strong></th>
<th><strong>Narrative Details</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>9.1</strong> Does the team have a risk rubric to categorize threat and risk to the campus?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9.1</strong> Does the risk rubric have attached action items to each of the levels to guide team decision-making?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>Is the rubric used consistently with the BIT?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>Is the rubric used objectively with the BIT?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>Is the rubric designed specifically for higher education settings?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>Does the rubric indicate at what point the team should use a psychological assessment?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>Does the rubric indicate at what point the team should use a threat assessment?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>Does the rubric address both mental health disorders and violence/aggression?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>Is the rubric accessible to all team members (not just those with advanced psychological training)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0= yes, 1= in progress, 2= not present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#10 Quality Assurance</th>
<th>Score 0, 1, 2*</th>
<th>Narrative Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.1 Is there a commitment by the team to assess its on-going functioning to find areas of improvement?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1 Does the team look for ways to improve internal team communication?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1 Does the team look for ways to improve communication between the team and the overall campus community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1 Does the team discuss process issues related to applying the risk rubric and developing an action plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1 Does the team address on-going obstacles among team members or departments?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>Does the team avoid rushing through meeting for the sake of finishing rather than fully exploring cases?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>Does the team address “elephant in the room” issues that prevent smooth communication?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>Does use quiet times to address training issues?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>Does the team generate end of semester reports?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>Do these end of semester reports create data that is then used to improve team functions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>Does the team compare cases based on how they originally presented to the current rating of the case risk follow the intervention?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 = yes, 1 = in progress, 2 = not present
Appendix M: NaBITA Threat Assessment Tool
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THREAT ASSESSMENT IN THE CAMPUS SETTING

Introduction

The NaBITA Threat Assessment Tool ("Tool") was first introduced in 2009. The Tool provides a rubric for behavioral and risk evaluation and helps create a common language for Behavioral Intervention Teams ("BITs"). It now commands respect as the tool most commonly used by campus behavioral intervention and threat assessment teams across the United States (Bennett & Lengerich, 2011; Van Brunt et al, 2012). Given the prominence it has achieved, we at NaBITA are mindful of our ongoing obligation to update the tool, to validate it, and assure that it continues to reflect best practices. While our trainings and our literature describing the use and application of the tool have evolved, this marks the first substantial revision to the tool itself, and an update of the 2009 Whitepaper that first introduced the tool to the field.

NaBITA’s plan for advancing the tool to the next level is three-pronged. First, the graphic and its implementing instructions have been updated. Over the years we have found a disconnect between and frequent misapplication of the concept of identifying a baseline and the NaBITA tool. Our follow-up research showed clearly that this concept was widely misunderstood and misapplied, and it needed to be addressed. You will find that the revision not only clarifies the appropriate use of baseline, but also turns that former weakness into a strength of the tool. You’ll also notice more intentional attribution of the scholarly conceptual underpinnings of the tool. The original tool was put together from many sources, and the threat assessment field suffers acutely from layers of derivative works. Our intention was never to omit attribution, but original sources weren’t always clear and our tool is far more than the sum of its parts. This revision more accurately demonstrates that our tool is effective because it relies on the validated work of many other experts, who deserve gratitude and credit for their contributions. Their credibility is a core strength of the NaBITA tool, and is now more accurately and fully referenced.

Second, we have designed, piloted, implemented and validated the Structured Interview for Violence Risk Assessment – 35 (SIVRA-35) as a companion tool to supplement and enhance the initial assessment capacities of the NaBITA Tool. The SIVRA-35 allows teams to in-source the triage assessment of harm to others, which is a critical evolution for campus teams. Behavioral intervention and threat assessment teams have struggled with triage assessment because outside assessments were not available or were too costly, and suffered from insufficient accuracy to meet team needs. NaBITA has come to realize over the last five years that this essential function can be more accurately, affordably and accessibly provided.
within and by the team through the SIVRA-35. More importantly, this can be accomplished without the need for specialized mental health, forensic training or costly external violence risk assessments.

Third, we recently published a study cross-validating the NaBITA tool with other respected, empirically validated tools (Van Brunt, 2013). The cross-validation demonstrates that the results provided by the correct use of our tool correlate with other commonly respected and valid tools in the field. Instruction on the tool has been provided by our trainers via a consistent set of fifteen case studies used for five years with all trainee groups, to empirically benchmark attainment of the correct learning outcomes needed to apply the tool accurately. Because the NaBITA tool is free, simpler to learn, and faster to implement and deploy than other tools, we believe colleges and universities will continue to embrace the NaBITA tool as an indispensable aid in accomplishing their behavioral intervention and threat assessment priorities, now with the added assurance of validity.

We expect the SIVRA-35 will quickly attain similar relevance and widespread implementation, but as a more sophisticated tool than the NaBITA Tool, the SIVRA-35 must be licensed and is not available for free. The license is packaged together with a half-day of online or in-person specialized training. The learning curve is not steep, and the cost is moderate. Together, the NaBITA and SIVRA-35 tools offer the more well-rounded functionality teams have been asking us for.

Finally, we want to stress that the NaBITA tool is not and never has been intended to serve as the sole determinate of harmful behavior for college and university behavioral intervention and threat assessment teams. Indeed, it should not be the only tool employed by members of campus teams, but as an initial assessment or triage tool, pared with other valid methodologies identified by your team. Since its creation over five years ago, we have seen immense efficacy when the tool is used appropriately and in tandem with the knowledge, expertise, abilities and tools of team members.

Law Enforcement and Work Place Violence Threat Assessment Models

Law enforcement and workplace violence-based threat assessment models have been developed and used successfully by organizations such as the Association of Threat Assessment Professionals (www.atapworldwide.org), the Federal Bureau of Investigations (FBI), U.S. Secret Service, U.S.

Admittedly, we acknowledge that the study to validate the tool was commissioned by NaBITA and led by one of the authors of this article. It was not independent. Thus, we recommend careful review of the study to assess our methodology and the objectivity of the results.
Department of Education, U.S. Postal Service, ASIS International, the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM), and the American Society of Mechanical Engineers – Innovative Technologies Institute (ASME-ITI). Several prominent experts in campus violence and workplace threat assessment have also recommended key considerations salient when assessing risk and threat (Meloy, 2000; Turner & Gelles, 2003; Deisinger, Randazzo, O’Neill & Savage, 2008; Meloy, Hoffmann, Guldimann, & James, 2011; O’Toole, 2014; Meloy & Hoffman, 2014).

These models offer insight into potential criminality and can aid in preventing some forms of campus violence. However, there are some limitations given the criminal-level focus of such models because much of the behavior within the purview of behavioral intervention teams is not criminal in nature. Many of these models also address threats to facilities and organizations; such issues are a component of the campus behavioral intervention and threat assessment setting, but we need a broader approach – one that takes into account the specific challenges of threats and behaviors that are unique to college campuses. Similarly, threat assessment tools designed to avert terrorist acts or assassinations may be reliable, but often are not applicable to the campus culture and broader issues of disruption, hostility and violence on campus.

**Mental Health Assessment**

Colleges and universities historically rely on campus mental health professionals for some measure of insight and analysis of threat/risk assessment. While this function brings a necessary element to the table, it is only part of the overall threat assessment capacity needed. The tools used in the mental health field, often based on clinical diagnosis and psychological personality assessment, are essential for accurately assessing the potential for harm to self, suicidality and larger mental health disorders that may pose concern to the wider campus community (e.g.: delusional thoughts, idiosyncratic behaviors, odd speech or social interactions). However, assessing suicide and mental health disorders are only part of the behavioral intervention team function. Campus mental health clinicians have been reluctant to dip their proverbial toes into the “harm to others” arena, yet assessing for the potential of harm to others is an essential element in the campus setting. There are some credible tools used by mental health professionals, such as the HCR-20 by Stephen Hart, the Firestone Assessment of Violent Thoughts (FAVT), the Paulhus Deception Scale (PDS), the HARE Psychopathy Checklist (PCL-R), and the State Trait Anger Expression Inventory (STAXI-2) but they rely on a level of deep forensic and diagnostic experience not always available on college campuses. The tools are complex and often require a longer period of
assessment, more intensive training and a diversion of resources away from the central goal of college counselors; resources generally more limited to short-term, developmentally appropriate treatment. Additionally, we must acknowledge that not all risks brought to the attention of behavioral intervention and threat assessment teams stem from mental health roots. A more easily obtainable and applicable capacity for assessing the potential of harm to others is needed. Stated differently, the field needs an effective, generalized threat assessment tool that operates outside of a strictly clinical/mental health framework.

**Going Beyond Our Current Threat Assessment Capacities**

Recognizing the limits of current threat assessment capacities, the authors have developed and honed a multidisciplinary threat assessment Tool that holistically synthesizes three essential bodies of knowledge into a cohesive model. The Tool includes measures for generalized risk (harm to facilities, reputation, operation, finances, etc.), mental and behavioral health-related risk (harm to self) and hostility and violence (harm to others). This article presents the updated NaBITA Tool as a straightforward, easily understood, broadly applicable model of threat assessment specifically designed to be applied by campus behavioral intervention teams.13

**Harm to Self: Measures of Mental Health-Related Risk – The “D” Scale**

Behavioral intervention teams need a measure to assess mental health related risks, and for that we created the “D” scale. In doing so, we drew from important and relevant research and writing on the topic of mental health as it relates to violence and threat assessment (Delworth, 1989; Dunkle, Silverstein, & Warner, 2008; Jed Foundation, 2008; 2013; Eells & Rockland-Miller, 2011; Van Brunt, 2013). Today’s “D” scale is very much an update of Ursula Delworth’s (1989) measures, using the current terminology of the mental health field. While this scale may represent some oversimplification compared to the clinical assessment of a mental health professional, it is not a gross oversimplification. It is pared down to the point of easy application without needing a high level of clinical mental health expertise. The “D” scale progressively escalates from Distress to Disturbance to Dysregulation/Decompensation.

13 The prominent and widespread adoption of the NaBITA Tool does not let teams off the hook for identifying and assuring that the campus can deploy a full range of tools. For example, teams may wish to access additional training on techniques useful to de-escalate affective violence. These are difficult to teach and learn through an article, though they are essential to campus behavioral intervention teams and campus law enforcement who may need to defuse threats when encountered.
The definition of each “D” is as follows:

- **Distress**
  - Emotionally troubled (e.g., depressed, manic, unstable)
  - Impacted by actual/perceived situational stressors and traumatic events
    - Behavior may subside when stressor is removed or trauma is addressed/processed
    - May be psychiatrically symptomatic if not coping/adapting to stressors/trauma

- **Disturbance**
  - Increasing disruptive or concerning behavior; unusual, and/or bizarrely acting
    - May be destructive, apparently harmful or threatening to self/others
    - Substance misuse and abuse; self-medication

- **Dysregulation**
  - Acutely suicidal (thoughts, feelings, expressed intentions and ideations at the level of threat/attempt)
  - Parasuicidal (extreme self-injurious behavior, eating disorder, personality disorder)
    - Engaging in risk-taking behaviors (e.g., substance abusing)
    - Hostile, aggressive, relationally abusive
    - Deficient in skills that regulate emotion, cognition, self, behavior, and relationships

- **Decompensation** (a parallel level of risk to dysregulation)
  - Profoundly disturbed, detached view of reality
  - Unable to care for themselves (poor self care/protection/judgment)
    - At risk of grievous injury or death without an intent to self-harm
    - Often seen in psychotic breaks

**Harm to Others: Measuring Hostility and Violence**

The second rubric that contributes to the NaBITA Tool enables campus behavioral intervention and threat assessment teams to assess the potential for harm to others through the lens of hostility and violence. The authors have incorporated the transformative work of Friedrich Glasl into this model to equip behavioral intervention and threat assessment teams with this needed capacity (Glasl, 1999). Dr. Glasl, Professor at Salzburg University in Austria, developed the “Model of Conflict Escalation” (www.mediate.com/articles/jordan.cfm) that offers nine stages of conflict escalation useful in understanding how an individual begins to escalate toward violent action (Glasl, 1999). These stages, along with supportive research from the threat assessment community, provide behavioral intervention and threat assessment teams the tools needed to better understand the potential warning signs that present prior to violence. Hostility and violence occur primarily in one of two ways: through affective violence or targeted violence.
Affective violence is adrenaline-driven and occurs as part of a biological reaction to aggression, the production of adrenaline, the increase in heart rate, and the resulting body language, behavior and communication indicators that we can identify and measure (Howard, 1999; Grossman, 1996; 2000; Hart, 1999; Grossman and Siddle, 2000, Meloy, 2000; 2002; 2006). This hostility is reactive and impulsive in nature and driven by perceived or actual threats or fear. An individual trying to manage and respond to this mixture of vulnerability and physiological responses prompted largely by the release of adrenaline often results in unpredictable, spontaneous, affective violence (Howard, 1999).

Conversely, targeted or predatory violence is the result of a planned, intent-driven action that we see more commonly exhibited by terrorists and those engaging in rampage violence and school shooting sprees. Targeted violence involves a more strategic, focused attack and a desire for the individual to complete a mission (Meloy, 2000; 2006; Meloy, Hoffmann, Guldimann, & James, 2011; O'Toole, 2014; Meloy & Hoffman, 2014). This hostility occurs when a person becomes isolated, disconnected, lacks trust and often feels threatened and frustrated by a perceived attack. He plots and plans his revenge and often executes his plans with a militaristic, tactical precision (Meloy, 2000; 2006; Meloy, Hoffmann, Guldimann, & James, 2011; O’Toole, 2014; Meloy & Hoffman, 2014). Such violence and hostility typically develop over time, and those planning such attacks often “leak” information about their plans to others (O’Toole, 2014). Such leakage and the nature of stage-by-stage progression provide behavioral intervention and threat assessment teams the potential opportunity to prevent the harm. Targeted violence may be a bit of a misnomer in the sense that the term does not imply a specific target, but instead references threats that are pre-meditated, planned and methodically executed, rather than those that are spontaneous and more likely to emerge without leakage and therefore without warning.

O’Toole (2014), describes those intending targeted violence as individuals who are “mission-oriented”:

Mission-oriented shootings are hardly impulsive crimes. They are well planned and can involve days, weeks, months, even years of making preparations and fantasizing about the crime. The planning is strategic, complex, detailed, and sufficiently secretive to minimize the risk of being detected and maximize the chances for success. The planning does not occur in a vacuum—during this phase, mission-oriented shooters make many decisions, including the types of weapons and ammunition they will use and where to obtain it, the clothes they will wear, the location of the
assault, who the victims will be, what they will do at the location, and the date and time of the shooting (p. 9).

Glasi’s (1999) model of crisis escalation provides a useful framework in understanding the progressive acceleration that occurs with students prior to such a targeted violent episode. To help connect his framework to predatory and targeted violence, additional resources and research will be cited for each of the nine levels identified by Glasi:

**Stage 1: Hardening**

**Description:** The individual begins to selectively attend to his or her environment, filtering out material or information that doesn’t line up with his or her beliefs. Stances begin to harden and crystalize. There is some oscillation between cooperative and competitive.

**Examples:** A student begins to spend more time studying and joining websites related to white supremacy. He starts talking with others who share his beliefs and filters out those with differing opinions. Another example includes a falling out between those who had common cause, which results in a polarization of perspectives.

**References:** Van Brunt, 2012; Meloy et al., 2011; ASIS and SHRM, 2011; Sokolow et al, 2011; Randazzo and Plummer, 2009; Sokolow & Lewis, 2009; ATAP, 2006; Glasi, 1999; Turner and Gelles, 2003; O’Toole, 2002.

**Stage 2: Debate and Contentious Arguments**

**Description:** The individual further filters out any conflicting information and adopts polarizing points of view with others. There is a level of aggression threaded throughout all of the interactions and a sliding into extreme positions. There may be some lingering desire to convince others to his or her point of view, but being right supersedes the facts. Differences become polarizing.

**Example:** A student believes the nursing faculty is on a mission to drum him out of the program since he is a male. He argues publicly with them and shares his thoughts with other students. This is the kind of debate you never win, as there is no desire to see eye-to-eye as in academic debate, but to bring about capitulation.

**References:** Van Brunt, 2012; Meloy et al., 2011; ASIS and SHRM, 2011; Sokolow et al, 2011; Randazzo and Plummer, 2009; Sokolow & Lewis, 2009; ATAP, 2006; Glasi, 1999; Turner and Gelles, 2003; O’Toole, 2002.
Stage 3: Actions not Words

*Description:* There is a fundamental lack of trust and increased suspicion of others. The individual assumes negative intentions from others and debate is deadlocked. There is movement toward non-verbal behaviors to express frustration rather than engaging in conversation.

*Example:* A student gets a letter from Financial Aid telling her the forms needed for this semester are not on file. The student knows she filed the forms and storms into the office, upends a display stand and proceeds to curse at the staff for their incompetence and accuse them of targeting her.


Stage 4: Images and Coalitions

*Description:* The individual has an image of the target and strives to enlist supporters to the cause, often within the peer, social or work group of the target. The individual only sees what confirms existing beliefs that reinforce a villainized target who now has accusations hurled against him or her. Physical confrontation and conflict enter the mix, no longer just verbal in arguments.

*Example:* A staff member receives a parking ticket and her request for an appeal is denied. This is her fifth parking ticket of the semester for illegal parking. The staff member claims the refusal was racially motivated and writes dozens of letters to the board of regents and forms an underground organization to find ways to make the on-campus parking department’s job more difficult.


Stage 5: Loss of Face

*Description:* The individual creates an outcast of his target and goes on the offense in order to unmask them in the community as a fraud. In an often public effort at undermining, the target is treated as inhuman and past events are viewed with a new, negative perspective.

*Example:* A student creates a Facebook group called “Everyone hates Terry.” In that group, she posts things about Terry such as “Terry lies to all of her friends, she talks behind your backs constantly. Terry pretends to be a sweet girl, but she is really a drug-addled whore.” She sends group membership invitations to all of her friends and all of Terry’s friends and organizational colleagues.

Stage 6: Strategies of Threat

**Description:** The individual begins to make ultimatums and threats that contain a “do this or else” quality. Might be mere saber rattling, but the individual will attempt to infuse his or her threat with credibility. There are threats of punishment in order to get one's way. Conflict is escalating and may soon turn violent.

**Example:** A student upset with how campus safety escorted him off campus for handing out brochures about a concealed carry protest calls the officers “monsters” and warns them that he was taught how to deal with monsters during his time in the army. He threatens to return again tomorrow.

**References:** Meloy & Hoffman, 2014; ASIS and SHRM, 2011; Meloy et al., 2011; Sokolow et al., 2011; Drysdale et al., 2010; Randazzo and Plummer, 2009; ATAP, 2006; Turner and Gelles, 2003; O’Toole, 2002.

Stage 7: Limited Destructive Blows

**Description:** Threats are implemented. There is a high level of objectification and depersonalization toward the target. Deceit and lies are championed and used to cause harm to the other party. Damage, while occurring, is limited. Often seen in the form of the acts of an accomplice, the pulled punch, or in the acts of the criminal mastermind who orchestrates harm to others but is not the direct instrument of its delivery.

**Example:** A student becomes enraged at his girlfriend and punches the wall next to her and says, “Next time that’s your face, bitch.”


Stage 8: Fragmentation of the Enemy

**Description:** The individual is ready to destroy the enemy target. The attack may be physical, material, psychological and/or spiritual. There is a desire to tear down the core of the system so it can no longer be rebuilt. There remains some desire for self-preservation during the attack. This is described as a win-lose attack where the individual keeps his or her own life and destroys his target.

**Example:** A faculty member brings a gun into a meeting with other faculty and demands they get on their knees to beg for their lives.

**References:** Meloy & Hoffman, 2014; O’Toole, 2014; Van Brunt, 2012; Meloy et al., 2011; Sokolow et al, 2011; ATAP, 2006; Turner and Gelles, 2003.
Stage 9: Plunging Together into the Abyss

**Description:** The individual is focused and fixated on destroying the target with no regard for his or her own safety. As long as the opponent is dragged into the abyss as well, even self-destruction is a triumph. This is described as a lose-lose attack where intent of the threatener is to destroy the target and him or herself.

**Examples:** Seung-Hui Cho at Virginia Tech, Steven Kazmierczak at Northern Illinois University and Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold from the Columbine High School massacre.

**References:** Meloy and Hoffman, 2014; O’Toole, 2014; Van Brunt, 2012; Meloy et al., 2011; O’Toole and Bowman, 2011; ASIS and SHRM, 2011; Sokolow et al, 2011; Randazzo and Plummer, 2009; ATAP, 2006; Turner and Gelles, 2003; O’Toole, 2002; Vossekuil et al., 2000; 2002.

The stages are outlined here to offer delineated points of opportunity to engage with the individual, intervene and move him or her off the “pathway to violence” as described by Calhoun and Weston (2003) and Fein et al.(1995). Each of the nine stages can be observed and methodically engaged with all necessary resources by law enforcement, campus housing, student conduct, counseling and others trained to identify and intervene. Engagement is intended to prevent the individual from further escalation.

**Overall and Generalized Risk – The NCHERM Group 5-Level Risk Rubric**

The third scale informing the NaBITA Tool is a generalized risk rubric originally developed by the National Center for Higher Education Risk Management (NCHERM; now The NCHERM Group, LLC), from an enterprise risk framework. It is applicable to potentially violent and injurious acts, as well as to risks that threaten reputation, facilities, normal operations, finances, etc. This is the central spine of the Threat Assessment Tool, and it is universally applicable. This rubric is specifically designed for campus threat assessment purposes as default measures when the “D” Scale or Violence and Hostility Scales are not applicable, as the overall risk category, and as measures for the enterprise risk areas identified above, which may not include threats of violence or self-harm. Every case examined using the NaBITA Tool should result in a determination of the level of risk as delineated by The NCHERM Group 5-Level Risk Rubric, often working from the “D” Scale or the Hostility and Violence Scale, inward to get an accurate overall risk level. At each encounter with an at-risk individual, teams should update records to reflect the current status on this scale that results from observable behaviors, taking baseline adjustments into account as needed. These criteria are drawn from widely accepted measures including those promulgated by the U.S. Department of Education and the U.S. Secret Service (Cornell, 2010; Pollack, Modzeleski & Rooney, 2008;
Drysdale, Modzeleski, & Simons, 2010; Vossekuil, Fein, Reddy, Borum, & Modzeleski, 2000, 2002). The following are the specific definitions of threat levels in the NCHERM Group 5-level generalized risk rubric:

**Mild risk**
- Disruptive or concerning behavior
- May or may not show signs of distress
- No threat made or present

**Moderate risk**
- More involved or repeated disruption; behavior more concerning; likely distressed or low-level disturbance if on the “D” Scale
- Possible threat made or perceived (often conditional)
- Threat is vague and indirect (no identified means or target)
- Information about threat or threat itself is inconsistent, implausible or lacks detail
- Threat lacks realism
- Content of threat suggests threatener is unlikely to carry it out

**Elevated risk**
- Seriously disruptive or concerning incident(s)
- Exhibiting clear distress, more likely disturbance, if on the “D” Scale
- Threat made or present
- Threat is vague and indirect, but may be repeated or shared with multiple reporters
- Information about threat or threat itself is inconsistent, implausible or lacks detail
- Threat lacks realism, or is repeated with variations
- Content of threat suggests threatener is unlikely to carry it out

**Severe risk**
- Disturbed or advancing to dysregulation
- Threat made or present
- Threat is vague but direct, or specific but indirect (type of threat v. object of threat)
- Likely to be repeated or shared with multiple reporters
- Information about threat or threat itself is consistent, plausible or includes increasing detail of a plan (i.e., time, place)
- Threat likely to be repeated with consistency (may try to convince listener they are serious)
- Content of threat suggests threatener may carry it out

**Extreme risk**
- Dysregulated (way off his/her baseline) or decompensating
- Threat made or present
- Threat is concrete (specific and direct)
- Likely to be repeated or shared with multiple reporters
- Information about threat or threat itself is consistent, plausible or includes specific detail of a plan (i.e., time, place), often with steps already taken
- Threat may be repeated with consistency
- Content of threat suggests threatener will carry it out (reference to weapons, means, target)
• Threatener may appear detached

**The Chart Graphically Represents the Threat Assessment Tool**

Below we have graphically represented our above multidisciplinary model. This page is a color coded chart that demonstrates how our three scales for measuring threat (mental and behavioral health related risk, generalized risk, and hostility and violence toward others) correspond to and intersect with each other. This is a handy reference chart to using the NCHERM Group 5-level Risk Rubric. This chart lists in the left column the levels of risk ranging from mild to extreme, with bullet points summarizing how to classify the level of risk of a range of behaviors. The right column lists the range of risk from mild to extreme, this time suggesting the range of intervention tools available to most behavioral intervention teams to address the level of risk identified in the left column.

