

Old Dominion University

ODU Digital Commons

Educational Foundations & Leadership Theses
& Dissertations

Educational Foundations & Leadership

Fall 2019

Community College Presidents' Perspectives on Campus Safety

Chad Christopher Sartini

Old Dominion University, sartinic@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/efl_etds



Part of the [Community College Education Administration Commons](#), [Community College Leadership Commons](#), and the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Sartini, Chad C.. "Community College Presidents' Perspectives on Campus Safety" (2019). Doctor of Philosophy (PhD), Dissertation, Educ Foundations & Leadership, Old Dominion University, DOI: 10.25777/epzh-4553

https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/efl_etds/216

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Educational Foundations & Leadership at ODU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Educational Foundations & Leadership Theses & Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ODU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@odu.edu.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENTS' PERSPECTIVES ON CAMPUS SAFETY

by

Chad Christopher Sartini
B.A. June 1997, Washington and Lee University
M.A. October 2004, Teachers College, Columbia University

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of
Old Dominion University in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEADERSHIP

OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY
December 2019

Approved by:

Dennis E. Gregory (Director)

Shana Pribesh (Member)

Mitchell R. Williams (Member)

ABSTRACT

COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENTS' PERSPECTIVES ON CAMPUS SAFETY

Chad Christopher Sartini
Old Dominion University, 2019
Director: Dr. Dennis E. Gregory

This study addressed the phenomenon of campus safety from the perspective of the community college president. The researcher employed a mixed methods design by surveying the community college presidents of one state community college system followed by in-depth interviews of three of the presidents of the same community college system. The quantitative inquiry used descriptive statistics to detail community college presidents' knowledge and perceptions of campus safety. The qualitative inquiry employed case study analysis through in-depth interviews to develop a deeper understanding of the relationship between community college presidents and the phenomenon of campus safety.

The results of the study showed that community college presidents believe that their respective institutions are safe and that campus safety is an important issue in higher education. Additionally, the results indicated that community college presidents believe being proactive, reinforcing the values that promote safety, prioritizing campus safety, complying with safety protocols, policies, and regulations, and having adequate resources are crucial to ensuring campus safety. The researcher concluded that while community college presidents deem their institutions to be safe, they are concerned with promoting and maintaining safe institutions in the face of inadequate funding and resources.

I would like to dedicate this dissertation to my parents, Bonnie and Tony Sartini, who have supported me in all of my academic pursuits. I would also like to extend a special thank you to Lori Baker, Dean of Student Services, my former boss and one of the finest leaders I know, and the staff members of the Financial Aid, Veterans' Affairs, and Records Offices at Virginia Western Community College who supported me and allowed me the time necessary to complete this program.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my director, my committee members, my peers, and especially my family and friends for their support, patience, and guidance on this journey.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| LIST OF TABLES | vii |
| Chapter | |
| I. INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM | 1 |
| STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM | 4 |
| PURPOSE OF THE STUDY | 5 |
| RESEARCH QUESTIONS..... | 5 |
| CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK..... | 6 |
| METHODOLOGY | 7 |
| SIGNIFICANCE OF STUDY..... | 8 |
| DELIMITATIONS..... | 9 |
| ASSUMPTIONS | 9 |
| DEFINITIONS OF TERMS..... | 10 |
| ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY | 11 |
| II. LITERATURE REVIEW..... | 12 |
| CAMPUS SAFETY STATISTICS | 12 |
| THE <i>CLERY ACT</i> | 14 |
| THE IMPACT OF <i>CLERY</i> | 16 |
| STUDENT PERCEPTIONS | 18 |
| FACULTY, STAFF, AND ADMINISTRATOR PERCEPTIONS | 21 |
| CRISIS PREPARATION AND THREAT ASSESSMENT..... | 24 |
| LEGAL ISSUES..... | 26 |
| STUDENT HEALTH AND PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING | 28 |
| CONCLUSION | 30 |
| III. METHODOLOGY | 32 |
| RESEARCH DESIGN | 32 |
| RESEARCH QUESTIONS..... | 32 |
| ROLE OF THE RESEARCHER..... | 33 |
| PARTICIPANTS..... | 34 |
| DATA COLLECTION MEASURES | 36 |
| DATA ANALYSIS | 38 |
| TRUSTWORTHINESS..... | 39 |
| ETHICAL ISSUES..... | 40 |
| LIMITATIONS | 41 |
| SUMMARY | 41 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| IV. RESULTS | 42 |
| PARTICIPANT PROFILE SUMMARY | 42 |
| RESEARCH QUESTIONS | 43 |
| RESEARCH QUESTION ONE RESULTS..... | 44 |
| RESEARCH QUESTION TWO RESULTS..... | 47 |
| RESEARCH QUESTION THREE RESULTS..... | 54 |
| RESEARCH QUESTION FOUR RESULTS | 58 |
| RESEARCH QUESTION FIVE RESULTS..... | 62 |
| SUMMARY | 65 |
| V. DISCUSSION, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS..... | 67 |
| SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS..... | 68 |
| INTERPRETATION OF THE FINDINGS | 74 |
| IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY..... | 78 |
| RECOMMENDATIONS | 79 |
| CONCLUSIONS..... | 82 |
| REFERENCES | 84 |
| APPENDICES | |
| A. SURVEY INSTRUMENT..... | 91 |
| B. RESEARCH PARTICIPANT INFORMATION AND CONSENT FORM: SURVEY .. | 95 |
| C. INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT..... | 99 |
| D. RESEARCH PARTICIPANT INFORMATION AND CONSENT FORM: INTERVIEW | |
| | 101 |
| E. HUMAN SUBJECTS EXEMPTION | 105 |
| VITA..... | 106 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | Page |
|--|------|
| 1. Display of Themes Addressing Research Question 1..... | 45 |
| 2. Display of Themes Addressing Research Question 2..... | 51 |
| 3. Display of Themes Addressing Research Question 3..... | 56 |
| 4. Display of Themes Addressing Research Question 4..... | 60 |
| 5. Display of Themes Addressing Research Question 5..... | 64 |
| 6. Summary of the Study Results..... | 69 |

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Campus safety is an ongoing concern for institutions of higher education. It affects students (current and prospective), faculty and staff, administration, campus law enforcement personnel, and the entire community. It can affect an institution's financial stability through a decline in enrollment due to a reputation of being unsafe or through legal action brought by a student victim or a victim's family against the college or university. Moreover, it may "be seen as an issue that destabilizes the core principles of higher education itself" (Jennings, Gover, & Pudrzynska, 2007). That it took a heinous criminal incident perpetrated against a student, Jeanne Clery, at Lehigh University in 1986 and the resulting campaign by her parents, Connie and Howard Clery, to bring campus crime and safety to the forefront of national social issues is of interest.

Background of the Problem

The history of campus crime and safety at colleges and universities in the United States begins with the colonial era. According to Sloan and Fisher (2011) higher education began in New England and Virginia with nine colleges established prior to the Revolution. Most early colleges were all male and religiously affiliated. College faculty and administrators controlled all aspects of students' lives with strict schedules, rules, and discipline. Still, in this strict environment documented accounts from the historical record show numerous examples of deviant or criminal behavior ranging from hazing and drunkenness to assault and murder. College administrators during this period attributed such behaviors and criminal activity to the breakdown of the institution's discipline system (Sloan & Fisher, 2011).

During the 19th century, the number of colleges and universities in the United States grew as the nation grew in both population and geography. More students enrolled in more colleges and universities, naturally, meant more examples of deviant and criminal behavior. Historical records and media accounts show that such student behavior in the 19th century included drunkenness, gambling, sexual promiscuity and crimes like the murder of a University of Virginia professor by a student (Sloan & Fisher, 2011). Sloan and Fisher also point to student behavior issues related to the close living quarters and poor conditions of dormitories that led to, or were linked to, both violent student protests and rebellions and the on-campus murders of students and faculty members at numerous colleges and universities.

Deviant and criminal behavior on college and university campuses continued into the 20th century. Drunkenness and its resulting behavior was the order of the day for college students from the turn of the 20th century into the 1920s. According to Sloan and Fisher (2011), this time period also saw the emergence of issues regarding male and female relationships that continued into the 1930s and led *Fortune* magazine to write an investigative report on sex on campus in 1936. A 1938 study of students at 46 colleges and universities found one-half of college men and one-quarter of college women had premarital sex while in college (Sloan & Fisher, 2011). So, by the end of the 1930s college students continued to build upon their reputation for heavy and frequent drinking and sexual promiscuity.

The 1940s seem to be exception to the rule in the 19th century timeline of deviant and criminal student behavior in the 20th century. Due to enlistment in the armed services for World War II, college enrollment fell dramatically but quickly increased as service members returned from the war. Sloan and Fisher (2011) described the students of the 1940s who enrolled in college after returning from war as older, mature, married with children, focused, and studious.

These veteran students “wanted to finish their education quickly, improve their economic prospects, and move on with their lives” (Sloan & Fisher, 2011, p. 19). The GI Bill (Servicemen’s Readjustment Act, 1944) gave veterans the financial ability to improve economically and to move on. Moreover, the discipline these students learned in the armed forces in a time of war arguably contributed to their focus and studiousness. In short, the veteran students of the 1940s were too focused, studious, and mature to take part in deviant or criminal behavior while in college.

In the 1950s students returned to patterns of deviant and criminal behavior especially regarding male and female relationships. One of the most widespread behaviors of this decade was the panty raid, which grew to such proportions that colleges reported thousands of dollars of damage to campus housing. Local police arrested perpetrators who were removing undergarments from women wearing them (Sloan & Fisher, 2011). Certainly, panty raids and, particularly, the latter example above would be defined as sexual assault today. Issues with sexual promiscuity also continued as the 1950s marked the advent of spring break week where alcohol-fueled sexual encounters were the norm (Sloan & Fisher, 2011).

Student protests and demonstrations regarding civil rights and the war in Vietnam marked the decades of the 1960s and 1970s with regard to deviant and criminal behavior on college campuses. Protests and demonstrations took place on college and university campuses across the country. Some protests and demonstrations ended in violence and even death as students came toe-to-toe with local police or even National Guard soldiers. Further, the “free love” movement of the 60s continued into the 70s and led to even greater problems in male and female relationships on campus. As Sloan and Fisher (2011) state, “college campuses during most of the 20th century continued to experience levels of violence, vice, and victimization similar to

what their counterparts of previous eras encountered” (p. 23). Certain themes run through this brief history of deviant and criminal behavior on college campuses: excessive consumption of alcohol, strained relationships between males and females, and group demonstrations or protests.

It was not until the 1980s and 1990s, however, that society’s perceptions about deviant and criminal behavior on college and university campuses began to change (Sloan & Fisher, 2011). With the rape and murder of Jeanne Clery in 1986, a new social movement addressing campus crime and safety began. Media coverage of crime on college and university campuses intensified bringing the issue of campus crime directly into the homes of the average American citizen. From the 80s and 90s through today, colleges and universities find themselves on the receiving end of unflattering, and even damning, media coverage (Goldberg, 1997; Gross & Fine, 1990; Solomon, 1988).

Statement of the Problem

Community colleges are not immune from campus safety issues, as the October 1, 2015 mass shooting at Umpqua Community College illustrates (Sidner, Lah, Almas, & Ellis, 2015). Although sensational violent events like the mass shooting at Umpqua Community College garner significant amounts of national press coverage across the nation, such events are not the norm. Still, community college administrators must be aware of and deal with a spectrum of campus safety issues that include both nonviolent and violent crimes. During a conversation with graduate students and faculty at Old Dominion University in 2017, Walter Bumphus, President and Chief Executive Officer of the American Association of Community Colleges, named the safety and security of community college campuses as one of the top challenges currently facing community college leaders. Moreover, compliance with federal campus safety

laws and regulations has a direct impact on both an institution's finances through fines and its reputation through negative publicity.

Much of the research on campus safety addresses the campus constituencies most directly affected or involved in its daily operations. These constituencies include students, faculty, and other institutional personnel like student services administrators and staff or campus safety officers (Baker & Boland, 2011; Chekwa, Thomas, & Jones, 2013; Janosik & Gregory, 2003a, 2009b; Patton & Gregory, 2014). A review of the literature revealed a dearth of research addressing the knowledge and perceptions of college and university presidents about campus safety. The American Council of Education (2012) recognized that even though college and university presidents may not have direct involvement in the oversight of campus safety matters and regulatory compliance, college and university presidents ultimately may be held responsible. The potential negative legal, financial, and professional ramifications of a lack of knowledge about campus safety, make it a topic of importance to community college presidents.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to research community college presidents' perceptions of the phenomenon of campus safety. Community college presidents must be knowledgeable about a variety of topics that affect the operations of an institution. Campus safety is one such topic. This study expands the body of research on campus safety by including community college presidents as one of the groups affected by campus safety issues, thus, creating a more thorough understanding of the phenomenon of campus safety.

Research Questions

The study addressed the following research questions:

1. What are community college presidents' experiences with issues pertaining to campus safety?
2. What are community college presidents' perceptions of safety on their individual campuses?
3. What do community college presidents believe their role to be in campus safety?
4. What are community college presidents' perceptions of campus safety as an issue of importance in higher education?
5. What level of knowledge do community college presidents have of laws pertaining to campus safety?

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework guiding this study is Heifetz's (1994) approach to ethical leadership. Heifetz's approach to ethical leadership entails a leader using authority to help followers work through challenging problems (Northouse, 2013). Heifetz's approach places the community college president in the position to mobilize his or her followers in a supportive context to confront difficult issues (Northouse, 2013). Campus safety is a potentially difficult issue, particularly as addressing campus safety issues often requires significant appropriation of funds, whether it be funds for improving the physical safety of campus through better lighting or the implementation of an emergency alert system, or funds for increasing the number of campus police or safety officers. Funds spent on campus safety initiatives are funds that may otherwise be used to enhance academic programs or student support services or to hire additional faculty or student support services staff. In the current atmosphere of decreased state funding for community colleges, every dollar counts and the decision to fund one initiative over another poses an ethical dilemma for community college presidents.

In 2004, The American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) surveyed the participants of its 2004 leadership summits and the members of the Leading Forward National Advisory Panel. From this survey, the AACC (2005) published *Competencies for Community College Leaders*. The results listed collaboration as one of the 6 main competencies for community college leaders. According to the AACC (2005), collaboration entails managing conflict and change through developing teamwork and cooperation. Collaboration in this context fits naturally into Heifetz's approach to ethical leadership.

Resource management is another of the six AACC competencies, and the authors suggested community college leaders must manage institutional resources in a manner "consistent with the college master plan and local, state, and national policies" (AACC, 2005, p.4). In a study of community college presidents' views of ethical leadership and decision making, Garza Mitchell (2012) found resource management as the critical decision making issue cited most by community college presidents. In an environment of decreased state funding for higher education, resource management is even more critical, and a community college president's ethical leadership plays an important role in how resource management decisions are collaboratively determined. With unfunded federal mandates to ensure campus safety and the potential negative fiscal impact of regulatory noncompliance or legal findings of negligence, campus safety becomes an important variable in the resource management discussion.

Methodology

To learn about community college presidents' knowledge and perceptions of campus safety, the researcher used both quantitative and qualitative research methods. This mixed methods study used descriptive statistics to detail community college presidents' knowledge and perceptions of campus safety. Following the quantitative inquiry, the study focused on three

cases and employed case study analysis to develop a deeper understanding of the relationship between community college presidents and the phenomenon of campus safety.

Significance of Study

Community college presidents face myriad decisions each day. Deciding how to allocate financial resources is one of those decisions. Decisions regarding appropriation of funds may be especially challenging in the current environment of decreased state funding for higher education. Since 1986, inflation adjusted state spending per college student (two- and four-year public institutions) has declined 22% (Kelly & Carey, 2013). In Virginia, state spending for higher education declined 21% since its peak in 2007, prior to the 2008 recession (Hiltonsmith & Huelsman, 2014). This means that community college presidents must find ways to manage institutional budgets and maintain academic standards and the institutional mission in the face of declining resources from the state. Allocating funds in one area means not allocating funds in another area. The results of this study may assist community college presidents in better understanding the phenomenon of campus safety and deciding how limited funds may be allocated to ensure the safety of students, faculty, staff, and visitors on their campuses.

Campus safety, likely, is not an expressed tenet of an individual community college's mission statement. Providing a safe environment in which students may learn, grow, and succeed, in which faculty may teach, in which staff and administrator may work, and community members may visit is inherent in the historical open access mission of community colleges in the United States. As such, campus safety is a critical issue about which community college presidents should be knowledgeable. This study is significant because it offers current community college presidents' perspectives on this critical issue.

Delimitations

This study focuses on the knowledge and perceptions of community college presidents regarding campus safety. For the initial survey, each of the 23 presidents in the Virginia Community College System received the questionnaire, so the sample will be comprehensive in that the initial survey will include all community college presidents in the Commonwealth. Comprehensive sampling is the most representative of the purposeful sampling methods since the entire group established by set criteria (all community college presidents in Virginia) is selected (Hays & Singh, 2012). Still, the twenty-three community college presidents in Virginia cannot be assumed to represent the entire population of community college presidents in the United States.

The study used purposive sampling to select the sample of Virginia community college presidents chosen to interview. The sample was convenient because the researcher is an employee of one of the 23 Virginia community colleges and had convenient access to the population of community college presidents. Ease of access is a tenet of convenience sampling and offers money, time, and energy savings advantages to the researcher (Hays & Singh, 2012). One of the downsides to convenience sampling is that it is one of the least representative methods of sampling thus limiting the transferability of the findings of this study (Hays & Singh, 2012).

