

In presenting this dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree at Idaho State University, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for inspection. I further state that permission for extensive copying of my thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the Dean of the Graduate School, Dean of my academic division, or by the University Librarian. It is understood that any copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Signature _____

Date _____

**THE IMPACT ON CAMPUS SAFETY OF ALLOWING CONCEALED CARRY
WEAPONS AT IDAHO COMMUNITY COLLEGES:
A MULTIPLE CASE STUDY**

By Graydon A. Stanley

A dissertation presented to the Department of Education Administration

submitted in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership

IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY

Fall 2019

©Copyright (2019) Graydon A. Stanley

To the Graduate Faculty:

The members of the committee appointed to examine the dissertation of Graydon A. Stanley find it satisfactory and recommend that it be accepted.

Dr. Richard Wagoner
Graduate Advisor

Dr. Paul Watkins
Committee Member

Dr. Mark W. Neill
Committee Member

Dr. Caroline Faure
Committee Member

Dr. Lyn Redington
Graduate Faculty Representative

From: baerralp@isu.edu <baerralp@isu.edu>
Sent: Monday, April 8, 2019 9:28 AM
To: stangray@isu.edu; watkpaul@isu.edu
Subject: IRB-FY2019-198 - Initial: Letter of Approval (exempt)

April 8, 2019

Graydon Stanley
Educ Leadership
MS 8059

RE: regarding study number IRB-FY2019-198: The Impact on Campus Safety of Allowing Concealed Carry of Weapons at Idaho Community Colleges: A Case Study

Dear Mr. Stanley:

I agree that this study qualifies as exempt from review under the following guideline: Category 2.(i). Research that only includes interactions involving educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior (including visual or auditory recording).

The information obtained is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that the identity of the human subjects cannot readily be ascertained, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects.

This letter is your approval, please, keep this document in a safe place.

Notify the HSC of any adverse events. Serious, unexpected adverse events must be reported in writing within 10 business days.

You are granted permission to conduct your study effective immediately. The study is not subject to renewal.

Please note that any changes to the study as approved must be promptly reported and approved. Some changes may be approved by expedited review; others require full board review. Contact Tom Bailey (208-282-2179; fax 208-282-4723; email: humsbj@isu.edu) if you have any questions or require further information.

Sincerely,

Ralph Baergen, PhD, MPH, CIP
Human Subjects Chair

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my wife, Tammi, my boys, Graham and Jordan, and my mother, D. J. Stanley. More than any other reason, I wanted to complete this research and degree for me and my family as it was a goal I always had for us. Here is to us!

My wife has been the perfect complement to me as she is many of the things that I am not, as a spouse, parent, and partner. Through more than 40 years, we have navigated the joys and sorrows of life together, including the completion of this dissertation and doctoral degree. As it has been so many times before, she has been the one to bring a little structure to the process, make me sit down at the table and write, and develop a plan and timeline for getting this done. There may have been a few times that I seemed less than grateful for that, but I know how instrumental she was in keeping me on task. Thank you, Tammi. XO

My boys, Graham and Jordan, have always known the importance of going to college and getting their degrees, so I have been proud of their educational and career accomplishments. I have always wanted to be good role model for them, so this dissertation and degree is dedicated to them and their futures too. I have appreciated their interest in and enthusiastic support of this process and look forward to a family celebration of its completion. Thank you, Graham and Jordan. XO

My mother, D. J. (or Delirious, as she prefers to be called), has always been my most unconditional and loving supporter. She has worried about the time and toll this task may have taken on my sleep and well-being, but nobody has done more to inspire the completion of this goal. She was the one who always talked about the completion of a degree as being a credential that no one could ever take away, so this is another one for her and me. Thank you, Mom. XO

Acknowledgment

I have many people to thank and recognize for their inspiration and support. Thanks to Jerry Meyerhoeffer, President Emeritus of the College of Southern Idaho, for his nearly lifelong support of my work, education, and family. He has been an incredible personal and professional mentor to me. Dr. Joe Dunlap, former President of North Idaho College, hired me at NIC and convinced me that I was not too old to pursue and complete another degree.

I am especially grateful for the support of colleagues and friends at Idaho State University. Dr. Caroline Faure (Smitty) was another one to convince me that I could complete this and stayed by my side all along the way. Dr. Mark Neill has been a strong supporter along with Dr. Paul Watkins, who provided lots of advice along the way. Toward the end of the process, I have benefitted from the advice and support of Dr. Rick Wagoner, who helped get me close to the finish line, and Dr. Lyn Redington, whose enthusiasm was desperately needed and appreciated. Roar, Bengals, roar.