**Understanding the Chart**

The chart depicts on its far left the “D” scale, referencing the three levels of mental health-related risk used in our model. Each of the terms Distress, Disturbance and Dysregulation/Decompensation is defined, and indicated by escalating levels of threat, from the highest at the top of the chart (Dysregulation/Decompensation) to the lowest at the bottom of the chart (Distress). The column in the middle of the chart depicts the NCHERM Group 5-Level Risk Rubric (Mild, Moderate, Elevated, Severe, Extreme). The far right column illustrates the nine stages of Hostility and Violence. Each is color coded to show its correspondence.

A distress-level of mental health-related risk corresponds normally to mild-to-moderate levels of generalized risk, and may manifest Violence and Hostility at the escalation phase (Hardening, Debate and Contentious Arguments, Actions not Words, Images and Coalitions, Loss-of-Face). The next level of the “D” scale, disturbance, corresponds normally to the range of generalized risk from moderate-to-elevated-to-severe. Hostility and violence may manifest at this level with some of the lower level measures and most likely with Strategies of Threat. At the highest level of the “D” scale, dysregulation and decompensation usually correspond to the two highest levels of generalized threat – severe and extreme. They can also manifest on the three highest stages of the hostility and violence scale with Limited Destructive Blows, Fragmentation of the Target and finally Plunging Together into the Abyss.

**How Should Behavioral Intervention Teams Use This Tool?**
Using the campus behavioral intervention team can measure actual threats posed to the campus. The overall risk level is represented by the NCHERM Group 5-level Risk Rubric for generalized risk (mild to extreme) – a scale that will indicate to the team the overall risk level and appropriate resources, support and intervention techniques to deploy. This scale applies to every case. Regardless of where you start, the goal is to end in the center column. The mental health and hostility/violence measures only apply as overlays when mental health issues and/or signs of hostility are indicated, but are the best starting point because they are more accurate scales than the generalized, center rubric. Using all of the information reported to the team, background on the student, and any investigation done by the team, the team will then assess baseline and trajectory, assimilate the information and assign a risk level.

As we mentioned earlier in this Whitepaper, baseline has become a misunderstood concept, and because it is essential to understanding where to start on the tool, and how to get an overall accurate assessment, we want to unpack the concept here. In an environment like a residential college, threat or risk assessment need not be done in a vacuum. Most threats that are directed at the community are directed at it by a member of the community, or someone closely associated with it. Thus, we potentially know a lot about the sources of threats to our communities. Let's mine that data, use it wisely, and assess risk within its context. We have to assume a "normal" baseline for any threatener who we know nothing about. Normal means they are no closer to violence or harm than any other person who makes a similar threat or gesture. For those we know some history or context about, there are two relevant questions:

1) Is the individual off his baseline?
2) Does the individual have an elevated baseline?

We think the confusion comes from mingling these two concepts, or not understanding and operationalizing how they are distinct. Let's use the example of someone who self-injures via cutting to better understand the difference. If your BIT learns student Janine is engaged in superficial cutting, it will evaluate her risk according to her behaviors. If your team later learns (a second report, from a different source) that Janine is cutting herself again, and is cutting exactly as before, you will be less concerned by the second report, because it simply confirms the baseline that Janine is someone who cuts. If we knew prior to first hearing about Janine that Janine was not involved in cutting, hearing that she now cuts would represent a change in her baseline. That doesn't affect her level of risk any differently than her cutting behavior represents, but it tells us something about her trajectory that is useful. She has moved off her norm. She will either return to
her norm (expected and low risk), maintain the cutting (a higher risk than her norm) or begin to cut more harmfully, or progress to other self-injurious acts (her risk will worsen). We’re watching for where her trajectory will go. This is not predictive because we don’t know that her trajectory will exacerbate, but we do know with some likelihood what her progression will look like if she continues. When Janine begins to cut more significantly, it will mean more to a BIT because we know the context of where her baseline was, and how quickly and how far her self-injury has progressed. Being "off your baseline" simply gives context to someone’s trajectory toward harm or violence. Nothing more. The second (and separate) consideration is whether Janine has an "elevated baseline." A baseline is elevated when historical or contextual factors about the individual empirically place them closer to the threshold for violence or harm to self or others. "Empirically” means that research or data tells us the history or context is an exacerbating factor, and it must be research based. What are some circumstances that occur in the literature that empirically enhance risk factors for violence or self-harm? Here are some examples:

- Past alcohol abuse or alcoholism or other drug abuse
- Current alcohol use, abuse or alcoholism or drug use, abuse or addiction
- PTSD
- History of eating disorders
- Cutting and other intentional self-injury
- Significant suicidal threats or attempts
- A history of violence
- Etcetera

If the historical risk factor or context is not an empirical exacerbating factor in the risk of harm or violence, the baseline is normal (indicated at the bottom of the tool). Conduct your risk assessment as you normally would. If the baseline is elevated, how elevated is it? It depends on the research and what it tells us. It may tell us, using the NaBITA five-level scale (Mild—Moderate—Elevated—Severe—Extreme), not to start an assessment from the bottom of the chart (normal baseline), but to start with the Mild level, Moderate level, Elevated level, or even higher (that is rare). Let’s assume that Janine presents with some disrupting behavior and that we know historically that Janine is a cutter whose self-injury is rapidly becoming worse in terms of frequency and severity. And, let’s assume just for the sake of discussion, that she is 20% more likely to attempt suicide as a result of her cutting pattern. With a five-level scale, each level is perhaps 20% of the path to violence or harm (it’s as much art as science in this regard). Janine’s behavior, because of her elevation, has to be evaluated starting 20% closer to harm, which is a baseline of Mild (rather than normal/no risk). Her current disruption would result in a Mild assessment without the baseline elevation,
but with one level of baseline elevation, Janine is Moderate on the scale, not Mild, though her present disrupting behavior would only merit a Mild categorization without the context.

If the literature said the risk was 30% higher, Janine would score between Moderate and Elevated. If it was 40% higher, Janine would score firmly in the Elevated risk category. Thus, a person whose risk is categorized as Elevated by their current behaviors, but who has an elevated baseline by two levels (Moderate) would in fact peg the tool at Extreme (Elevated + two levels = Extreme). Part of the confusion occurs here because of our dual uses of the term "elevated" and "Elevated." To have an elevated baseline could refer to any one of 1-5 levels of elevation. To be Elevated on the chart refers to the third or middle category of risk. One can be Elevated without a baseline elevation, or because of one. Again, baseline elevations only occur where a baseline is known, and that history or context is the basis for a BIT to believe the individual is empirically closer to harm or violence. Teams should assess both being off one's baseline, as evidence of trajectory, and having an elevated baseline, which is essential to accurate assessment in context. One can be both off their baseline (their norm) and have an elevated baseline, but those would normally be caused by totally different factors.

Let's say someone becomes suddenly delusional from a baseline of previous mental competence. If so, that's a sharp baseline departure. They are off their baseline. This represents an acute concern because of how abruptly and substantially someone has departed from their baseline. A minor departure from baseline is less concerning, but may start to signal a trajectory (leftward or rightward). But, the baseline is not elevated by any historical or contextual factor. Add the fact of a history of substance abuse, and the baseline would then elevates by a category or two, thus combining an advancing trajectory with elevated risk in a worrisome combination. So, step one for using the tool is to assess baseline, and determine trajectory, if you can. Trajectory will be leftward toward the “D” Scale, rightward to the Violence and Hostility Scale, or both (which is a more acute scenario).

If mental and behavioral health-related issues are most obvious, the trajectory is primarily leftward, and you will classify the student on the “D” scale first, taking into account any baseline elevation you can determine. If violence and hostility to others are most apparent, you’ll want to start on the right, and use the violence and hostility scale. The trajectory is rightward, and you’ll want to assess for any baseline elevations.
If there is no evidence of mental and behavioral health-related risk, violence or hostility, you can directly classify the risk according to the 5-level scale, using it as a default or for its enterprise risk application. Assuming that you can start on one (or both) flanks, you then work from the left or right scale to the center, assigning a correct level of overall risk from the rubric (Mild though Extreme). The tool is not meant to be worked all the way across from left to right, or right to left, but when you can, that confirms the strength of your assessment. There may or may not be a corresponding level of mental and behavioral health-related risk to the level of violence and hostility indicated, or a level of violence and hostility that corresponds to the mental and behavioral health risk information you have. The order for teams using the Tool should be: 1) identify the behavior, 2) gather additional data, 3) assess baseline and trajectory, 4) assign a risk level, then 5) determine the institutional intervention/response from the parameters outlined.

A Word about the SIVRA-35

The SIVRA-35 is a specialized, structured inventory that is useful to assess individuals who may pose a risk or threat of harm to others, and is designed to be administered by team members. The SIVRA-35 is *not* designed as a psychological test and it is *not* designed to assess suicidal students. Mental health expertise is not necessary to utilize it. It is a guided structured interview tool useful for classifying risks into low, moderate, and high categories, and integrates with the NaBITA Tool at the levels of Elevated and above, when those levels result from classification with the hostility and violence scale. Integrating the SIVRA-35 at this point in the assessment process will produce a more accurate risk picture using 35 variables than the NaBITA Tool would, alone. While the SIVRA-35 primarily assists those conducting violence risk assessments through narrative and structured questions, there is a quantitative, numeric scoring key to further assist staff in their decision-making. A single administrator will either ask questions directly to the person being assessed or review relevant incident reports and other forms of data to determine a true or false answer for each item.
NABITA THREAT ASSESSMENT TOOL

HARM TO SELF
MENTAL & BEHAVIORAL HEALTH, “THE D-SCALE”

DYSREGULATION/DECOMPENSATION
- Acutely suicidal (thoughts, feelings, expressed intentions and ideations)
- Parasuicidal (extreme self-injurious behavior, eating disorder, personality disorder) at life-threatening levels
- Engaging in risk-taking behaviors (e.g., substance abusing)
- Hostile, aggressive, relationally abusive
- Deficient in skills that regulate emotion, cognition, self, behavior and relationships
- Profoundly disturbed, detached view of reality
- Unable to care for themselves (poor self care, protection, judgment)
- At risk of grievous injury or death without intent to self-harm
- Often seen in psychotic breaks

DISTURBANCE
- Increasingly disruptive or concerning behavior, unusual and/or bizarre acting
- May be destructive, apparently harmful or threatening to others
- Substance misuse and abuse, self-medication, erratic medication compliance

DISTRESS
- Emotionally troubled (e.g., depressed, manic, unstable)
- Individuals impacted by situational stressors and traumatic events that cause disruption or concern
- May be psychopathologically symptomatic if not coping/adapting to stressors/trauma
- Behavior may subside when stressor is removed or trauma is addressed/processed

OVERALL & GENERALIZED RISK RUBRIC

EXTREME
- Plunging together into the abyss

SEVERE
- Fragmentation of the enemy
- Limited destructive blows
- Strategies of threat
- Loss of face
- Images and coalitions
- Actions not words

ELEVATED
- Debates and contentious arguments
- Hardening

MILD

HARM TO OTHERS
NINE LEVELS OF HOSTILITY AND VIOLENCE

TRAJECTORY?

BASELINE

TRAJECTORY?
## Classifying Risk

**Mild Risk**
- Disruptive or concerning behavior
- May or may not show signs of distress
- No threat made or present

**Moderate Risk**
- More involved or repeated disruption, behavior more concerning, likely distressed or low-level disturbance
- Possible threat made or perceived
- Threat is vague and indirect
- Information about threat or threat itself is inconsistent, implausible or lacks detail
- Threat lacks realism
- Content of threat suggests threatener is unlikely to carry it out

**Elevated Risk**
- Seriously disruptive incident(s)
- Exhibiting clear distress, more likely disturbance
- Threat made or present
- Threat is vague and indirect, but may be repeated or shared with multiple reporters
- Information about threat or threat itself is inconsistent, implausible or lacks detail
- Threat lacks realism, or is repeated with variations
- Content of threat suggests threatener is unlikely to carry it out

**Severe Risk**
- Disturbed or advancing to dysregulation
- Threat made or present
- Threat is vague, but direct, or specific but indirect
- Likely to be repeated or shared with multiple reporters
- Information about threat or threat itself is consistent, plausible or includes increasing detail of a plan (time, place, etc.)
- Threat likely to be repeated with consistency (may try to convince listener they are serious)
- Content of threat suggests threatener may carry it out

**Extreme Risk**
- Dysregulated (way off baseline) or medically disabled
- Threat made or present
- Threat is concrete (specific or direct)
- Likely to be repeated or shared with multiple reporters
- Information about threat or threat itself is consistent, plausible or includes specific detail of a plan (time, place, etc.), often with steps already taken
- Threat may be repeated with consistency
- Content of threat suggests threatener will carry it out
  (reference to weapons, means, target)

## Intervention Tools to Address Risk As Classified

**Mild Risk**
- Meeting/soft referral by reporter
- Behavioral contract or treatment plan with student or employee (if at all, only for low-level concerns)
- Student conduct or HR response
- Evaluate for disability services and/or medical referral
- Conflict management, mediation, problem-solving

**Moderate Risk**
- Meeting/soft referral by reporter
- Behavioral contract or treatment plan with student (if at all, only for low-level concerns)
- Student conduct or HR response
- Evaluate for disability services and/or medical referral
- Conflict management, mediation (not if physical/violent), problem-solving

**Elevated Risk**
- Meeting/mandated referral by reporter
- Evaluate parental/guardian notification
- Obtain and assess medical/educational and other records
- Consider interim suspension if applicable
- Evaluate for disability services and/or medical referral
- Consider referral or mandated assessment (IVRA-33 or other violence risk assessment)

**Severe Risk**
- Possible confrontation by reporter
- Parental/guardian notice; obligatory unless contraindicated
- Evaluate emergency notification to others (FERPA/HIPAA/Clery)
- No behavioral contracts
- Recommend interim suspension or paid/unpaid leave
- Evaluate for medical/psychological transport
- Evaluate for custodial hold
- Consider voluntary/involuntary medical withdrawal
- Direct threat eligible
- Law enforcement response
- Consider eligibility for involuntary commitment
- IVRA-33 or other violence risk assessment

**Extreme Risk**
- Possible confrontation by reporter
- Parental/guardian notice; obligatory unless contraindicated
- Evaluate emergency notification to others
- No behavioral contracts
- Interim suspension or paid/unpaid leave if applicable
- Possible liaison with local police to compare red flags
- Too serious for mandated assessment
- Evaluate for medical/psychological transport
- Evaluate for custodial hold
- Initiate voluntary/involuntary medical withdrawal
- Law enforcement response
- Consider eligibility for involuntary commitment
Conclusion

The authors are dedicated to developing models of behavioral intervention and threat assessment based on adaptation of academic research, clinical studies, law enforcement reports, governmental investigations and campus best practices. It is the authors’ goal in this article to stimulate current interest in and concern on campuses regarding risk and threat assessment and to offer practical models for addressing campus safety. Ultimately, the model offered in this paper may enhance early intervention, foster thoughtful and timely response, and avert tragedy. If you find this paper to be of use, please share it with your colleagues. Copies may be downloaded at www.nabita.org.

NaBITA -- A Membership Association for Higher Education

While visiting the NaBITA website, the authors encourage you to explore its resources and to consider becoming NaBITA members. NaBITA serves as a membership association, a clearinghouse for resources, and a mechanism for sharing and disseminating best practices for an emerging field. You will find that NaBITA membership is distinguished by a strong value-inclusive philosophy. NaBITA membership offers a community, a newsletter and a listserv. NaBITA’s members experience added value through discounted and free webinars and seminars, free or discounted registration to the NaBITA Annual Conference, access to a Q&A panel of behavioral intervention experts, and behavioral intervention documentation, including a member library of more than 300 practical documents and resources on successful models, sample policies, protocols, training tools and tabletop exercises. www.nabita.org.
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The Structured Interview for Violence Risk Assessment (SIVRA-35)
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Those who complete the SIVRA-35 training can administer the SIVRA-35 (see https://nabita.org/resources/sivra-35/ for more information). The SIVRA-35 is designed as a structured interview and can be used by residential life staff (such as hall directors and executive housing directors), campus police, conduct officers, counselors, and psychologists, student affairs administrators, and anyone connected with the campus student of concern or Behavioral Intervention Team (BIT).

Unlike other psychological tests focused on threat and danger to others, the SIVRA-35 is designed with non-clinical language and can be completed accurately by those without psychological or forensic training.

The SIVRA-35 can be used as a structured questionnaire or can be scored to provide the assessor a low, moderate, or high rating of risk for a range of behaviors including:

**Direct Communicated Threats**
- Social media picture postings that involve a weapon being brandished
- Bullying or intimidating behavior (may include both the target and the perpetrator of these behaviors)
- Disruptive behavior that includes threatening gestures, physical intimidation or aggressive outbursts
- Potential “off color” jokes or veiled statements: “I should blow this place up!”, “I’m going to go off like that Korean kid at V-Tech.”
- Threatening writings or drawings

**Observable Behaviors/Language/Factors**
- Para-weapon or dangerous material possession like airsoft guns, the Anarchist’s Cookbook, swords, knife collections, etc.
- Psychotic, delusional or schizophrenic talk: “I am Hitler/Jesus”, “The people in the chairs don’t swim like the others”, “I can’t cry on Tuesdays”
- Disruptive behavior that is perceived as overly rude, entitled or includes threatening gestures, physical intimidation or aggressive outbursts
• Odd, strange or concerning writings or drawings
• Bloody or violence-filled tattoos
• Lack of empathy or objectification of others

**Contextual Environmental Factors**
• Obsessional pursuit and stalking
• Return to campus following involuntary commitment or hospitalization
• Rapid change in previously upsetting behavior without explanation
• Elevated “conational” response regarding other extreme events (an inclination: as an instinct, a drive, a wish, or a craving to act purposefully)

The Structured Interview for Violence Risk Assessment (SIVRA-35) is a thirty-five-item inventory designed by Brian Van Brunt, Ed.D., that is used to assist Behavioral Intervention Team members and clinical staff in conducting a more thorough and research-based violence risk assessment.

The SIVRA-35 is designed to assist with individuals identified as elevated, severe, or extreme risk by the NaBITA Threat Assessment Tool or using similar methodologies. The SIVRA-35 is an informal, structured set of items for those who work in Higher Education to use with individuals who may pose a risk or threat to the community. The SIVRA-35 is not designed as a psychological test and it is not designed to assess suicidal students. **SIVRA-35 results are not a prediction of future violence.**

The ideal approach to violence risk assessment is utilizing an individual trained and experienced in violence risk assessment to interview the subject. Since these individuals are difficult to find, the SIVRA-35 serves as a starting place for clinical staff and administrators to conduct a more standardized research-based violence risk assessment with students determined to be at an increased risk.

While risk and threat assessment cannot be predictive, multiple agencies (FBI, Secret Service, Department of Education, US Post Office, ASIS International and the Society for Human Resource Management, ASME-ITI) have suggested risk factors to attend to when determining the potential danger an individual may represent. Several prominent experts in campus violence and workplace threat assessment have also recommended key considerations salient when assessing risk and threat (Meloy, 2000; Byrnes, 2002; Turner & Gelles, 2003; Deisinger, Randazzo, O’Neill & Savage, 2008; Meloy, Hoffmann, Guldimann, & James, 2011).
**Rule #1**

- The SIVRA-35 provides the user a score from 0-70 indicating a numerical level of risk.
  - Items are scored as:
    - 0 for no present
    - 1 for partially present or needs further data to score
    - 2 for present

**Rule #2**

- The SIVRA-35 provides the user a score from 0-70 indicating a numerical level of risk.
  - Scores from 1-20 indicate a low risk for violence; scores from 21-40 indicate a moderate risk for violence; and scores from 41-70 indicate a high risk for violence.

**Rule #3**

- The first twelve items are critical items that are weighted more heavily than the rest.
  - When four or more of the first 12 are marked non-zero (either 1 or 2) this moves the scoring automatically to the high category.

The utility of the SIVRA-35 depends first on the rapport developed between the assessor and the subject. The assessor should avoid rattling off SIVRA-35 questions in a formal and potentially off-putting manner. The best way to obtain accurate data is through a conversation with the individual based on mutual respect and a stated commitment to serving the best interest of the individual. This will decrease the individual’s defensiveness (some degree of defense is normal given the nature of the interview) and will lead to more genuine responses.

There is no set of risk factors or list of concerning behaviors that can predict a future violent event. SIVRA-35 is a useful reference tool when conducting a structured interview during a violence risk assessment. Ideally, the assessment should take place after the assessor has reviewed incident reports, available documents related to conduct in the educational setting and in the immediate community, and
any other information that has led to the initial concern. Any violence risk assessment involves static and dynamic risk factors, contextual and environmental elements, and mitigating factors. There is no current tool or computer model that can accurately predict future violent behavior, and no tool is ever a substitute for professional expertise.

Therefore, the use of structured professional judgment in combination with documentation and consultation with trusted colleagues is the current best practice.

While the SIVRA-35 primarily assists those conducting violence risk assessments through narrative and structured questions, there is a quantitative, numeric scoring key to further assist staff in their decision making. A single administrator will either ask questions directly to the person being assessed or review relevant incident reports and other forms of data to determine a true or false answer for each item.

**SIVRA 35 Items**

1. **There is a direct communicated threat to a person, place, or system.**
   (e.g. "I'm going to blow up this school.", "I'm going to kill my four professors." While direct communicated threats warrant immediate evaluation, Vossekuil et al. (2002) found most attackers don't threaten their targets directly before an attack)

   **Description:** This item is endorsed when there is a direct threat communicated to a person, place, or system. This threat can occur in person, over the phone, or through social media or email. Examples of each of the scoring indicators are as follows:

   **Sample 2-point Indicators**
   - Student posts on Facebook, “I’m going to kill my roommate with a my switchblade if his alarm goes off one more time”
   - Student says to professor, “If I don’t pass this exam, you might want to consider finding another way to drive into work in the morning”
   - Student threatens to punch lunch staff worker if she doesn’t let him in even though he left his ID card in is dorm room
   - Student tells roommate she is going to jump from the parking structure on campus and she hopes she doesn’t fall on anyone important on the way down
   - Student screams at professor: “I hate you and I’m going to make you pay for the way you have treated me!”