Assumptions

The researcher assumes that the information shared by the college presidents on the survey and in the interview is honest, and, thus, a fair representation of the knowledge and perceptions of each individual community college president. The researcher also assumes that community college presidents strive to comply with federal and state laws and regulations that

apply to higher education, in general, and campus safety, in particular. Finally, the researcher assumes community college presidents have a vested interest in providing a safe environment for the students, faculty, staff, administrators, and visitors of their respective institutions.

Definitions of Terms

The following terms are defined for the purpose of this study:

Campus

A campus includes all campus locations of a community college as well off-site locations at which a community college offers courses or programs. A campus does not include area secondary schools at which a community college offers dual enrollment courses as area high schools are responsible for the safety of their own facilities.

Campus Safety

Campus safety is the establishment of, and the ongoing commitment to, ensuring a safe environment for all campus constituents: students, faculty, staff, administrators, and visitors.

The Clery Act

The *Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act* (2000) is the federal statute legislating the required yearly disclosure of campus crime statistics and campus security policy for U.S. institutions of higher education receiving Title IV funds. Failure to comply with this legislation may result in fines of up to \$35,000 per violation levied by the United States Department of Education upon an institution of higher education.

Community College

A community college is a comprehensive, 2-year institution of higher education offering associate degrees, certificate programs, workforce training, and, in some limited cases, bachelor's degrees. A community college is predominantly nonresidential although community

college in some states offer housing in dormitories. All of the community colleges in Virginia, the state focused on this study, are nonresidential and none offer bachelor's degree.

Virginia Community College System (VCCS)

The Virginia Community College System comprises the twenty-three community colleges that serve the Commonwealth of Virginia. The State Board for Community Colleges governs the VCCS and consists of fifteen members appointed by the Governor. The State Board appoints the Chancellor who is the executive officer of the VCCS. The Chancellor appoints each of the individual community college presidents who are responsible to the Chancellor for the operations of their individual colleges.

Organization of the Study

The researcher organized the remaining chapters as follows: Chapter 2 reviews the related literature. The literature review includes research related to campus safety statistics; *the Clery Act* and its impact on campus safety; student, faculty, and campus student services and safety administrator perspectives on campus safety; federal and state statute and regulations regarding campus safety; campus emergency readiness; legal theories or grounds pertaining to campus safety; and student health and psychological well-being issues.

Chapter 3 outlines the research methodology used in the study. This chapter presents the research tradition; sampling size and methods; explanations of the survey and interview protocols; descriptions of data collection, coding and analysis; methods for maximizing trustworthiness and validation of findings, and explanations of the study's limitations. Chapter 4 presents the quantitative and qualitative findings of the study by research question. Finally, Chapter 5 discusses the findings, presents conclusions, and makes recommendations for current community college leadership and those aspiring to lead community colleges in the future.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Campus safety is a well-documented topic in the academic literature. Academic journals addressing topics ranging from issues in higher education, community college, student services, professional psychology, and health and law reviews have addressed the topic of campus safety. This literature review examined the academic literature from each of the areas in order to provide a thorough assessment of the body of knowledge pertaining to campus safety. Specifically, the literature review addressed the following areas regarding campus safety: the impact of the *Clery Act* (20 U.S.C. §1092 (f)); student perceptions and knowledge; faculty and staff perceptions and knowledge; campus crisis preparedness and threat assessment; legal issues; and student health and psychological well-being issues. The literature review begins with a brief statistical description of the state of campus safety and an explanation of the *Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act*, or the *Clery Act* or *Clery*, (2000).

As stated in chapter one, the purpose of this study was to learn about the relationship between community college presidents and the phenomenon of campus safety. The following examination of the literature by this researcher found that this specific topic is not addressed. The lack of research about the relationship between community college presidents and the phenomenon of campus safety further emphasized the importance and relevance of this research topic.

Campus Safety Statistics

High profile events such as the tragedies at Virginia Tech in 2007 (Hauser & O'Connor, 2007), Northern Illinois University in 2008 (Saulny & Davey, 2008), and, more recently,

Umpqua Community College in 2015 (Sidner, Lah, Almasy, & Ellis, 2015) keep the issue of campus safety on the minds of the general public, college students, and those who work in higher education. High profile events portray college campuses as unsafe, but comparisons of campus crime rates to the crime rates of the general public offer a more complete picture of the phenomenon.

Birnbaum (2013) provided a comparison based upon 2010 crime statistics. Birnbaum focused his report on the crimes the *Clery Act* requires colleges and universities to report and compared them to rates of crime in the general population. His report used descriptive statistics for comparison. Further statistical analysis would be necessary to determine if the statistics are statistically significant. Still, the descriptive statistics offered insight. For example, Birnbaum found the rate of violent crime at American colleges and universities as a percent of US population was between 10.8% and 12.8% from 1997 to 2010. He noted further that violent crime rates both on campus and in the general population have declined for the same time period. Birnbaum concluded these statistics illustrated that while college and university campuses are not free of criminal activity, campuses are safer in comparison to the general public. He further concluded that campuses are not the violent and unsafe places the mass media portrays them to be.

In a study of the frequency and correlates of campus crime in Missouri colleges and universities from 2006 through 2008, Han (2013) found that the most frequent crimes were liquor law violations and burglary. Han reported that incidents of violent crime for the time period were negligible in comparison to nonviolent crimes. Han's statistics for colleges and universities in Missouri also supported Birnbaum's (2013) conclusion above.

The United States Department of Education (ED) annually publishes data on criminal offenses at American colleges and universities on the Department's webpage. The 2016 report included criminal offenses reported by colleges and universities as required by the *Clery Act (1990)*. A review of the report supported the data of both Birnbaum and Han. Incidents of violent and nonviolent campus crime decreased within the ten-year period of 2006 to 2016 from 60,024 to 37,389. Burglary continued to be the most frequently reported campus crime with 13,575 incidents reported in 2016, 13,951 incidents reported in 2015, and 15,459 incidents reported in 2014. During the ten-year period of 2006 to 2016, reported incidents of burglary declined from 35,082 to 13,575 (United States Department of Education, 2018). The data available in the ED report are weak on their own and require further statistical analysis to determine statistical significance. Still, it is telling in the respect that it shows declining crime rates in all *Clery* related crime categories over a three-year period.

The *Clery Act*

The *Clery Act* (20 U.S.C. §1092 (f)) includes a number of key provisions required of colleges and universities participating in federal student aid programs. Burke and Sloan (2013) provided an overview of the key provisions of the *Clery Act*. The first requirement is that institutions of higher education publish an annual crime report by October 1 of each year. This report must contain, among other things, information about an institution's current security policies, student crime or emergency reporting procedures, the location students should go to report, and policies pertaining to facility access. This report must be disseminated to all current students and employees of the institution and be available to prospective students and employees upon request. Further, the report must be submitted to United States Education Department (ED) each year.

A second requirement is institutional disclosure of three years of campus crime statistics. These data include crime statistics from on-campus, satellite campuses, and non-campus and public areas near campus. The *Act* specifies four general categories for which reporting is required. The categories include criminal offenses, hate crimes, *Violence Against Women Act* (Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013, 2013) offenses, and arrests and referral for disciplinary action (U.S. Department of Education, 2016). Moreover, for reporting *Clery* requires that if an incident meets more than one of the four categorical definitions, the incident must be reported in each category.

The *Clery Act* also requires colleges and universities to provide “timely warnings” for crimes that are occurring and that college officials believe pose a threat to the community. In addition to “timely warnings,” *Clery* requires “emergency notification” in the event of an immediate threat to the campus community. Institutions must also publicly post daily crime logs and provide information about the power and authority of the institution’s campus police or security force. A final requirement is that colleges and universities report on their sexual assault policies and procedures and institutional programs for sexual assault and campus crime prevention. Failure to comply with the *Clery Act* may result in a fine of up to \$35,000 for each violation or loss of eligibility to participate in federal financial aid programs.

Since its initial passage in 1990, the *Clery Act* has been amended a number of times. In some cases, amendments are the direct result of current campus crime events. The requirement of “emergency notification” was not part of the original legislation but came about as a result of the 2007 Virginia Tech tragedy. Families of the victims lobbied Congress vigorously for inclusion of the “emergency notification” requirement after this tragic incident (Burke & Sloan, 2013). Other amendments result from the necessity to update outdated provisions of the *Act* to

include more current understanding of a particular issue. An example of this is one of the most recent amendments to *Clery*, the *Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 (VAWA)* (Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013, 2013). *VAWA* updated *Clery* provisions pertaining to campus domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking prevention and institutional policies and procedures regarding each (Clery Center for Security on Campus, 2015). *VAWA* also added new categories of hate crimes for disclosure requirements (U.S Department of Education, 2016).

The Impact of *Clery*

More than twenty-five years after the passage of *Clery*, scholars continue to question the impact the act has had on campus crime and safety. Has *Clery* had an impact on student decision-making? Has *Clery* made colleges and universities safer for students? Have there been unintended consequences resulting from the legislation? This section of the literature review addresses these questions.

Ten years after initial passage of *Clery*, Janosik (2001) explored the impact of the legislation on student decision-making. He explained that the purpose of the legislation was two-fold. The first purpose was to allow prospective students and parents to have specific crime statistics and information about campus crime to factor in their college decision-making process. The second purpose was to make campus constituencies aware of potential risks through notification and, with the resulting knowledge and information, actively change their personal behavior (Janosik, 2001).

Janosik (2001) surveyed students from three institutions of higher education about their knowledge of the legislation and whether the students changed their behavior as a result of reading the reports or as a result of attending crime prevention programs. Seventy-one percent of

respondents indicated no knowledge about the existence of the legislation, and 88% of respondents indicated they had not received or did not recall receiving their college's annual security report, which is a requirement of the legislation. A scant 4% of the respondents indicated using the security report in their decision of which college to attend. Regarding crime awareness programs, the results were more positive as 52% of respondents reported having read flyers, posters, and newspaper articles about crime awareness. Moreover, 40% of female students reported that such material changed their behavior about protecting themselves and their personal property. Janosik concluded that less formal methods of promoting campus crime awareness may be more effective than the annual publication and dissemination of institutional crime reports. Further, Janosik stated, "The findings in this study suggest that the attention paid to these formal reporting requirements may be misplaced. Devoting time and energy in developing a single reporting mechanism . . . may not have its desired effect if the Act's purpose is to educate, change behavior, and protect college students" (2001).

Harshman, Puro, and Wolff (2001) put forth an intriguing piece addressing the impact of *Clery* on the relationship between students and institutions. Harshman et al. focused on the student development aspect of student discipline and concluded that *Clery* had the unintended consequence of disrupting this process. In their view of *Clery*, the federal government became a part of disciplinary actions and learning experiences that were once solely between the student and the institution. Ultimately, Harshman, Puro, and Wolff believed that the federal mandates of *Clery* "may obliterate the trust and confidence inherent in the student development relationships and processes facilitated by and between students and . . . campus security authorities" (2001). The authors offered no evidence to support this claim. Still, it is an intriguing argument and may

warrant further research to learn if *Clery* has had an unintended negative effect on student-institution relationships.

Nobles, Fox, Khey, and Liz (2012) examined crimes perpetrated by students and nonstudents on and off campus at a large southeastern university in an effort to assess the effectiveness of the *Clery Act*. They examined on and off campus arrest data over a five-year period from January 2003 to December 2007 from campus and local law enforcement. The results of the geospatial analysis indicated that college crime reporting required by the *Clery Act* does not accurately reflect campus safety because off-campus crime that is very near campus is not reported. By not reporting nearby crime, the authors conclude that the *Clery Act* may create a false sense of security on college campuses.

The research on the impact of *Clery*, is mixed at best. Students seem not to read the yearly crime reports college publish as required by *Clery*. In some cases, students are not even aware that campus crime reports exist (Janosik, 2001). Some suspect that *Clery* has further complicated and possibly deteriorated the student-institution relationship (Harshman, Puro, and Wolff, 2001). This is an interesting hypothesis, but it needs testing. Finally, some research found that crime reporting that shows low levels of crime in and around college campuses may actually work oppositely than intended and develop a false sense of safety in college students (Nobles, Fox, Khey, and Liz, 2012).

Student Perceptions

Student perceptions of campus crime and safety are an important factor to consider. Jennings, Gover, and Pudrzynsk (2007) surveyed undergraduates at a large southeastern university to study campus victimization, fear of crime, safety, perceived risk of crime, and constrained behavior intended to reduce the risk of victimization. From their study, they found

that 22% of the respondents reported having been a victim of a crime. Moreover, they found that student self-reporting of crime did not reflect indirect reporting of a student knowing of someone else who had been a victim. Either student self-reporting of crime or student over-reporting of knowing a victim was an issue for this study. Additionally, students indicated moderate levels of fear and safety on campus but indicated higher levels of feeling likely to become a victim of a crime on campus. When taking gender into account, Jennings et al. (2007) found that males were more likely to become victims than females but that females were more afraid of crime than males. Jennings et al. (2007) promoted structural changes like increased lighting on campus, increased access control to parking garages, and student escort services for long term positive effects on crime and safety. Additionally, they proposed instituting campus education and awareness programs to promote safety and prevention.

Baker and Boland (2011) conducted a survey of student, faculty, and staff perceptions of campus crime and safety at a small all-female liberal arts college in Pennsylvania. Their survey measured beliefs and attitudes towards campus safety, daily behavior, personal safety precautions, and cases of victimization. They found that while students felt safe on campus and rated campus safety features as satisfactory, results regarding victimization were high enough to warrant attention. Baker and Boland (2011) proposed ongoing efforts to educate all campus constituents about campus safety, revising and updating the campus safety plan, and the tracking of inappropriate or disruptive behavior. Since this study focused on one all-female college, its generalizability was limited, but it does echo findings in other studies regarding student perceptions of campus safety, notably that students generally feel safe on a college campus.

Chekwa, Thomas, and Jones (2013) conducted a similar survey on student perceptions of campus safety. Using a significantly smaller sample size than Jennings et al. (2007), Chekwa et

al. found that 70% of respondents reported campus safety as being an important issue in their decision of which college to attend. Respondents also perceived that structural security features like those mentioned by Jennings et al. (2007) were important deterrents to campus crime and also reported the need for more campus police or safety officers. Moreover, 45% of respondents felt unsafe on campus, and for protection some students considered taking a self-defense course while others considered carrying a firearm. Chekwa, Thomas, and Jones (2013) also explored student perceptions about the role of alcohol in campus crime. Sixty percent of the respondents indicated that they felt alcohol was a contributing factor to campus crime. Chekwa, Thomas, and Jones (2013) cautioned that because of the small sample size of their survey, the findings should not be generalized across the entire population of college students. This study had one of the higher percentages of students who felt unsafe on campus and provided strong evidence of the importance of campus safety to students.

Patton and Gregory (2014) studied student perceptions of safety at the 23 community colleges in the Commonwealth of Virginia. The researchers explored what types of crime Virginia community college students feared most becoming a victim of on campus, the effect of student demographics on level of fear of crime, perceptions of campus safety based on the type of campus security or police, perceptions of campus safety based on rurality of campus, and perceptions of campus safety based on different campus areas. Of the respondents, 24% most feared being a victim a robbery while on campus. Patton and Gregory pointed out this is a high percentage when comparing it to actual reported cases of robbery, 18%, on Virginia community college campuses since 2001. The study also found no significant difference in student perception of campus safety based upon the demographics of race and gender. They did report a significant difference in the demographics of student age and enrollment status (full-time or part-

time). Younger students felt safer on campus than older students. Patton and Gregory (2014) explained that this difference may be due to the fact that more of the younger students are on campus during the day while many the older students take classes in the evening. There was no significant difference in student perceptions of campus safety when taking into account type of campus safety officer, campus security or campus police. The researchers found significant differences in student perceptions of campus safety when considering for rurality of the campus setting and also found that students felt safest in areas on campus where they were likely to be with other people. Students were most concerned about their safety in college parking lots. This research serves as an example that campus safety remains an issue of concern for students twenty-five years after the passage of *Clery*.

Faculty, Staff, and Administrator Perceptions

Baker and Boland (2011) included faculty and staff perceptions in the study cited previously. Their findings pertaining to faculty and staff echoed their student findings. Faculty and staff felt safe on campus and rated campus safety features satisfactorily. Like the students' perceptions about victimization, faculty and staff perceptions regarding victimization were low but high enough to warrant attention. Even though faculty and staff feel safe on campus, their perceptions are important for administrators to consider especially since they fear victimization at similar levels as students.

Fletcher and Bryden (2009) surveyed 229 female faculty and staff at a Canadian university to explore the perceptions female faculty and staff have about safety on and around campus. Results indicated that female faculty and staff had high levels of awareness of campus safety related services. Results also showed that female faculty and staff employed various precautionary measures for personal safety. Female faculty and staff were dissatisfied with

certain campus safety features (faculty more so than staff) like lighting, signage, and availability of emergency phones. Moreover, more faculty than staff reported being victimized on or around campus with harassment being the most common form of victimization. According to Fletcher and Bryden (2009), campus safety clearly was an issue of concern for female faculty and staff. Their research provided evidence showing that campus safety is not only an issue of concern for higher education faculty and staff in the United States.

Janosik and Gregory (2009) surveyed senior student affairs officers about the effectiveness of *Clery* and their views on campus safety. They emailed surveys to 1065 members of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators of whom 30% responded. The sample included senior student affairs officers from both public and private institutions and two- and four-year institutions. Although student affairs officers from two- and four-year institutions were aware of *Clery*, more officers at four-year institutions were aware and the difference was found to be statistically significant. Also, while high percentages of student affairs officers believed their students receive the mandated crime disclosures, very few believed students used the information when making the decision of which college to attend or read it in general. 64% were unsure. These student affairs officers generally were more positive in their responses to questions about students reading other types of safety material or attending educational programs on campus safety. Only 5% of respondents thought *Clery* was related to reducing crime on their campuses although 65% believed *Clery* had improved crime reporting on their campuses. Of note, community college student affairs officers were statistically less likely to know about *Clery* than their peers at four-year institutions. Student affairs officers at private institutions were statistically more optimistic about the effects of *Clery* than officers at public institutions. This study reinforced previous studies that concluded *Clery* reporting does little to

reduce campus crime. Janosik and Gregory (2009) concluded that a better use of resources would be safety education programs and advertising campaigns.