Lastly, many thanks to my dear friends and supporters, Kassie Silvas and Mark Browning. Each of them have become like sister and brother to me and as classmates in the doctoral program, we have spent many hours cursing, celebrating, and completing our studies together.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables	xii
Abstract	xiii
Chapter I: Introduction.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	2
Purpose of the Study	3
Research Questions	4
Definition of Terms.....	5
Limitations	6
Delimitations	7
Assumptions.....	7
Significance of the Study	8
Organization of the Study	9
Researcher Perspective	9
Chapter Summary	15
Chapter II: Review of Literature.....	16
Introduction.....	16
A National Perspective	16
Second Amendment	17
Gun Control	20
Differing Views	21
States' Status	24
Campus Stakeholders.....	25

The State of Idaho Perspective	26
Guns in Idaho	27
Higher Education	28
Law Enforcement.....	31
Faculty View	32
Student View.....	32
Financial Implications.....	34
The Idaho Community College Perspective	35
New Policies, Processes, and Personnel	36
Researcher Perspective	37
Chapter Summary	39
Chapter III: Research Methodology.....	40
Introduction.....	40
Purpose of the Study	40
Research Questions	41
Research Design.....	42
Methodology	43
Units of Analysis.....	43
Institutional Contexts	44
Participants.....	44
Data Collection	45
Surveys.....	47
Interviews.....	48

Document Review.....	50
Direct Observation	50
Participant Observation.....	51
Data Analysis	51
Validation Strategies	53
Triangulation.....	53
Peer Review	54
Member Checking.....	54
Chapter Summary	54
Chapter IV: Results.....	55
Institutional Profiles.....	55
Participant Profiles.....	56
Questionnaire	57
Interviews.....	58
Document Review.....	58
Direct Observation	59
Participant Observer.....	60
Within Case Analyses	61
College 1	61
College 2	66
College 3	71
College 4	76
Cross Case Analysis.....	80

Researcher Perspective	87
Chapter Summary	89
Chapter V: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations	90
Discussion	90
Research Questions	90
Connection to the Literature	91
Design	92
Conclusions.....	92
Key Findings of this Research	96
Recommendations for Further Research.....	98
Researcher Closing Perspective	100
Chapter Summary	101
References.....	103
Appendix A: States' Status	112
Appendix B: College of Southern Idaho Policy	115
Appendix C: North Idaho College Policy	118
Appendix D: College of Western Idaho Policy	123
Appendix E: College of Eastern Idaho Policy	126
Appendix F: Idaho Senate Bill 1254.....	127
Appendix G: Informed Consent Statement.....	128
Appendix H: Data Tables.....	131
Appendix I: Campus Crime Report Comparisons	146

List of Tables

Table 4.1 College 1 Major Themes.....	65
Table 4.2 College 2 Major Themes.....	70
Table 4.3 College 3 Major Themes.....	75
Table 4.4 College 4 Major Themes.....	79
Table 4.5 Cross Case Major Themes	86

The Impact on Campus Safety of Allowing Concealed Carry of Weapons at Idaho Community Colleges: A Multiple Case Study

Dissertation Abstract – Idaho State University (2019)

In July 2014, the State of Idaho Legislature, after several failed attempts in earlier years, successfully passed Idaho Senate Bill 1254 which allowed for the possession of weapons on Idaho public college campuses by individuals with enhanced concealed carry permits. The Idaho State Board of Education and the boards of trustees from each of the Idaho community colleges unanimously opposed the law, but were left with no option but to change their policies and adapt their processes upon its passage. While most of the previous discussion centered on an often emotional and volatile debate regarding whether the college campuses would be more or less safe, very little attention was initially given to the impact on the policy-making and operational processing of a new reality. The legalization of weapons on the Idaho college campuses impacted campus safety in ways that most of the stakeholders had never experienced.

This multiple case study provided a rich view of the impacts on campus safety at each of the four Idaho community college campuses. Through a collection of data obtained by interviews with key stakeholders, detailed observations on each of the campuses, and a thorough review of the key documents, this study explored the impact on the policy, processes, recruitment, retention, and perception of safety following the passage of the new state law. An analysis of the data from each of the campuses resulted in identification of themes that were compared across the four colleges and generates conclusions that will inform future policy and process making. The primary researcher was an active participant observer in the study and added his informed perspective to the process and results.