   **Sample 1-point indicators**
   - Student threatens to kill the college president the next time the tuition rates go up.
   - Student overheard in the computer lab: “I’m going to rape some short-skirted ho’s tonight at the party if I get them alone in a dark corner”
- Student gets angry about having a library hold on his accounts and says, “I’m going to go all Uma Thurman Kill Bill on you with my Katana if you don’t let me register for classes right now”
- Student slams door and mumbles something under his breath at the professor when storming out of the room. Another student said he called the professor an “dead asshole”
- Student overheard telling roommate, “I’d like to punch that stupid housing director right in his stupid face for this fine”

Sample 0-point indicators

- Student makes avatar of professor online and has other online players throw daggers at his head
- Student posts a negative review and advice to “kill yourself before taking a class with this ass-clown” at www.ratemyprofessor.com
- Student protests outside the bio-ethics department with a sign that says: “All baby-killers will burn in a lake of hell-fire”
- Student rates professor negatively on performance evaluation
- Student glares at professor but says nothing to her

2. The student has the plans, tools, weapons, schematics and/or materials to carry out an attack on a potential target.
   (e.g. the student has begun to acquire weapons, make lists of weapons or objectives)

Description: This item is endorsed when the student has, in his/her possession, the materials or information needed to carry out the attack. There must be a potential target identified. This item is not endorsed if the student has the materials but has no target or plan of attack.

Sample 2-point Indicators

- Student has collected bomb-making materials and plans to replicate the Boston Bomber attack on campus during a homecoming event
- A student downloaded a copy of The Anarchist Cookbook with plans to build “something” to get back as his professor who gave him a bad grade in chemistry class
- Student obtains a concealed carry permit with plans to smuggle a gun on campus to intimidate a group of students who are bullying him
- Student does not have a gun, but proceeds to purchase high-capacity clips, laser sights, holographic sites, militaristic clothing, and protective SWAT gear with plans to eventually get a gun and “finally put my ‘plan B’ to work on campus
- Student acquires a large amount of castor beans with the plan to extract the ricin to use in a mail attack

Sample 1-point indicators

- Student shares she is thinking about ways to build a bomb
- Student begins to download information about past school shootings and is fantasizing what it might be like to be the one pulling the trigger
- Student joins a website dedicated to terrorist attacks related to politics, ethnicity, or other hardened thoughts
- Student obtains a concealed carry permit and jokes about “working through his list once he gets his gun”
• Student researches ways to kill someone he doesn’t like. He is unsure if he would carry out the plan or not

Sample 0-point indicators

• Student shares he/she is thinking about ways to build a bomb during a therapy session simply to shock the therapist. He/ she has no access to materials and no target in mind.
• Student says to a resident advisor that he has “dark thoughts” about finding a gun and using it in a campus shooting
• Student obtains a concealed carry permit
• Student shares repeated nightmares about being the school shooter on campus
• Student shows interest in the bomb-making process with a reasonable justification (plan to join the military, interest in law enforcement)

3. The student harbors violent fantasies to counteract his/her isolation and/or emotional pain. (e.g. keeping a violent journal about killing others or exacting revenge)

Description: This item is endorsed if the student becomes enthralled in violent fantasies with violent themes to another person, place or system. These fantasies could include drawings, writings, verbal communications or thoughts about harming others. The fantasy helps reduce the student’s pain or frustration in the face of isolation, teasing or frustration. This is beyond a simple one-time comment.

Sample 2-point Indicators

• A student is upset about a grade a professor gave her. She follows the professor and learns his schedule. The student dreams of various gruesome ways to kill the professor to make her pay for the grade. This continues after the student is no longer enrolled in the class.
• After a recent break up, a student continues to call and text his ex after she asks him not to. She takes out a “stay-away” order with the conduct office. He continues to text and call her telling her in graphic detail how he would punish her for her unfaithfulness.
• A student feels all women on campus are dressing in a way that distracts him from his studies. He begins writing rape fantasy stories about a girl who sits in front of him in class. He finds these stories calming and let him focus more on the class material.
• A student creates a website and posts pictures and detailed stories about how he would kill his ex-girlfriend.
• A student begins to follow the student conduct officer around campus following a meeting for an alcohol violation. The conduct officer approaches the student after noticing him following her. He says, “I can follow you. You wrecked my life and called my parents, so I spend my days thinking about ways to make you pay for what you did to me.”

Sample 1-point indicators

• A student is angry with another in class who didn’t complete a group project. The student tells a friend that he dreams about harassing her through text, phone calls, and emails to get back at her.
• An advisor tells a student she will never make a very good teacher. The student is upset and tells this story to all her friends over the next several weeks. She writes an opinion letter about the advisor in the school paper and writes a letter to the head of the department requesting the advisor be fired and forced into being homeless. This continues for two months.
• A student is upset about a break up and publishes a blog about his feelings about the relationship and why his ex is a horrible person for what she did. He spends several hours each day for several weeks writing about his feelings and shares the link with his friends and ex.
• A student fails to get his financial aid approved. He begins a letter-writing campaign to the front office staff person who denied him. He writes all her co-workers in the department about what a bad person she is. This continues for months.
• After being kicked off the basketball team by the coach for a second drug violation, the student continues to attend practices to sit in the stands and glares at the coach.

Sample 0-point indicators

• Following a break up, a student sends text messages to his ex asking her to get back together
• A student is mad about a grade a professor gave her and makes a negative comment on www.ratemyprofessor.com
• A student goes to her ex’s class and practice to try to talk to him/her after they break up.
• A student is angry with his roommate and thinks about ways to embarrass him.
• A student is curious about a new girl he wants to date in his sociology class and spends time looking her up online and on Facebook. He fantasizes about being with her.

4. The student has an action plan and/or timeframe to complete an attack.
(e.g. is there an indication of impending action such as: "They are going to be sorry if they give me a poor evaluation." or "I'm going to take care of them this weekend.")

Description: This item is endorsed when a student has a plan of attack against a person, place, or system and this plan has an associated time—day or hour—during which the plan will be carried out.

Sample 2-point Indicators

• A student tells a professor, “If you don’t change my grade before end of the semester, I will find you in your office during finals week and make you pay.”
• A student yells at a financial aid officer, “Don’t come to work tomorrow, because I’ll be here waiting for you.”
• A student puts a post on Facebook that says, “Better not come to class on Friday. It’s going to all go down!”
• A student has been arguing with an ex trying to get him to go back out with him. He tells him, “You have until the end of the week to decide, then I’m going to decide for you"
• A student threatens a conduct officer by saying, “You better not come to work tomorrow if my appeal doesn’t go through.”

Sample 1-point indicators

• Student who is upset at a professor threatens, “I’m not going to be here at the end of the semester and neither is Professor Norris”
• Student says to girlfriend, “You cheated on me for the last time. I’m going to make sure you don’t cheat on me again in the future”
• A student fails to meet the GPA requirement for playing football. He says, “I’ll make sure that the professors who failed me get some front row seats for the next game. Right up front where I can see them, if you know what I mean”
A student is asked to leave the residence halls for a failure to pay. He is given a timeline to move out. He says, “I have my own timeline and I’ll leave when I’m ready. If you push me, you’ll find out what happens when you try to come into my room before I’m ready to leave.”

Sample 0-point indicators

- A student shares she is frustrated with a professor and says, “they better watch out”
- A student posts on Facebook, “If she doesn’t take me back, I’m going to make everyone she knows miserable”
- A student is upset at conduct outcome and says, “This school makes me sick! I’m done with all these rules. I’m leaving at the end of the semester”
- A student says, “This is the last time I’m putting up with this bullshit class. I’m dropping it next week”
- A student is upset about a parking ticket. He calls the parking office and says, “I hope you all choke on my payment, you money-hungry bastards.”

5. The student is fixated and/or focused on his target in his actions and threatening statements.

"Everyone is causing me to fail at college" would be a 0 or 1 "It’s Becky, that bitch from the Kappa Gamma Sorority who is going to pay" is a 2

Description: This item is endorsed when an individual centers his or her attention on a particular group (fixation) and then narrows this attention down to a smaller subset or individual in the group (focus). There must be some threatening statements or actions along with this intensifying scrutiny.

Sample 2-point Indicators

- A student becomes passionately angry toward women on campus who dress provocatively. He begins to think about ways to hurt or threaten members of the women’s volleyball team
- A student becomes enraged with the liberal faculty on campus and begins writing hate-filled letters to the political science department
- A student is enraged by a recent pro-life rally on campus and begins think about ways to carry out an attack on the biology department for their support
- A student is upset about his Wiccan club not being recognized by the student government. He gathers information about the student government president in order to make him pay.
- A student is upset with a policy that says she can’t have a pet in their room. She posts pictures of decapitated animals on her Resident Advisor’s door and with the writing “You’re next!”

Sample 1-point indicators

- A student becomes infuriated during class at the incompetence of the group to which she is assigned. She threatens the other group members by saying, “I’m going to tell the professor you did none of the work. Then you all will fail. You deserve to get kicked out of school. You are just a bunch of ignorant hicks like half the enrolled students here! I wish you were dead!”
- A student has an on-air radio show and shares his belief that all people who listen to country music should be shot. He then goes on to list a bunch of people and groups around campus that are known to like country music. He says, “Well, there is your list. Get to it!”
- A student is teased in his dorm. He explodes when he finds his room covered in post it notes. He singles out the three floormates, “I’ll make you all pay for this! You’ll be six feet under!”
• A student blames his academic failure on affirmative action on campus. He posts on Facebook, “Let’s go to the black fraternity and steal a car from them since they take all our money!”
• A student expresses anger at LGBT students on campus. He tells his roommate a plan he has to use an airsoft gun to shoot out his dorm window at anyone he thinks is gay.

Sample 0-point indicators

• A student is upset at the counseling department for having session limits. She writes her counselor an angry letter about abandoning her and files a complaint with the ethics board.
• There is a pro-life preacher on campus and a student becomes upset and protests with a sign
• A student feels as if the white race is superior to all other ethnicities at college and requests permission to form a white-only appreciation club.
• A student expresses rage to the food service company on campus for their on-going neglect of vegetarian options. The student starts writing letters to the school newspaper attacking the chef’s ability to cook anything but dead animals.
• A student becomes upset at a student conduct officer after being asked to leave the school following a third alcohol violation. The student slams the door of the officer and knocks over a plant on the way out. The student shouts, “Screw you and screw this place!”

6. The student carries deep grudges and resentments. He can’t seem to let things go and collects injustices based on perceptions of being hurt, frustrated with someone, or annoyed. (e.g. talks about minor incidents that upset him from years ago, lacks empathy to understand other's perspective, self-focused and collects past wrongs done to him)

Description: This item is endorsed when a student with a narrowly-focused preoccupation on a person, place, or system creates lengthy writing or art related to the fascination. This created product is part of an overall pattern (a collection of journals, website, series of drawings, or paintings) rather than a single expression. These writings are not only created as part of a class assignment or therapy journaling

Sample 2-point Indicators

• A student posts a series of lengthy articles on his online blog about how much he would like to kill his professor for his art history class
• A student creates a series of drawings in class exploring his hatred of black students on campus
• A student writes a book to outline how he feels the Christian right is taking over the country and needs to be destroyed. He frequently shares his views with on-campus Christian groups
• A student posts a series of hostile and inflammatory blogs on her website related to male bashing and the rape culture on campus. She calls for the fire-bombing of fraternity houses
• A therapist asks a student to journal about her thoughts related to killing her boyfriend who cheated on her. The student creates a public journal, details how she would kill him, and sends the link to all of her friends on Facebook

Sample 1-point indicators

• A student writes a series of increasingly disturbing stories in a creative literature class related to dismemberment and killing. This is not related to the assignment at hand
• A student is a Creative Arts major and makes a detailed series of sculptures for an art show on campus related to the death of his relationships by portraying the death of his ex-girlfriend. He names the series Killing Jill, which is the name of his ex
• A student downloads a very violent and realistic video game depicting the most recent school shooting and posts pictures of his kills with comments about his college on Facebook
• A film student makes a graphic video depicting an entire classroom of college students being killed, including his ex-girlfriend
• A student keeps of journal of all the people he interacts with during the day that he would want to kill. He vividly describes these deaths

**Sample 0-point indicators**

• A student creates a blog to talk about her feelings following the breakup of her five-year relationship
• A student is asked by his therapist to journal about his darkest fantasies of harming others and the journal is discovered and turned into campus safety
• A creative-writing student writes a story from the perspective of a school shooter
• A student posts on Facebook a lengthy rant about how he hates his roommate
• A student draws a picture of himself being shot in the head on an exam he failed

7. The target is described negatively in writing or artistic expression. There is a narrow focus on a particular person that has a level of preoccupation or fascination with the target. There is a pattern of this behavior, rather than a one-time act.

*Sample 1-point indicators*

• A student writes a series of increasingly disturbing stories in a creative literature class related to dismemberment and killing. This is not related to the assignment at hand
• A student is a Creative Arts major and makes a detailed series of sculptures for an art show on campus related to the death of his relationships by portraying the death of his ex-girlfriend. He names the series Killing Jill, which is the name of his ex

*Sample 2-point Indicators*

• A student posts a series of lengthy articles on his online blog about how much he would like to kill his professor for his art history class
• A student creates a series of drawings in class exploring his hatred of black students on campus
• A student writes a book to outline how he feels the Christian right is taking over the country and needs to be destroyed. He frequently shares his views with on-campus Christian groups
• A student posts a series of hostile and inflammatory blogs on her website related to male bashing and the rape culture on campus. She calls for the fire-bombing of fraternity houses
• A therapist asks a student to journal about her thoughts related to killing her boyfriend who cheated on her. The student creates a public journal, details how she would kill him, and sends the link to all of her friends on Facebook
• A student downloads a very violent and realistic video game depicting the most recent school shooting and posts pictures of his kills with comments about his college on Facebook
• A film student makes a graphic video depicting an entire classroom of college students being killed, including his ex-girlfriend
• A student keeps of journal of all the people he interacts with during the day that he would want to kill. He vividly describes these deaths

Sample 0-point indicators

• A student creates a blog to talk about her feelings following the breakup of her five-year relationship
• A student is asked by his therapist to journal about his darkest fantasies of harming others and the journal is discovered and turned into campus safety
• A creative-writing student writes a story from the perspective of a school shooter
• A student posts on Facebook a lengthy rant about how he hates his roommate
• A student draws a picture of himself being shot in the head on an exam he failed

8. There has been leakage concerning a potential plan of attack. Leakage can include a direct threat, but also can be "found" items shedding light on a plan of attack.
(e.g. a list of names, collection of weapons or means to acquire weapons, direct threat statements on social media such as "I'm going to kill my roommate")

Description: This item is endorsed when there is a plan of an attack that has been shared (either intentionally or accidentally with others). This would include the plan being discovered by a third party. This item can be confusing, as leakage occurs only when an attack is planned. Further questions and investigation may be needed to confirm the presence of a threat.

Sample 2-point Indicators

• A student goes to a shooting range and video tapes himself shooting at the camera. He says, “You are next” and posts this to YouTube.
• A student shares with a friend that he is building a bomb to set off at homecoming
• A student prints out schematics for an attack on a printer in the computer lab
• A student texts a few friends warning them to not come to class tomorrow because “something big is going to go down and I don’t want you to get hurt”
• A chemistry student makes several inquiries to his professor about making explosives. The FBI contacts the school police to share that the student has made several “flagged” purchases as part of a new terrorist watch program after the Boston Marathon bombings

Sample 1-point indicators

• A student has trouble making friends on campus and is overheard joking about “maybe I should just kill everyone and then we would all be equal in the friend’s category”
• A student offers to gives other students in the hall her prized possessions since “I won’t be needing them anymore. Its not like I’m going to kill everyone at graduation or anything, but I just don’t think I’ll be around”
• A student gets drunk at a party and jokes about his plan to set fire to his professor’s car
A student talks about the coming zombie apocalypse and how he is thinking about stockpiling weapons. Several packages come from the mailroom containing body armor and military clothing. The student starts wearing these around campus.

A student creates a website praising past campus shooters and creates a blog about how to increase the “kill-count” in hypothetical future attacks.

Sample 0-point indicators

- A student has trouble making friends on campus and prints out 4000 letters that he shares under the doors of people in on-campus housing. He suggests a place and time to meet in the letter and ends with the vague statement “if you know me, you shouldn’t come”
- A student is observed leaving a list of student names behind in a classroom. The list has many of the names crossed out with a red pen and others circled with a green pen.
- A student posts on Facebook: “Sometimes, I can really understand why people would want to go shoot up a school. Not me, of course. But I understand that kind of hatred for humanity”
- A student draws out a map of the school with ideal sniper positions circled for a humans vs. zombie nerf gun game.
- A student is reported for frequently watching graphic depictions of death and surgery on YouTube in her room in the residence hall.

9. The student has current suicidal thoughts, ideations and/or a plan to die.
(e.g. the student says, "I don't want to be here anymore and I'm thinking of taking an overdose of my medication I have in my room)

Description: This item is endorsed when a student has suicidal thoughts or intent to kill him or herself. Past suicidal attempts or hospitalization are not coded on this item.

Sample 2-point Indicators

- Student tells her roommate she plans to hang herself in the woods this weekend.
- Student takes an overdose of pills at an off-campus party while drinking. Student is reported to campus police and taken to the hospital.
- Student posts on his online blog, “Well, tonight is the night. I have the gun and the bullets. Now I just need the courage to not chicken shit out again. Bye.”
- Student writes a detailed suicide note that is discovered by roommate while he is at class.
- Student drives motorcycle late at night with the lights off while drinking. He tells a friend, “I don’t care about me or anyone else when I’m out there. Whatever happens will happen”

Sample 1-point indicators

- Student posts on Facebook, “I’m tired of all this. Goodbye everyone”
- Student tells her professor, “If I don’t pass this test, I don't see the reason of even trying anymore. You’ll have one less student to worry about in your class”
- Student recently lost her mother in a car accident. She tells her therapist “I’m not sure I can go on without her in my life anymore. I think I might do something”
- Student worries many friends and has had past passive suicidal ideation with no attempts. The students come to the Dean’s office concerned she talked about renting a gun to kill herself at the local shooting range.
• Student acts odd and strange and tells others in class the end of the world is coming so they should drink the Kool-Aid before they have to die an excruciating death

Sample 0-point indicators

• Student has depression and mentions he was once suicidal in high school
• Campus police find a box with razors and bloody tissues. The student says she engages in self-injury as a release from her pain
• Student is reported to be suicidal by sister who lives off campus. She says, “He won’t return my calls and he has been suicidal before. Someone needs to find him.” She has no other information or reason for concern
• Student is depressed and is vocal about how negative and meaningless the future is. Student denies feeling suicidal but can’t promise what the future may hold
• Student is worried and overwhelmed about grades and what the future might hold if he/she doesn’t pass this semester

10. The student talks about being persecuted or being treated unjustly.
(e.g. Do they have a victim mindset? Do they see others as responsible for all their problems?)

Description: This item is endorsed when a student has an on-going and pervasive manner of seeing him or herself as the target of continual persecution or being the object of frequent incidents of being treated prejudicially. This is beyond a feeling of being treated unfairly once or twice, or a student who is frustrated with a legitimate power imbalance (e.g. a conduct action where they are denied a second appeal) or receiving multiple parking tickets. This is also different from developmentally understandable frustrations about being treated unfairly. We are looking for a pervasive and recurrent way of viewing his or her place in the world.

Sample 2-point Indicators

• Student complains the university is illegal and attempting to keep him from expressing his free speech in class (student talks out of turn and refuses to be redirected by professors). He feels it is his right to talk whenever he wants to in multiple classes
• Student complains that he is the target of a vast conspiracy to be attacked and marginalized for the way he dresses around campus. The student wears dirty and ripped clothing
• Student is continually enraged that all other students “have it easy” on campus and don’t have to work hard academically. Complains to everyone she sees about students who get allowances from parents and how hard she has to work for what she gets
• Student takes out multiple conduct and police reports (5-6 per semester) for being harassed on campus for being gay. He goes to campus ministry meetings and argues with members that their beliefs are bigotry. He doesn’t listen to other perspectives and argues whenever the opportunity presents. The student is rarely harassed and is avoided for being demanding
• Student claims that feminism is against his religion and that he is maltreated as a man on campus because of his strong religious beliefs. He argues frequently with others and shares that no one is willing to listen to him at this liberal, hippy, NPR-listening campus

Sample 1-point indicators
• Student argues with professor about a grade on paper. She says, “This is a pattern with professors not following their syllabus requirements about what they want on papers. I’m being persecuted!”
• Student shares with others he is upset with Black history month saying, “We don’t have a white history month. Why should we have a black history month?” The student complains frequently about race favoritism on campus and shares he lost a scholarship because of affirmative action
• A male student in a women’s studies class files a formal complaint against the professor for talking negatively about men and making him feel uncomfortable based on his gender. The student has several sexual harassment charges against him by other female professors and a “stay-away” order from his ex-girlfriend for stalking-like behaviors
• A student complains she is frequently looked over for graduate student lab positions in the biology department. The student does poorly in class and has a poor relationship with the professors in the department. The student says, “This place plays favorites. I’m just as good as everyone else here and always get passed over for the choice lab jobs”
• A student runs for student government three years in a row and loses the election each time. She complains to the Dean that it is because she is a woman and can’t win the popularity content that is student government. She says, “No one votes for me. This whole thing is fixed!”
• Student has strong religious beliefs about abortion rights for women and complains to her roommate that others on campus don’t share her perspective
• Student has second conduct meeting regarding an alcohol violation and argues the school is “out to get him.” He says, “Other people on campus drink WAY more than I do”
• Student complains to professor about a grade on a final paper
• A student complains about the health service fee for visiting the doctor on campus. She says, “This isn’t fair! I pay tuition and shouldn’t have to pay this fee.”
• Student complains to public safety officer who pulls him over for speeding on campus. The student says, “This place is ridiculous. You are all just sitting here waiting to catch students do something wrong to meet your quota of tickets!”

Sample 0-point indicators

• Student has strong religious beliefs about abortion rights for women and complains to her roommate that others on campus don’t share her perspective
• Student has second conduct meeting regarding an alcohol violation and argues the school is “out to get him.” He says, “Other people on campus drink WAY more than I do”
• Student complains to professor about a grade on a final paper
• A student complains about the health service fee for visiting the doctor on campus. She says, “This isn’t fair! I pay tuition and shouldn’t have to pay this fee.”
• Student complains to public safety officer who pulls him over for speeding on campus. The student says, “This place is ridiculous. You are all just sitting here waiting to catch students do something wrong to meet your quota of tickets!”

11. The student has engaged in 'last acts' behaviors or discusses what he wants people to remember about his actions. Creation of a legacy token.
(e.g. giving away personal property, writing a suicide note/video, destroying property or engaging in ritualistic acts)

Description: This item is endorsed when the student leaves messages, notes, or online communication indicating an upcoming ending or threat. Student closes down accounts or organizes items prior to moving forward on an attack.