In an earlier study, Janosik and Gregory (2003) surveyed the membership of the International Association of College Law Enforcement Administrators regarding *Clery* and its influence on law enforcement practices in higher education settings. The survey included questions about the *Clery Act* and how it has changed the nature of law enforcement on campus, how mandated reports were distributed to campus constituents, whether the act has had an impact on campus crime reduction, if student behavior has changed, and if college administrators hide reported incidents of campus crime. Results found that respondents indicated that *Clery* has been effective in improving campus crime reporting procedures and that institutions used various methods of disseminating the mandated reports including college websites, campus mail, and the U.S. mail. Campus law enforcement administrators reported that crime rates have remained constant since the passage of *Clery*. Regarding law enforcement administrators' perceptions about how the Act has changed student behavior, survey results indicated approximately one-third of respondents perceived that student behavior has changed. The vast majority (91.5%) of respondents reported that college administrators do not hide campus crime incidents. The research showed that *Clery* has had modest perceived impact on campus law enforcement but that the law has had little impact on campus crime rates.

A current topic of particular interest in the campus safety debate surrounds the carry of concealed weapons on campus. Campus carry of concealed weapons has been on the agenda of a number of state legislatures. In the state of Wyoming, campus security directors have the authority either to allow or not allow concealed firearms on their institutions' campuses (Hosking, 2014). In a 2014 dissertation, Hosking studied the perceptions of campus security

officers in Wyoming community colleges regarding the influence of concealed carry of firearms. In this qualitative phenomenological study, Hosking interviewed seven Wyoming community college security directors. The findings included mixed results that varied from concealed carry may enhance safety on the community college campus to concealed carry may not enhance safety on the community college campus. Wyoming provided an interesting example regarding perceptions of campus safety as the decision to allow concealed carry on college campuses falls under the purview of one individual on each campus. Arguably, this is a great deal of responsibility to put into the hands of one decision-maker.

Faculty, staff, and administrators are important college constituents, and their safety is just as important as the safety of the students. It should be noted in the case of community colleges in particular that faculty, staff, and administrators spend more time on the college campus than the students because, in most cases community colleges are commuter institutions. Students come to the campus for class and to make use of campus resources like the library, but they likely do not spend the same amount of time on the campus as the college employees.

Crisis Preparation and Threat Assessment

Crisis preparation and threat assessment are two important aspects of campus safety. Crisis prevention and threat assessment point to an institution's readiness to address acts on or around a college campus that threaten the safety of the individuals present. The idea that an institution has plans in place and has assessed possible threats may influence the perceptions constituents have about a campus's relative safety.

Bennett and Bates (2015) discussed research on targeted violence at institutions of higher education including guides, reports, and studies from the National Institute of Justice, U.S. Secret Service, U.S. Department of Justice, and U.S. Department of Education. Review of these guides,

reports, and studies brought the researchers to the conclusion that institutions need threat assessments in place to determine both if a student made a threat and if a student actually poses a threat. The researchers identified six main areas of focus for campus policy and campus violence prevention: ensure authority through legislation and other means, create and use a multidisciplinary threat assessment team, develop procedures that employ a threat assessment rubric, create a culture of reporting, ensure sustainable training and resources, and develop community and campus partnerships. The researchers also identified factors unique to community colleges: open access/open campus, general student body characteristics, limited campus student services resources, a sense of disconnect and inefficacy among faculty (may be especially true for adjunct faculty), and the completion agenda which may increase tolerance for student misconduct and disruptive behavior (pressure to keep disruptive students because of focus on increasing completers). Bennett and Bates (2015) also offered a brief case study of an effective campus threat assessment policy at a community college that included the aforementioned factors.

In a brief article for the *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, Connolly (2012b) outlined the importance of college preparedness for potential crisis situations stating that community colleges are not only responsible for the education of their students but also for their safety and welfare. Connolly (2012b) stressed the importance of each administrator and faculty knowing their roles in a crisis situation and discussed proactive measures for preparedness including training, identifying and referring persons of concern, and practicing for emergency situations. A study by the author indicated varying levels of constituent concern including lack of knowledge about both a college's crisis preparedness plan and how to report a person of concern. Connolly (2012b) found that 74% of respondents indicated they were unsure of their

role during an emergency and concluded that students, faculty, and administrators must feel confident in their school's emergency preparedness plan.

In a second article in a different issue of the same journal, Connolly (2012a) explained the socio-political reasons for creating a Campus Emergency Response Team (CERT). The basic premise was that colleges and communities need to be trained to care for themselves in the event of a catastrophic event. She then explained four steps for organizing a campus CERT: designate a resource coordinator, focus on logistics like working with a community CERT and getting the word out on campus, provide training, and evaluate the program. Connolly (2012a) concluded by tying CERTs to student learning through student engagement with the campus and the community and student empowerment that may affect a student's overall attitude toward school, work, and self.

Gnage, Dziagwa, and White (2009) described, in a case study, the steps a rural community college took to enhance preparedness through communication. Institution administrators considered employee and student demographics, adjunct faculty, part-time staff, and part-time students (individuals who may not be on campus when an emergency event takes place). They implemented a multi-faceted approach to campus communication: bull-horns, fire alarms, public address announcements and sirens, an emergency Web page portal, mass email dissemination, closed circuit video monitors, partnership with local media, and cell phone notification. They also instituted ongoing exercises to keep campus safety on the forefront of constituents' minds and to allow for evaluation and updates to crisis plans.

Legal Issues

The legal relationship between student and institution continues to evolve. Although not a current article, Smith (1996) introduced legal theories that have been successfully litigated in

suits brought by victims of campus crime. Smith (1996) asserted that knowledge of these legal theories is an important starting point for campus administrators to understand campus crime and its potential impact on an institution. The theories included: duty to warn students about known crime risks, duty to provide students with adequate security protection, duty to screen employees, and in some cases other students, for crime risks, and the contractual liability of avoiding creating additional, higher guarantees of protection than the college can actually deliver. Smith (1996) cited case examples for each of the theories in which courts found against institutions.

Adolf (2012) explored several legal theories with which he explained higher education administrators should be familiar or concerned. Providing background and context for his research by listing 10 high profile campus security incidents from 1966 to 2010, Adolf (2012) explained how the growth of higher education enrollment and student diversity since World War II and issues related to campus safety interrelate. According to Adolf (2012), as the demographics of college campuses began to increasingly mirror society's demographics so have campus crime rates begun to reflect society's crime rates (research comparing campus crime rates to public crime rates contradicts this conclusion, see Birnbaum, 2013). Adolf identified the Kent State massacre as the single event that changed the role of the American legal system in higher education. He also addressed the shift in legal theory as applied to campus safety from *in loco parentis* to treating students as adults and institutions having no legal duty, to the more current theories that assign a duty of care to institutions (Adolf, 2012). The shift in legal theory applied to campus safety may result in increased findings against institutions in cases regarding campus safety.

Colleges and universities are not immune from litigation in the wake of an event that has threatened the safety of or caused harm to its students, faculty, staff, or visitors. College

administrators need to be aware of the potential legal repercussions and the potential costs of these repercussions when assessing campus safety. In assessing campus safety, college administrators must weigh legal duties and contractual obligations and determine how best to ensure safety while at the same time mitigate risk of litigation.

Student Health and Psychological Well-Being

Student health and psychological well-being are relevant factors for consideration when exploring campus safety. Recognizing the important tie between student health and campus safety, the *Journal of American College Health* published a white paper addressing campus violence (Carr, 2007). Citing numerous descriptive statistics, Carr explained campus crime and violence as a serious college health issue that results in student victims dropping out or taking leaves of absence from college or experiencing problems studying, concentrating, or attending classes if the student victim chooses to remain in school. The extremely disruptive nature of campus violence, thus, is an obstacle for student success.

Dykes-Anderson (2013) framed the case for comprehensive counseling centers at colleges and universities within the contexts of student health and campus safety. She explained that professional counselors serve an important role in assisting students with psychological and emotional issues and are better equipped to deal with student psychological health issues than faculty and staff. Comprehensive counseling may offer colleges and universities a means of identifying and assisting student at risk of committing violent acts. Moreover, Dykes-Anderson (2013) cited studies showing that offering comprehensive counseling services increases both student success and retention.

Flannery and Quinn-Leering (2000) came to a similar conclusion over a decade earlier about the positive impact of counseling services in their review of the literature on campus

violence. Their literature review focused on two issues pertaining to campus violence: student experience with and exposure to violence and steps that community college administrators can take to ensure student safety. Flannery and Quinn-Leering (2000) explained that understanding student socio-emotional development is key to understanding student antisocial behavior. They found that much of the literature focused on school-age children because little research existed about exposure to violence and other risk factors and college-aged students (Flannery & Quinn-Leering, 2000). The researchers maintained that research on school-age children is useful and adaptable to college-age students. As such the researchers offered that college administrators and faculty must be aware that students on their campus have been or are being exposed to violence and that it is important to be prepared to be able to identify students who may act aggressively or violently. Flannery's and Quinn-Leering's (2000) suggestions for practice include counseling services, support groups, positive activity offerings, implementation of effective security programs, establishment of a crisis intervention plan, and finding ways for students to connect.

In an even earlier study on the psychology of campus violence, Pezza and Bellotti (1995) focused on individual psychological aspects of college campus violence including reinforcing factors, family history and personal experience, developmental issues, and alcohol use and abuse. Pezza and Bellotti (1995) also addressed the impact of violence on the campus community with a focus on victimization and its negative effects on student development, recruitment, and retention and its economic impact. Finally, they outlined a framework for prevention that included reducing risk through education and training; identifying and correcting existing problems as early as possible while limiting their consequences; creating intervention services

for victims, perpetrators and witnesses; changing campus norms and behaviors by creating an ethical setting and decentralizing authority; and fostering peer involvement.

Understanding the student health and psychological wellness underpinnings of campus violence is an important aspect to understanding campus safety and its importance as an issue in higher education. Over thirty years of academic literature supports this conclusion and illustrates that providing mechanisms like counseling services to address and improve student health and psychological well-being are important considerations for college and university administrators who want to ensure the safest possible campus environment for their students, faculty, staff, and visitors.

Conclusion

The campus safety landscape is complex. Compared to the crime rates of the general public crime rates on American college and university campuses are lower and seem to suggest that college and university campuses are relatively safe. Moreover, students, faculty, and staff perceive college and university campuses as safe although a level of fear of victimization exists within each of these constituencies that is worrisome. Unfunded federal mandates require colleges and universities to report crime statistics and provide timely warnings to campus constituents in the event of the occurrence of a criminal act on or near campus. Little evidence exists showing that federal mandates make college and university campuses safer or positively influence student, faculty, and staff behaviors. Providing avenues for improved student health and psychological well-being likely are more effective means of ensuring a safe campus environment.

In the wake of some of the most violent attacks on college campuses over the last decade, colleges and universities have stepped up campus safety efforts by establishing mechanisms to assess campus safety and instituting emergency response plans. These initiatives are partly a

result of efforts of colleges and universities to provide a safe learning and working environment for their students, faculty, and staff. These initiatives are also a result of recognizing the possible legal repercussions of failure to adequately provide for the safety of their students, faculty, and staff. Whether framed within the context of regulatory compliance; student, faculty, and staff perceptions; legal theory and litigation; or student health and well-being campus safety continues to be an issue of great importance in higher education.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to research community college presidents' perceptions of the phenomenon of campus safety. This study sought to examine the experience, knowledge, and perceptions community college presidents have regarding campus safety. By including community college presidents as one of the groups that shapes and is affected by campus safety issues, this study hoped to expand the body of research on campus safety and to create a more thorough understanding of the phenomenon of campus safety.

Research Design

This study used a mixed methods design utilizing both quantitative and qualitative research methods. The quantitative piece of the study addressed community college presidents' general knowledge and understanding of campus safety and perceptions of campus safety at the presidents' institutions and regarding higher education in general. Recognizing that campus safety is a phenomenon, this study utilized a qualitative research method guided by the case study research tradition. As a research tradition, case study attempts to examine "a phenomenon as it exists in its natural context to identify the boundaries between the two" (Hays & Singh, 2012, p. 44). Thus, through the case study approach, the aim of this study was to learn about the phenomenon of campus safety within the context of the experiences of community college presidents.

Research Questions

As explained in Chapter I, this study addressed the following research questions:

1. What are community college presidents' experiences with issues pertaining to campus safety?

2. What are community college presidents' perceptions of safety on their individual campuses?
3. What do community college presidents believe their role to be in terms of campus safety on their campus?
4. What are community college presidents' perceptions of campus safety as an issue of importance in higher education?
5. What level of knowledge do community college presidents have of laws pertaining to campus safety?

Role of the Researcher

The researcher is a key instrument in qualitative research (Creswell, 2013). As a key instrument, the researcher develops and maintains an appropriate relationship with the research purpose (Hays & Singh, 2012). Throughout the course of the research project, a qualitative researcher practices reflexivity or self-reflection (Hays & Singh, 2012). Continuous self-reflection is an important means of building credibility and trustworthiness in qualitative research (Hay & Singh, 2012). The researcher accomplished this by documenting self-reflection in a reflexive journal.

The role of the researcher may be described as that of an insider or outsider. With insider research, the researcher may not be a part of the organization or phenomenon of inquiry but has knowledge of the organization or phenomenon prior to the study. With outsider research, the researcher has no prior experience with the organization or the phenomenon (Hays & Singh, 2012). For this study, the researcher self-identified as an insider. The researcher is not a community college president in the Commonwealth of Virginia, but the researcher was an employee at one of the colleges in the Virginia Community College System. Moreover, in his

role at the college at which he worked the researcher was familiar with the federal requirements of campus safety reporting as part of the requirements for institutional eligibility for participation in federal student aid programs.

Participants

Community college presidents were the focus of this study. The researcher collected data via a survey of all community college presidents and in-depth interviews with three community college presidents from the Virginia Community College System (VCCS). In determining the participants, the study employed purposeful sampling. Purposeful sampling addressed the following considerations: who to select, what type of sampling strategy, and what size of sample (Creswell, 2013).

Because the study focused on the experiences of community college presidents in one community college system to which the researcher had access, the sampling strategy was purposive. Since the VCCS comprises 23 colleges with twenty-three presidents, convenience dictated surveying all twenty-three presidents in the system. Convenience also factored into the selection of presidents chosen for the in-depth interviews. By focusing on community college presidents, the sample was homogenous in terms of levels of educational and professional attainment. Homogeneity of sample also was evident because each community college president in Virginia reports to the system chancellor and follows the governing guidelines of the Virginia State Board for Community Colleges. The gender, age, and racial characteristics of the individual presidents as well as the characteristics of the individual institution (size of student body and geographic location) served by each president, however, was not homogeneous.

Rather than focusing on sample size exclusively, sampling adequacy guided the selection of interview participants. The research tradition and research questions factored into

determining sampling adequacy (Hays & Singh, 2012). Moreover, collection of extensive detail from each individual, which is an important tenet of qualitative research (Creswell, 2013), rather than number of participants surveyed played a part in determining sample size. The researcher determined that since the quantitative piece of the study focused on surveying all twenty-three community college presidents in Virginia, an adequate sample for the in-depth interviews was three presidents each representing a community college with a small, medium, and large population.

The study used the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education (n.d.) to sort the Virginia community colleges based upon size and setting. For the purposes of this study, small Virginia community colleges included the Carnegie designations of two-year, very small and small with full time equivalent enrollment of 1,999 students or fewer. Medium sized Virginia community colleges included the Carnegie designations of two-year, medium and large with full time equivalent enrollment of between 2,000 and 9,999 students. Large Virginia community colleges included the Carnegie designation of two-year, very large with full time equivalent enrollment of 10,000 or more students. Identifying Virginia community colleges in this way allowed for the selection of community college presidents for in depth interviews to represent colleges of varying size and varying geographic locations within the Commonwealth.

The small Virginia community colleges tend to be in rural areas. The medium sized community colleges tend to be in small to medium sized cities serving both urban and rural populations. The large sized Virginia community colleges tend to be in or around large urban population centers. Interviewing college presidents representing different college size classifications and geographic areas allowed for studying a cross section of presidents from institutions in a community college system that encompasses an entire state.

Depth of understanding is an important aspect of qualitative research (Hays & Singh, 2012). Depth of understanding results from choosing a number of participants to adequately address the phenomenon being studied (Hays & Singh, 2012). The initial survey of all twenty-three community college presidents in Virginia provided descriptive statistical data from which to develop the interview protocols for the three in depth interviews. In-depth interviews with three community college presidents provided the opportunity to delve more deeply into the phenomenon of campus safety and to promote depth of understanding. The combination of surveying and in-depth interviews strengthened depth of understanding for this study.

Data Collection Measures

Data collection methods included an initial survey of the 23 presidents in the Virginia Community College System (see Appendix A). The survey included questions asking the participants to rate levels of knowledge and perceptions of campus safety on a Likert-type scale. To ensure reliability, the researcher piloted the survey twice with a group of graduate students in the Community College Leadership Ph.D. Program at Old Dominion University. The survey underwent two rounds of test-retest analysis. After the first round of test-retest analysis, the coefficients of reliability indicated less than permissible reliability of the survey questions from test one to test two. At this point, the researcher sent the draft survey to a panel of three experts for input and suggestions. Two of the three experts responded with comments and suggestions. The researcher rewrote survey questions following the advice of the panel of experts and sent the revised survey to a second group of graduate students for a second round of test-retest reliability testing. Results of the second round of test-retest showed much improved coefficients of reliability and indicated the survey was ready for dissemination.