The conclusions of this study suggest that policy makers more genuinely consider the views of stakeholders in future decisions, that key campus stakeholders improve and expand campus safety training, and that primary attention be given to providing additional support for mental health services. The research findings suggest that the change in law and policy had little impact on the perception of campus safety and campus crime statistics demonstrated little change in campus crime rates. The study will serve as a springboard for additional research on other aspects of campus safety as the higher education environment responds to new laws and a changing landscape.

Key Words: weapons, concealed carry, campus safety, community college

Chapter I: Introduction

After several failed attempts in the early 2000s, the State of Idaho Legislature succeeded in passing legislation allowed concealed weapons to be carried on Idaho public college and university campuses. The legislation, Senate Bill 1254, passed through both houses and was signed by the governor to become effective on July 1, 2014 (“2014 Legislation,” 2014), despite the opposition voiced by the Idaho State Board of Education, all nine Idaho public colleges and universities, and most state and local law enforcement agencies. The local governing boards for the three public community colleges in Idaho: College of Western Idaho, College of Southern Idaho, and North Idaho College all opposed the legislation.

Proponents of the legislation argued that this law would enhance campus safety and support gun rights as they are spelled out in the United States Constitution (U.S. Const. amend II). Opponents countered that the legalization of guns on campus would create new anxieties for most interactions between stakeholders on campus whether in an office, a classroom, or at major event. Opponents also countered that the second amendment right to bear arms, like most of the Bill of Rights, speaks to limitations and not the absolute right to carry a weapon anytime and anywhere. Community college representatives added that these matters of campus safety were best left to the discretion of the local, publicly elected boards as they were best equipped to determine policy that would be reflective of local norms and constituent views. Neither side presented much in the way of empirical evidence that would support either view, but testimony generated considerable emotion, passion, and storytelling.

Idaho House Bill 1254 became effective on July 1, 2014 with a few conditions placed on its enforcement. Those able to carry a weapon on Idaho public college and university campuses were mandated to have an enhanced conceal carry permit which requires an eight-hour gun

training course and firing of a minimum number of live rounds. Campus residence halls and public facilities that can accommodate more than 1000 people can restrict concealed carry, but these facilities must be clearly marked as such (Idaho Legislature, 2014).

More than five years later, there have been no studies or stories that have reported the outcomes of this major change in law and practices on Idaho's higher education campuses. Without summary evidence of the outcomes, whether there has been an increase in crime and gun-related incidents on campus, perceptions of campus safety may not have changed. Or, like the original arguments made for and against the change in the law, there is likely an uninformed, but strong sentiment that our campuses are either more or less safe than before. Regardless of the perception, higher education campuses in Idaho have likely made adjustments to their policies, processes, hiring, and training related to campus safety because of the legalization of concealed carry weapons on their campuses. This study assesses, reports, and compares the impact on campus safety at the four Idaho community colleges through the lens of primary stakeholders on each of the campuses.

Statement of the Problem

In response to the passage of this legislation, each of the Idaho colleges and universities has responded with a variety of new policies, procedures, processes, and personnel. In some cases, the response included the training and arming of campus security officers. Other campuses sought to contract with local law enforcement agencies that bring their own standards, trainings, and weapons to campus. All campuses reported the need for additional funding to secure training, equipment, and additional officers.

Will the legalization of concealed carry weapons and the institutions' response to this legislation make our campuses safer? There are vastly differing responses to this question from

the various primary stakeholders on campus, just as there has likely been different responses from each campus to support campus safety given the new reality of guns on campus. The passage of Senate Bill 1254, while providing for the legalization of concealed carry of weapons on campus, did not consider the implications for necessary changes in policy, practices, hiring, and training, so this qualitative study addressed that issue by giving a voice to those most directly involved in assessing and executing those changes.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this multiple-case study was to describe and better understand the impact on campus safety given the legalization of concealed carry weapons at Idaho community colleges. Though governed by a locally elected board of trustees, Idaho community colleges are subject to complying with this change in state law, so their policies and practices had to be changed to address the impact of Senate Bill 1254 on campus safety. Key campus stakeholders were charged with assessing, communicating, and executing changes in policy, processes, hiring, and training. This qualitative study collected data from primary campus stakeholders on Idaho community college campuses. The results from each campus yielded valuable information that can be used to inform future changes necessary to support campus safety. A cross analysis of the findings from each of the campuses or cases also informs an assessment of best practices in addressing campus safety and yield consistent evaluations of personnel and fiscal impacts. The results of this study may then be used to provide more comprehensive information to inform policy makers of the impacts of changes in public law on higher education campuses.