Sample 2-point Indicators

• A student posts on Facebook: “Everything is going to be different soon. I’m tired of all this crap and everyone will be sorry when I do what I’m planning to do.”
• A student gives away his favorite clothes, computer, and his guitar to friends. He tells them he won’t need them anymore
• A student closes down his Facebook account and tells people, “I won’t need it after what I’m going to do.”
• A student makes a YouTube video and describes what is going to happen to all the people who wronged him in his life
• Student stops going to class and begins to purchase military clothing, bags, and pouches

Sample 1-point indicators

• A student closes down his Facebook account and stops all his on-campus mail from being delivered. He shuts off his cell phone and becomes more isolated
• A student argues with classmates and professors about how much she hates the school and how things are going to be different soon. The student is very vague about what this means
• A student shares with others he is nearing completion of a ‘manifesto’ about corruption at the school and he assures others it will soon be household reading
• A student stops engaging in activities she used to enjoy (going out to eat, movies, playing video games) and talks more about a ‘coming apocalypse’ that will change everything
• A student is forced to leave his education major because he fails the teacher exam. He doesn’t seem upset by this and ignores requests to talk with his advisor to make future plans. He refuses to talk about this and says, “You’ll see my plan soon enough”

Sample 0-point indicators

• A student becomes angry at his professor and threatens to drop all his classes
• A student packs up her room mid-semester because she is going to leave school
• A student stops hanging around with his friends and suddenly becomes distant from others
• A student posts dozens of times each day to Facebook encouraging people to ‘like’ his posts
• A student creates a “bucket list” of things she wants to do before she dies

12. The student seems confused or has odd or troubling thoughts. The student may hear voices or see visions that command him/her to do things.

(e.g. the student has trouble following what is going on around him, may begin to see things differently than how others see him, ask odd or strange questions no one understands. The student may say, "I’m hearing thoughts from the TV that tell me I am supposed to be the father of Britney Spears baby.")

Description: This item is endorsed when the student has intrusive thoughts or ideas that prevent him from focusing or creates confusion for the student discerning what is real or not real. Beyond these thoughts, the student may experience seeing things that other people are not able to see or hearing things other people are not able to hear. This is unrelated to drug use.

Sample 2-point Indicators

• A student hears voices that keep a running negative commentary on his behavior
• A student believes the college or university is actually a front corporation for the FBI and CIA
• A student becomes overwhelmed with thoughts that the shadows around campus hide demons that are hunting him. He also believes there are demons watching him in the reflective surfaces around campus
• A student feels his professors are working against him to ensure he is unable to successfully complete college. He believes his parents are involved in this plot against him
• A student wakes each morning and hears the sound of barking. He feels a pack of dogs wanders the campus at night and is able to read his thoughts when he is asleep
Sample 1-point indicators

- A student seems distracted around campus and can be seen mumbling to himself. He startles out of this state when anyone touches his arm or raises his/her voice to get his attention. His eyes dart around, almost looking for something.
- A student shares with his roommate that sometimes he can’t get to sleep at night and hears whispering in his mind. He is unsure if the whispers are his own voice or something else.
- A student argues with a faculty member teaching an introductory math class and suggests that the number 18 is really the number 5.
- A student stands up during a class and begins to write everything the professor says on the side white board. The student doesn’t give an explanation for his behavior.
- A student begins talking to a poster of Ke$ha on her residence hall wall. She tells her roommate the poster sometimes talks back to her.

Sample 0-point indicators

- A student who has had a trauma experience on campus has trouble focusing in class.
- A student acts oddly and has trouble forming connections with other students in her classes.
- A student seems distracted and doesn’t listen during a conduct meeting.
- A student tries LSD for the first time and hears voices around him.
- A student is in the philosophy club and enjoys challenging people about their perspectives. He says, “How do you know a chair is really a chair?”

13. The student displays a hardened point of view or strident, argumentative opinion. This is beyond a person who is generally argumentative or negative.
(e.g. does this student have strongly held, intractable beliefs that are often hot spots or emotional explosions with others? These viewpoints are not open for debate or change.)

Description: This item is endorsed when a student has an inflexible and firm position that he or she is not willing to alter. The student’s point of view is strengthened by disagreement and becomes upset and rage-filled when challenged. The student lacks empathy and a willingness to see things from another perspective. There is often objectifying language that flows from these beliefs.

Sample 2-point Indicators

- A student has strong political beliefs and often challenges others and calls them objectified names and becomes infuriated when people don’t agree with him.
- A student is a member of the KKK and supports white supremacy. The student attempts to create a club on campus and yells racial slurs at black students on campus.
- A student is part of a Fundamentalist Christian group and targets students who go to health services with signs and posters calling provocatively dressed women “sluts” and “harlots.”
- A student sees other students on campus as “part of the herd” and posts YouTube clips about the how someone should teach people a lesson and that students are illiterate lemmings.
- A student believes the nursing faculty is on a mission to drum him out of the program since he is a male. He argues publically with them and shares his thoughts with other students.

Sample 1-point indicators
• A student is against the drone strikes the US is involved in overseas. The student begins to research groups that protest these strikes. He says publically in class, “You know, I can understand the Boston bombings. Sometimes that’s the only thing that makes people listen.”
• A student becomes enraged after receiving parking tickets from campus police. She argues the administration is targeting her and begins to post signs around campus. The student continues, on a daily basis, to describe her persecution by the “unjust higher ups.”
• A student argues in class for communism over capitalism. The class is not related to politics and any time someone disagrees with him, he yells and tries to dominate the conversation.
• A student is teased by others and begins writing an online blog that graphically describes the teasing and makes references to how easy it would be to “snap” one of these days on all the jocks and popular kids.
• A student is angry at all the “pretty girls” on campus and becomes enraged during conversations with others about how all the bad guys get the girls. He says, “It’s like I have to treat women like shit and rape them to get respect. They are just a bunch of bitches!”

Sample 0-point indicators

• A student believes Jon Stewart should be the next president and thinks Republicans are idiots.
• A student feels strongly that abortion is a sin and shares her belief with other students that abortion is murder.
• A student is a member of the Tea Party political group and sees the current president as steering the country on a horrible course.
• A student argues that Greek students on campus should be all kicked out and are creating a rape culture in the community.
• A student is vegetarian and believes those who eat meat are animal killers and should be forced to pay a tax to reduce the attractiveness of being a carnivore.

14. The student has a lack of options and/or a sense of hopelessness and desperation. 
(e.g. does the student see the future as inevitable? Is there hope for creative solutions or outcomes?)

Description: This item is endorsed when the student is miserable and full of despair about a positive future. She or he has given up and has trouble seeing any escape from the current gloom.

Sample 2-point Indicators

• A student says to an advisor: “What’s the point in living? I’m done with this life.”
• A student shares a YouTube video that depicts the student breaking all of her possessions in her dorm room. She says, “Fuck this world. Fuck humanity. Everyone would be better off with a bullet hole in their head”
• A student continues to speak negatively in class, displays poor eye contact and responds to the professor who asks how he is doing with, “Better if I was dead. Like everyone else.”
• A student starts looking up websites about the end of the world and the apocalypse. When asked about it by friends, he says he is “tired of this world.”
• A student breaks up with his girlfriend and sells his car. He talks to his friends about “checking out” and “looking into joining the foreign legion.”

Sample 1-point indicators

• A student posts nihilistic updates on Facebook such as, “Life is nothingness.”
• A student who was previously happy and engaged on campus suddenly spends all his time in his room and doesn’t want to talk to anyone.
• A student becomes frustrated after an argument with her professor and immediately tells everyone she is going to drop out of school because she thinks college is a scam.
• A student doesn’t get into the fraternity he wants and becomes despondent and upset. He doesn’t see the reason to continue at college if he can’t be where he wants to be.
• A student’s girlfriend (of two years) breaks up with him and he tells his friends, “I’m not sure I can go on anymore. I don’t see the point.”

Sample 0-point indicators

• A student is frustrated about his major and not sure what he should study.
• A student feels homesick and can’t wait until Thanksgiving break.
• A student is sad or upset over losing an internship opportunity she wanted and worries she might not be able to find another one like it.
• A student is upset after being cut from the basketball team.
• A student shuts down his Facebook account and tells friends, “I can’t take one more picture of a cat meme or stupid political update.”

15. The student is driven to a particular action to cause harm.*
(e.g. Does the student seem pushed or pulled to a particular action like a moth to a flame? For example: I have to rent the gun in order to learn how to shoot it in the future.)

Description: This item is endorsed when a student displays a “moth-to-the-flame” level of attachment to the idea of harming another. Despite multiple obstacles and opportunities to redirect the behavior by friends, family, and school administration, the student persists in the fantasy and desire to carry out his or her plan.

Sample 2-point Indicators

• A student has a persistent desire to date a girl on campus and becomes increasingly enraged at her when his attempts are rebuked. He tells friends over and over again: “If I can’t have her, then no one can.”
• A student is frustrated with a professor and starts a website discussing humorous ways the professor should be killed. The student is asked to take the website down by student conduct. She initially complies, but then begins posting similar ideas on Facebook.
• A student talks about wanting to kill the president. He starts a club on campus called “Obliterate Obama” and has meetings to rally other students to his cause.
• A student becomes upset over the unfair fees being charged by health services. She begins a picketing campaign and after being arrested and meeting with student conduct, continues her actions by mailing threatening letters to health center staff.
• A student becomes upset at the computer lab policy to limit printing by students and starts to sabotage the printers and computer lab equipment.

Sample 1-point indicators

• A student becomes upset after a break up and starts to fantasize about what it would be like if his ex wasn’t at school anymore. He talks to his friends about this and despite them telling him “Dude, that’s freaky” and “...let her go,” he continues unabashed.
• A student is angry at her professor for a poor grade she received on her midterm and posts a scathing review on www.ratemyprofessor.com. She then shows this to the professor and laughs about it to other students.
• A student loses his girlfriend to his best friend on campus and talks about what it would be like to kill them both. He says he is joking, but consistently talks about this even after his Resident Advisor asked him to stop.
• A student is kicked off the hockey team for drug use. He writes an opinion article in the school paper accusing the coach of smoking crack cocaine. He is confronted by the student conduct and asked to stop. The student continues to spread rumors around campus.
• A student argues with parking enforcement about a ticket he received. The student makes up rumors about the parking officer drinking on the job. He shares them in class and in his residence hall.

Sample 0-point indicators

• A student is upset about a grade she received on a paper she wrote in class. She confronts the professor.
• A student is upset about a parking ticket he got on campus and talks to friends about how unfair that department is with their appeal policy.
• A student thinks the foreign language requirement is unfair on campus and goes back repeatedly to the registrar’s office to complain.
• A student breaks up with his girlfriend and sees her dating another guy. He waits for her by her classes to confront her.
• A professor tells a student he should change majors because he is a bad photographer. The student complains to the department head and Dean.

16. The student has had a recent breakup or failure of an intimate relationship and/or student has become obsessed in stalking or fixated on another person romantically.
(e.g. loss of dating relationship, unrequited love, repeated attempts to connect with another through romantic relationships that are rebuffed)

Description: This item involves a student who has experienced the loss of an important dating relationship. This can be someone he or she was dating for a long or short time. The student is unable to let the other person go and engages in obsessive and/or stalking behavior. The challenge when rating this item is that it requires an understanding that there is a normal amount of sadness and frustration at the loss of any important relationship. For this item, higher scores require an increased level of pain, frustration, and accompanying preoccupied and fanatical behavior.

Sample 2-point Indicators

• A student is told by his fiancée that she isn’t ready to be married. The student follows her around campus demanding an explanation for why she is leaving him. For weeks he is outside her class, at the dining hall, and camped out in her residence hall lobby.
• After a particularly difficult break up, a basketball player’s ex-girlfriend follows the team to an away game at great expense. She tells friends: “This will make him see how much I love him.”
• A student breaks up with her girlfriend and she begins to have mental health problems. She hears voices telling her that the relationship was “ordained by god” and shares these thoughts on Twitter. She refuses to give up on her girlfriend and continues to text her several times a day.
• A student breaks up with her boyfriend. He becomes enraged and threatens her. He says, “You think you are better than me? You are not. I’m going to make your life a living hell.”
• A first-year student breaks up with his high school senior girlfriend back home when he goes away to college. He realizes his mistake and begins to write her every day and post on her Facebook wall begging her to take him back. Her parents call the college and ask for a no-contact order.

Sample 1-point indicators

• A student sees her boyfriend kissing another girl at a fraternity party and she throws her drink on the other woman and calls her a whore. The boyfriend breaks up with her and the student becomes hysterical and is taken home by friends.
• A student is upset at the idea of his boyfriend going out to clubs with friends. He breaks up with him and continually checks his Facebook account and, for days after their relationship is over, tries to find out who he is dating.
• A student becomes enraged at the idea that his girlfriend talks to other people around campus. He is constantly concerned that she is cheating on him. She avoids him and won’t return his calls. He becomes increasingly upset and paranoid, rambling to all those around him.
• A student covers the floor of a classroom with roses in an attempt to get his ex-girlfriend to love him again. She is horrified and embarrassed and runs from the room.
• After a particularly difficult break up, a student continues to text her boyfriend to try to rekindle the relationship. He asks her to stop and she cuts back some but then starts messaging him on Facebook.

Sample 0-point indicators

• A student breaks up with her boyfriend because he seems “too needy.” He takes this hard and talks to his friend about how upset he is.
• A student breaks up with his girlfriend and she becomes hysterical. She yells, “No one will every love you like I do!”
• After ending a relationship with his girlfriend, a student checks her Facebook wall to try to see what her ex is doing.
• A student breaks up with her girlfriend and doesn’t talk to her or acknowledge her existence on campus. The girlfriend becomes upset about this and wishes they could be friends.
• A student tells his girlfriend that she isn’t the kind of girl he wants a long-term relationship with. She becomes upset and says, “See! This is what I mean.” He breaks up with her. She becomes depressed and withdrawn and ends up seeing a counselor for suicidal thoughts.

17. The student acts overly defensive, aggressive or detached given the nature of this risk/threat assessment. Seeks to intimidate the assessor or displays an overly casual response given the seriousness of the interview.
(e.g. how would a normal student handle this kind of intervention? Some caution and defensiveness is to be expected, but how is this student handling it differently?)

Description: The student approaches the threat assessment interview in an odd or strange manner. He or she could act in a guarded and shielded manner and only answer questions with a “yes” or “no.” The student could be aggressive and angry at being called in and takes a hostile, argumentative, or intimidating attitude with the evaluator and/or those accusing the student of causing a threat. The
A student could also be withdraw and unwilling to fully engage emotionally in the process by frequently answering “I don’t know” or “whatever.”

Sample 2-point Indicators

- A student storms into the office of the evaluator and demands to know his credentials and accuses: “Who the hell do you think you are to sit in judgment over me?”
- A student becomes agitated and begins cursing about the professor whom she threatened. Carelessly, she restates the threat she made that caused her to be evaluated.
- A student sulks and sinks into the chair. He makes poor eye contact and mumbles responses to the evaluator.
- A student denies any involvement in the incident and questions why he is being singled out for this kind of persecution. The student denies any problems (despite clear evidence) on campus and demands to be able to return to class.
- A student seems distracted during the interview as if she is hearing other people talking in her head. She looks at the far corner of the room and yells at the evaluator to “stop this witch hunt or they will be sorry!”

Sample 1-point indicators

- A student argues with the purpose of the interview and complains that he is being unjustly singled out. He says, “Other people do far worse than I do and nothing happens to them!”
- A student says, “I just can’t do this right now.” She asks permission to leave the interview and come back later.
- A student complains about the school targeting Fraternity members and feels like this entire process is a designed to try to shut down his Fraternity house.
- The student answers the questions but never makes eye contact with the evaluator the entire time they are in the meeting. He refuses to shake hands at the start and conclusion on the interview.
- A female student refuses to talk to a male evaluator and demands to be seen by a female staff member that can do the threat assessment.

Sample 0-point indicators

- A student is tearful and upset during the interview and has trouble focusing on the questions.
- A student answers questions directly, but offers little detail. When confronted about this, he shares “My dad is a lawyer and he said to just answer the questions asked and not to offer anything additional.”
- A student takes little responsibility for her actions and doesn’t see why she has to come in to do this threat assessment.
- A student is shy and withdrawn throughout the interview. He answers questions in a quiet voice and is often hard to understand.
- A student is shy and often asks the evaluator to repeat back questions because she didn’t “understand what was being asked.”

18. The student displays little remorse for his actions, lacks understanding for the view for potential victims and acts with a detachment or bravado during the interview.
(e.g. does the student laugh at the threat assessment, lack insight for the seriousness of what lead to the assessment? Does the student have a disdain for the process?)

Description: Here the student lacks an appreciation for the seriousness of what occurred and has difficulty showing any degree of empathy or ability to put him or herself in the position of others. He or she expresses disdain for the process and doesn’t understand “why this all has to be taken so seriously.”

Sample 2-point Indicators

- A student says, “I don’t see what the big deal is. So I said I’d shoot them if I had a gun. I don’t have a gun. So there isn’t a problem.”
- A student consistently avoids talking about or asking questions about a professor he had threatened in class. He takes the attitude, “She should just get over it. It’s part of the job.”
- A student continues to interrupt the evaluator asking, “Am I done now? Can I go?”
- A student shows up to the assessment wearing pajamas and with his hair a mess. When asked about his appearance, the student says, “I was out drinking last night. You were the one who set the meeting at 9am.”
- A student refuses to answer questions during the interview beyond a simple yes or no. When asked about this, he stares at the evaluator with cold, angry eyes and says, “I’m answering everything you are asking.”

Sample 1-point indicators

- A student focuses on being frustrated about the entire process of threat assessment and doesn’t take responsibility for his or her involvement or actions.
- A student is distracted throughout the interview and has to be asked several times to put her smart phone down.
- A student doesn’t acknowledge he inconvenienced the entire residence hall by pulling the fire alarm while drunk. He says, “I’ve had to get up for a fire alarm before. It’s no big deal.”
- A student doesn’t understand why people would be concerned when she posted a threat to “blow up the school.” She admits it was a dumb, but doesn’t see why it is a problem since she never intended to hurt anyone and doesn’t “even know how to make a bomb.”
- A student comes in late to the threat assessment and says, “I don’t see why I have to be here at all. I’m supposed to be in class. That’s why I’m in college, after all. Can we get this done?”

Sample 0-point indicators

- Throughout the interview, a student continues to ask how much trouble he is in but never asks about how his behavior affected others.
- A student is self-involved throughout the interview and has trouble focusing on answering the question being asked.
- A student is has troubling staying on task and often talks about unrelated things instead of answering the question being asked.
- A student argues that he is “paying for what I did by having to come in here and talk to you. That should be punishment enough.”
- A student thinks it is unfair she has to engage in a restorative justice sanction with the person she threatened.
19. The student has a weapon (or access to weapon), specialized training in weapon handling, interest in paramilitary organizations or Veteran/Law Enforcement status.
(e.g. a large gun collection, past courses in combat handgun or explosives. Shows an interest in joining a militia, thinking about stocking up on weapons for end of world)

Description: This item reflects the student’s access and knowledge concerning firearms. There does not need to be any threat or brandishing of the weapon in order to rate this item a 2. The simple possession of a firearm or past training in military tactics or firearms is enough to endorse this item. Police, law enforcement, those with a concealed carry permit, active duty military, and Veterans are all marked 2 on this item. Since all military service requires firearm proficiency to be completed in basic training, all military personal are rated on this regardless if they are or have served in a combat zone.

Sample 2-point Indicators

- A student brings his firearm into the residence hall and says, “I’m worried about all this school shooting stuff so I’m going to be protected.”
- A student lives off campus and has a concealed carry permit and gun for personal protection.
- A student’s parents have firearms in the home and the student has access.
- The student completed basic training in the military, but never served in active combat.
- The student completed the police academy as part of her criminal justice program.

Sample 1-point indicators

- A student took a hunter safety course once in high school but does not have a gun and hasn’t shot a rifle since the course five years ago.
- A student plays realistic first-person shooter video games and is very knowledgeable about tactics, weapons, and how they are used.
- A student comes from a “big hunting family” but hates guns and everything to do with them.
- A student frequently watches YouTube clips on firearms and military tactics.
- A student is fascinated by school shootings and studies the weapons and motives of those involved in the attacks for a thesis project in graduate school.

Sample 0-point indicators

- A student knows nothing about firearms and has no desire to learn.
- A student is interested in signing up for a concealed carry course over the next year.
- A student plays Halo and other first-person shooter video games.
- A student argues for the right of students to carry weapons on campus even though he personally does not have a gun or would ever own a gun.
- A student shot a .22 rifle at boy scout camp when he was in high school.

20. The student glorifies and revels in publicized violence such as school shootings, serial killers, war or displays an unusual interest in sensational violence. The student uses weapons for emotional release and venerated destruction.
(e.g. tattoos of popular torture horror movies, brags about gun collection or posters and other materials related to war, violence and killing.)
Description:
The student spends her or his time exploring and talking about violence. This could be violence related to school shootings, homicides, serial killers, or war. The student has a passion for the subject matter and often shares this information with others. Another way to endorse this item would be a student who fires a gun or weapon at a firing range and experiences an emotional release associated with yelling, using a target with a familiar face or enemy on it or finds shooting cathartic or erotic.

Sample 2-point Indicators

- The student watches violent movies involving gruesome deaths and torture. The student has pictures of these movies all over his dorm room and incessantly talks about the movies with others around him to stop.
- A student studies school shootings with a passionate glee. After the latest attack he posted “Kill count 6. I’ve seen better.”
- A student talks constantly with others around campus about violence and school shootings.
- A student tells his friends “I’m going to the firing range and I’m going to put some shots through this picture of my ex. I call it bullet therapy.”
- A student brags about her knowledge of how to kill people and shares details from YouTube videos and movies like “Face of Death” about the best way people can kill themselves.

Sample 1-point Indicators

- A student exclusively likes violent movies such as Saw, Apocalypse Now and Kill Bill. She has always enjoyed movies and books about serial killers and fantasy violence like Freddy Kreuger and Friday the 13th.
- A student enjoys going to the shooting range and says, “It helps me blow off steam. Kind of get a chance to have a little fantasy shooting time.”
- A student plays violent video games based on geography and layouts of past shootings like the Colorado movie theatre and Columbine. When asked why he likes that kind of stuff, he responds, “It’s just fun to see what it was like from the shooter’s perspective.”
- A student studies violence and crime scene materials for her criminology class. She talks with friends who are “creeped out” by her desire to go to a body farm internship where she can study decomposition of corpses left outside.
- A student has a fascination with hard-core music groups such as Insane Clown Posse. He dresses up in costume and attends events where they talk about having sex with dead bodies and chasing people down with hatchets. When confronted about this, he says, “I’d never to anything like that…I just like to freak out the normals.”

Sample 0-point Indicators

- A student goes to the firing range off campus because he or she finds it calming and enjoys perfecting his or her shooting skills.
- A student writes a paper on a recent school shooting for a final project in a class. She says, “I want to understand how someone can do these kinds of things.”
- A student likes to watch all kinds of movies, including those that have violent or destructive themes.
- A student writes about the apocalypse and what the world might be like without other people on the planet. These are papers for a creative writing class.
• A student is very interested in going to a shooting range to fire a handgun. He has researched what kind of gun he wants to shoot and is trying to find other friends who want to go with him.
• A student studies violence and crime scene evaluation for her forensic criminology class.

21. The student externalizes blame for personal behaviors and problems onto other people despite efforts to educate him/her about how others view these actions. The student takes immediate responsibility in a disingenuous manner.