Prior to sending an introductory email, the researcher employed the assistance of the president of the college at which he worked to contact the group of community college presidents in Virginia. The president sent his colleagues an email regarding the impending survey request the presidents would be receiving from the researcher. The researcher then sent an introductory email to the 23 community college presidents. The introductory email explained the purpose of the research and considerations of confidentiality and anonymity. The researcher sent the electronic survey one day after sending the introductory email. The survey remained open for five weeks, and the researcher sent reminders weekly. At the midway point, the researcher asked his college president to send reminders to the remaining group of presidents who had not yet participated. 22 out of 23 Virginia community college presidents participated in the survey. During survey dissemination, the researcher learned of the retirement of one of the community college presidents. Since the incoming college president was new to the role of community college president, the researcher determined the new president's insight may be limited and chose not to invite the new president to participate in the survey.

The participants provided data regarding community college presidents' knowledge and perceptions of campus safety. The researcher used the data to calculate descriptive statistical results. The researcher also used the descriptive statistical results of the survey to inform the development of the interview protocol (see Appendix C) for the three in-depth interviews and to develop the research questions further. For the in-depth interviews, the researcher selected three community college presidents from the VCCS. The researcher recorded the interviews and took field notes during each interview. The researcher provided the interview participants copies of the interview transcripts to review for confirmation of authenticity following the in-depth interviews. Two of the three presidents responded to the researcher's request for transcript

review and confirmation. Additionally, throughout the data collection process the researcher kept a reflexive journal and maintained field notes.

Data Analysis

The results of the initial survey of Virginia community college provided descriptive statistics of community college presidents' perceptions and knowledge of campus safety issues. The determination of common themes from the initial survey allowed for the further development of an interview protocol that expanded upon the results and themes revealed from the survey. The interview protocol included open ended questions designed to elicit the knowledge, perceptions, and experiences each of the interview participants have had regarding campus safety.

The researcher recorded each interview and actively took notes while interviewing the participants. Following the interviews, the researcher transcribed the interview recordings. The researcher shared the transcriptions and notes with the respective interview participants allowing the participant to comment upon or clarify statements from the interview. Once the transcripts and notes had been reviewed by the interview participants, the process of pattern matching began.

Yin (2014) identified pattern matching as one of the most desirable techniques for case study analysis. Pattern matching occurs as the researcher analyses the data for issue-relevant meaning and patterns for each of the cases (Creswell, 2013). Because this is a multiple case study analysis, cross-case synthesis was used to determine similarities and differences between the three cases (Creswell, 2013). Finally, the researcher developed naturalistic generalizations to learn from or to apply to other similar cases (Creswell, 2013).

Trustworthiness

The researcher employed various methods to build trustworthiness. Maximizing trustworthiness means maximizing truthfulness of findings by maximizing participant voice (Hays & Singh, 2012). One method used in this study to maximize participant voice was member checking. Member checking “is the ongoing consultation with participants to test the “goodness of fit” of developing findings” (Hays & Singh, 2012, p. 206). After transcribing each interview session, the researcher offered each interview participant the opportunity to review and amend the participant’s respective interview transcript.

Triangulation is another common method of building trustworthiness in qualitative studies. Triangulation is the use of multiple forms of evidence throughout a study to support and better describe findings (Hays & Singh, 2012). The researcher triangulated data sources by surveying the entire population of community college presidents in the Virginia Community College System and following the survey with in-depth interviews of three presidents representing three community colleges with distinctly different population sizes from distinctly different geographical areas.

Another method of triangulation as a strategy for establishing trustworthiness is triangulation of researchers (Hays & Singh, 2012). After independently coding the results of the interviews, the researcher asked two peers familiar with the researcher’s project to review the interviews and researcher’s codes for agreement or disagreement to establish interrater reliability. One peer participated. The researcher calculated interrater reliability with the following formula:

$$\text{Reliability} = \frac{\text{Number of agreements}}{\text{Total number of agreements} + \text{disagreements}}$$

According to Hays and Singh (2014), a ratio of .70 is an acceptable minimum to show adequate interrater reliability. The reliability ratio for this study was .78 indicating that interrater reliability for the study exceeded the acceptable minimum.

The researcher used thick description to detail research results in chapter 4. Thick description is a method of building trustworthiness that provides credibility, transferability, confirmability, authenticity, coherence, and substantive validation of research results (Hays & Singh, 2012). Thick description is more than simply reporting the details of the study. Thick description provides context, intention, meaning, synthesis, interpretation, and development of the phenomenon being studied (Hays & Singh, 2012).

Throughout the study, the researcher also maintained an audit trail providing “physical evidence of systematic data collection and analysis procedures” (Hays & Singh, 2012, p. 214). Components of the audit trail for this study included field notes and transcripts from the in-depth interviews, a codebook, audio recordings, and the researcher’s reflexive journal.

Ethical Issues

The researcher addressed ethical issues throughout the course of the study. Kitchener’s (1984) and Meara and colleagues’ (1996) six principles of ethics for qualitative research guided the study. These principles include autonomy, nonmaleficence, beneficence, justice, fidelity, and veracity. The researcher sought permission to conduct this study from the Human Subjects Committee of the Darden College of Education (see Appendix E). The researcher explained participant confidentiality verbally before interview sessions, and survey and interview participants received consent forms with explanations of steps taken to ensure anonymity, confidentiality, and general protection of participants (see Appendices B and D).

Limitations

This study is limited to one state community college system. As such, generalizability and transferability regarding the quantitative findings to other community college systems is limited. Differences in system governance from state to state may have an impact on a community college's president's knowledge and perceptions of campus safety issues.

Summary

This study examined the knowledge and perceptions of community college presidents regarding campus safety. While the knowledge and perceptions of students, faculty, and administrators whose responsibilities directly include campus safety have been studied, there is a dearth of research pertaining to community college presidents and campus safety. This research project adds to the body of scholarly literature on campus safety.

The participants of this study were community college presidents from the Virginia Community College System. The researcher invited all 23 community college presidents in the VCCS to participate in the survey. The researcher selected a sample of three presidents representing Virginia community colleges with distinct student population size and geographic setting for the in-depth interviews.

The researcher used pattern matching, a case study data analysis method, to analyze and interpret the results. Choosing a respected qualitative research tradition to guide the study and employing the use of triangulation of data sources, thick description of findings, and an audit trail ensured the trustworthiness of this study. Through these methods, the researcher obtained detailed insight into community college presidents' and knowledge and perceptions of the phenomenon of campus safety.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This study examined community college presidents' perspectives of the phenomenon of campus safety. This study utilized a mixed methods approach. The first method utilized was quantitative and involved electronically surveying the community college presidents in the Virginia Community College System. The second method utilized was qualitative and involved in-depth, in-person interviews with three Virginia community college presidents representing small, medium, and large institutions. This chapter includes the results of both the quantitative and qualitative portions of the study broken down by each of the five research questions.

Participant Profile Summary

Survey. The researcher selected the entire population of 23 Virginia Community College presidents to send the survey. Twenty-two presidents responded. Seventeen respondents were male, and five respondents were female. The twenty-two community college presidents have a combined 211 years of experience as community college president with a mean experience of 9.6 years. Size of college served included one president from a college of fewer than 500 full time equivalent students, seven presidents from colleges with 500 to 1,999 full time equivalent students, nine presidents from colleges with 2,000 to 4,999 full-time equivalent students, three presidents from colleges with 5,000 to 9,999 full-time equivalent students, and two presidents from college with 10,000 or more full-time equivalent students.

In the survey the researcher asked the community college presidents to identify the type of location of their respective institutions. Eleven presidents identified the location of their institution as rural. One president identified the college location as town. One president identified college location as suburban. Two college presidents identified the college location as

city. Two other presidents identified the college location as rural with multiple campuses. Three presidents identified the college location as suburban with multiple campuses. Finally, two presidents identified the college location as city with multiple campuses.

Interviews. The researcher selected three community college presidents representing colleges of different size and location. At the time of the interviews, community college president A had four years of experience as a community college president and currently serves at a small community college in a small town. Community college president B had 19 total years of experience as a community college president, with 15 years at the current position in the VCCS at a mid-sized suburban community college with multiple campuses. Community college president C had 22 years of experience as a community college president with seven years at the current position in the VCCS at a large urban community college with multiple campuses.

Research Questions

As explained in Chapter I, the following research questions guided this study:

1. What are community college presidents' experiences with issues pertaining to campus safety?
2. What are community college presidents' perceptions of safety on their individual campuses?
3. What do community college presidents believe their role to be in terms of campus safety on their campus?
4. What are community college presidents' perceptions of campus safety as an issue of importance in higher education?
5. What level of knowledge do community college presidents have of laws pertaining to campus safety?

Research Question One Results: What are community college presidents' experiences with issues pertaining to campus safety?

Survey results. Survey statements 21, 34, 35 and 36 addressed research question one: What are community college presidents' experiences with issues pertaining to campus safety? Survey statement 21 addressed the participants level of agreement as to whether they believe their college has an adequate campus emergency response plan. Twenty-two participants, 100.00%, either agreed (10), or strongly agreed (12) with the statement that their campus had an adequate campus emergency response plan. Statement 34 addressed the participants level of agreement as to whether they believe their decisions have a direct impact on campus safety. Twenty participants, 90.91%, either agreed (8) or strongly agreed (12) with the statement. Two participants, 9.09%, neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement. Statement 35 addressed whether participants have experience dealing with campus safety issues. Seventeen participants, 77.27%, either agreed (12) or strongly agreed (5) with the statement that they did have experience dealing with campus safety issues, while three participants, 13.64%, neither agreed nor disagreed and two participants, 9.09%, either disagreed (1) or strongly disagreed (1) with the statement. Statement 36 addressed the participants knowledge of what to do in an emergency situation. Twenty-two, 100%, of the participants either agreed (10) or strongly agreed (12) with the statement that they know what to do in an emergency situation.

Interview results. One major theme emerged from the interviews with the three community college presidents about research question one as shown in Table 1. The first theme that emerged was the presidents indicated they lacked the resources to reinforce campus safety and security. Two subthemes emerged under this theme: acquiring the needed and latest security tools and equipment and the availability of police, security forces, and security personnel. Aside

from the main theme, two outliers emerged. The outliers are coded ideas that received just one reference. The first outlier was the need to have plans and trained personnel in place. Under this outlier was the usefulness of emergency units and plans during unexpected incidents. The second outlier pertained to the awareness of the perceptions of safety and its impact on the stakeholders. Table 1 contains the display of findings in response to the first research question.

Table 1

Display of Themes Addressing Research Question 1

| Major Theme | Subthemes | Number of References |
|---|--|----------------------|
| Lacking the resources to reinforce campus safety and security | | 2 |
| | Acquiring the needed and latest security tools and equipment | 2 |

Major Theme 1: Lacking the resources to reinforce campus safety and security. The first major theme of the study was the lack of resources to practice and reinforce campus safety and security. For all the three participants, the critical issue is the lack of support in terms of funds and resources. Specifically, the three participants shared concerns about acquiring the needed and latest security tools and equipment and the availability of police, security forces, and security personnel to safeguard the campus.

Subtheme 1: Acquiring the needed and latest security tools and equipment. The first subtheme was the need to secure the latest security tools and equipment. For two participants, one of the most significant challenges was obtaining the proper resources to assist the community college presidents as they implement their security plans and actions. President A

admitted that they do not have the funds to protect the campus and their students fully.

However, this participant also added that they have started to raise money to improve their current security practices, saying:

I think for us the biggest challenge is putting enough resources into campus safety because I feel like at times I'm talking out of both sides of my mouth – it's important, it's important and this is why, but we don't have the money to do it. But, basically in my mind is what do we eliminate to pay for it? Equipment and things like that, we've been fairly successful to raise some dollars and get some private grants and so forth.

President C shared an example of how their decreased budget affects the system and organization of their school which then also interrupts their security policies and protocols. This participant explained how their institutional signage has become inconsistent or even obsolete as they do not have the budget to update them. As a result, it has become more difficult to direct the individuals to the proper places and rooms especially during emergencies and crucial situations.

The participant narrated:

Well, I think signage is something for us that is an issue. We, because of the size of our campuses, our signage as the campuses were being built, the signage on the buildings and the directional signage inside the buildings, was haphazard. In buildings such as the [A Campus] was some old buildings. The room numbering was a hodgepodge. In fact, we don't have consistency on our room numbering college-wide. So, in some areas because of renovations that took place they kept the room numbering in place and then when the new rooms got added they gave them a whole different category. So, you have an H in one part of a building then some numbers and then you have a K on another floor because it was an addition and to rectify all of that and also to improve the signage, the directional

signage, on the different intersections on our campuses, the estimates are almost 3 million dollars. That includes interior signage, consistency of signage.

Other Issues of Concern. The interview participants discussed other issues of concern that are notable. President A discussed the need to have plans and trained personnel in place. President B discussed the importance of having awareness of the perceptions of safety and its impact on the stakeholders

Research Question Two Results: What are community college presidents' perceptions of safety on their individual campuses?

Survey results. Survey statements four through 15 and statements 22 through 27 addressed research question two: What are community college president's perceptions of safety on their individual campuses? Statements four through nine and statement 27 addressed participants' level of agreement with their perceptions of how different groups, including themselves, view the safety of their respective campuses. Twenty-one participants, 95.45%, responded either agree (8) or strongly agree (13) to statement four, "my college is safe," while one participant, 4.55%, neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement. Statement five addressed participants' level of agreement with the statement, "students attending my institution believe my college is safe." Twenty participants, 90.91%, either agreed (11) or strongly agreed (9) with the statement while two participants, 9.09%, neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement. Statement six addressed participants' level of agreement with the statement, "faculty employed at my institution believe my college is safe." Nineteen participants, 86.36%, either agreed (14) or strongly agreed (5) with the statement while two participants, 9.09%, neither agreed nor disagreed and one participant, 4.55%, disagreed with the statement. Statement seven addressed participants' level of agreement with the statement "staff employed at my institution

believe my college is safe.” Again, 19 participants, 86.36%, either agreed (13) or strongly agreed (6) while two participants, 9.09%, neither agreed nor disagreed and one participant, 4.55%, disagreed that staff employed at the participant’s institution believe it is safe. Statement eight addressed college security personnel employed at the participants’ institution. Twenty-one participants, 95.45%, either agreed (13) or strongly agreed (8) and one participant, 4.55%, neither agreed nor disagreed that college security personnel employed at the participant’s institution believe it is safe. Statement nine addressed participants’ level of agreement with the statement, “visitors to my institution believe my college is safe.” Twenty-one participants, 95.45%, either agreed (13) or strongly agreed (8) and one participant, 4.55%, neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement. Finally, statement 27, asked participants level of agreement with the statement, “the immediate surroundings of my college are safe.” Eighteen participants, 81.82%, either agreed (16) or strongly agreed (2), three participants, 13.64%, neither agreed nor disagreed, and one participant, 4.55%, disagreed that the immediate surroundings of his or her college are safe.

Survey statements 10 through 15 addressed participants’ level of agreement with statements pertaining to adequacy of safety personnel, initiatives, and features at each participant’s institution. Statement 10 addressed adequate number of safety personnel. Fourteen participants, 63.64%, agreed (10), or strongly agreed (4) that their institution has an adequate number of safety personnel. Two participants, 9.09%, neither agreed nor disagreed, and five participants, 22.73%, either disagreed (3) or strongly disagreed (2). One participant, 4.55%, did not respond to statement 10. Statement 11 addressed adequate training for campus safety personnel. Twenty participants, 90.91%, either agreed (11) or strongly agreed (9) that campus safety personnel at their respective institutions are trained adequately. Two participants, 9.09%,

disagreed with statement 11. Statement 12 addressed adequate funding for campus safety personnel. Thirteen participants, 59.09%, respondents either agreed (11) or strongly agreed (2) that campus safety personnel are funded adequately at their respective institutions. Five participants, 22.73%, neither agreed nor disagreed, and four participants, 18.18%, either disagreed (3) or strongly disagreed (1) with statement 12. Statement 13 addressed adequate funding of safety initiatives at the participants' respective institutions. Sixteen participants, 72.73% either agreed (13) or strongly agreed (3) that campus safety initiatives are funded adequately at their respective institution. Three participants, 13.64%, neither agreed nor disagreed, and three participants, 13.64%, disagreed with statement 13. Statement 14 addressed adequacy of safety features at each participant's institution. Thirteen participants, 59.09%, either agreed (9) or strongly agreed (4) that safety features at their respective institutions are adequate. Seven participants, 31.82%, neither agreed nor disagreed, and two participants, 9.09%, disagreed with statement 14. Finally, statement 15 addressed if safety features at each participant's institution are up to date. Twenty participants, 90.91%, either agreed (15) or strongly agreed (5) that safety features at their respective campuses are up to date while one participant, 4.55%, neither agreed nor disagreed and one participant, 4.55%, disagreed with statement 15.

Survey statements 22 through 27 addressed participants' level of agreement with statements addressing whether the same groups as above (students, faculty, staff, college security personnel, and visitors) know what to do in an emergency situation on campus. Fourteen participants, 63.63%, agreed that students know what to do in an emergency situation while five participants, 22.72%, neither agreed nor disagreed, and three participants, 13.64%, disagreed. Regarding faculty, 20 participants, 90.91%, either agreed (19) or strongly agreed (1) and two participants, 9.09%, neither agreed nor disagreed that faculty know what to do in an emergency

situation on campus. The same statement regarding staff, statement 24, had the same results as the statement regarding faculty above. For college security personnel, 21 participants, 95.45%, either agreed (7) or strongly agreed (14) and one participant, 4.55%, neither agreed nor disagreed that this group knows what to do in an emergency situation on their college's campus. Finally, regarding visitors to the institution, one participant, 4.55%, agreed, 10 participants, 45.45%, neither agreed nor disagreed, and 11 participants, 50.00%, disagreed that visitors to their respective institutions know what to do in a campus emergency situation.

Interview Results. The three interviews with community college presidents uncovered one major theme pertaining to research question two. The theme was the need to be proactive in building a safety program to prepare for threats and issues. All three community college presidents addressed this theme and expounded upon it with several subthemes. These subthemes were: partnering with or having an accredited police force (increased visibility); having periodic drills and mock training; providing formal training to their college personnel; and keeping up with technological advances. Table 2 contains the breakdown of the themes in response to the second research question.

Table 2

Display of Themes Addressing Research Question 2

| Major Theme | Subthemes | Number of References |
|---|--|----------------------|
| Being proactive in building a safety program to prepare for threats and safety issues | | 3 |
| | Partnering with or having an accredited police force (increased visibility) | 3 |
| | Having periodic drills and mock training | 2 |
| | Providing formal safety training to their college personnel | 2 |
| | Keeping up with technological advances (cameras, text or email alert system) | 2 |

Major Theme 2: Being proactive in building a safety program to prepare for threats and issues. The second major theme of the study was the presidents conveying the need to be proactive in continuously creating and maintaining a safety program to prepare for threats and issues. Each of the three participants described their current safety status or condition as being aware of the need to continually improve their safety measures and needs to secure the wellbeing of their students. In particular, they shared four practices or protocols currently in place: partnering with or having an accredited police force (increased visibility); having periodic drills and mock training sessions; providing formal safety training to their college personnel; and keeping up with technological advances (cameras, text or email alert systems).

Subtheme 1: Partnering with or having an accredited police force (increased visibility). The first subtheme that emerged was partnering with or having an accredited police

force within the campus for increased visibility. For the participants, each is fortunate to have security forces keeping them safe and protected at all times. As President A explained, police visibility is crucial in minimizing potential threats and issues. The participant narrated:

We're fortunate in a way that the... [local] police is within 2 miles of the campus. The state police and the sheriff, the county sheriffs, they do rounds on campus all the time. I see the cars out there all the time, so they, they have created the visibility and being able to actually..., you know, we have a presence. We have a presence during the day, and we have a presence, and a lot of times when I come in in the morning there's either a sheriff and a state police or two state police. I say lot of times. I'd say probably once a month there's two cars right at the entrance just, you know, they're parking there as we come in. So, I like having that presence to be able to... I mean fortunately we've never had theft issues. We've never had, you know, anything like that. We have done some other things, when we get to question 9, I'll talk about that.

Subtheme 2: Having periodic drills and mock training. The second subtheme was the presence of periodic drills and mock training sessions on campus. These activities allow for the campus stakeholders to prepare themselves for similar security threats and incidents in the future. President C explained during the interview that they continue to promote the importance of awareness by being proactive and securing the cooperation of both the administration and the students. The participant explained:

Well, we have regular practice drills for things like weather incidents, emergencies. You know, we have like tornado warnings. There're certain parts of the building you go to. We have regular, routine drills. They're regularly scheduled, not every week.... Fire drills, you know, we test the equipment. I mean, if the police chief were here or... our

C.F.O. who oversees all the police and facilities, [they] she could probably come up with ten other things that we do that just aren't popping into my head, but, I mean, ... it's a very ... regulated is not quite the right word but it's a very carefully monitored practice process that we have. So, I mean, it's routine, I guess. It's built into our schedules for safety and that includes things like C.P.R. training for certain, you know, some people, things like that ... and we partner a lot with our local jurisdictions.

Subtheme 3: Providing formal safety training to their college personnel. The third subtheme that followed was the provision of formal safety training to the college's personnel. The interviewed participants shared how they have been very much open and willing to invest in the development of their personnel's security skills and knowledge over the years. As President B explained, they require their security staff to undergo strict education and orientation processes before allowing them to take the job formally. The participant stated:

We do practices and, I mean, we actually spend the money to send someone to the police academy if we hire someone who's not been to the police academy before we let them be a police officer. I don't know that other colleges do that. I don't know. Maybe they do. I just don't know.

Subtheme 4: Keeping up with technological advances (cameras, text or email alert systems). The fourth subtheme that emerged was the practice of keeping up with current technological advances, such as having high-definition cameras and communicating through text or email. President A emphasized the importance of having the latest tools and equipment that can help security personnel with their job monitoring and identifying security threats and issues on campus. The participant narrated:

So, in the short period of time we've things, for example, we also have a center in [another location] ok, we actually have cameras on, on that, at that center that we were able to get grant money, and we didn't have enough grant money to this campus but there's more bodies here and more, more of us administration on a regular basis. So, we, we put safety cameras in, and they have actually helped in a couple of instances if there had been damage or something, we can actually see cars driving in. They're of decent quality, so you can identify people's faces and you can identify things such as, you know, license plates, and, you know, and so forth. We upgraded the, on this campus, we upgraded things such as the sound system for the external speakers. So, when we have a lock down, you know, we, we clearly hear it and not jumbled or if you're in a – there's no dead zones as far as we could tell based on, so we were able to, you know, if you're down at the other end of the campus that speaker should be, and it wasn't a speaker there.

Research Question Three Results: What do community college presidents believe their role to be in terms of campus safety on their campus?

Survey results. Survey statements two and three and 37 through 41 addressed research question three: What do community college presidents believe their role to be in terms of campus safety on their campus? Statement two addressed staying current with campus safety issues. Twenty-two participants, 100.00%, either agreed (11) or strongly agreed (11) with the statement, "I stay current with campus safety issues." Statement three asked participants to rate level of agreement with the statement, "Considerations of campus safety guide my decision making." Twenty participants, 90.91%, either agreed (6) or strongly agreed (14) while two participants, 9.09%, neither agreed nor disagreed with statement three. Statement 37 asked participants' level of agreement with addressing constituents about campus safety. Twenty-two participants either

agreed (11) or strongly agreed (11) with statement 37. Statement 38 asked participants' level of agreement with informing college board members of issues pertaining to campus safety. Twenty participants, 90.91%, either agreed (9) or strongly agreed (11) and two participants, 9.09%, neither agreed nor disagreed. Statement 39 addressed participants' level of agreement with advocating for adequate funding of campus safety initiatives. Eighteen participants, 81.82%, either agreed (9) or strongly agreed (9) that they advocate for adequate funding of campus safety initiatives, and four participants, 18.18% neither agreed nor disagreed. Statement 40 addressed participants' level of agreement with advocating for adequate funding of campus safety personnel. Eighteen participants, 81.82%, either agreed (10) or strongly agreed (8) that they advocate for adequate funding of campus safety personnel, and four participants, 18.18% neither agreed nor disagreed. Statement 41 asked participants about reading the annual security report each year before it is distributed to the campus community. Nineteen, 86%, of the participants either agreed (12) or strongly agreed (7) with the statement. Three participants, 14%, responded neither agree nor disagree with the statement.

Interview Results. One major theme concerning research question three emerged from the interviews with the three community college presidents. Each of the three community college presidents explained their perceptions of the role of the community college president in campus safety as the individual who reinforces the values that promote safety and security. Two subthemes also emerged from the interviews: being active in ensuring the wellness and safety of stakeholders at all times and having the knowledge and skills to reinforce campus security and safety. Table 3 contains the breakdown of the themes addressing the third research question of the study.

Table 3

Display of Themes Addressing Research Question 3

| Major Theme | Subthemes | Number of References |
|---|---|----------------------|
| Reinforcing and communicating the values that promote safety and security | | 3 |
| | Being active in ensuring the wellness and safety of stakeholders at all times | 2 |
| | Having the knowledge and skills to reinforce campus security and safety | 2 |

Major Theme 3: Reinforcing and communicating the values that promote safety and security. The third major theme of the study was the community college president's role of continually reinforcing and communicating the values that promote their stakeholders' safety and security. For all the interviewed participants, their role entails the following: being active in ensuring the wellness and safety of stakeholders at all times; having the knowledge and skills to reinforce campus security and safety; and communicating campus safety and security matters to stakeholders. For President B, it was important for the college presidents to be able to convey campus safety messages and communicate with the other members of the campus. This participant believes that communication entails the participation of all parties. Thus, college presidents must secure the cooperation of the administration, faculty members, parents, and students. The participant noted:

I think communicating overall what I think of campus safety and being serious about when we have issues with our safety. Taking seriously when we do drills – campus safety drills, incident responses. Taking seriously when complaints from students or staff

come about, maybe a hostile environment or treatment by somebody, to say that it's unacceptable and use the processes that we have for investigation to communicate that that is important.

The researcher discusses each subtheme below.

Subtheme 1: Being active in ensuring the wellness and safety of stakeholders at all times.

The first subtheme that emerged from the analysis of the interviews was the need to be proactive in critically analyzing campus safety issues and incidents and implementing rules to address them accordingly. As President C explained, school leaders must be aware of the current problems and have the initiative to conduct reviews and examinations that would help them determine the best possible solutions that would fit their campus' needs and resources. This participant explained during the interview:

We just approved a policy that every employee, every student will be required to carry their ID card.... We had an incident not too long ago where a student who was no longer a student assaulted a female faculty member in a bathroom, and the only way she was able to identify him, he had been in one of her classes last year. But he had no ID. Whether she would have been able to see his ID because of the way of the nature of the incident, I don't know. It made us question our safety precautions, and, so, I directed a review of all of our policies, our emergency response and one of the very simple and small outcomes out of it was that access to buildings. We have safety officers with the security officers that we have that are contracted. Students, they need to have the ability to stop somebody and we said that can only happen if everybody wears it, and, so we're implementing effective September 1 the requirement that every student and every staff have to have ID's.

Subtheme 2: Having the knowledge and skills to reinforce campus security and safety.

Another subtheme uncovered from the analysis was the need to have both the knowledge and skills to reinforce campus security and safety. For President A, college presidents must have the proper training to lead both the campus staff members and students and to have them listen to and respect to their words and opinions. Based on President A's experience, college presidents must lead the school's security initiatives, and, without the president's understanding of the urgency of the issues and capability to develop the adequate and operational security plans, it would be challenging to build a safety program on campus. The participant explained:

Well the president needs to... I can tell you that since I got here and since being a president and this is my first presidency; it [campus safety] has been a number one. I mean, you know, I think about it daily. I think about, I don't, I can't say that I lose sleep over it but it's always one of things I always think about during the day as I walk around as I look at things. So, the president really needs to be, I think, trained to a point. Have some of those trainings which I have done and part of it because I was on my leadership team of my last school, we all got trained from ICS and all those you know online training and those types of things but, but as president being able to sort of understand and have those – needs to be the, you know safety on a. If campus safety is not discussed at a senior team meeting at least monthly, I think it's the president's role to really be able to say what have we, what have we done on campus to potentially improve safety this month? It needs to be always a constant, a constant priority.

Research Question Four Results: What are community college presidents' perceptions of campus safety as an issue of importance in higher education?

Survey statements one and 28 through 31 addressed research question four: What are community college presidents' perceptions of campus safety as an issue of importance in higher education? Statement one addressed participants' level of agreement with the statement, "campus safety is an important issue in higher education." Twenty-two participants, 100%, either agreed (2) or strongly agreed (20) that campus safety is an important issue in higher education. Statement 28 addressed participants' level of agreement with the safety of higher education institutions, in general. Seventeen participants, 77.27%, either agreed (15) or strongly agreed (2) that institutions of higher education are safe while four participants, 18.18%, neither agreed nor disagreed and one participant, 4.55%, disagreed. Statement 29 addressed the safety of community colleges in general. Nineteen participants, 86.36%, either agreed (14) or strongly agreed (5) that, in general, community colleges are safe while two participants, 9.09%, neither agreed nor disagreed and one participant, 4.55%, disagreed. Statement 30 addressed the safety of 4-year colleges and universities in general. Sixteen participants, 72.72%, either agreed (14) or strongly agreed (2) that, in general, 4-year colleges and universities are safe while four participants, 18.18%, neither agreed nor disagreed and two participants, 9.09%, disagreed. Finally, statement 31 asked participants' level of agreement with the statement, "in general, community colleges are safer than 4-year colleges and universities." Four participants, 18.18%, either agreed (2) or strongly agreed (2) that community colleges are safer than four-year colleges and universities. Fourteen participants, 63.64%, neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement, and four participants, 18.18%, disagreed.

Interview Results. One major theme emerged from the in-depth interviews about research question four. The participants believed that as an issue in higher education campus safety needs prioritization and more considerable attention. Two subthemes emerged as well:

needing to manage and control safety and security issues and affecting the overall environment and climate of the school community. Table 4 contains the display of themes addressing the fourth research question of the study.

Table 4

Display of Themes Addressing Research Question 4

| Major Theme | Subthemes | Number of References |
|---|---|----------------------|
| Prioritizing campus safety and security | | 3 |
| | Needing to manage and control safety and security issues | 2 |
| | Affecting the overall environment and climate of the school community | 2 |

Major Theme 4: Prioritizing campus safety and security. The fourth major theme of the study was prioritizing campus safety and security. All the three participants believed that higher education has started to understand and address the importance of campus safety and security. Overall, they indicated the need to continually access security in colleges and universities across the nation. Participants also addressed the need to manage and control safety and security issues as these affect the environment and climate of the college community.

Subtheme 1: Needing to manage and control safety and security issues. The first subtheme that emerged was the call to manage and control security threats within institutions. For President A, it was crucial to stay updated and examine incidents at different institutions across the nation. Through this practice, President A explained college presidents and

stakeholders may better identify potential issues and create plans and solutions to mitigate incidents accordingly. The participant explained:

Well, I read articles every day in Inside Higher Ed or the Chronicle of Higher Ed about incidents across the country and know there's even things about free speech and demonstrations and so forth. So being able to sort of have that controlled, controlled to a point and that they don't get out of hand, but campus safety, again, has to be a priority among other priorities and in many cases, you know, I see campus safety in the top three to five of my priorities, and, again, we're in a quiet area. I've always used the analogy – no one ever heard of Columbine – no one ever heard of New Town, Connecticut, and I was up in New England when that happened, until those incidences. I said I don't want anybody to hear nationally about [his institution's town] unless it is a positive thing. So, that's been the line I've been sharing is that, you know, safety still a priority for me. Unfortunately, we haven't been able to put the resources that we need to. We've put some, and I'll answer that in the next question but have not really put what we need to, but we have some plans that we may be able to incorporate over the next year.

Subtheme 2: Affecting the overall environment and climate of the school community. The study also uncovered that college presidents have already realized how much security threats affect the overall environment and climate of their communities. President B noted how perceptions of safety affect the attitudes and behaviors of the stakeholders. President B explained further that students and their parents must be assured of the safety of the institution and college leaders have the key responsibility to do so by trying to manage perceptions:

Well, I think that there are two different aspects of it. One is, there's a real aspect and then there's the perceptions of safety, and you have to manage both because what you

don't want to have is the perceptions of safety and then find out people are getting hurt because it's not safe. If you have, and if you poorly manage the reality of a safe environment, then you scare people off, too, or they don't learn as much, or they can't concentrate, or you don't attract as good of employees because they think it's unsafe, right? So, they are equally, I think, important.

Research Question Five Results: What level of knowledge do community college presidents have of laws pertaining to campus safety?

Survey statements 16 through 20 and statements 32 and 33 addressed research question five: What level of knowledge do community college presidents have of laws pertaining to campus safety? Statement 16 addressed participant's agreement with knowing if the participant's respective institution publishes an Annual Security Report. Twenty-one participants, 94.45%, either agreed (10) or strongly agreed (11) while one participant, 4.55%, neither agreed nor disagreed that their respective institutions publish an Annual Security Report. Statement seventeen addressed level of agreement with participants' familiarity with federal laws pertaining to campus safety. Twenty participants, 90.91%, agreed (12) or strongly agreed (8) that they are familiar with federal campus safety laws. Two participants, 9.09%, disagreed with statement seventeen. Statement eighteen addressed compliance with federal campus safety laws. Twenty-two respondents, 100%, either agreed (9) or strongly agreed (13) that their respective institution complies with federal campus safety laws. Statement nineteen addressed familiarity with state laws pertaining to campus safety. Twenty participants, 90.01%, either agreed (9) or strongly agreed (11) that they are familiar with state campus safety laws. Two participants, 9.09%, disagreed with statement nineteen. Statement 20 addressed compliance with state

campus safety laws. Twenty-two participants, 100%, either agreed (8) or strongly agreed (14) that their respective institution complies with state campus safety laws.

Statements 32 and 33 addressed level of agreement with effectiveness of federal and state campus safety laws. Statement 32 asked participants their level of agreement with the statement, “The *Clery Act* is effective in promoting safe colleges.” Ten participants, 45.45%, either agreed (9) or strongly agreed (1) with statement 32. Eight participants, 36.36%, neither agreed nor disagreed with statement 32 while four participants, 18.18% disagreed. Statement 33 addressed effectiveness of state campus safety regulations. Twelve participants, 54.55%, either agreed (10) or strongly agreed (2) that campus safety regulations are effective in promoting safe colleges. Six participants, 27.27%, neither agreed nor disagreed with statement 33 while four participants, 18.18%, disagreed.