(e.g. does the student avoid taking blame for her behaviors and look to lay responsibility on others? Particularly focused on supervisor or those in authority. She says something like “fine it was my fault. That’s what you want to hear, right?)

Description: Here the student focuses blame for his behaviors on others rather than taking responsibility for his own actions. This is beyond the normal, developmental tendency for college students to focus on their own needs and lack deeper empathy about how their actions affect others. The item is also scored for those who give lip service to taking responsibility, but do so in order to complete the interview and move on rather than truly accepting any blame.

Sample 2-point Indicators

• A student says, “Listen I’m done with this today. It’s my fault. Fine. I’m sorry. Can I go now?”
• A student who threatened another student in class says, “She shouldn’t have looked at me that way. What else should she have expected?”
• A student is frustrated about being called in for interrupting class because he yelled at his professor about a grade on his paper. He says, “If the professor graded fairly, none of this would have happened to begin with. I don’t see why this is my fault.”
• A student says, “You push my buttons and I react. That’s the way it goes. If they didn’t want me to get up in their face, then they shouldn’t have pissed me off.”
• A student says, “This entire meeting is ridiculous. Do you just need me to say I did it and I’m sorry? Ok, I did it and I’m sorry. What now?”

Sample 1-point indicators

• A student continues to text and call his girlfriend after being asked by student conduct to “stay away” from contacting her. He says, “I just need her to explain to me why we aren’t together anymore. If she can do that, we won’t have any more problems.”
• A student becomes upset at the process and shouts, “This is really frustrating. I don’t see why I have to be here to talk to you about my behavior when my roommate doesn’t have to do the same thing!”
• A student forgets his ID and is told by food services he cannot come into the dining hall. He argues with the staff and says, “Just look me up in the computer. I don’t see why you have to make this so much of a problem.”
• A student refuses to leave the gym after getting into an argument with a referee during an intramural sports game. He says, “The other team is doing the same thing. They are fouling as much as I am.”
• A student complains to her professor about a final grade in the class that was lower than expected. The professor tells her it was because she didn’t show up to class enough. The student says, “Maybe if the class was more interesting, I would show up more.”
Sample 0-point indicators

- A student has trouble seeing why her misuse of technology in class is a disruption to the faculty and other students.
- A student is frustrated with the parking enforcement officer who keeps giving him tickets for parking illegally. He rants to his floor mates, “I pay to be here at school. This is ridiculous.”
- A student argues with his professor about a poor grade on an exam. He says, “It’s unfair. I studied the material you told me to and this isn’t what was on the test. This is your fault.”
- A student refuses to keep his screen in his dorm room window. He tells the RA, “The policy about this is stupid and I’m just not going to do it.”
- A student is caught for underage drinking on campus. He defends himself to the conduct officer by saying, “I can go to war and vote for the president but I can’t drink? That’s unfair.”

22. The student intimidates or acts superior to others. The student displays intolerance to individual differences.
(e.g. does the student lack empathy and see himself as chosen or given to a special place in the world? Does the student see others as inferior or not worth his time?)

Description: This item is endorsed when a student displays a pervasive way of acting toward other students, faculty or staff that implies a loftier, “I’m better than you” relationship. The student sees him or herself as the ultimate and others as less than. The student has difficulty tolerating other people’s differences.

Sample 2-point Indicators

- A student tells her RA, “This whole place is being overrun by black students. I didn’t sign up to come to this school and be surrounded by them. I’m better than that.”
- During a conduct process for parking fines, a student defends himself by saying, “My dad will pay the fine. I don’t see why I have to waste my time talking in here with you about this.”
- A student tells his professor, “I’m tired of you dumbing down the lecture for all the learning disorder kids in this class. This place needs to teach to the elite, not the idiots.”
- A student demands special placement in a class that has is full. She says, “I’ll take this to the president. I’m not like all the other students here goofing off. I’m going to graduate school and need this class. I pay your salary and the professor’s salary who teaches the class.”
- A student interrupts another student during class who speaks in a heavy accent. He says, “This is America. Learn to speak the language or go back to your own lame country.”

Sample 1-point indicators

- A student goes on and on about how they are smarter than 90% of the students at this school and that most people should just keep their mouths shut in class instead of spreading their ignorance.
- A student tells her floormates, “Everyone on this campus is going to hell. No one has any moral values. The entire campus is living in sin and has lost its way.”
- A student argues about the food options during a dinner service. He shouts, “Another freaking international night? I’m tired of all this crappy food. Let’s get some steak and potatoes going here.”
- A student tells another interested in pledging their fraternity, “I don’t think you should. I hate to tell you, but you aren’t the kind of person we would ever have in our brotherhood.”
During student senate, a Christian student argues to cut funding the GLBT club because, “It’s a club that endorses a sinful lifestyle and encourages students to behave in a depraved way.”

Sample 0-point indicators

- After winning a sports game, a student says, “Oh yes! I’m the best. The rest of you suck!”
- A student talks about how easy it is to get good grades at this school.
- A student tells her professor that she is an atheist and doesn’t want to hear about what she did at church this weekend.
- A student tells his friend, “I only date white women. I don’t like ethnic-looking women.”
- A pro-life student organizes a picket against a pro-choice speaker on campus.

23. The student has a past history of excessively impulsive, erratic or risk taking behavior. (e.g. does the student have a judicial or conduct history of impulsive actions? Does the student engage in high danger, risk taking activities such as skydiving or riding a motorcycle at night with lights off?)

Description: The student engages in activities with little forethought or concern for his or her well-being or safety. The student acts inconsistently and engages in dangerous activities that put his or her life or well-being at risk.

Sample 2-point Indicators

- A student goes skydiving every weekend with friends and says, “It’s the best way to feel alive. Facing death right in your face. It’s such a rush.”
- A student exceeds the credit limit on four of her credit cards. She uses the money on exotic vacations, parties for her friends, and clothes. She ignores any bills that come and puts them all in her bottom drawer.
- A student drinks to excess frequently despite the frequent problems it causes in his life.
- A student tells his friends, “I want to do everything once to really feel alive. Cocaine, heroin, LSD...whatever it is I want to experience it.”
- A student drives his motorcycle at night and occasionally turns off the headlight on a straight stretch of highway.

Sample 1-point indicators

- A student talks about how his life dream is to go skydiving and plans a trip next semester with a few friends.
- A student has multiple unprotected sexual relationships without thought of the consequences
- A student rides his motorcycle at over 100mph on the highway.
- A student drinks heavily and often drives home intoxicated.
- A student talks about wanting to take LSD one day, if the opportunity presents itself, just to see what it feels like.

Sample 0-point indicators

- A student likes to scuba dive.
- A student drinks to excess at parties but stays within a group of friends
• A student spends too much money while at college and doesn’t budget well when it comes to fun purchases
• A student likes to go to the shooting range to fire the guns there.
• A student likes to run and workout to the point of exhaustion. She has trouble walking or moving her arms the next day after a hard workout.

24. The student has a past history of problems with authority. The student has a pattern of intense work conflicts with supervisors and other authorities (e.g. Resident Advisor, Conduct Officer, Professor or Dean).
(e.g. does the student have a history of arguing and being in conflict with authority figures?)

Description: The student has past judicial, conduct, or legal troubles. She or he has past charges or a record. The student often gets into arguments with those in authority. This would include professors, work supervisors, Resident Advisors, Parents, or law enforcement.

Sample 2-point Indicators

• A student threatens to punch his Resident Advisor when confront about his under-age drinking in the residence hall.
• A student has been arrested on two occasions for fighting with police.
• A student has a history of arguing with professors and escalating to student conduct meetings. The police were called on one occasion when the student wouldn’t stop arguing.
• A student has a history of DUI arrests.
• A student has been fired from several jobs after arguing with his supervisor.

Sample 1-point indicators

• A student constantly argues with all of his professors about grades. He is known as a “grade grubber” around campus and other students roll their eyes when he starts in with his speech about how a particular assignment was unfair.
• A student argues with her professor, slams her books down and storms out of the classroom.
• A student was fired from one past job for arguing with his supervisor.
• A student argues with his RA and pushes the limits concerning dorm rules about having candles, playing music too loud, and bringing guests into the room afterhours.
• A student argues with his academic advisor. He yells at her, “You aren’t doing your job! I need to sign up for the right class and you don’t know what you are talking about!”

Sample 0-point indicators

• A student has received two speeding tickets during the last semester
• A student doesn’t like his job and quits.
• A student argues with a professor about an unfair grade on a group project.
• A student likes to argue with her friends and others about religion and politics.
• A student drinks to excess and has been reported twice for intoxication.

25. The student handles frustration in an explosive manner or displays a low tolerance for becoming upset. This is beyond avoiding responsibility or calling mom/dad or a lawyer.
(e.g. does the student "fly off the handle" or "retreat into anger" when upset or frustrated about something that bothers him? How does the student tolerate this very interview?)

**Description:** This item is endorsed when the student flies into a rage and becomes upset beyond what is reasonably expected given the situation. The student becomes upset quickly and without much cause. This is different from a student who is reasonably upset or calmly explains how and why he or she is upset, as well as what action will be taken given the situation.

**Sample 2-point Indicators**

- During a conduct meeting, a student yells, “You are a freaking idiot! Do you think I’m going to stand for this? My parents have a lawyer. You can expect to hear from her. You are going to lose your job!”
- A student yells at his RA after being confronted about leaving his sports equipment out in the hallway for the third time this week. He yells, “I’ll leave my stuff wherever the hell I want!”
- Other students tease Karl in the class for asking too many off-based questions. Karl stands up and throws his book against the wall and storms off in a rage.
- A student gets a letter from financial aid telling her the forms needed for this semester are not on file. The student knows she filed the forms and calls the office and proceeds to curse at the staff for their incompetence.
- A student comes into the Dean’s office to discuss his attitude toward a parking enforcement officer who gave him a ticket. The student is argumentative, demanding, and yells at the Dean.

**Sample 1-point indicators**

- A student complains to a professor about a grade on an assignment. It takes the professor several attempts to calm her down and has her to talk after class about the concern.
- A student is upset about getting an expensive parking ticket on campus and goes to the president’s office to complain.
- A student flies into a rage during an intramural sports game and pushes another student down who supposedly fouled him. The student is ejected from the game and leaves the gym.
- A student, upset at her boyfriend for cheating on her, yells and curses at him in a public lounge and threatens to “kick that bitch’s ass if I see her around you.”
- A student is frustrated with a professor because of a “no cell phone” policy in class. He interrupts class to argue with the professor saying, “All of my other professors allow this. I don’t understand why you think it’s such a big deal.”

**Sample 0-point indicators**

- During a conduct meeting, a student becomes upset and says, “I’m finished talking today. I’m going to have my parents’ lawyer call you about this situation.”
- During a student senate meeting, a student complains about how the funds are distributed to the clubs in an unfair manner.
- A student gets a letter from the financial aid office telling her that her paperwork is incomplete. The student calls the office upset and says, “I’ve already turned all of this in. I don’t understand why you are sending me this letter!”
• A student is frustrated at a grade on a paper and talks to the professor after class about her frustration.
• A student argues loudly in the hall with his girlfriend who just broke up with him.

26. The student has difficulty connecting with other people. The student lacks the ability to form intimate relationships. The student lacks the ability to form trust.
(e.g. does the student isolate from contact with others because of the belief that he or she is different or superior?)

Description: The student has difficulty relating to others and has trouble forming lasting, meaningful relationships with peers. The student has few experiences with dating and has trouble trusting others. This is different than a student who might simply be shy or introverted. While there may be external causes for this isolation, the SIVRA-35 item here is scored based on social isolation, not the cause. This can be surprising to people, given the international, and Asperger’s examples in the 2-point codes. However, it is not that the students in those examples are international, or have Asperger’s, it is the extreme social isolation the student exhibits.

Sample 2-point Indicators

• A student spends all his time alone in his dorm room and is teased by other members of his floor.
• A student likes to play children’s card games and talks about cartoons and age-inappropriate topics with his peers. The student is isolated and alone.
• A student travels from another country to study on campus. She has trouble with language and making friends on campus. She spends all her time in her room and has no social relationships.
• A student has Asperger’s disorder and has trouble making friends on campus and is seen as odd or strange by others.
• A student immediately asks out every new female he meets. He operates under the assumption that: “I can’t get rejected every time.” He gets rejected every time. Women on campus begin to talk about him and report him to the campus BIT for being creepy.

Sample 1-point indicators

• A student sits alone in class and doesn’t talk to her peers.
• A student has a few shallow friendships and has not dated before despite a desire to do so.
• A student feels isolated and alone on campus. He goes to counseling in order to work on his social skills. There is some improvement in his ability to make friends when he joins a role playing club on campus.
• A student gets along well with her professors, but can’t form social relationships with her peers. She describes them all as “not worth the time” and focuses on her positive relationships with her professors and staff around campus.
• A homeschooled student is shy and introverted. He wants to change this behavior but finds it hard to talk to others around campus. The few attempts to make friends have failed awkwardly. Other students either ignore him or think he is odd.

Sample 0-point indicators

• A student is shy and doesn’t like group exercises in class.
• A student is social with others, but has never dated.
• A student prefers to stay in her room on the weekends and watch TV or read a book rather than going to parties or hanging out with friends.
• A student is very focused on her studies. She gets along well with her professors, but spends little time with her peers. She has a few close friends, but school always comes first.
• A student spends all of his time talking to his girlfriend in high school back home. He has no friends on campus.

27. The student has a history of drug or substance use that has been connected to inappropriate ideation or behavior. Substances of enhanced concern are methamphetamines or amphetamines, cocaine or alcohol. (e.g. thinks of hurting herself when she drinks, seems calm now in the office, but when starts drinking over the weekend becomes aggressive to housemates; etc.)

Description:
This item is endorsed when the student has a history or current use of drugs that are connected to inappropriate behavior. Drug use that is illegal would be considered an inappropriate behavior. Acting impulsively while under the influence or behaving recklessness would be included under this item. This is scored for current use or a history of use.

Sample 2-point Indicators

• A student is addicted to meth.
• A student has a history of heroin use.
• A student gets drunk at parties and has sexually harassed several other students.
• A student drinks and drives.
• A student uses steroids to improve his or her athletic performance.

Sample 1-point indicators

• A student is addicted to prescription medication that he says, “helps me study and focus better.” He buys the medication from another student on campus.
• A student uses pot several times a week to help him stay calm and deal with his anger problems.
• A student uses LSD once with a group of friends because he wants to know what it would feel like.
• A student drinks to excess at parties and likes to feel like the life of the party.
• A student saves her own pain medication in order to take it all at once to get high.
• A student uses MDMA at a party and thinks she will do it again.

Sample 0-point indicators

• A student drinks at parties in order to be less shy and loosen up.
• A student occasionally smokes pot with friends.
• A student once took a family member’s pain medication, with permission, after he sprained his leg.
• A student uses MDMA at party and swears she will never do it again.
• A student drinks after an exam to celebrate
28. The student has mental health issues that require assessment and treatment.  
(e.g. general question about mental health stability, with specific focus on depression.)

Description: This item is endorsed for a student who has a major mental health issue that requires assessment and treatment in order to get better. This should not be endorsed for minor mental health problems such as seeking therapy for relationship problems, adjustment disorders, or academic support issues.

Sample 2-point Indicators

- A student hears voices commanding him to do odd things around campus.
- A student has bi-polar disorder and experiences vast mood swings up and down.
- A student is depressed and suicidal.
- A student has an eating disorder that puts his life at risk.
- A student is so anxiety she cannot spend time with others without becoming sick to her stomach and having a panic attack.

Sample 1-point indicators

- A student is mandated to therapy for problems controlling his anger toward his roommate. The arguments have recently escalated from yelling at each other to pushing.
- A student is on medication for ADD/ADHD and goes to counseling weekly to have help with his academic support.
- A student is homesick and begins to have thoughts of “not wanting to be around anymore” that worry his roommate.
- A student has esoteric behaviors such as touching light switches when coming into a room or going back 5-6 times to check if she locked her car.
- A student was diagnoses with bi-polar disorder in high school but it has been in remission for several years. She no longer seeks therapy here at college for the disorder. She continues to take medications to manage her moods.

Sample 0-point indicators

- A student saw a therapist for three sessions in 9th grade after her parents’ divorce.
- A student talks to a therapist after a difficult break up with his girlfriend.
- A student gets started on medication from his primary care doctor because he has trouble focusing in class. There was no psychological testing or formal ADD/ADHD diagnosis.
- A student has some anxiety speaking in front of people. She goes to therapy to find ways to better manage her anxiety
- A student has trouble getting along with his roommate and goes to therapy to deal with the stress.

29. The student has poor and/or limited access to mental health and support.  
(e.g. Are most of the relationships and friendships the student has fixated on negative and risk-taking in nature?)

137
**Description:** The student has no access to mental health services if there was a need. If there are mental health services on campus, there are strict session limits or services are limited to certain diagnoses that preclude the student. This item is not endorsed if the student refuses to go to therapy. The item is about the student’s access to care.

**Sample 2-point Indicators**

- A student is hearing voices and his parents want him to get help. He attends a community college that does not have a counseling center. They live in a rural setting with few providers.
- A student is depressed and considering suicide. The on-campus counseling service does not provide counseling for suicide. They refer to a local crisis center. The student doesn’t have a car to drive to the center.
- A student has frequent panic attacks and seeks therapy. The therapy is available on campus for three sessions and then the student has to pay out-of-pocket or use her insurance. The student uses her free sessions and doesn’t have insurance or the money to continue therapy.
- A student struggles with an eating disorder. The counseling center doesn’t treat students with eating disorders since they don’t have a clinician who specializes in that. The nearest specialist is an hour away and the student doesn’t have insurance or a vehicle to go to therapy.
- A student abuses alcohol and is looking for treatment after getting a DUI off campus. The counseling center is unwilling to see him since they don’t provide alcohol treatment.

**Sample 1-point indicators**

- A student starts therapy with a clinician but becomes increasingly paranoid about the therapist keeping notes about the sessions or talking to the campus BIT. The student stops coming to therapy for a few weeks and then comes back in to tell the therapist about his concerns.
- A student with suicidal thoughts is hospitalized from the counseling center following an appointment with her therapist. She refuses to go back to the therapist because she feels her trust was violated.
- A student comes into therapy because she is questioning her sexual identity. The therapist handles the situation poorly and refers the student to another therapist who is “more comfortable with the gay students.” The student isn’t sure she wants to return.
- A student wants to come into therapy for his eating disorder but the therapy office is located in the health services building and he has had bad experiences with the doctor in health services.
- A student begins therapy at the counseling center for a panic disorder and early childhood abuse. He stops treatment over the summer and finds out his therapist has moved to another school. The student isn’t sure he wants to start over with another therapist.

**Sample 0-point indicators**

- A student has bi-polar disorder but doesn’t want to go to therapy for it despite the counseling department’s willingness to see her.
- A student has depression but worries the counseling department will share records with his parents so he doesn’t go to counseling.
- A student begins to experience delusions. He goes to counseling once but becomes paranoid the therapist is watching him on closed circuit TV. He doesn’t want to go back.
- There is no counseling available on campus, but the school offers a flexible EAP-like program that covers up to 10 sessions for students.
A student has trouble focusing in class and has a medical evaluation on campus for ADD/ADHD symptoms. He is stared on medication and sees a therapist on campus for follow-up.

30. Objectification of others (perhaps in social media or writings).
(e.g. can an unrealistic positive (i.e. "an angel", "perfect", etc.), negative (i.e. "evil", "murderer", "spawn of Satan", etc.) or a shift detected from writings from unrealistically positive to unrealistically negative (e.g. "Madonna/Whore" thinking)

Description:
This item is endorsed when there are examples of the student objectifying others. This can be verbal statements, social media posts, or journal writings. Objectification can include depersonalization, misogyny, or grouping an entire collection of people under the same characteristic such as racist or homophobic behavior.

Sample 2-point Indicators

- A student tells another student in the class who has a thick accent, “This is America, learn to speak the freaking langue.”
- A student refuses to be in the same room as students who are gay or lesbian.
- A student frequently calls women “bitches,” “whores,” and “cunts” while talking to his friends around campus.
- A student has a white supremacy blog.
- A student writes a paper in class that supports the Nazi’s attempt to eradicate the Jews.

Sample 1-point indicators

- A student expresses how uncomfortable she feels being surrounded by “black students” that hang around outside of her residence hall. She complains to the residential life office and demands they enforce the “no loitering rule.”
- A student becomes enraged at the street preacher on campus and hurls insults and curses at him while he preaches outside of the student union.
- A student comes from a rural area and hasn’t had much contact with people of a different race or background. He often makes inappropriate comments in class that are far from politically correct.
- A student argues her strong pro-life viewpoint in class and is berated and laughed at by other students who hold a pro-choice standpoint. She finally gets so upset she yells, “You believe what you want, baby killers!”
- A student doesn’t like President Obama’s policies and says that they are the result of a “black being elected to office by a bunch of other minorities.”

Sample 0-point indicators

- A student feels abortion is murder and shares her thoughts with others during a class discussion.
- A student shares that, according to her church, it is a sin to be gay and she does not support gay marriage because of this.
• A student expresses his thoughts on immigration reform during a class discussion by saying “I do believe we need a wall to keep out people who are here illegally.”
• A student expresses support for the Westboro Baptist church and “how they stand up for what they believe in.”
• A Republican student vocally questions President Obama’s polices and thinks he is the worst president we have ever had in our country. He feels, “African Americans made a mistake voting for him just because he was black.”

31. The student seems obsessed with another person, location or behavior the individual has little control over.
(e.g. the student is obsessed with a certain place or person. the student spends a large amount of time talking about the object of obsession or visiting the place. The obsession is strange and not a normal obsession (e.g. movies, fantasy football, shopping). More concerning targets would be the president of the college, a movie star or train/airplane network.)

Description: Here the student has repeated thoughts and desires to connect with an individual with whom he or she has no connection or access. This could be a political figure or celebrity; someone with power and influence that the student is drawn to. This item would not be endorsed for a student who is preoccupied with an authority figure on campus, such as a professor or conduct officer with whom he or she has had contact, or someone the student previously dated.

Sample 2-point Indicators
• A student believes the TV is communicating with him and the singer Ke$ha is sending him messages in her songs.
• A student spends much of his time in the evening thinking about the president and what he would say about the administration if he was able to talk directly to him.
• The student is fascinated with a popular sports figure and feels if he can just talk directly to him that he will be able to change the outcome of playoff game.
• A student thinks Tina Fey would be her best friend if she only knew her. The student talks constantly around campus with her classmates about how she and Tina have so much in common. The student dreams of finding where she lives and dropping by for a visit.
• A student feels the liberal media is unfairly targeting the stars of Duck Dynasty. The student writes hundreds of emails and letters of support to the show and offers to come down Duck HQ to help them out. The student talks about frequently and sends emails to all students on campus about the unfairness of the situation.

Sample 1-point indicators
• A student at a large university becomes consumed with having an audience with the president of the school. He has never met the president and has been turned away by campus security when he tries to schedule an appointment.
• A student is obsessed with the actor who played Jason in the Halloween movies. He follows him throughout the country to talk to him at appearances and wants to become friends.
• A student is obsessed with the idea of having a Justin Timberlake follow him on Twitter. He spends a few hours each week trying to hatch a plot to make his dream come true.
• A student feels the political system in this country is broken and consumed with the idea that he and Glenn Beck would immediately get along if they ever met. He talks to his friends about how brilliant Glenn Beck is and watches his show religiously.
• A student talks about baseball constantly and spends a lot of money and time to go down to spring training to meet his favorite player. He wants to be part of his entourage and thinks if he can just meet him, he will immediately be offered friendship and a job.