Interview results. One major theme pertaining to research question five emerged from the in-depth interviews with the three community college presidents: the need for community college presidents to understand and comply with safety protocols, policies, and regulations. The participants specifically mentioned Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) regulations, SANS cybersecurity training, and the campus safety regulations of the *Clery Act*. Knowledge of specific examples of training and regulatory requirements emerged as subthemes. Table 5 displays a summary of the theme and subtheme.

Table 5

Display of Themes Addressing Research Question 5

| Major Theme | Subtheme | Number of References |
|--|---|----------------------|
| Understanding and complying with safety protocols and policies | | 3 |
| | Knowledge of training and regulatory requirements (SANS, FEMA, and <i>Clery Act</i>) | 3 |

Major Theme 5: Understanding and complying with safety protocols and policies.

The fifth and final major theme uncovered from the analysis of the three interview transcripts was the college presidents' awareness of the need to follow certain safety protocols and policies. All three participants mentioned and displayed their awareness of various government policies such as FEMA, the need for SANS training, and the Clery Act. President B discussed the requirement of following the Clery Act yearly, saying:

I forget what it's called. There's a report that is required for campus safety each year that the feds require. Do you know what I'm talking about? (Researcher – Clery.) Clery, Clery. I think it's called Clery, yeah, and, so, you know, you want those numbers to be good because, I mean, think about how many college decisions are not made by the students but by their parents, and one of the things the parents do, especially when they are youngsters, their child's in high school, is, if they think there's a risk, I mean I can tell you, a lot more parents were, their sensitivity to safety was raised after the Virginia Tech shootings than ever before.

As part of the interview, the researcher directly asked for each participant to describe his or her knowledge of state and federal laws pertaining to campus safety. President A described his level of knowledge of state and federal laws pertaining to campus safety as follows, “I would say I’m competent. I’m far from any expert... I’m one that I’m not going to ask people to do it [security training] unless I’m going to do it as well. So, I would say competent, far from an expert but not... I’m aware and can speak at a low level of the rules and requirements are.” President B did not directly answer the question but taking his interview as a whole he displayed strong knowledge of campus safety in general and, as quoted above, spoke about crime reporting, which is a specific requirement of the *Clery Act*. President C described her level of knowledge of state and federal laws pertaining to campus safety as follows, “So, my level of knowledge in state and federal laws pertaining [to campus safety], I would have to admit that I am vaguely familiar. I couldn’t tell you the specific sections and everything. I know about the *Clery Act*.... I know we that we have to have certain number of compliance activities. I don’t have intimate knowledge.”

Summary

The fourth chapter of the study contained the results from the surveys and in-depth interviews of the Virginia community college presidents. The purpose of this study was to learn about the relationship between community college presidents and the phenomenon of campus safety. The descriptive statistics gathered from the survey results displayed the general knowledge and perceptions about campus safety of the participating community college presidents. The thematic analysis of the in-depth interviews led to the discovery of five major themes related to the five research questions of the study. These themes provided insight directly from community college presidents into the study purpose and research questions. In the next

chapter, the researcher's recommendations, study implications, and conclusions will be presented.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS

Campus safety is a crucial element and responsibility of every institution. Ensuring the welfare of institutional stakeholders such as the students, faculty, staff, parents, and visitors should be a priority for institutional leadership. Having an unsafe campus can lead to various negative implications which can then cause the overall decline of the institution because prospective students, faculty, staff, and administrators may choose not to attend or work at an institution with a reputation of being unsafe. Campus crime is an on-going issue in the United States, and with continuous campus violence comes increasing calls for concrete action from institutions themselves and for laws and regulations from state and federal governments. The purpose of this study was to learn about the relationship between community college presidents and the phenomenon of campus safety. Community college presidents must be knowledgeable about a variety of topics that affect the operations of an institution, and campus safety is one of these topics. This study utilized a mixed methods approach.

The first research method utilized was quantitative and involved electronically surveying the community college presidents in the Virginia Community College System. The second method utilized was a qualitative study which involved in-depth, in-person interviews with three Virginia community college presidents representing small, medium, and large institutions. The following research questions guided the study:

1. What are community college presidents' experiences with issues pertaining to campus safety?
2. What are community college presidents' perceptions of safety on their individual campuses?

3. What do community college presidents believe their role to be in terms of campus safety on their campus?
4. What are community college presidents' perceptions of campus safety as an issue of importance in higher education?
5. What level of knowledge do community college presidents have of laws pertaining to campus safety?

This chapter contains a summary of the findings, a discussion of the findings in relation to the reviewed literature and theoretical framework, implications of the findings, recommendations for community college leaders, recommendations for future research, and conclusions.

Summary of the Findings

This section discusses the results of the findings. Table 6 presents the overall findings from the data analyses and contains the breakdown of the compiled results from the surveys and interviews.

Table 6

Summary of the Study Results

| Research Question | Survey Results | Interview Results |
|---|---|--|
| RQ1. What are community college presidents' experiences with issues pertaining to campus safety? | Majority of the Respondents Agreed/ Strongly Agreed with having experience and their decisions having an impact in addressing issues pertaining campus safety, having | Lacking the resources to reinforce campus safety and security <i>*Acquiring the needed and latest security tools and equipment</i> |
| RQ2. What are community college presidents' perceptions of safety on their individual campuses? | Majority of the Respondents Agreed/ Strongly Agreed that they have positive perceptions of the safety of their campus and surrounding area and that they perceive that students, faculty, staff, security personnel, and visitors perceive their campus as safe | Being proactive in building a safety program to prepare for threats and safety issues <i>*Partnering with or having an accredited police force</i> <i>*Having periodic drills and mock training</i> <i>*Providing formal safety training to their college personnel</i> <i>*Keeping up with technological advances</i> |
| RQ3. What do community college presidents believe their role to be in terms of campus safety on their campus? | Majority of the Respondents Agreed/ Strongly Agreed with being current and considering campus safety in decision making, the importance of communication with stakeholders, and adequately advocating for campus safety initiatives | Reinforcing the values that promote safety and security <i>*Being active in ensuring the wellness and safety of stakeholders at all times</i> <i>*Having the knowledge and skills to reinforce campus security and safety</i> |
| RQ4. What are community college presidents' perceptions of campus safety as an issue of importance in higher education? | Majority of the Respondents Agreed/ Strongly Agreed that campus safety is an important issue in higher education but were less certain about their perceptions of the general | Prioritizing campus safety and security <i>*Needing to manage and control safety and security issues</i> <i>*Affecting the overall environment and climate of the school community</i> |

(continued)

| Research Question | Survey Results | Interview Results |
|--|---|--|
| | safety of all college campuses and if community colleges are safer than 4-year institutions | |
| RQ5. What level of knowledge do community college presidents have of laws pertaining to campus safety? | Majority of the Respondents Agreed/ Strongly Agreed with being familiar with laws pertaining to campus safety and that their colleges comply with said laws but were less certain about the positive impact of campus safety laws | Complying with safety protocols and policies * <i>Knowledge of training and regulatory requirements (SANS, FEMA, Clery Act)</i> |

Research Question 1. What are community college presidents' experiences with issues pertaining to campus safety? From the survey data, 22 participants, 100.00%, either agreed, or strongly agreed with the statement that their campus had an adequate campus emergency response plan. Further, participants' level of agreement as to whether they believe their decisions have a direct impact on campus safety was high. The majority or twenty participants, 90.91%, either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Participants also reported their experiences in dealing with campus safety issues. Seventeen participants, 77.27%, also agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that they had experiences dealing with campus safety issues. Finally, the majority of the participants reported their knowledge of what to do in an emergency situation with twenty-two, 100%, of the participants either agreeing or strongly agreeing with the statement. Overall, from the survey, the majority of the surveyed participants agreed and strongly agreed that they already have an awareness of current campus safety issues present in their respective institutions. They identified how they already have an adequate campus emergency response plan, that they have a direct say on the safety of their campus, that

they have previously dealt with campus safety issues, and that they are equipped with the knowledge and skills to respond to emergency situations.

The analysis of the interviews with the participants uncovered one major theme which was the report that the participants believe there is a lack of resources to support and reinforce campus safety and security. For all of the interviewed participants, the most critical issue for them was the lack of funding. Explicitly, the three interviewed participants indicated their concerns about acquiring the required and latest security tools and equipment and the accessibility of police, security forces, and security personnel to safeguard the campus.

Research Question 2. What are community college presidents' perceptions of safety on their individual campuses? The survey data established that the respondents generally agreed and strongly agreed that their campuses were safe for their students, staff, faculty, and the rest of the community. The participants' level of agreement with their perceptions of how different groups, including themselves, view the safety of their respective campuses demonstrated that twenty-one participants (95.45%) responded positively about the safety of their campuses. In addition, twenty participants (90.91%) also agreed that they believe their students find their campuses safe. As for the perceptions of the faculty members and the other staff members, the majority (86.36%) of the surveyed respondents agreed that their faculty and staff members find that the college is safe. Meanwhile 95.45% of the surveyed respondents indicated that they believe that their own security personnel as well as visitors find their campuses safe. Finally, 81.82% of the participants believed that the immediate surroundings of their colleges are safe.

It is notable that when asked about the adequacy of the safety personnel, initiatives, and other features of campus safety, the respondents agreed less with the statements. Although only

63.64% of the respondents believed that they had an adequate number of safety personnel, 90.91% of the respondents emphasized that their institutions have safety training programs in place. Meanwhile, only 72.73% believed that they have adequate funding for their campus safety efforts, and 59.09% agreed that their current safety practices are adequate. Finally, 90.91% of the participants reported that their safety resources are up to date.

Also, although not on par with the positive results of the previous statements, the responses of the respondents expressed that their stakeholders are well-equipped during emergency situations remained positive as well. The security personnel followed by faculty members and staff members received the highest positive response with the respondents' perceived readiness during emergency situations. Meanwhile, 63.63% of the respondents believed that students were well prepared for emergency situations. Finally, the majority of the respondents indicated that their visitors would be unaware of what to do during emergency incidences.

From the qualitative data set, the interviewed participants agreed that community college presidents should be proactive in creating and maintaining a safety program to prepare for threats and safety issues. In particular, the interview participants suggested several practices to be followed or that are currently in place. These were: partnering with or having an accredited police force (increased visibility); having periodic drills and mock training sessions; providing formal safety training to their college personnel; and keeping up with technological advances (cameras, text or email alert system).

Research Question 3. What do community college presidents believe their role to be in terms of campus safety on their campus? With regard to the third research question, data from the respondents reported that the community college presidents found that they were

positively updated about the safety of their campus. The majority of respondents would also usually consider campus safety when making decisions. Further, the majority of the participants agreed with the statement of needing to approach and inform the other stakeholders about the safety of the campus. The survey also revealed how the community college presidents agree that they believe they advocate for adequate funding for campus safety initiatives and personnel.

From the interviews, each of the community college presidents reported that they continue to reinforce the values that promote safety and security inside the campus. The participants emphasized their willingness to take an active role to guarantee the safety of all campus members. Specifically, they indicated that they are active in promoting the safety and welfare of their stakeholders at all times and relayed that they are confident of their knowledge and skills to implement proper safety measures.

Research Question 4. What are community college presidents' perceptions of campus safety as an issue of importance in higher education? In response to the fourth research question, all of the survey respondents believed that campus safety is an important issue in higher education. However, when asked about the general safety of all college campuses, there was a decline in the positive responses of the participants. Further, the researcher found it notable that the respondents were uncertain if community colleges were safer than 4-year colleges and universities.

From the interviews, community college presidents all indicated the need for the higher education community to prioritize campus safety and give more attention to the overall safety issues and concerns of the stakeholders. With a lack of attention, it is highly plausible that the overall environment or climate of the college community will be affected.

Research Question 5. What level of knowledge do community college presidents have of laws pertaining to campus safety? The survey data showed that the majority of the community college presidents were well aware of the need to publish an annual security report. The majority of the respondents also indicated their familiarity with the federal campus safety laws and how they agree or strongly agree with their institutions' compliance with these laws. Finally, when asked about the effectiveness of the *Clery Act*, only 45.45% shared that they strongly agreed or agreed that *Clery* has had a positive impact on campus safety.

From the thematic analysis of the interviews, all participants reported that they believed their institutions comply with safety protocols and policies. In particular, interview participants discussed FEMA training (Federal Emergency Management Agency), SANS Institute (SysAdmin, Audit, Network, and Security) training, and annual crime reporting required by the *Clery Act*. Some participants were unable to fully and completely explain the purpose and processes of these laws and regulations, but the participants could state and explain how laws and regulations are important in promoting campus safety.

Interpretation of the Findings

This section discusses the researcher's interpretation of the findings by research question.

Research Question 1. What are community college presidents' experiences with issues pertaining to campus safety? Examining the results of the survey and interview data, the researcher inferred that the respondents and participants had varying experiences on the issues pertaining to campus safety. In the survey data, the respondents shared their awareness of the safety of their campuses as well as the issues surrounding them. Meanwhile, the interview results revealed that the community college presidents continuously encounter problems with finding adequate resources to ensure safety at their institutions. Although the respondents

remained positive about their awareness, the results of the interviews indicated the community college presidents required more resources to promote campus safety and comply with laws and regulations.

As noted in Chapter 2, resource management is one of the six competencies of community college leaders as put forth by the American Association of Community Colleges (2005). The literature supported the importance of resource management as explained by Garza Mitchell (2012) who found that resource management is the most crucial aspect of decision making for community college presidents. Maintaining safe college campuses requires funds, and, as the interviews show, community college presidents struggle to find and to allocate limited funds to campus safety initiatives. The literature reviewed for this study did not expressly address campus safety funding, so the finding that the study participants have concern about having adequate resources to ensure campus safety at their institutions offers new insight into the issue of campus safety.

Research Question 2. What are community college presidents' perceptions of safety on their individual campuses? From the survey, the community college presidents believed that majority of their stakeholders found their campuses to be safe. For the educators and staff members, the community college presidents believed that they viewed safety positively and were well aware of what to do during emergency situations. Meanwhile, the researcher noted that community college presidents supposed the students viewed their campuses to be somewhat safe and were also somehow ready during emergency situations. As for their security personnel and visitors, the respondents found that these stakeholders also perceive the campuses to be safe. Finally, the community college presidents believed that they had the proper resources for their

safety practices and efforts. This last finding does not adhere to the interview theme of inadequate funding, as seen in the previous research question.

The analysis of the interviews led to the discovery that the majority of the participants found that there is a need for community college presidents to be proactive in creating and maintaining campus safety programs to prepare for threats and issues. In particular, the interview participants suggested: partnering with or having an accredited police force (increased visibility); having periodic drills and mock training sessions; providing formal safety training to their college personnel; and keeping up with technological advances (cameras and text or email alert system). This finding confirmed previous research, including Connolly's (2012b) report on the promotion of crisis preparation and threat assessment at community colleges. In this study, the researcher highlighted the need for administrators to be knowledgeable and proactive when dealing with campus-safety problems and issues.

Research Question 3. What do community college presidents believe their role to be in terms of campus safety on their campus? From the two data sources, the results supported one another in terms of the positive roles that the community college presidents take on in order to secure the safety of their campuses and stakeholders. The survey revealed how the community college presidents continue to play an active role in protecting their campuses as well as communicating safety decisions and measures to the rest of the community. As for the interviews, the community college presidents provided examples on how they reinforce safety values and practices mainly doing so through communication. There is a need for the community college presidents as leaders to spearhead the institution's safety practices to enhance institutional preparedness and readiness when faced with campus safety issues (Gnage et al.,

2009). Again, responses to survey and interview questions pertaining to this research question reiterated that community college leaders need to be proactive at all times (Connolly, 2012b).

Research Question 4. What are community college presidents' perceptions of campus safety as an issue of importance in higher education? From the two data sources, the key finding uncovered in the fourth research question was that the participating community college presidents agree that campus safety is an important issue in higher education and should be a priority for leadership. While displaying strong agreement that campus safety is an important issue, the participants were less sure about their perceptions of the overall safety of colleges and universities and whether community colleges are safer than four-year institutions. The participants seemed to display caution when asked to share their perceptions of the overall safety of all college campuses and whether one type of institution is safer than another. The study participants understood campus safety to be a serious issue, and they understood the impact campus safety has on institutional climate. Still, the participants showed uncertainty in making blanket generalizations about campus safety and comparing campus safety at community colleges to four-year institutions. They seemed to be more comfortable addressing campus safety as it pertained to their own institutions.

Research Question 5. What level of knowledge do community college presidents have of laws pertaining to campus safety? The two data sources again had similar findings with the awareness of the community college presidents on the importance and efficiency of the laws on campus safety. The participants provided *Clery Act* annual reporting and FEMA and SANS training as examples. The participants were knowledgeable about the fact that colleges and universities must follow certain laws pertaining to campus safety. Additionally, they displayed skepticism about the efficacy of campus safety laws. It is positive that the study results

showed the participants are knowledgeable about campus safety laws. Further, that the participants displayed skepticism toward the efficacy of campus safety laws illustrated a deeper understanding of campus safety laws than mere working knowledge of the existence of these laws.

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework guiding this study was Heifitz's approach to ethical leadership. In the case of campus safety, Heifitz's approach would have the community college president mobilize college leadership, faculty, staff, and students to confront this difficult issue. For a community college president this means sharing his or her perceptions about the safety of his or her institution with his or her constituents and actively learning the perceptions of his or her constituents. The community college president then mobilizes his or her followers to learn the truth about campus safety at the institution and to offer his or her support to address what the followers find and to work with them to develop a plan to address the findings. The ethical community college leader does not hide campus safety issues and concerns from stakeholders. Rather, the ethical community college is transparent about both campus safety issues and funding inadequacies that challenge addressing campus safety issues. The ethical community college president then seeks the assistance of stakeholders to identify and recommend solutions to address the challenges of maintaining a safe college campus with limited resources.

Implications of the Study

From the report on the quantitative and qualitative results, the current study may bring new insights to the key policy and decision makers of community colleges across the country. Specifically, the results of this study may be employed by community college presidents themselves to modify or improve their current campus safety initiatives and practices. Data from

the current study may be applied by community college presidents as they advocate for funding for initiatives that aim provide a safe environment where their students may have the opportunity to learn, grow, and succeed. A safe campus will allow faculty members to freely and effectively teach the students and pursue research interests. Further, on a safe campus staff and administrators may work harmoniously. With the promotion of a safe environment all stakeholders benefit potentially leading to more efficient performance from all members of the college community.

The study demonstrated the awareness and readiness of college presidents to provide the best and safest possible environment for their students, faculty, staff, and visitors. However, the researcher notes that there are issues and challenges faced by community college presidents as they perform their roles. The results of the study are crucial in identifying the kind of support needed by community college presidents in order to promote the goal of a safe community college campus. Additionally, the results of the current study serve as an eye-opener to the education community to the challenges community college presidents face working to ensure safe colleges for teaching, learning, and working. Ultimately, this study offers initial insight into the phenomenon of campus safety from the perspective of community college presidents, a group that the literature on campus safety does not address. Therefore, this study is a starting point for future research that delves more deeply into the role of the community college president regarding campus safety.

Recommendations

Based on the study results, the researcher offers several recommendations which may be employed in current practice and future studies. The recommendations are:

1. Community college presidents should regularly review their own perceptions of campus safety at their institutions and compare them to the reality of campus safety by regularly surveying key constituents and comparing the findings to campus crime data. The community college presidents surveyed and interviewed for this study perceived their institutions to be safe at a high rate. The ethical leader trusts not only his or her own perceptions but seeks input from his or her followers.
2. Community college presidents should increase their awareness of the current state of campus safety. Community college presidents should continually evaluate their knowledge and skills pertaining to campus safety issues and advance their knowledge and skills as needed. Further, by studying the examples and practices of other colleges, community college presidents may discover new perspectives that could assist them in their leadership practices in terms of campus safety needs and initiatives.
3. Community college leaders should address student preparedness in emergency situations. Because community colleges are commuter campuses, it may be challenging to address emergency preparedness in venues other than the classroom. One option is to train faculty to educate students on campus safety and emergency preparedness so they may address these issues at the start of each semester. A challenge with this option is finding adequate training time for faculty on ten-month contracts. The number of adjunct faculty who spend limited time on campus and the need for proper training is also a concern. Another option is to provide mandatory online emergency preparedness training for all students, faculty, staff, and administrators. Challenges with this option are figuring out how to make online training mandatory and how to provide it to students who may not have online accessibility. For faculty, staff, and administrators, the challenge may simply be finding

the time. The cost of either developing or purchasing an online training program is yet another issue. The National Center for Campus Public Safety offers training webinars for higher education professional. Community colleges like Virginia Western Community College incorporate emergency preparedness training by requiring instructors to show a safety video in each class at the start of each semester.

4. Future researchers can add to the knowledge of campus safety by conducting interviews with other community college members or stakeholders such as the faculty, students, security personnel, board members, and parents. By doing so, campus safety perceptions of the community college presidents gathered from both the surveys and interviews may be validated. Triangulation of the similarities and differences of the data collected from the different groups may then be performed. The additional data from the various groups may also help improve overall recommendations for how campus safety may be improved based on the perceptions and experiences of all campus stakeholders.
5. Future researchers should increase the sample size of the interview participants in the qualitative component of the study. By doing so, more themes may be generated per research question which may lead to a more exhaustive discussion of campus safety at different colleges. Further, additional interviews may address the outliers found in the study and further develop trustworthiness of the finding.
6. Future researchers should study the possible effects of the characteristics and demographics of the participants' institutions because community college presidents' perceptions and experiences may vary based on institutional characteristics and demographics, including institution size and location.

7. Future researchers should conduct similar studies in states with different community college governance systems. A limitation of this study is that it focuses on one centralized state community college system. The body of knowledge on campus safety would benefit from similar studies of different state community college systems allowing for comparison based on community college governance.
8. Future researchers should conduct similar studies in states without a mass campus shooting incident to learn if having a major incident occur in the same state has an impact on community college presidents' perceptions of campus safety. Does having a major tragedy in one's state affect community college presidents' perceptions of the importance of campus safety?

Conclusions

In conclusion, the results of the current study may be employed as solid pieces of evidence that expand the body of research on campus safety. The current study is unique given that the main data source used was gathered from the community college presidents themselves. Community college presidents' firsthand perceptions and experiences brought new insights and lessons on how community college presidents view campus safety. For the community college presidents, they constantly highlighted that awareness and education are crucial. However, leaders must also take charge and stay proactive and current on campus safety conditions and the needs of their respective institutions. In addition, although the community college presidents were positive about the current status of the safety of their respective colleges; the community college presidents surveyed and interviewed voiced their concerns about promoting and maintaining safe institutions in the face of inadequate funds and resources. Community college presidents face lack of funding which greatly affects their ability to develop and enact safety

initiatives. Ultimately, the community college presidents reported the importance of following the laws, policies, and other regulations to warrant the welfare and safety of all the stakeholders of the campus. Through this research study, the participants consistently highlighted the importance and value of campus safety.

REFERENCES

- Adolf, D. (2012). Legal issues with security on higher education campuses: Rethinking campus security liability. *Journal of Applied Security Research*, 7(2), 253-267.
Doi:10.1080/19361610.2012.656258
- American Association of Community Colleges. (2005). *Competencies of Community College Leaders*. Retrieved from <http://www.aacc.nche.edu/Resources/competencies/Documents/competenciesforleaders.pdf>
- American Council on Education, Leadership and Advocacy. (2012). *A President's Guide to the Clery Act*. Retrieved from www.acenet.edu/news-room/Documents/A-Presidents-Guide-to-the-Clery-Act.pdf
- Baker, K., & Boland, K. (2011). Assessing safety: A campus-wide initiative. *College Student Journal*, 45(4), 683-699. Retrieved from <http://www.projectinnovation.com/college-student-journal.html>
- Bennett, L. & Bates, M. (2015). Threat assessment and targeted violence at institutions of higher education: Implications for policy and practice including unique considerations for community colleges. *JEP: eJournal of Education Policy*, 1-16. Retrieved from https://nau.edu/COE/eJournal/_Forms/fall2015/Bates_Bennett
- Birnbaum, R. (2013). Ready, fire, aim: The college campus gun fight. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 45(5), 6-14. Doi: 10.1080/00091383.2013.812462
- Burke, J.M. & Sloan, III, J.J. (2013). State-level *Clery Act* Initiatives: Symbolic Politics or Substantive Policy? In B. Fisher & J. Sloan (Eds.), *Campus crime: Legal, social, and policy perspectives* (pp. 46-62). Springfield: Charles C. Thomas.

- Carr, J.L. (2007). Campus violence white paper. *Journal of American College Health, 55*(5), 304-319. Retrieved from <http://www.acha.org/Publications/JACH.cfm>
- Chekwa, C., Thomas, Jr., E., & Jones, V.J. (2013). What are college students' perceptions about campus safety? *Contemporary Issues in Education Research, 6*(3), 325-332. Retrieved from <https://www.cluteinstitute.com>
- Connolly, M. (2012a). Creating a campus based community emergency response team (CERT). *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, (36)*, 448-452. Doi:10.1080/10668920903018134
- Connolly, M. (2012b). Is your college ready for a crisis? *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, (36)*5, 376-378. Doi:10.1080/10668920902782516
- Creswell, J.W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Dykes-Anderson, M. (2013). The case for comprehensive counseling centers at community college. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 37*(10), 742-749. Doi: 10.1080/10668921003723235
- Fisher, B.S., Hartman, J.L., Cullen, F.T., & Turner, M.G. (2002). Making campuses safer for students: The Clery Act as a symbolic legal reform. *Stetson Law Review, 32*, 61-89. Retrieved from <http://www.stetson.edu/law/lawreview/media/making-campuses-safer-for-students-the-clery-act-as-a-symbolic-legal-reform.pdf>
- Flannery, D.J. & Quinn-Leering, K. (2000). Violence on college campuses: Understanding its impact on student well-being. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 24*(10), 839-855. Doi:10.1080/10668920050179835
- Fletcher, P.C. & Bryden, P.J. (2009). Preliminary examination of safety issues on a university campus: Personal safety practices, beliefs, & attitudes of female faculty & staff. *College*

- Student Journal*, 43(1), 181-195. Retrieved from <http://proxy.Lib.odu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eue&AN=508047207&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Garza Mitchell, R.L. (2012). Doing the right thing: Ethical leadership and decision making. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 159, 63-72. Doi: 10.1002/cc.20027
- Gnage, M.F., Dziagwa, C., & White, D. (2009). Safety on a rural community college campus via integrated communications. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 33(11), 948-950. Doi:10.1080/10668920903153105
- Goldberg, D. (1997, April 6). Crime on campus: How safe are students. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from <https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/1997/04/06/crime-on-campus-how-safe-are-students/86df66d1-3a1c-4130-8cae-966791f2ddd1/>
- Gross, K. & Fine, A. (1990). After their daughter is murdered at college, her grieving parents mount a crusade for campus safety. *People*, 33(7). Retrieved from <http://www.People.com/people/archive/article/0,,20116872,00.html>
- Han, S. (2013). Frequency and correlates of campus crime: Missouri public postsecondary institutions. *International Journal of Education Policy & Leadership*, 8(3), 1-14. Retrieved from www.ijepl.org
- Harshman, E., Puro, S., & Wolff, L.A. (2001). The *Clery Act*: Freedom of information at what cost students? *About Campus*, 6(3), 13-18. Retrieved from [http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1002/\(ISSN\)1536-0687](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1002/(ISSN)1536-0687)
- Hauser, C. & O'Connor, A. (2007, April 16). Virginia Tech shooting leaves 33 dead. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2007/04/16/us/16cnd-shooting.html>

- Hays, D. G., & Singh, A.A. (2012). *Qualitative inquiry in clinical and educational settings*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Heifetz, R.A. (1994). *Leadership without easy answers*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hiltonsmith, R., & Huelsman, M. (2014). *Virginia's great cost shift: How higher education cuts undermine the state's future middle class*. Retrieved from Demos website: www.demos.org/publication/virginia's-great-cost-shift-how-higher-education-cuts-undermine-state's-future-middle-cl
- Hosking, J. (2014). *Campus security director perceptions concerning the influence of concealed carry firearms on safety at Wyoming public community colleges: A phenomenological study* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global (1552969437)
- Janosik, S.M. (2001). The impact of the *Campus Crime Awareness Act of 1998* on student decision-making. *NASPA Journal (National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Inc.)*, 38(3), 348-360. Retrieved from <http://www.naspa.org/publications/journals>
- Janosik, S.M., & Gregory, D.E. (2003). The *Clery Act* and its influence on campus law enforcement practices. *NASPA Journal (National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Inc.)* 41(1), 180-197. Retrieved from <http://www.naspa.org/publications/journals>
- Janosik, S.M., & Gregory, D.E. (2009). The Clery Act, campus safety, and the perceptions of senior student affairs officers. *NASPA Journal*, 46(2), 208-227.

- Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act. 20 U.S.C. § 1092(f) (2000). Retrieved from <https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/20/1092>
- Jennings, W.G., Gover, A.R., & Pudrzynska, D. (2007). Are institutions of higher learning safe? A descriptive study of campus safety issues and self-reported campus victimization among male and female college students. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 18*(2), 191-208. Doi: 10.1080/10511250701383327
- Kelly, A.P., & Carey, K. (Eds.). (2013). *Stretching the higher education dollar: How innovation can improve access, equity, and affordability*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Kitchner, K.S. (1984). Intuition, critical evaluation, and ethical principles: The foundation for ethical decisions in counseling psychology. *The Counseling Psychologist, 12*(3), 43-55.
- Meara, N.M., Schmidt, L.D., & Day, J.D. (1996). Principles and virtues: A foundation for ethical decisions, policies, and character. *The Counseling Psychologist, 24*(1), 4-77.
- Nobles, M.R., Fox, K.A., Khey, D.N., & Lizotte, A.J. (2012). Community and campus crime: A geospatial examination of the Clery Act. *Crime and Delinquency, 59*(8), 1131-1156. Doi: 10.1177/0011128710372188
- Northouse, P.G. (2013). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Patton, R.C. & Gregory, D.E. (2014). Perceptions of safety by on-campus location, rurality, and type of security/police force: The case of the community college. *Journal of College Student Development, 55*(5), 451-460. Doi: 10.1353/csd.2014.0049
- Pezza, P.E., & Bellotti, A. (1995). College campus violence: Origins, impacts, and responses. *Educational Psychology Review, 7*(1), 105-123. Retrieved from <http://link.springer.com/journal/10648>

- Saulny, S. & Davey, M. (2008, February 15). Gunman slays 6 at N. Illinois University. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2008/02/15/us/15shoot.html>
- Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, PL 78-346, (1944).
- Sidner, S., Lah, K., Almasy, S., & Ellis, R. (2015). Oregon shooting: Gunman was student in class where he killed 9. *CNN*. Retrieved from <http://www.cnn.com/2015/10/02/us/89ennsy-umpqua-community-college-shooting/>
- Sloan, J.J, III. & Fisher, B.S. (2011). *The dark side of the ivory tower: Campus crime as a social problem*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, M.S. (1996). Crime liability suits and campus administrators. *New Direction for Higher Education*, 95, 11-16. Retrieved from <http://resolver.ebscohost.com.proxy.Lib.odu.edu/openurl?sid=EBSCO%3a&genre=article&issn=02710560&ISBN=&volume=1996&issue=95&date=19960901&spage=11&pages=11-16&title=New+Directions+for+Higher+Education&atitle=Crime+liability+suits+and+campus+administrators.&aulast=Smith%2c+Margaret+D.&id=DOI%3a&site=ftf-live>
- Solomon, W.E. (1988, November 6). Pennsylvania to make schools disclose their crime figures. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/1988/11/06/us/89ennsylvania-to-make-schools-disclose-their-crime-figures.html>
- The Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education. (n.d.). About Carnegie Classification. Retrieved from <http://carnegieclassification.iu.edu/>
- U.S. Department of Education. (2018). *The handbook for campus safety and security reporting*. Washington, DC: Office of Postsecondary Education.
- VAWA amendments to Clery. Retrieved from <http://clerycenter.org/article/vawa-amendments-clery>

Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013. 42 U.S.C. § 13701. (2013). Retrieved from https://www.law.cornell.edu/topn/violence_against_women_reauthorizatio_act_of_2013

Yin, R.K. (2014). *Case study research: Design and Methods*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publications.

APPENDIX A
SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Introduction: Campus safety is an issue of importance in higher education. As a community college president, you are being asked to participate in a survey regarding campus safety.

Purpose: Existing research on campus safety has focused on the knowledge and perceptions of students, faculty, staff, campus safety administrators, and campus security or police personnel. Research on the knowledge and perceptions of college and university presidents regarding campus safety is lacking. The purpose of this survey is to study community college presidents' knowledge and perceptions of campus safety.

Procedure: This survey is designed to be completed electronically and should take approximately 20 minutes.

Participation and consent: Your participation in this survey is voluntary. You may choose not to participate. You may choose to participate and not answer particular questions on the survey. Survey results are confidential and will be kept on a password protected computer in a password protected file. Before proceeding with the survey, you will be provided a consent form which you must read and agree before proceeding with the survey. If you have any questions about this survey or about this research project please contact Chad Sartini, csart001@odu.edu.

Instructions: Please answer each question. You may skip a question you do not wish to answer.

College size in full time equivalent (FTE):

- less than 1,999
- 2,000 to 9,999
- 10,000 or more

College location:

- rural, small town
- small to medium sized city
- large city

Respond to the following statements using this scale:

1 – Strongly agree

2 – Agree

3 – Neither agree nor disagree

4 – Disagree

5 – Strongly disagree

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. Campus safety is an important issue in higher education. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2. I stay current with campus safety issues. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 3. Considerations of campus safety guide my decision making. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 4. My college is safe. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 5. Students attending my institution believe my college is safe. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 6. Faculty employed at my institution believe my college is safe. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 7. Staff employed at my institution believe my college is safe. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 8. College security personnel employed at my institution believe my college is safe. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 9. Visitors to my institution believe my college is safe. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 10. My college has an adequate number of safety personnel. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 11. Campus safety personnel at my institution are trained adequately. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 12. Campus safety personnel at my institution are funded adequately. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 13. Campus safety initiatives are funded adequately at my college. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 14. Safety features at my institution are adequate. | 1 2 3 4 5 |

15. Safety features at my institution are up to date. 1 2 3 4 5
16. My college publishes an Annual Security Report. 1 2 3 4 5
17. I am familiar with federal laws pertaining to campus safety. 1 2 3 4 5
18. My college is compliant with federal laws pertaining to campus safety. 1 2 3 4 5
19. I am familiar with state laws pertaining to campus safety. 1 2 3 4 5
20. My college is compliant with state laws pertaining to campus safety. 1 2 3 4 5
21. My college has an adequate campus emergency response plan. 1 2 3 4 5
22. Students at my institution know what to do in an emergency situation on campus. 1 2 3 4 5
23. Faculty at my institution know what to do in an emergency situation on campus. 1 2 3 4 5
24. Staff at my institution know what to do in an emergency situation on campus. 1 2 3 4 5
25. College security personnel at my institution know what to do in an emergency situation on campus. 1 2 3 4 5
26. Visitors at my institution know what to do in an emergency situation on campus. 1 2 3 4 5
27. The immediate surroundings of my college are safe. 1 2 3 4 5
28. In general, institutions of higher education are safe. 1 2 3 4 5
29. In general, community colleges are safe. 1 2 3 4 5
30. In general, 4-year colleges and universities are safe. 1 2 3 4 5

31. In general, community colleges are safer than 4-year colleges and universities. 1 2 3 4 5
32. The Clery Act is effective in promoting safe colleges. 1 2 3 4 5
33. State regulations regarding campus safety are effective in promoting safe colleges. 1 2 3 4 5
34. Decisions I make have a direct impact on campus safety. 1 2 3 4 5
35. I have experience dealing with campus safety issues. 1 2 3 4 5
36. I know what to do in an emergency situation. 1 2 3 4 5
37. I have addressed constituents about campus safety. 1 2 3 4 5
38. I inform college board members of issues pertaining to campus safety. 1 2 3 4 5
39. I advocate for adequate funding of campus safety initiatives. 1 2 3 4 5
40. I advocate for adequate funding of campus safety personnel. 1 2 3 4 5
41. I read the Annual Security Report yearly before it is distributed to the campus community. 1 2 3 4 5

APPENDIX B

RESEARCH PARTICIPANT INFORMATION AND CONSENT FORM: SURVEY

Dear Participant:

The purposes of this form are to give you information that may affect your decision whether to say YES or NO to participation in this research, and to record the consent of those who say YES. You are being asked to participate in a research project. Researchers are required to provide a consent form to inform you about the study, to convey that participation is voluntary, to explain risks and benefits of participation, and to empower you to make an informed decision. You should feel free to ask the researchers any questions you may have.