Sample 0-point indicators

• A student really likes Katy Perry’s music and wishes she could meet her in person.
• A student loves Tina Fey and Amy Poehler when they host the Golden Globes. She talks to her friends about how they should all hang out together. She is clearly joking about this.
• A student is obsessed with fantasy football and talks about it at length when the season starts.
• A student looks up to Ellen DeGeneres and hopes to meet her someday because she has been so instrumental in guiding her life.
• A student sends a letter to the president requesting an explanation for the NSA wire tapes.

32. The student has oppositional thoughts and/or behaviors.
(e.g. the student argues consistently with others or engages in bullying or cyber-bullying behavior.)

Description: A student stands against all others around him or her. The student engages in arguments frequently and takes the contrary position to sustain the arguments. He or she has little interest in finding a middle ground or forming a consensus, but rather seems to reveal in discord and conflict.

Sample 2-point Indicators

• A student argues with all of his professors in class despite being asked to limit his questions and stay respectful of others time.
• A student argues with administrators, teachers, and staff around campus continually about the unfair tuition charges on his account. These arguments are continual and not triggered by anything the staff or faculty says to the student.
• A student isolates herself from everyone on the floor by calling her hallmates sinners and whores. She does this indiscriminately and writes Bible verses on the bathroom mirror.
• A male student thinks all athletes on campus are ignorant and often shares his views about this. The student also thinks the women on campus dress too provocatively and people who drink are taking their life in their hands. He argues with everyone he comes in contact with.
• A student is a regular fixture in financial aid, the registrar, student affairs, academic advising, and housing complaining about various injustices and appealing decisions that she believes were unfair. This is a pervasive behavior that spans across many departments.

Sample 1-point indicators

• A student is upset about the parking situation on campus. He engages parking enforcement officers in arguments and name calling when he sees them writing a ticket.
• A student is overly analytical and critical of those around them.
• A student seeks out confrontations with Greek members on campus because he was denied his pledge to the Fraternity he wanted to join. He sees all Greek students on campus as his enemies.
• A student believes eating meat is a crime and confronts other students in the dining hall who are eating meat and engages her friends and professors in lengthy arguments about their lifestyles.
• A student frequently spends hours on the Internet each night arguing with people and “trolling” other users in order to get a reaction.

Sample 0-point indicators

• A student is frustrated with food service on campus and writes an opinion article for the school paper.
• A student argues with his professor about some points the professor made in class that had religious and political overtones.
• A student appeals a parking ticket she received on campus because she thinks it was unfair.
• A student tends to have an overly pessimistic attitude and keeps mostly to himself.
• A student likes to argue and debate with friends and family on the Internet.

33. The student has poor support and connection from faculty, administration and staff. The student has an unsupportive family system and peers who exacerbate bad decisions and offer low quality advice or caring. They experience evaporating social inhibitors.
(e.g. does the student lack supporting factors to mitigate risk for escalation for violence?)

Description: This item is endorsed when the student is isolated from previous support. Faculty and staff roll their eyes when the student’s name comes up in a discussion and people around campus are generally tired and exhausted by the student’s behavior. The student has no one in his or her corner to advocate for him or her. The support of friends and family is sporadic and typically unhelpful, making stressful situations worse instead of helping. Like a building with scaffolding around it for support, the student’s scaffolding is slowing falling away and exposing the underlying structure to the elements.

Sample 2-point Indicators

• A student refuses to take a shower on campus and has a rather distinct, unpleasant smell. This isolates the student from many faculty, staff, and peers.
• A student has little support from her family while at college (she is a first generation college student) and has trouble making friendships on campus.
• A student is extremely introverted and avoids eye contact or conversations with anyone in the college community. She has no friends and little support from her family.
• A popular student is accused of sexual assault on campus and immediately becomes the target of vicious attacks and rumors. The student’s friends no longer hand out with him and even his instructors begin to treat him differently while the case is being reviewed by conduct.
• A student who previously got along well with her friends in her residence hall develops homesickness and depression. She stops going to dinner, refuses to go out to with friends.

Sample 1-point indicators

• A student doesn’t talk much to her faculty and says her main job at college is to “just finish.” She is a commuter student who comes to campus just for her classes and leaves immediately afterwards. Faculty and staff don’t know her name.
• A student starts to develop anxiety in social situations and stops going out with her friends at night and starts spending more time alone.
• A student begins to drink more and starts missing her classes more frequently. Faculty who used to know the student well and see promise in her are frustrated that she seems to be “blowing off class.”
• A student is very close to his family. His parents are going through a divorce and communication with them becomes stressful and difficult.
• A student becomes sick for a few weeks during the fall semester and falls behind in his classes. During this time, his friends seem to move on without him and his girlfriend from high school breaks up with him. He has never been close to his parents. He feels alone and isolated.

Sample 0-point indicators

• A student is shy and introverted and only has a small group of friends.
• A student is homesick and begins going home on weekends.
• A student is falling behind academically and begins to spend more time studying and less time hanging out with friends.
• A student experiences depression and starts to attend counseling to address her lack of energy and desire to hang out with her friends or go to class.
• A student is socially awkward and has a harder time than most making friends on campus. He has some friends, but not as many as he would like.

34. The student experiences overwhelming, unmanageable stress from a significant change such as losing a job, a conduct hearing, failing a class, suspension or family trauma. This stress is beyond what would normally be expected when receiving bad news.
(e.g. the student's parents get divorced or there is an unexpected death of a friend. There is a suspension from school around finals and the student is concerned he will fail.)

Description: A student experiences a life circumstance that causes a great amount of stress in his or her life. The stress becomes overwhelming and the student struggles with carrying out everyday tasks like getting up for class, eating, spending time with friends, and studying. The student’s reaction is beyond what would be normally expected. For instance, it would be normal to experience some sleep problems, difficulty focusing, and anger or frustration if the student’s father died or the student was suspended from school for a week.

Sample 2-point Indicators

• A student has a conduct hearing for constant arguments with his professor in class. During the hearing, the student begins to yell and threaten those people on the hearing board. He flies into a rage and storms out of the room.
• A student begins to cry hysterically when confront by her RA for listening to her music too loudly in her dorm room.
• After failing a test in biology, the student stops going to class and enters a depression. He is worried he will fail out of school and end up being homeless on the streets.
• A student is upset about a post someone put up about her on social media. She flies into a rage and begins yelling and screaming at her computer. The student responds on social media with angry tirades and becomes so overwhelmed she misses class the next day.
• A student is given an A- on a paper. The student feels she earned an A. The student finds the professor during office hours and screams and curses at him. She makes an appointment to talk to the college president about the professor’s unprofessional behavior.

Sample 1-point indicators

• A student yells at his RA for writing him up for drinking underage. He yells, “This is fascism. Why can I go to war and vote for the president, but I can’t have a freaking beer! This whole place is ridiculous. You and your stupid rules.” The student remains upset when he meets with the Resident Director about his behavior.

• A student argues with her professor about a grade she received on her paper. She interrupts class to have the argument and then continues to email the professor about his grading decision throughout the week.

• After a local campus shooting, a student has trouble feeling safe in class and begins to miss all of his classes. His friends are worried about him and he agrees to go to counseling to get some help.

• A student learns that his financial aid has reached a cap and he won’t be able to pay for school this semester. The student becomes enraged and complains to everyone he sees about this over the next week.

• A student is told she will not be able to take a class she needs to graduate on time. She becomes angry at the registrar and barges into her academic advisor’s office demanding to know why he didn’t inform her about this class not being offered in time for her to graduate.

Sample 0-point indicators

• After a hospitalization for suicidal thoughts, a student worries others on campus are going to think she is crazy.

• A student meets with a conduct officer for receiving too many parking tickets. The student is upset about the lack of parking options on campus.

• A student takes two weeks home after he learns that his brother has cancer. The student has trouble focusing in class and tells his roommate, “None of this seems to matter anymore. Why should I care about anything when my brother might die?”

• A student is upset that he has to “waste a Saturday” attending a mandatory alcohol education class because he was caught drinking underage.

• A student feels a professor grades her too harshly in class and takes her case to the department head to complain.

35. The student has drastic, unexplained behavior change.
(e.g. the student suddenly is much happier, less social, spiritual (having had no interest before), manic and/or verbal.)

Description: This intentionally broad item is endorsed when a student begins to behave in a manner significantly different from his or her everyday, normal, baseline behavior. The item focuses on the behavior change of the student. If there is a clear cause for the behavior change (e.g. dating relationship ending, difficulty in coursework), the item is less likely to be endorsed.

Sample 2-point Indicators
A student is typically very religious and vocal about her beliefs about god and church attendance. She suddenly stops going to church and talking about god.

A student who struggles with depression and is known on campus for generally being negative abruptly appears happy-go-lucky and is overly positive and cheerful with those around them.

A student stops hanging out with their friends and begins to talk in rhythm and a sing-song voice when engaging in conversation.

A student who is typically very active in student government and social justice issues quits all of her club involvement and tells her friends, “There just isn’t any point anymore.”

A student who is normally level-headed and reasonable, becomes irritable and flies into a rage at seemingly small, unimportant changes like a class meeting being canceled because the instructor is sick. She bursts into tears and says, “Isn’t this just what I should have expected!”

Sample 1-point indicators

A student begins to fall behind in class and has trouble focusing on the assignments.

A normally vocal and talkative student starts to keep more to herself and rarely asks questions in class anymore.

Out of the blue, a normally calm and easygoing student begins to have panic attacks and expressing worry about everyday minor things. Her friends are worried about her.

A student who is known as having strong religious beliefs about abstaining from alcohol unexpectedly is seen at a fraternity keg party getting drunk.

A student who seemed pretty average and ordinary begins mumbling to himself as he walks around campus.

Sample 0-point indicators

A student starts the semester with a lot of energy and enthusiasm and becomes more tired and less optimistic after the first few weeks of class.

A normally introverted and shy student begins to interact more with others and start spontaneous conversations with people in her residence hall.

A student begins to have trouble focusing in class, as the material gets more difficult.

Following a particularly bad break up with his girlfriend, a student seems more withdrawn and less social a few days afterwards.

A normally calm and reserved student slams her book down and mumbles under her breath when her instructor tells her during class, “Maybe you picked the wrong major—I don’t see much in the way of artistic talent.”
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The VRAW2 designed by Brian Van Brunt, Ed.D., is to offer members of Behavioral Intervention Teams an additional risk rubric to apply when the team is face with written communication of concern. The VRAW2 is not designed as a psychological test, but rather a structured way of thinking about written communication and writing samples. No degree or clinical expertise is required to use the VRAW2.

The VRAW² consists of five main factors:
1) Fixation and Focus;
2) Hierarchical Thematic Content;
3) Action and Time Imperative;
4) Pre-Attack Planning; and
5) Injustice Collecting.

Each factor has five sub-items that are numerically scored to assist staff completing the assessment to make a decision about the endorsement of the main factor. Ideally, the assessment should take place after the assessor has reviewed incident reports, available documents related to conduct in the educational setting and in the immediate community, and any other information available in the context of the writing sample.

Scoring the VRAW²

- To score the VRAW2, the writing sample should be read through carefully several times and areas of concern highlighted. In the case of video footage or other recorded audio messages or voicemails, the content should be transcribed into text and then reviewed.

- Staff uses the VRAW2, then makes a decision surrounding each of the main five factors to determine if it is present.

- This is determined by rating each of the five sub-factors either 0 for not present, 1 for unsure, or 2 for present. The subfactor scores are then added up.

- Scores of 5 or more indicate the overall factor is endorsed.

FACTOR A:
FIXATION AND FOCUS

This factor is based on the concept of a specific target being identified in the writing sample. This is a target in real life and the target is identified specifically.

Sub-factor A.1 Naming of Target: Is the person, place, or system being targeted identified clearly in the writing sample?
**Sub-factor A.2 Repetition of the Target:** Is the target mentioned more than once? Is the target identified and then repeated multiple times for emphasis?

**Sub-factor A.3 Objectification of Target:** Is there language that indicates a negative view or dehumanizing of the target?

**Sub-factor A.4 Emphasis of Target:** Does the writer use capital letters, quotes, color changes, graphics, parenthetical inserts, or emoji to emphasize the target? This becomes more concerning if related to a theme of retaliation, blaming others, or wounded self-image (my life is over).

**Sub-factor A.5 Graphic Language:** Does the writer describe what s/he wants to do to the target in a graphic or detailed manner?

**FACTOR B:**
**HIERARCHICAL THEMATIC CONTENT**

This factor is based on the concept of the writer or protagonist in the story being identified in the writing sample as superior or in an avenging or punishing role. This can occur through the anti-hero of the story or writer being seen as all-powerful and giving out judgment for past wrongs or the proletariat or targets in the story being seen as weak, stupid, or naïve.

**Sub-factor B.1 Disempowering Language:** Is the person, place, or system being targeted described as a sheep, lemming, cattle, retarded, or something similar?

**Sub-factor B.2 Glorified Avenger:** Is the writer or protagonist described as an all-powerful figure or someone who is smart, knowledgeable, and able to punish those who have wronged him/her? There may also be a tendency to use the gun or weapon to enhance the attacker’s gender status to present him/herself as all powerful or superior.

**Sub-factor B.3 Reality Crossover:** For fiction pieces, is there a cross-over between fiction and reality? Additionally, does the writer reference an ideology or historical figure such as Hitler / Nazis or previous mass murderer as a role model or someone to emulate or copy?

**Sub-factor B.4 Militaristic Language:** Does the writer use military language around tactical or strategic attacks on a target?

**Sub-factor B.5 Paranoid Content:** Does the story structure give a sense of paranoia or worry beyond what would be considered normal?

**FACTOR C:**
**ACTION AND TIME IMPERATIVE**

This factor is concerned with writing content that conveys a sense of impending movement toward action. This may be communicated by mentioning a specific time, location, or event such as a graduation, academic admission, or results of a conduct meeting.

**Sub-factor C.1 Location of the Attack:** Is the location of a potential attack site mentioned in detail?
**Sub-factor C.2 Time of the Attack:** Is there a time/date given for the attack?

**Sub-factor C.3 Weapons and Materials to be Used:** Are specific weapons or materials mentioned in the writing that will be used in the attack?

**Sub-factor C.4 Overcoming Obstacles:** Does the writing sample include examples of obstacles that must be first overcome in order to carry out an attack?

**Sub-factor C.5 Conditional Ultimatum:** Is there an ultimatum attached to the time and the location of the attack?

**FACTOR D:**
**PRE-ATTACK PLANNING**

Many who move forward with violent attacks write and plan in detail prior to these attacks. Sometimes, this pre-attack planning is boastful and can be described as a “howling” behavior designed to intimidate others towards compliance. Other times the pre-attack planning is unintentionally leaked prior to the attack and discovered by a third party.

**Sub-factor D.1 Discussion and Acquisition of Weapons:** Does the writing contain evidence of discussion about potential weapons or materials that may be used to carry out an attack?

**Sub-factor D.2 Evidence of Researching or Stalking the Target:** Does the writing give evidence the author has conducted detailed research concerning the potential target?

**Sub-factor D.3 Details Concerning Target:** Has the writer given evidence of studying the details of a particular location to attack?

**Sub-factor D.4 Fantasy Rehearsal for Attack:** Is there evidence of a fantasy rehearsal concerning a potential attack?

**Sub-factor D.5 Costuming Description:** In fiction writing, is there a discussion of elaborate, dark costuming worn by the anti-hero prior to or during the attack?

**FACTOR E:**
**INJUSTICE COLLECTING**

The term “injustice collector” was coined by Mary Ellen O’Toole as a risk factor in the first prong of the threat assessment approach: the personality of the student. The injustice collector keeps track of his/her past wrongs and is often upset in a manner beyond what would typically be expected.

**Sub-factor E.1 Perseverating on Past Wrongs:** Does the writer give evidence of being wronged by others?

**Sub-factor E.2 Unrequited Romantic Entanglements:** Does the writer discuss past romantic relationships that ended in frustrated outcomes with the writer or protagonist alone and isolated?
**Sub-factor E.3 Desperation, Hopelessness or Suicide Ideation/Attempt:** Does the story or email have a quality of sadness, isolation, and a lack of positive outcomes or options for either the writer or the main character? Did the writer express an idea, thought, or description of a plan to kill him/herself?

**Sub-factor E.4 Amplification/Narrowing:** Is there language that amplifies (use of CAPS, emoji, or color / highlighting) or narrows the focus of anger and threat to a particular individual, department, or group?

**Sub-factor E.5 Threats to Create Justice:** Does the writer offer an explanation of how s/he will seek ultimate justice, karma, payback, or a narrative on how the individual will “make things right?”

---

After an assessor(s) has complete their work with the NaBITA Threat Assessment Tool, SIVRA35 and the VRAW2 (if a writing sample is available), making a comparison on the chart below will assist the team in making their structured professional judgment (SPJ) on the person of concern. These tools will assist greatly in making determinations that are quantifiable, articulable and defensible. However, it is important to note that the professionals involved in this process should also gather other related data and utilize their collective years of experience and training when formulating their conclusions and interventions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors Endorsed</th>
<th>NaBITA Tool</th>
<th>SIVRA35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Factors</td>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Factors</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Factors</td>
<td>Elevated</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Factors</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Factor</td>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VIOLENCE RISK ASSESSMENT OF WRITTEN WORD

FACTOR A: FIXATION AND FOCUS

This factor is based on the concept of a specific target being identified in the writing sample. This is a target in real life and the target is identified specifically.

Sub-factor A.1 Naming of Target: Is the person, place, or system being targeted identified clearly in the writing sample?

Sub-factor A.2 Repetition of the Target: Is the target mentioned more than once? Is the target identified and then repeated multiple times for emphasis?

Sub-factor A.3 Objectification of Target: Is there language that indicates a negative view or dehumanizing of the target?

Sub-factor A.4 Emphasis of Target: Does the writer use capital letters, quotes, color changes, graphics, parenthetical inserts, or emoji to emphasize the target? This becomes more concerning if related to a theme of retaliation, blaming others, or wounded self-image (my life is over).

Sub-factor A.5 Graphic Language: Does the writer describe what s/he wants to do to the target in a graphic or detailed manner?

FACTOR B: HIERARCHICAL THEMATIC CONTENT

This factor is based on the concept of the writer or protagonist in the story being identified in the writing sample as superior or in an avenging or punishing role. This can occur through the anti-hero of the story or writer being seen as all-powerful and giving out judgment for past wrongs or the protagonist or targets in the story being seen as weak, stupid, or naïve.

Sub-factor B.1 Disempowering Language: Is the person, place, or system being targeted described as a sheep, lemming, cattle, retarded, or something similar?

Sub-factor B.2 Glorified Avenger: Is the writer or protagonist described as an all-powerful figure or someone who is smart, knowledgeable, and able to punish those who have wronged him/her? There may also be a tendency to use the gun or weapon to enhance the attacker’s gender status to present him/herself as all powerful or superior.

Sub-factor B.3 Reality Crossover: For fiction pieces, is there a cross-over between fiction and reality? Additionally, does the writer reference an ideology or historical figure such as Hitler/Nazis or previous mass murderer as a role model or someone to emulate or copy?

Sub-factor B.4 Militaristic Language: Does the writer use military language around tactical or strategic attacks on a target?

Sub-factor B.5 Paranoid Content: Does the story structure give a sense of paranoia or worry beyond what would be considered normal?

FACTOR C: ACTION AND TIME IMPERATIVE

This factor is concerned with writing content that conveys a sense of impending movement toward action. This may be communicated by mentioning a specific time, location, or event such as a graduation, academic admission, or results of a conduct meeting.

Sub-factor C.1 Location of the Attack: Is the location of a potential attack site mentioned in detail?

Sub-factor C.2 Time of the Attack: Is there a time/date given for the attack?

Sub-factor C.3 Weapons and Materials to be Used: Are specific weapons or materials mentioned in the writing that will be used in the attack?

Sub-factor C.4 Overcoming Obstacles: Does the writing sample include examples of obstacles that must be first overcome in order to carry out an attack?

Sub-factor C.5 Conditional Ultimatum: Is there an ultimatum attached to the time and the location of the attack?
VIOLENCE RISK ASSESSMENT OF WRITTEN WORD (CONT.)

FACTOR D: PRE-ATTACK PLANNING

Many who move forward with violent attacks write and plan in detail prior to these attacks. Sometimes, this pre-attack planning is boastful and can be described as a “howling” behavior designed to intimidate others towards compliance. Other times the pre-attack planning is unintentionally leaked prior to the attack and discovered by a third party.

Sub-factor D.1 Discussion and Acquisition of Weapons: Does the writing contain evidence of discussion about potential weapons or materials that may be used to carry out an attack?

Sub-factor D.2 Evidence of Researching or Stalking the Target: Does the writing give evidence the author has conducted detailed research concerning the potential target?

Sub-factor D.3 Details Concerning Target: Has the writer given evidence of studying the details of a particular location to attack?

Sub-factor D.4 Fantasy Rehearsal for Attack: Is there evidence of a fantasy rehearsal concerning a potential attack?

Sub-factor D.5 Costuming Description: In fiction writing, is there a discussion of elaborate, dark costuming worn by the anti-hero prior to or during the attack?

FACTOR E: INJUSTICE COLLECTING

The term “injustice collector” was coined by Mary Ellen O’Toole as a risk factor in the first prong of the threat assessment approach: the personality of the student. The injustice collector keeps track of his/her past wrongs and is often upset in a manner beyond what would typically be expected.

Sub-factor E.1 Perseverating on Past Wrongs: Does the writer give evidence of being wronged by others?

Sub-factor E.2 Unrequited Romantic Entanglements: Does the writer discuss past romantic relationships that ended in frustrated outcomes with the writer or protagonist alone and isolated?

Sub-factor E.3 Desperation, Hopelessness or Suicide Ideation/Attempt: Does the story or email have a quality of sadness, isolation, and a lack of positive outcomes or options for either the writer or the main character? Did the writer express an idea, thought, or description of a plan to kill him/herself?

Sub-factor E.4 Amplification/Narrowing: Is there language that amplifies (use of CAPS, emoji, or color/highlighting) or narrows the focus of anger and threat to a particular individual, department, or group?

Sub-factor E.5 Threats to Create Justice: Does the writer offer an explanation of how s/he will seek ultimate justice, karma, payback, or a narrative on how the individual will “make things right?”