Study Title: Community College Presidents' Perspectives on Campus Safety

Primary Investigator: Dennis E. Gregory, Ed.D., Associate Professor, College of Education, Department of Educational Foundations and Leadership, Old Dominion University

Investigator: Chad Sartini, M.A., Doctoral Student, Community College Leadership Program, College of Education, Department of Educational Foundations and Leadership, Old Dominion University

1. PURPOSE OF RESEARCH:

As a community college president in the Virginia Community College System, you are being asked to participate in a research study exploring the perspectives of current community college presidents on campus safety. Your participation will contribute to the knowledge surrounding campus safety and leadership. This study, entitled Community College Presidents' Perspectives on Campus Safety, is conducted by Dr. Dennis E. Gregory and Mr. Chad Sartini.

2. WHAT YOU WILL DO:

You are request to complete an electronic survey of approximately 20 minutes in length.

3. RISKS AND BENEFITS:

Because information will be kept confidential, this study poses little to no risk to participants. And, as with any research, there is some possibility that you may be subject to risks that have not yet been identified. Participants will benefit from engaging in the process of self-reflection and developing a voice for their experiences while contributing to the literature that explores campus safety, in general, and community college presidents' perspectives, in particular.

4. PRIVACY AND CONFIDENTIALITY:

Your confidentiality will be protected to the maximum extent allowable by law. Any direct identification information, including your name, will be removed from data when responses are analyzed. All data will be secured in locked file cabinets and electronic data will be password protected. The data will be accessible only to the researchers associated with this study and the Institutional Review Board. During dissemination, findings will be reported by theme (aggregating the data). The results of this study may be published or presented at professional meetings, but the identities of all research participants will remain confidential. Special care will be taken to ensure contextual details do not give away your identity. Although every attempt will be made to keep your identification private, some distinguishing responses that you share and other comments may reflect your identity. All data will be stored for at least five years after the project closes. Five years after the conclusion of the study, the data (digital audio files, transcripts, my notes, documents related to your teaching online) will be destroyed.

5. YOUR RIGHTS TO PARTICIPATE, SAY NO, OR WITHDRAW:

Your participation is completely voluntary. It is OK for you to say NO. Even if you say YES now, you are free to say NO later, and walk away or withdraw from the study – at any time. You may choose not to participate at all, or to answer some questions and not others. You may also change your mind at any time and withdraw as a participant from this study with no negative consequences.

6. COSTS AND COMPENSATION FOR BEING IN THE STUDY:

You will receive no compensation for participating in this study.

7. CONTACT INFORMATION FOR QUESTIONS AND CONCERNS:

If you have any questions later on, then the researchers should be able to answer them; please contact the researchers Dr. Dennis E. Gregory, 120 Education Building, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA, dgregory@odu.edu, 757-683-3702, ext. 3326, or Chad Sartini, csart001@odu.edu, 1733 Maiden Ln, SW, Roanoke, VA, 24015, 540-857-6495. If you have questions or concerns about your role and rights as a research participant, would like to obtain information or offer input, or would like to register a complaint about this study, you may contact, anonymously if you wish, Dr. Petros Katsioloudis, Chair of the Darden College of Education Human Subjects Review Committee at (757) 683-5323 or Dr. George Maihafer, the current IRB chair, at 757-683-6028, or the Old Dominion University Office of Research, at 757-683-3460.

By signing below, you are indicating your voluntary participation in this study and acknowledge that you may: 1) choose not to participate in the study; 2) refuse to answer certain questions; and 3) discontinue your participation at any time without any penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You are saying that you have read this form or have had it read to you, that you are satisfied that you understand this form, the research study, and its risks and benefits. The researchers should have answered any questions you may have had about the research. The researcher will give you a copy of this form for your records.

Your signature below indicates your voluntary agreement to participate in this study.

Signature _____ Date _____

Name (Printed) _____

In addition, your signature below means that you voluntarily agree to allow your responses to be digitally recorded.

Signature _____

Date _____

8. INVESTIGATOR'S STATEMENT

I certify that I have explained to this subject the nature and purpose of this research, including benefits, risks, costs, and any experimental procedures. I have described the rights and

protections afforded to human subjects and have done nothing to pressure, coerce, or falsely entice this subject into participating. I am aware of my obligations under state and federal laws, and promise compliance. I have answered the subject's questions and have encouraged him/her to ask additional questions at any time during the course of this study. I have witnessed the above signature(s) on this consent form.

Signature _____

Date _____

Name (Printed) _____

APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT

Introduction: The researcher will greet the participant and introduce himself/herself.

Purpose: The researcher will then explain that the purpose of the current study is to learn more about the community college presidents' perceptions of campus safety.

Procedures: The researcher will also explain that open-ended questions and prompts will be asked in individual interviews. Interviews will last approximately 60 to 90 minutes, depending on how much information the participant wishes to share. Conversations will be recorded on a digital recording device and transcribed. After data is collected, names will be removed and data will be analyzed.

Consent: Participants will be encouraged to share only information with which they are comfortable sharing. In addition, participants will be reminded that their privacy will be protected through the use of pseudonyms and that they may choose to disengage at any point. If they choose not to provide a pseudonym, the researcher will select one to use.

Dialogue: Interview questions (research instrument) are listed below:

1. How long have you been a community college president?
2. What positions did you hold in community college prior to becoming president?
3. How do you define campus safety?
4. How do you think campus safety affects a college's environment?
5. What do you believe to be the role of college president regarding campus safety?
6. Describe your experiences with issues pertaining to campus safety.
7. Community college presidents deal with an array of issues. How does campus safety fit

into the variety of issues facing higher education?

8. What do you see as the most prevalent safety issues at your college?
9. What have you done to make your college campus safer?
10. What initiatives would you like to pursue to make your campus safer?
11. Describe your level of knowledge about state and federal laws pertaining to campus safety.
12. Explain your college's safety protocols.
13. As a community college president, what are the challenges you face with the issue of campus safety?
14. What do you view as the most pressing safety issues facing your college?
15. What do you view as the most pressing safety issues facing higher education?
16. Is there anything else you would like to share?

Conclusion:

- Turn audio-recording device OFF
- Thank interviewee for participating and answer any questions he or she has about study.
- Give the participant a business card and tell him/her to contact you with any questions or additional information they think of relevance to the conversation.
- Tell participant you enjoyed meeting him/her.

APPENDIX D

RESEARCH PARTICIPANT INFORMATION AND CONSENT FORM: INTERVIEW

Dear Participant:

The purposes of this form are to give you information that may affect your decision whether to say YES or NO to participation in this research, and to record the consent of those who say YES. You are being asked to participate in a research project. Researchers are required to provide a consent form to inform you about the study, to convey that participation is voluntary, to explain risks and benefits of participation, and to empower you to make an informed decision. You should feel free to ask the researchers any questions you may have.

Study Title: Community College Presidents' Perspectives on Campus Safety

Primary Investigator: Dennis E. Gregory, Ed.D., Associate Professor, College of Education, Department of Educational Foundations and Leadership, Old Dominion University

Investigator: Chad Sartini, M.A., Doctoral Student, Community College Leadership Program, College of Education, Department of Educational Foundations and Leadership, Old Dominion University

1. PURPOSE OF RESEARCH:

As a community college president in the Virginia Community College System, you are being asked to participate in a research study exploring the perspectives of current community college presidents on campus safety. Your participation will contribute to the knowledge surrounding campus safety and leadership. This study, entitled Community College Presidents' Perspectives on Campus Safety, is conducted by Dr. Dennis E. Gregory and Mr. Chad Sartini.

2. WHAT YOU WILL DO:

Each interview will last approximately 60-90 minutes, depending on length your responses. The interview will be conducted in an informal, conversational manner with open-ended questions that allow you to talk about your experience candidly. You may agree to be digitally recorded, or you may choose not to be digitally recorded during our conversations. Your identity will be held in strict confidence, and during data collection, researchers will arrange for private or semi-

private areas for consent and the interviews.

3. RISKS AND BENEFITS:

Because information will be coded and kept confidential, this study poses little to no risk to participants. And, as with any research, there is some possibility that you may be subject to risks that have not yet been identified. Participants will benefit from engaging in the process of self-reflection and developing a voice for their experiences while contributing to the literature that explores campus safety, in general, and community college presidents' perspectives, in particular.

4. PRIVACY AND CONFIDENTIALITY:

Your confidentiality will be protected to the maximum extent allowable by law. Any direct identification information, including your name, will be removed from data when responses are analyzed. All data will be secured in locked file cabinets and electronic data will be password protected. The data will be accessible only to the researchers associated with this study and the Institutional Review Board. During analysis, numeric codes will be assigned to your information so that your name is not associated with the data files. During dissemination, findings will be reported by theme (aggregating the data) or by pseudonym (assigning a fake name). The results of this study may be published or presented at professional meetings, but the identities of all research participants will remain confidential. Special care will be taken to ensure contextual details do not give away your identity. Although every attempt will be made to keep your identification private, some distinguishing responses that you share and other

comments may reflect your identity. All data will be stored for at least five years after the project closes. Five years after the conclusion of the study, the data (digital audio files, transcripts, my notes, documents related to your teaching online) will be destroyed.

5. YOUR RIGHTS TO PARTICIPATE, SAY NO, OR WITHDRAW:

Your participation is completely voluntary. It is OK for you to say NO. Even if you say YES now, you are free to say NO later, and walk away or withdraw from the study – at any time. You may choose not to participate at all, or to answer some questions and not others. You may also

change your mind at any time and withdraw as a participant from this study with no negative consequences.

6. COSTS AND COMPENSATION FOR BEING IN THE STUDY:

You will receive no compensation for participating in this study.

7. CONTACT INFORMATION FOR QUESTIONS AND CONCERNS:

If you have any questions later on, then the researchers should be able to answer them; please contact the researchers Dr. Dennis E. Gregory, 120 Education Building, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA, dgregory@odu.edu, 757-683-3702, ext. 3326, or Chad Sartini, 1733 Maiden Ln, SW, Roanoke, VA, 24015, csart001@odu.edu, 540-857-6495. If you have questions or concerns about your role and rights as a research participant, would like to obtain information or offer input, or would like to register a complaint about this study, you may contact, anonymously if you wish, Dr. Petros Katsioloudis, Chair of the Darden College of Education Human Subjects Review Committee at (757) 683-5323 or Dr. George Maihafer, the current IRB chair, at 757-683-6028, or the Old Dominion University Office of Research, at 757-683-3460.

By signing below, you are indicating your voluntary participation in this study and acknowledge that you may: 1) choose not to participate in the study; 2) refuse to answer certain questions; and 3) discontinue your participation at any time without any penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You are saying that you have read this form or have had it read to you, that you are satisfied that you understand this form, the research study, and its risks and benefits. The researchers should have answered any questions you may have had about the research. The researcher will give you a copy of this form for your records.

Your signature below indicates your voluntary agreement to participate in this study.

Signature _____ Date _____

Name (Printed) _____

In addition, your signature below means that you voluntarily agree to allow your responses to be digitally recorded.

Signature _____

Date _____

8. INVESTIGATOR'S STATEMENT

I certify that I have explained to this subject the nature and purpose of this research, including benefits, risks, costs, and any experimental procedures. I have described the rights and protections afforded to human subjects and have done nothing to pressure, coerce, or falsely entice this subject into participating. I am aware of my obligations under state and federal laws, and promise compliance. I have answered the subject's questions and have encouraged him/her to ask additional questions at any time during the course of this study. I have witnessed the above signature(s) on this consent form.

Signature _____

Date _____

Name (Printed) _____

APPENDIX E

HUMAN SUBJECTS EXEMPTION



OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH

Physical Address

4111 Monarch Way, Suite 203

Norfolk, Virginia 23508

Mailing Address

Office of

Research 1 Old

Dominion University

Norfolk, Virginia 23529

Phone(757) 683-3460

Fax(757) 683-5902

DATE: February 6, 2017

TO: Dennis Gregory

FROM: Old Dominion University Education Human Subjects Review Committee

PROJECT TITLE: [1010282-1] Community College Presidents' Perspectives on Campus

Safety REFERENCE #:

SUBMISSION TYPE: New Project

ACTION: DETERMINATION OF EXEMPT STATUS

DECISION DATE: February 6, 2017

REVIEW CATEGORY: Exemption category # [6.2]

Thank you for your submission of New Project materials for this project. The Old Dominion University Education Human Subjects Review Committee has determined this project is EXEMPT FROM IRB REVIEW according to federal regulations.

We will retain a copy of this correspondence within our records.

If you have any questions, please contact Petros Katsioloudis at (757) 683-5323 or pkatsiol@odu.edu. Please include your project title and reference number in all correspondence with this committee.

This letter has been electronically signed in accordance with all applicable regulations, and a copy is retained within Old Dominion University Education Human Subjects Review Committee's records.

VITA

Chad Christopher Sartini

Candidate for Doctor of Philosophy

Community College Leadership

Old Dominion University
 Department of Educational Foundations and Leadership
 120 Education Building
 4301 Hampton Boulevard, Suite 2300
 Norfolk, VA 23529

EDUCATION

- Master of Arts, October 2004
 Social Studies Education
 Teachers' College, Columbia University
 New York City, New York
- Bachelor of Arts, June 1997
 Politics and Russian Studies
 Washington and Lee University
 Lexington, Virginia

HIGHER EDUCATION EXPERIENCE

| | | |
|-----------------|---|----------------|
| 2019 to Present | Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Associate Director of Client Services Office of University Scholarships and Financial Aid | Blacksburg, VA |
| 2011 to 2019 | Virginia Western Community College Director Offices of Financial Aid, Veterans' Affairs, and Records | Roanoke, VA |
| 2010 to 2011 | Virginia Western Community College Assistant Registrar Records Office | Roanoke, VA |
| 2008 to 2010 | Virginia Western Community College Education Support Specialist Admissions Office | Roanoke, VA |

HONORS AND AWARDS

- American Association of Community Colleges Future Leaders Institute, 2015
- Virginia Western Community College Armed Forces Association Outstanding Faculty Recognition, 2014
- Virginia Western Community College representative, Virginia Community College System Classified Staff Leadership Institute, 2011

CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS

- *What to Expect When You Are Expecting... A Program Review*, Southern Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators 2019 Annual Conference (co-presenter) and Virginia Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators 2019 Annual Conference (co-presenter)
- *Professional Judgements in Financial Aid*, Virginia College Access Network 2017 Annual Conference (co-presenter)
- *Declaration of Independence: Custody v. Guardianship v. Ward of the Court v. Dependency Override*, Virginia Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators 2017 Annual Conference (co-presenter)

COMMITTEE INVOLVEMENT

- Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
 - New Student Transitions Committee, 2019 to current
 - Transfer Student Initiatives Committee, 2019 to current
- Virginia Western Community College
 - Academic and Student Affairs Committee, 2016 to 2019
 - Administrative Faculty Senate, chair, 2012 to 2015
 - Classified Staff Senate, co-chair, 2012
 - Commencement Committee, 2010-2011
 - Curriculum Committee, 2010 to 2017
 - Institutional Effectiveness Committee, 2010-2011
 - Instructional Programs Committee, 2017-2019
 - Strategic Enrollment Management Committee, co-chair, 2018-2019
 - Strategic Plan Steering Committee, 2014 to 2019
 - Sustainability Committee, 2010

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

- National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators, member, 2011 to present
- Southern Association of Student Financial Aid Administrator, member, 2011 to present, Government Relations Committee member, 2013 to 2017; Board member 2016 to present; Electronic Services Committee, chair, 2017 to 2019; Conference Committee, 2017 to 2019; Social Media Policy Taskforce, 2019-2020
- Virginia Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators, member, 2011 to present, Government Relations Committee, chair, 2013 to 2015, Board Member-at-Large, 2014 and 2018-2019, President-elect, 2015-2016, President, 2016 to 2017; Past president, 2017 to 2018; Electronic Services Committee, chair, 2018-2019, Conference Committee, chair, 2019-2020

COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP

- Roanoke Catholic School Advisory Board, 2012-2014