SCORING

To score the VRAW®, the writing sample should be read through carefully several times and areas of concern highlighted. Staff using the VRAW® then makes a decision surrounding each of the main five factors to determine if it is present. This is determined by rating each of the five sub-factors as 0 for not present, 1 for unsure, and 2 for present. The sub-factors are then added up. Scores of 5 or more indicated the overall factor is endorsed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors Endorsed</th>
<th>NaBITA Tool</th>
<th>SIVRA-35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Factors</td>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Factors</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Factors</td>
<td>Elevated</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Factors</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Factor</td>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# VIOLENCE RISK ASSESSMENT
OF WRITTEN WORD

Rate each of the five sub-factors either 0 for not present, 1 for unsure, and 2 for present, then add up all points. Scores of 5 or more indicated the overall factor is endorsed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th>POINTS</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FACTOR A: Fixation and Focus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-factor A.1 Naming of Target</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-factor A.2 Repetition of the Target</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-factor A.3 Objectification of Target</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-factor A.4 Emphasis of Target</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-factor A.5 Graphic Language</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FACTOR B: Hierarchical Thematic Content</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-factor B.1 Disempowering Language</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-factor B.2 Glorified Avenger</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-factor B.3 Reality Crossover</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-factor B.4 Militaristic Language</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-factor B.5 Paranoid Content</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FACTOR C: Action and Time Imperative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-factor C.1 Location of the Attack</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-factor C.2 Time of the Attack</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-factor C.3 Weapons and Materials to be Used</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-factor C.4 Overcoming Obstacles</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-factor C.5 Conditional Ultimatum</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FACTOR D: Pre-Attack Planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-factor D.1 Discussion and Acquisition of Weapons</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-factor D.2 Evidence of Researching or Stalking the Target</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-factor D.3 Details Concerning Target</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-factor D.4 Fantasy Rehearsal for Attack</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-factor D.5 Costuming Description</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FACTOR E: Injustice Collecting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-factor E.1 Persuaderating on Past Wrongs</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-factor E.2 Unrequited Romantic Entanglements</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-factor E.3 Desperation, Hopelessness, Suicide Ideation/Attempt</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-factor E.4 Amplification/Narrowing</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-factor E.5 Threats to Create Justice</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Dangerousness and violence, from a student, faculty, or staff member is difficult, if not impossible, to accurately predict. This training topic offers research-based techniques and theories to provide a foundational understanding and improved awareness of the potential risk. The training or tool should not be seen as a guarantee or offer any assurance that violence will be prevented.
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Radicalization Risk Rubric:
An Exploration of the Risk Factors, Protective Factors & Mobilization Related to College Student Radicalization and Extremism

Brian Van Brunt, Ed.D., The National Behavioral Intervention Team Association (NaBITA) & Amy Murphy, Ph.D., Angelo State University

Introduction
Campus Behavioral Intervention and Threat Assessment Teams have become increasingly concerned with how to identify the potential for radicalization of students, faculty, and staff. Radicalism and extremism should be viewed on a continuum, from critical or counterculture thinking to seeing violence as a reasonable pathway to bring about a desired change. The Radicalization Risk Rubric seeks to provide campus teams with an understanding of what to look for to identify and intervene with at-risk individuals who have radical thoughts and behaviors that are escalating to extremist violence and terrorism.

Defining Risk Factors (RF), Protective Factors (PF) & Mobilization (M)

Risk Factors (RF)
These are the concerning thoughts or behaviors that have been shown by research and past attacks to be present. The 10 Risk Factors listed below can help us to better understand the escalation from radicalization to extremist and violent behavior:

1. Hardened point of view and injustice collecting — Includes filtering out information that doesn't line up with personal beliefs, and keeping track of past wrongs against them.
2. Marginalization and perceived discrimination — Feelings of marginalization and discrimination lead to moral outrage.
3. Connection to extremists — Involves seeking out contact with extreme subcultures.
4. Affiliation seeking — Is motivated by a desire for solidarity.
5. Expressions of polarized thinking and ideology — Refers to teachings and doctrines that glorify violence and exploit followers’ frustration, anger, and desire to blame something tangible for their misfortune.
6. Cognitive bleakness — Results in disconnection, isolation, and rejection of the values and society.
7. Personal failures — Individuals’ environment and everything around them is in free-fall.
8. Societal disengagement — Involves separation from the larger societal values and experiencing social or political frustration.
9. Justification to violent action — Prior to committing to violence, there is peace and larger justification for violent actions.
10. Predisposing characteristics — Include being easily manipulated, having low self-esteem, religious naiveté, depressive symptoms, exposure to violence, military or paramilitary training, criminal past, and thrill-seeking.

Protective Factors (PF)
These are those stabilizing, social, or environmental supports that balance and guard the Risk Factors. These Protective Factors reduce and mitigate the impact of Risk Factors. As with the Risk Factors, these Protective Factors are supported by research in radicalization, extremism, and terrorism, as well as lessons from previous attacks. The key Protective Factors are as follow:

1. Social connection — Includes positive experiences, with social support and attachment to others who have positive attachments to the community and a sense of social bonds.
2. Pluralistic inclusivity — Refers to balancing various opposing viewpoints simultaneously.
3. Non-violent outlets — Involves access to democratic means for negotiating how to meet individual needs, improve situations (social mobility), or change impactful decisions.
4. Social safety — Individuals feel connected and able to have their voices heard.
5. Emotional stability — Refers to psychological steadiness, wellbeing, and constancy, as well as sense of empathy.
6. Professional/academic engagement — Individuals are engaged or have achieved professional, career, or academic success.
7. Global competence — Implies an empathic acceptance and tolerance to diverse viewpoints, religions, and philosophies.
8. Empathy — Promotes understanding and acceptance.
10. Consequences of actions — Involves avoiding negative actions to steer clear of negative consequences.
Mobilization (M)

Mobilization captures the factors present when an individual transitions from planning toward implementation. If the Risk Factors are the gas and the Protective Factors are dampening rain, the mobilization factors could be the match to the gasoline. The following factors should be understood as being broadly defined, and the presence of any one of the characteristics should lead to the factor being endorsed:

1. Direct threat — Has there been a direct threat made by the individual to move forward to an attack?
2. Reactivity — Does the individual engage in reactive and harmful interactions with others flowing from a hardened perspective? Does the person seem to be on edge?
3. Escalation to Action — Is there an intensifying or escalating pattern of behaviors moving towards violent action and a readiness to act?
4. Catalyst event(s) — Has the individual experienced a tragic or overwhelming event that serves as a potential trigger or springboard for action or change?
5. Suicide — Is the individual currently suicidal, with thoughts of hopelessness and desperation?
6. Increased group pressure — Does participation within a group include a crystallization of ideas and a movement toward strengthening a viewpoint with an implied action?
7. Access to lethal means — Does the individual have access to weapons, is the individual researching plans of attack, and/or building capability and the training that provides a readiness to act?
8. Narrowing on target — Is there a narrowing fixation and focus on a target such as a person, group, or system?
9. Evaporating protective inhibitors — Is there a loss, gradual or sudden, of the social, financial, emotional, cognitive, spiritual, or psychological support that previously kept the individual from unstable or violent action?
10. Leakage — Has there been leakage around an attack plan or research and/or sharing of last-act behaviors or the creation of a legacy token?
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Radicalization Risk Rubric Scoring Template

The scoring structure of the Radicalization Risk Rubric involves calculating the Primary Indicator (PI) and the Mobilization Factors (MF). Primary Indicator (PI) = Risk Factors (RF) + Protective Factors (PF). Risk Factors receive a score of 0 or 1 (if present or not present, respectively). Protective Factors receive a score of 0 or -1 (if present or not present, respectively). Mobilization Factors are scored 0 or 1 each (if not present or present, respectively), and then labeled on a range of low (if 1–2 factors are present), moderate (if 3–5 factors are present), or high (if 6–10 factors are present). This page summarizes all factors, and the following pages contain a scoring template and explanation of what different scores indicate.

Risk Factors (RF): Score either 0 (if present) or 1 (if not present).

- Hardened point of view/injustice collecting: Filtering out information that doesn’t line up with personal beliefs, and tracking past wrongs.
- Marginalization and perceived discrimination: Feelings of marginalization and discrimination lead to moral outrage.
- Connection to extremists: Involves seeking out contact with extreme subcultures.
- Affiliation seeking: Is motivated by a desire for solidarity.
- Expressions of polarized thinking/ideology: Teachings and doctrines that glorify violence and exploit followers’ frustration, anger, and desire to blame something tangible for their misfortune.
- Cognitive bleakness: Disconnection, isolation, and rejection of the values and society.
- Personal failures: Individuals’ environment and everything around them is in free-fall.
- Societal disengagement: Involves separation from the larger societal values and experiencing social or political frustration.
- Justification to violent action: Prior to committing to violence, there is peace and larger justification for violent actions.
- Predisposing characteristics: Include being easily manipulated, low self-esteem, religious naivety, depressiveness, and exposure to violence.

Protective Factors (PF): Score either 0 (if not present) or -1 (if present).

- Social connection: Social support and attachment to others with positive attachments to the community and a sense of social bonds.
- Pluralistic inclusivity: Refers to balancing various opposing viewpoints simultaneously.
- Non-violent outlets: Access to democratic means for negotiating how to meet individual needs, improve situations, or change impactful decisions.
- Social safety: Individuals feel connected and able to have their voices heard.
- Emotional stability: Refers to psychological steadiness, wellbeing, and constancy, as well as a sense of empathy.
- Professional/academic engagement: Individuals are engaged or have achieved professional, career, or academic success.
- Global competence: Implies an empathic acceptance and tolerance to diverse viewpoints, religions, and philosophies.
- Empathy: Involves having an understanding and acceptance of others and their experiences.
- Sense of identity: Involves progression towards self-actualization, with moral engagement and a sense of critical decision-making.
- Consequences of actions: Involves avoiding negative actions to steer clear of negative consequences.

Mobilization Factors (MF):

- Direct threat: Has there been a direct threat made by the individual to move forward to an attack?
- Reactivity: Does the individual engage in reactive/harmful interactions with others flowing from a hardened perspective? Is the person on edge?
- Escalation to action: Is there an intensifying or escalating pattern of behaviors moving towards violent action and a readiness to act?
- Catalyst event(s): Has the individual experienced an event that serves as a potential trigger or springboard for action or change?
- Suicide: Is the individual currently suicidal, with thoughts of hopelessness and desperation?
- Increased group pressure: Does participation within a group include a crystallization of ideas and a movement toward strengthening a viewpoint with an implied action?
- Access to lethal means: Does the individual have access to weapons? Is the individual researching plans of attack, and/or building capability and the training that provides a readiness to act?
- Narrowing on target: Is there a narrowing fixation and focus on a target such as a person, group, or system?
- Evaporating protective inhibitors: Is there a loss, gradual or sudden, of the social, financial, emotional, cognitive, spiritual, or psychological support that previously kept the individual from unstable or violent action?
- Leakage: Has there been leakage around an attack plan or research, and/or sharing of last-act behaviors or the creation of a legacy token?
### FACTORS

Add total Risk Factors and Protective Factors to reach a Primary Indicator score. The higher the score of the Primary Indicator (PI), the more concern a college or university would have with the individual. Add the total Mobilization Factors and then assign a risk level of low, moderate, or high based on the number of MFs present.

#### Risk Factors (RF): Score either 0 or 1.

- Hardened point of view/injustice collecting
- Marginalization and perceived discrimination
- Affiliation seeking
- Expressions of polarized thinking/ideology
- Cognitive bleakness
- Personal failure
- Societal disengagement
- Justification to violent action
- Predisposing characteristic
- TOTAL RISK FACTORS

#### Protective Factors (PF): Score either 0 or -1.

- Social connection
- Pluralistic inclusivity
- Non-violent outlets
- Social safety
- Emotional stability
- Professional/academic engagement
- Global competence
- Empathy
- Sense of identity
- Consequences of actions
- TOTAL PROTECTIVE FACTORS

#### PRIMARY INDICATOR (RF + PF)

Mobilization Factors (MF): Score either 0 (for not present) or 1 (for present) each, then label low (if 1–2 factors are present), moderate (if 3–5 factors exist), and high (if 6–10 factors are present).

- Direct threat
- Reactivity
- Escalation to action
- Catalyst event(s)
- Suicide
- Increased group pressure
- Access to lethal mean
- Narrowing on target
- Evaporating protective inhibitors
- Leakage
- TOTAL MOBILIZATION FACTORS

---
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### UNDERSTANDING THE SCORES

#### Mobilization Factors (MF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Indicator (PI)</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(-10, low)</td>
<td>(10, low)</td>
<td>(+10, high)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATALYST</td>
<td>EXTREMIST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANDARD</td>
<td>TEETERING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Catalyst**
Here, at the (+10, low) score, the individual has all the Risk Factors (RF) and no Protective Factors (PF), leading to a Primary Indicator (PI) score of +10. The Mobilization (M) score is in the low range. The concern is centered on the individual’s inertia and potential energy. An image here of an unlit bomb may be helpful to understand this category. The explosive is not lit, but the concern is present and awaiting a justification to movement toward an attack.

**Extremist**
Here, at the (+10, high) score, the individual in question has all the Risk Factors (RF) and no Protective Factors (PF), leading to a Primary Indicator (PI) score of +10. The Mobilization (M) score is in the high range. This represents an individual of extreme concern. This person presents all of the risk factors, no protective factors, and have a high score in justification to movement toward the attack.

**Standard**
Here, at the (-10, low) score, the individual has none of the Risk Factors (RF) and all the Protective Factors (PF), leading to a Primary Indicator (PI) score of -10. The Mobilization (M) score is in the low range. This individual presents a low risk in terms of correlating risk factors to previous extremist events, and lacks any movement toward violence.

**Teetering**
Here, at the (-10, high) score, the individual has none of the Risk Factors (RF) and all the Protective Factors (PF), leading to a Primary Indicator (PI) score of -10. The Mobilization (M) score is in the high range. This individual has a bleak life, thoughts of suicide, and an intense desire to be called to action. The lack of risk factors and presence of many protective factors keep this person from moving to violent action. There is, however, an external pressure that pushes against this scaffolding in this person’s life. The concern here becomes the escalation of risk factors or the deterioration of the scaffolding of protective factors.
Appendix Q: De-Escalation Decision Tree (D2T)
INTRODUCTION

Behavioral Intervention Team (BIT) members are in a position to make effective and lasting impacts on campus community members that present themselves as persons of concern (POC) who may harm themselves or others. Assisting POCs so that they may continue to be successful members of the campus community is at the heart of any BIT. There are times, however, when POCs can be better served away from campus and the community is safer when the POCs are removed from campus.

Making these difficult and at times life-altering decisions regarding a POC should be done with great care, grave consideration, and a certain degree of expertise. Dr. Brain Van Brunt (2015, New Orleans) refers to this decision process as a structured professional judgment (SPJ). If a BIT decision is brought into question, a well-trained BIT should be able to articulate and defend its actions and decision based on SPJ and best practices associated with the profession.

After several years of serving as an institution’s BIT Chair and advising other colleges and universities in the design and organization of their teams, the absence of two critical components — effective tool utilization and meeting flow — came to light. Identifying these common problems was the reasoning behind the development of the De-Escalation Decision Tree (D2T).

USING THE TOOLS

While many of the BITs observed understood the purpose of the tools mentioned above and they had a solid working knowledge of how to administer each, BITs were not fully using them. For example, it appears that most teams grasp the concept behind the NaBITA Threat Assessment Tool for conducting initial assessments for harm to self or harm to others. However, there was no consideration that a person of concern (POC) might need to be assessed on both sides of the tool, as in harm to self and/or harm to others. When pointed out to the teams that the POC might present on both sides of the assessment tool, thus complicating the intervention strategy, the groups reactions had somewhat of an ah-ha moment.

The same reaction occurred when it was pointed out that the BIT could and should use the NaBITA Threat Assessment Tool at a later date (after administering the prescribed intervention) to measure for de-escalation. This assessment might be used by the Case Management Coordinator to report back to the BIT on the progress of the POC or as a comparison analysis if the POC came to the attention of the BIT by way of a new and separate incident report. It was observed that the same problem existed with the use of the SIVRA-35. This tool might be used again by a Case Manager to determine if there appears to be some de-escalation with regard to harm to others.

While an initial assessment is just that, this assessment is critical to the overall behavior assessment and intervention operations of a BIT. Most of the POCs that come to the attention of the team will require a degree of ongoing care and assessment.
MEETING FLOW

Serving as Chair of a BIT and then discussing similar frustrations of other Chairs, it was apparent that many teams were operating with a brief-and-go meeting plan. That is, the BIT Chair would come to the meeting with an incident report, brief the team, and then make assignments for team members to go and gather data. This type of meeting leads to attendance and member buy-in problems. Members soon begin to question why they are needed at the table if the only person with information and doing the talking is the Chair.

Each team member should have the ability to gather basic data on a POC in their respective area. Members should have policy and practice experience, and “have the authority to take independent action when needed” (Van Brunt, Reese, and Lewis, 2015). Basic data should be brought to the BIT table during the initial discussion of a POC, not assigned out with an expected delivery at the next meeting. The NaBITA training video, A Window Into BIT offers a wonderful example of meeting flow. However, getting a BIT to this level of functionality requires training, guidance, and discipline. The Chair should understand that:

- BIT members do not come to the team understanding their roles and responsibilities. The BIT Chair should meet with new member individually to train them in the processes associated with behavior intervention and provide direction as to how they fit on the team.
- BIT members need continual guidance and encouragement. The BIT Chair should prompt each team member when a new case has been submitted for review. Using an electronic database such as Maxient, the BIT Chair should send messages by way of a Ping, alerting members to review a case and start gathering their particular set of pre-selected data for the meeting.
- BIT members have many other responsibilities at their institutions. It is the BIT Chair’s responsibility to assist team members when necessary and also to have the difficult conversations if specific members are not meeting their obligation to the team.

Meeting flow should always be respectful of the Three Phase Process, which is at the heart of a BIT: 1) gather and present data; 2) apply a rubric/analyze data; and (3) implement an appropriate intervention, as illustrated to the left.

c. Review of initial NaBITA Threat Assessment Tool (if applicable). 

2. Allow team members to deliver their set of pre-selected data (to be discussed later). 

3. Lead an assessment of the presented data against the NaBITA Threat Assessment Tool to determine if: 
   a. The POC is a threat of *harm to self*; and/or 
   b. The POC is a threat of *harm to others*; and if so, 
   c. What is the level of the threat? 

4. Lead a directed discussion to determine the recommended intervention tools and strategies. 

5. Make assignments of who is responsible for the application of the interventions. 

This three-phase process allows for efficient and effective meetings with the Core Members of the BIT, such as and in accordance with the 2014 NaBITA survey (Van Brunt, B., Reese, C., and Lewis, S. 2015): 

- Counseling (92 percent of teams). 
- Police/campus safety (88 percent of teams). 
- Deans of Students (75 percent of teams). 
- Student conduct (75 percent of teams; Note: Student conduct and Deans of Students are often the same person). 
- Housing and residential life (59 percent of teams). 
- Case Managers (20 percent, but a growing trend for larger campuses). 
- Human resources and/or academic administration (29 percent, but important for teams that take reports about staff and faculty as well). 

It should be noted that this is just the beginning of the BIT’s responsibility. The process described earlier applies to the initial reporting and assessment of a POC. Until such time as the BIT is comfortable with closing a case by way of a recommendation of the responsible member (i.e., Case Manager, Chair, or assigned member) and then by full agreement of the team, the *Three Phase Process* should be repeated at subsequent meetings. This is to include a new NaBITA Threat Assessment Tool rating each time. 

With an appreciation for the common problems associated with most teams and an understanding of the basics involved in a single meeting, BITs should consider using the De-Escalation Decision Tree to maximize their effectiveness. 

**The De-Escalation Decision Tree (D2T)** 

The D2T was designed to offer BIT members a directed methodology of gathering data, applying a rubric/analyzing the data, and then intervening with an appropriate action. By using the D2T, a BIT Chair can make the most effective use of the team’s time to pull all the pieces of a case together. Administered properly, the D2T takes into consideration information from the NaBITA Threat Assessment Tool (Sokolow, 2014), the Structured Interview for Violence Risk Assessment (SIVRA-35) (Van Brunt, 2014), and the Violence Risk Assessment of the Written Word (VRAW²) (Van Brunt, 2015), while also assimilating the myriad of resources and information offered by the institutional experts gathered around the BIT table. *(See next page.*)
As an incident report comes to the attention of the BIT Chair, the following should be taken into consideration:

1. How did it arrive (e.g., online form, telephone, email, personal communication)?
2. Is this an emergency or not? Can the discussion wait until the next regular BIT meeting?
3. What’s the status of the reporter (e.g., faculty, student, staff, other)?
4. What’s the status of the POC (e.g., faculty, student, staff, other)?
5. What does the NaBITA Threat Assessment Tool tell us?
   a) Harm to Self?
   b) Harm to Others?
   c) Neither?
      • If so, should this report be forwarded to another office?
      • Is this report about a current POC with the BIT?
      • Notification to BIT members to activate the processes associated with the D2T.

Each member of the BIT has specific responsibilities regarding what data to bring to the BIT table. As team members are delivering their reports, care should be taken not to interrupt the speakers except for a clarification-type of question. Other members may take notes, but should remain unemotional and non-judgmental at this time.

**MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES**

**BIT Chair:**
- Brief overview of the incident report (members should have already read the report).
- Cursory rating of the NaBITA Threat Assessment Tool (this is only a starting point based on the facts surrounding the incident report).
- Billing information from student accounts office to include financial aid.
  - The reported incident could be as simple as: “The POC is having difficulty paying the tuition bill and is frustrated. Working with the financial aid office to solve this problem may be all that is necessary.”

**Dean of Students (student conduct):**
- Case history of POC: academic and non-academic discipline, and BIT reports.
- Are there reoccurring themes of behavior or possibly escalating behaviors? Is the POC well known to the student conduct office?
- In any previous cases, what was the level of assessment using the NaBITA Tool? If a behavioral baseline has been established for this POC, is the currently reported behavior in line with the assessment baseline?

**Student Life/Greek Life:**
- Clubs and organization membership:
- Is the POC involved on campus?
- Does the organization have systemic problems?
- Is there a strong student leader or faculty advisor who may offer be a good mentor for the POC?
Police/Campus Safety:
- **Criminal history:**
  - Was the POC hired or admitted to the institution with a known criminal history? Could the same type of behavior be taking place now?
- **Police contact and reports:**
  - There may be a report with no charges of which only the police are aware. The POC may be a repeat witness to events; this may bring into question if the person is actually part of that problem. Has the POC been a recent victim of a crime?
- **Social Media:**
- Are posts by the POC dark or concerning? Do they have threatening statements or overtones? Who are the POC’s “friends” and what do they post? What groups, activities, etc., does the POC like? Are there writing on social media that could possibly be evaluated using the VARW²?

Housing and Residential Life:
- **Professional staff’s reflections on the latest face-to-face encounter** — upon receiving an incident report, it is important to have someone talk to the POC, even if it is a casual conversation.
- **Room condition** — Does residence life have a vehicle for conducting a room inspection?
  - Is the POC clean to the point of OCD? Is the room a health hazard? Are there pictures or posters of concern (e.g., depicting guns, death, or destruction)?
- **Roommates’ impression of the POC** — Care should be taken in obtaining this information.
- **Recent room changes:**
  - Does the POC have difficulty making friends? Is the POC intentionally creating a roommate conflict to drive others away to get a private room?
- **Recent maintenance requests:**
  - Are these request normal types of requests? Is there more than what would be considered normal wear and tear?

Case Manager:
- **If the POC is currently in the case management program,** the Case Management Coordinator should have a good bit of data to share.
- **Have goals been discussed and established with the POC?** If so, what is the progress?
- **The Case Manager could offer an additional SIVRA-35 assessment.**
- **The Case Manager could offer an additional NaBITA Threat Assessment Tool rating.**

Academic Affairs:
- **Review POC admission application.**
  - Did the POC check the box associated with a criminal history? Did the POC check the box noting having been suspended or expelled from another institution? Does the POC’s application and transcripts from other institutions match? Did the POC write in the space asking why the person wanted to attend your institution? Is there an admission essay, and if so, what does it say?
- **Academic history** (e.g., high school and college transcripts, and recent grades in past terms).
– Are current grades consistent with what should be normally expected? Are there
dips in grades with a return to normal (e.g., Did the POC withdraw from school for medical reasons? Did the POC receive Fs because the person should have withdrawn for medical, but did not)?

• Current class attendance, participation, and demeanor.
  – Is the POC attending? Was the person attending, but lately stopped? Does the POC take an active and constructive part in class discussions? Does the POC turn in assignments? What is the regular appearance and hygiene associated with the POC?

• Class disturbances addressed independently by the instructor.
  – Has the instructor had any unreported issues during class or possibly on-line with the POC?

Human Resources:
• If the POC is an employee, personnel files may indicate a criminal history, letters of correction or reprimand, letters of accommodation, complaints from others employees, appeals, or grievances filed.

Counseling:
• The team member from the counseling center most likely will not share any knowledge of a particular POC unless a release has been signed or there has been a public incident, such as suicide attempt in the resident halls. The counseling representative may be able to speak professionally to the public knowledge of an event.
• Counselors may also be able to share professional insight in a general sense, such as recalling a similar situation when working at another institution.
• Counselors may assist by educating the team about certain disorders that present in the POC based on observable behaviors being described by other team members at the meeting.

The BIT is looking for indicators of threat to self or threat to others, obviously. However, a review of the available data should also provide some insights as to conversation starters with the POC. There may not be enough data to make a threat determination, but understanding that the POC was having difficulty paying a tuition bill could provide an opportunity for the Dean of Students to speak with the POC and simply ask, “Did the university do a good job assisting you in a timely fashion with your financial aid situation?” This provides the opportunity to ask other customer service questions like, “How are other did move-in day go? Is your RA being helpful? How are classes going?”

During this conversation, an interviewer trained in the SIVRA-35 can direct the conversation through points of concern. Any window of opportunity to have a meaningful face-to-face conversation with a POC should be used.

Other data sources can be found through the institution’s Inner and Middle Circle BIT Members. Using the Watch List functionality offered through Maxient, the office of disability services, athletics, and Greek life can bring critical data to the BIT table during this first meeting on a particular POC. For instance, the team may discover though the office of disability services, that a military veteran suffering from PTSD or a traumatic brain injury (TBI) was not given extended time on an exam in math this past Wednesday morning, and that might be the reason the student verbally exploded on an 18-year-old student three
hours later. Having this information readily available through the Inner and Middle Circle BIT members can make all the difference in assessing threats and making appropriate interventions.

Each POC with an open case should be assigned a Case Manager of some type in following the D2Ts Recommendation to Refer and then Report Back to Team portions of the tool. This may be a formal Case Manager in the Case Management Program or a BIT member who will follow up with any requests and recommendations from the BIT. This could be the residence life team member who will check in on the POC for the next couple of weeks regarding roommate relations and conditions of the room.

Using the D2T to direct the flow of BIT meetings assists the team in remaining focused on the task at hand while using the appropriate assessment tools to their fullest. As team members have a greater understanding of their role and what data they can bring to the table, the BIT can act faster and more effectively in providing appropriate interventions. This will be a great help in getting the POC back on the pathway of success at the institution or in some instances, moving them to the appropriate off-campus situation for the needed attention and services.
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Introduction

The educational mission of Columbus State University holds many opportunities for intellectual and social development. A basic component of the educational mission embellishes expectations of acceptable behavior based on ethics and integrity necessary in a university community. The judicial affairs program at Columbus State exists to maintain discipline and decorum by augmenting the policies, procedures, and mission of the university. Judicial affairs contribute to the teaching of appropriate individual and group behavior, as well as protecting the campus community from disruption and harm.

Student discipline should be educationally directed towards personal growth as much as possible. Columbus State’s judicial program is conducted in ways that will serve to foster the ethical development and personal integrity of students and the promotion of an environment that is in accord with the overall academic mission of the institution. However, there are times when a student commits a violation, or series of violations, that it becomes necessary to remove them from the University community. In all cases, the institution should be diligent to ensure that the accused and the victim’s rights are protected and that University policy is followed.

The proceedings of all disciplinary hearings, investigations and findings are closed and will remain confidential within the disciplinary system. With exception to a need to know in order to perform assigned duties, all staff members involved in the judicial affairs process must refrain from discussing any and all details of disciplinary matters. Requests for information regarding a particular individual or the disposition of a hearing should be directed to the Dean of Students.

Columbus State University is not a sanctuary where students escape the responsibilities of good citizenship. Violations of civil and criminal laws will be referred to the appropriate law enforcement officials. The University will fully cooperate and assist all agencies in upholding local, state and federal laws. The University retains the right to impose sanctions independent of action taken by a regular court system if a student is accused of criminal misconduct on or off-campus, and during or between academic terms.

Columbus State University Mission Statement\textsuperscript{15}

We empower people to contribute to the advancement of our local and global communities through an emphasis on excellence in teaching and research, life-long learning, cultural enrichment, public-private partnerships, and service to others.

Student’s Rights and Responsibilities\textsuperscript{16}

Columbus State University exists to serve the higher education needs of those students who qualify for admission. The essence of higher education is found in the unhampered freedom to study, investigate, write, speak and debate on any aspect or issue of life. In attempting to achieve that unhampered freedom, the students acquire certain fundamental rights and responsibilities. These rights and responsibilities are considered an integral part of the educational process at Columbus State University. Any additional rights or responsibilities may be promulgated under established procedures during the school year as required for the general well-being of the student body and University. A student is expected to follow these rules and the University is expected to enforce them. At the same time, the University is expected to acknowledge the student’s rights stated herein and respect the student’s autonomy in these areas.

Unfamiliarity is not an excuse for infractions of the regulations. Knowledge of the regulations, on the other hand, can help the student use their rights to the fullest and avoid having others infringe on these rights.

Due Process

The Due Process Clause of the federal Constitution prohibits the government from depriving an individual of life, liberty, or property without certain procedural protections. The minimum requirements for due process were established by Dixon v. Alabama State Board of Education\textsuperscript{17} which said, [1] notice of the alleged charges of misconduct, and [2] opportunity to be heard by an appropriate hearing officer. This was reaffirmed in Willis v. Texas Tech Univ. Health Sciences Center, when the court stated, “[S]tudents who are subject to discipline by a public institution are entitled to [1] notice of the charges, [2] an explanation of the evidence supporting the charges, and [3] an opportunity to tell their side of the story” \textsuperscript{18}

\textsuperscript{15} Columbus State University, Strategic Plan. https://www.columbusstate.edu/strategicplan/index.php
\textsuperscript{16} Columbus State University Student Handbook
\textsuperscript{17} Dixon v. Alabama State Board of Education, 294 F.2d 150 (5th Cir.1961).
**Required Due Process for Non-Academic Misconduct**

Minimum requirements for an administrative hearing consist of:
1. The student being given written notice of the alleged violation(s),
2. The student being given a written explanation of the alleged violation(s) and
3. The student being given an opportunity to be heard by an appropriate Hearing Officer, which may be written.

**Definition of Terms**

- **Accused** – The individual named on the hearing notice as having allegedly violated university policy.
- **Appeal** – Action taken by an individual, after being found responsible of violating a university policy, that questions the sanctions imposed, the procedure applied, or offers new evidence not previously available.
- **Disposition Letter** – Notice given to an individual stating the findings of the hearing officer and listing sanctions, if any.
- **FERPA** – The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974, commonly referred to as the Buckley Amendment, protects the rights of students by controlling the creation, maintenance, and access to educational records. It guarantees students access to their academic records while prohibiting unauthorized access by others.
- **Guest** – Persons who are allowed to observe the proceedings of a hearing at the discretion of the dean of students. This may include parents of students who are involved, interested members of the campus community, or a lawyer of a student involved. The hearing officer may excuse a guest at any time without cause.
- **Hearing Advisor** - A current student or member of the faculty or staff. The hearing advisor does not represent the student and is only at the hearing to offer advice and to ensure that a fair hearing occurs.
- **Hearing Officer** - A Columbus State University faculty or staff member who is duly appointed to hear the facts of a matter, make a decision, and issue sanctions when appropriate.
- **Hearing Notice** – Letter given to an individual who is being charged with violating institutional policy.
- **Incident Report** - A record of an event that occurred.
- **Victim** – Individual(s), organization(s), or the university who has or will suffer loss due to the alleged violation.
- **Waiver of Hearing Letter** – A letter from the accused addressed to the appropriate hearing officer in which the accused forfeits their right for a hearing, enters a plea of guilty as charged, and accepts the sanctions outlined in the letter.

---

19 Columbus State University, Student Handbook
20 Hearing Officer is defined as any individual given the authority to render a decision which results in a sanction for misconduct.
Hearing Administrators and Officers
A student being called before a judicial body can be both a daunting and emotional experience. It is the responsibility of the hearing officer to provide an atmosphere that is professional, free of prejudice and bias, open to the facts and testimony of all witnesses, and is respectful to all parties before, during, and after the proceedings. A hearing officer is defined as a Columbus State University faculty or staff member who is duly appointed to hear the facts of a matter, make a decision, and issue sanctions when appropriate.

In the event that a hearing officer is directly involved as a witness to an incident, they should refer the hearing responsibilities to another qualified hearing officer for adjudication. This provides for impartial decision-making in the judicial process.22

Vice President for Student Affairs
The vice president for student affairs (VPSA) is the final authority for non-academic behavioral related issues.23 The VPSA will receive disciplinary appeal requests from decisions made by the dean of students.

Dean of Students
The authority and responsibility to act on social and disciplinary matters is vested with the dean of students and may extend beyond the physical boundaries of the University. The dean of students will receive disciplinary appeal requests from decisions made by the assistant dean of students.

The dean of students will act as the hearing officer for incidents that involve: 1) any evidence of drug possession or use, 2) physical assault or threatening behavior, 3) weapons, 4) violations of civil or criminal law, 5) behavior as reported by faculty and staff, or 6) as requested by the assistant dean of students.

Assistant Dean of Students
The assistant dean of students works under the authority of the dean of students and acts as the primary investigator in most cases. The assistant dean of students may act on all judicial matters as directed by the dean of students, or act in the absence of the dean of students, as

---

23 While the VPSA acts on the President’s behalf in most appeals, it is understood that the University President is the final authority in all matters related appeals as stated in BOR Policy 4.6.5.3 Appeals and found at http://www.usg.edu/policymanual/section4/C332/#p4.6.5_standards_for_institutional_student_conduct_investigation
directed by the VPSA. The assistant dean of students will receive disciplinary appeal requests from decisions made by the director of residence life

**Director of Residence Life**

Violations that occur in areas designated as residence life may be handled as an administrative hearing through the office of the director of residence life, in accordance with Columbus State Residence Life Policy, and in cooperation with the dean of students. The director of residence life may designate a senior member of the residence life staff to serve as the administrator for residence life judicial affairs. With exception to the incidents listed under the dean of students, the director of residence life has the authority to act on alleged violations of the Residence Life Handbook or Student Handbook. The director of residence life, or the designee, will receive disciplinary appeal requests from decisions made by residence life coordinators.

**Residence Life Coordinators**

Residence life coordinators may be directed to act as a hearing officer. Residence life coordinators may only issue sanctions that are listed in the Residence Life Handbook. A residence life coordinator may not evict a resident or issue sanctions that suspend or remove a resident’s rights. However, they may recommend these sanctions to the director of residence life.

**Title IX Coordinator**

The Title IX Coordinator is the senior administrator on campus for tracking and monitoring incidents, including sex discrimination and sexual; ensuring that the University responds effectively to each complaint; and where appropriate, conducting investigations of particular situations. Deputy Coordinators are appointed by the Title IX Coordinator and assist the Coordinator, as requested.

**Title IX Investigator**

The Title IX Investigator is an individual who has received specific training to interview the complainant, respondent, and witnesses when a sexual misconduct report has been filed.

**Hearing Panel**

The hearing panel is group of faculty, staff, and students specifically trained to hear cases related to non-academic misconduct. This panel is also responsible for hearing cases related to sexual misconduct (no student shall sit on the panel involving sexual misconduct).
**Hearing Procedure**

Since educational institutions have the responsibility for protecting the educational purposes for which they exist, each institution is charged with implementing safeguards to insure that those charged with violations of institutional standards on scholarship and behavior are accorded equal protection from unfair disciplinary measures. These safeguards must incorporate, as a minimum, the Board of Regents policy of 4.6.5 Standards for Institutional Student Conduct Investigation and Disciplinary Proceedings. The procedures for Columbus State University can be found in the Student Handbook.

**Hearing Decorum**

A student’s appearance before a judicial officer or panel to answer charges of violating institutional policy is a serious matter. It is also a very instructive format for educating students how to represent themselves in formal settings and to authority figures. The demeanor that a hearing officer exhibits, as well as the atmosphere in which the hearing is conducted, is as much a part of the educational process at Columbus State University as any academic opportunity the student will encounter.

The following is a list of guidelines that are expected levels of professional behavior for hearing officers during a disciplinary hearing.

- Maintain a calm and directed atmosphere. Explain the entire process to the accused before the hearing begins.
- Dress appropriately for the position of hearing officer.
- Use language that is appropriate to an office/professional setting.
- Listen intently to all that bring testimony, avoid interrupting except for points of clarification.
- Do not allow argumentative conversation or testimony. This includes the hearing officer and panel members who may try to argue with a witness.
- Ensure that the policies, procedures, and practices of the University are administered without prejudice or favoritism.
- Keep all participants of the hearing on task.
- Instruct individuals providing testimony to direct all remarks to the hearing officer.
- Instruct hearing advisor(s) that their comments should be directed through the student they are advising.

---

24 4.6.5 Standards for Institutional Student Conduct Investigation and Disciplinary Proceedings found at: [http://www.usg.edu/policymanual/section4/C332/#p4.6.5_standards_for_institutional_student_conduct_investigation](http://www.usg.edu/policymanual/section4/C332/#p4.6.5_standards_for_institutional_student_conduct_investigation)
- Instruct all guests that their presence is a courtesy and they are not to speak or draw attention in any way. Doing so may cause them to be removed from the hearing.

- Adhere to the guidelines and paperwork established for judicial procedures.

- A hearing officer is not to offer personal growth instructions to the involved parties, such that has been referred to as the **mama or daddy talk**. Hearing officers are to determine facts, determine findings, and recommend sanctions. At the conclusion of the hearing, if appropriate, the dean of students may have the conversation generally referred to as the **dean talk**, where they may offer personal growth instructions. This should center mostly on policy, procedure, and available services (such as the Counseling and Writing Centers).

### Reports and Letters

The letters and reports generated when an incident occurs is the official record of the event and the institution’s response to that event. Every file should have a minimum of four documents; 1) incident report, 2) hearing notice, 3) hearing worksheet, and 4) disposition letter. There may be additional documents in an individual’s file such as: police reports, pictures, witness statements, etc., however, it should be understood that once a document is entered into a student’s file it becomes a permanent part of that record.

Student conduct records are to be kept five (5) years after graduation or date of last attendance, but at least 1 year after final notice to Immigration and Naturalization Service. 25. Disciplinary records are protected *educational records* under FERPA. Thus, staff members who have access to these records and responsibility for administering judicial affairs should review and understand the laws and regulations associated. All electronic and hard copies of discipline records are housed by the dean of students in the student affairs office. Staff members that have been granted access will have view rights of these records at https://cm.maxient.com/colstate.

### Incident Reports

An incident report is the official record of an event that occurred.

- Incident reports are filed by employees or students of the university.
- An incident report may also include a written statement from a witness, however, witness statements cannot be filed without an incident report.

---

• All efforts should be made not to interject emotional statements or make assumptions as to what an individual was thinking or feeling at the time of the incident.
• The author of the incident report should be careful to note what observable behavior(s) they actually witnessed and/or what was related to them on a first-hand basis by others.
• Refer to the Student Handbook or Residence Life Handbook for descriptions of the alleged violation. Whenever possible, the alleged violation(s) should be included as a part of the incident report.
• Include all witnesses’ names, address, telephone number, and written statements, if possible.

**Notice of Investigation**
When it has been determined by the appropriate institutional conduct officer that a violation of the student conduct code may have occurred, this conduct officer should issue a Notice of Investigation letter to the involved party(s). The alleged victim and respondent shall be provided with written notice of the complaint/allegations, pending investigation, possible charges, possible sanctions, and available support services. The notice should also include the identity of any investigator(s) involved. Notice should be provided via institution email to the address on file.

**Hearing Notice**
A hearing notice is a letter given to an individual who is being charged with violating institutional policy. The author of this letter is determined by the nature of the alleged infraction.

• A Hearing Notice should be delivered electronically through Maxient. It may also be delivered via CSU email, registered U.S. Mail, or hand delivery with a signed receipt. Proof of attempt to deliver should be placed in the student’s file (copy of receipt, copy of email).
• Copies of incident reports, police reports, pictures, and other documents should be made available to the student prior to the hearing, giving full disclosure of all reports and evidence to student(s) accused of violating Student Conduct Standards and Non-Academic Violations.
• A hearing officer may issue an administrative directive within the hearing notice. These may limit a student’s participation in activities, restrict their movements on campus, or other directives needed to ensure safety and order while the accused prepares for their hearing.
• The dean of students has the authority to protect the identity of witnesses in some cases. If a hearing officer feels a problem may occur if the accused has knowledge of the names of witnesses, they may request that the dean of students withhold these names.
Hearing Worksheet

A hearing worksheet can be from an informal or formal hearing. This is considered the official record of a student judicial hearing having occurred. This is the document used on which all parties sign-in, the charges are listed, the accused places their initials on the blank line at the completion of each step of the hearing process, and the findings and sanction(s) are handwritten by the hearing officer.

When the hearing is completed, the hearing worksheet is to be scanned into the student’s file. Examples of hearing worksheets can be found in the Maxient data base under Letters.

Letter of Disposition

A letter of disposition is a letter given to an individual stating the findings of the hearing officer and listing sanctions, if any. This letter is issued at the completion of a hearing with efforts made to deliver it to the student within 24 hours of the hearing officer’s decision. This letter will include; 1) the original charges, 2) the findings of each charge and, 3) the sanctions issued. All sanctions should be referenced to the Sanctions and Remedies section of the Student Handbook. If a student is found not to be in violation of university policy after a formal or informal hearing, a letter of disposition should be filed indicating these findings (see the Maxient data base and look under Letters).

Judicial Appeal Procedure

The ability to appeal a judicial ruling is a fundamental right that will be afforded to students at Columbus State University. The University will entertain appeals from students that have been suspended, expelled, removed from housing, or removed from class or forced to withdraw from the course and/or department. Victims in a sexual misconduct case are also afforded the same appeal process. Other cases may be reviewed in regard to policy and procedural accuracy upon the request from the student. Appeals based solely on the assertion of innocence will not be considered. A full description of the appeals process can be found in the Student Handbook.

Appeals of the hearing officer’s decision must be presented in writing and may be requested under the following circumstances:

---
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1. A request to introduce new and compelling evidence which was not available at the time of a hearing and which could apparently result in a different final decision;
2. The specific citation of a violation of due process as it is defined in this policy;
3. The documentable failure of the decision to comply with specific Columbus State University or University System of Georgia policies;
4. The documentable error of facts substantial enough to apparently result in a different final decision; or
5. A mercy appeal requesting a less severe sanction.

Sanctions and Remedies

In determining the severity of sanctions or corrective actions the following will be considered:
1. The frequency, severity, and/or nature of the offense,
2. History of past conduct,
3. Offender’s willingness to accept responsibility,
4. Previous institutional response to similar conduct,
5. Strength of the evidence, and
6. Wellbeing of the University community.

The student conduct panel or hearing officer will determine sanctions and issue notice of the same, as outlined above. The broad range of sanctions includes:

1. Expulsion – permanent forced withdrawal from the university;
2. Suspension for an identified time frame and/or until the satisfaction of certain conditions;
3. Temporary or permanent separation of the parties (e.g., change in classes, reassignment of residence, no contact orders, limiting geography of where parties can go on campus) with additional sanctions for violating orders;
4. Required participation in sensitivity training/awareness education programs;
5. Required participation in alcohol and other drug awareness and abuse prevention programs;
6. Referral, such as but not limited to counseling, evaluation, treatment, or mentoring;
7. Volunteering/community service;
8. Loss of institutional privileges;
9. Delays in obtaining administrative services and benefits from the institution (e.g., holding transcripts, delaying registration, graduation, diplomas);
10. Additional academic requirements relating to scholarly work or research;
11. Forced withdrawal from a course and/or department within which the offense occurred, either with or without credit for the course, as may be adjudged;
12. Financial restitution or fees, which may be associated with specific violations; or
13. Any other discretionary sanctions directly related to the violation or conduct.

Special Notes:
1. Interim measures may be provided by the institution at any point during an investigation and should be designed to protect the alleged victim and the community. To the extent interim measures are imposed, they should minimize the
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burden on both the alleged victim and the respondent, where feasible. Interim measures may include, but are not limited to:

a. Change of housing assignment;
b. Issuance of a “no contact” directive;
c. Restrictions or bars to entering certain institution property;
d. Changes to academic or employment arrangements, schedules, or supervision; Interim suspension; and
e. Other measures designed to promote the safety and well-being of the parties and the institution’s community.

An interim suspension should only occur where necessary to maintain safety and should be limited to those situations where the respondent poses a serious and immediate danger or threat to persons or property. In making such an assessment, the institution should consider the existence of a significant risk to the health or safety of the alleged victim or the campus community; the nature, duration, and severity of the risk; the probability of potential injury; and whether less restrictive means can be used to significantly mitigate the risk.

* Before an interim suspension is issued, the institution must make all reasonable efforts to give the respondent the opportunity to be heard on whether his or her presence on campus poses a danger. If an interim suspension is issued, the terms of the suspension take effect immediately. Upon request, the respondent will have an opportunity to be heard by the respective conduct officer, Title IX Coordinator, or System Director, as appropriate, within three business days in order to determine whether the interim suspension should continue.

2. A person suspended or expelled is prohibited from entering the facilities or property of Columbus State University or the Columbus State Foundation except for the pursuit of due process.

3. Students who are suspended or expelled for disciplinary reasons or those who leave the University when disciplinary action is pending will receive a WF.

4. Students who are suspended or expelled from Columbus State University for disciplinary reasons may be held responsible for all tuition, fees, housing and meal charges, as defined by Residence Life and Business Office policies.

**NOTE:** At the discretion of the dean of students, sanctions imposed by a court system may be substituted for institutional sanctions. However, it must be understood that the University should “still ascertain that the conviction [had] a detrimental impact on the campus, and the affected student should have the opportunity to make a contrary showing.”

---

In addition, the University reserves the right to address conduct “that occurs off campus, particularly [but not limited to] if the misconduct also violates criminal law and the institution can demonstrate that the restrictions are directly related to its educational mission or the campus community’s welfare (Krasnow v. Virginia Polytechnic Institute, 551 F.2d 591 (4th Cir. 1977); Wallace v. Florida A&M University, 433 So. 2d 600 (Fla. Dist. Ct. App. 1983)).”

---

The Columbus State University, Behavioral Assessment and Recommendation Team Policies and Procedures Manual is openly shared with other colleges and universities as a model document. Each institution is encouraged to vet it appropriately and make the necessary changes for their particular institution. The following citation would be appreciated.