Research Questions

Research questions for this study were focused on the perceived impact on campus safety at Idaho's community colleges given the legalization of concealed carry weapons on campus.

Primary research questions included:

Q1: How did the legalization of concealed carry weapons impact campus safety at Idaho community colleges?

SQ1: How did the legalization of concealed carry weapons impact development of campus safety policy and processes?

SQ2: How did the legalization of concealed carry weapons impact the hiring, training, recruitment, and retention of employees and students?

SQ3: How did the legalization of concealed carry weapons impact campus safety preparedness, perception, and crime statistics?

The purpose of these research questions was to better understand how primary campus stakeholders assessed and responded to campus safety impacts given the passage of the concealed carry weapons law, including the effect the law had on policy, processes, hiring, and training of personnel. Participants responded to these questions from their unique campus perspectives. Survey and interview questions addressed the participants' experiences, opinions, and actions taken regarding campus safety given the passage of the concealed carry law.

Additional interview questions addressed the participants' feelings about the effectiveness of the law and subsequent changes in campus policy and practices in supporting a safe campus. The responses to these questions led to a general description of the stakeholders' current perception of campus safety and the impact of the legalization of concealed carry weapons. A comparison and analysis of the results from each of the four cases provided a rich description of similar

successes and best practices while identifying unique approaches and gaps which can be used to inform future policy and process making. A future study could compare those perceptions and changes in policy and process to other institutions of higher education in Idaho or states with similar laws to arrive at consistently successful models of campus safety.

Definition of Terms

Higher education, law enforcement, government agencies, and others entities utilize terms and acronyms whose meaning is critical to the understanding of this study. Listed below are many of those terms and their definitions, particularly as they are used in this study:

Administration – the executive or management branch of the college or university. In this study, this includes personnel with a title of dean, vice president, or president.

Campus crime report – The Clery Act (Clery, 2018) requires all colleges and universities that participate in federal financial aid programs to keep and disclose information about crime on or near their respective campuses, often referred to as the campus crime report.

Campus culture – a combination of language, behavior, values, and philosophy that are part of a college experience.

Concealed carry weapon – any deadly weapon carried on or about the person in a manner not discernable by ordinary observation.

Deadly weapon – any dirk, dirk knife, bowie knife, dagger, firearm, or any other device, instrument, material, or substance that is designed and manufactured to be readily capable of causing death or serious bodily injury.

Enhanced concealed carry permit– is separate from the standard concealed carry permit and requires additional training to obtain, and is required by Idaho law in order to conceal carry on an Idaho public higher education campus.

Faculty – the teaching employees of the college or university.

Firearm – any weapon that will, is designed to, or may readily be converted to expel a projectile by the action of an explosive.

Staff – employees charged with carrying out the work of the college or university with the exception of teaching. In this study, the employee titles are that of director or above in terms of classification.

Trustees – persons appointed or elected to serve as the governing board for a college or university.

Limitations

Creswell (2013) explained that limitations are influences on the study that occur and are beyond the control of the researcher. These limitations may weaken the study and pose a serious threat to internal validity. Limitations of this study included:

1. Participants were asked to share their observations and opinions. Their responses were subjective and unique to their experiences and their ability to communicate those to the researcher.
2. Titles and corresponding responsibilities varied by institution.
3. Direct observation of the impacts on campus safety was difficult to observe as incidents do not occur in a predictable manner or time and some responses are not directly observable.

4. Information obtained from documents may not be a direct transcription and is subject to the interpretation and communication by the researcher.
5. Participants from the College of Eastern Idaho had little institutional history as a community college since it was recently established by the State of Idaho in July 2017.

Delimitations

Delimitations of this study narrowed the scope of the study and thus may pose a threat to external validity (Creswell, 2013). The delimitations were made intentionally and include:

1. This case study was restricted to Idaho public community colleges.
2. The number and nature of the stakeholders participating in the study were limited to those who had a direct affiliation to the institution and were believed to have a direct impact on campus safety policy and processes.
3. Because Idaho Senate Bill 1254 is only enforceable in Idaho and thus only affects higher education institutions in Idaho, the results of the study cannot be generalized to community colleges outside of Idaho.
4. Students, although they represent the largest constituent group, were not represented in this study as they were not typically involved in assessing the impact of campus safety policy and practices and are often very transient on community college campuses and have limited longitudinal experience.

Assumptions

Assumptions are important to this research as they initially will provide a basis for the selection of participants and the development of the survey and interview questions. There were assumptions made about the accuracy of evidence collected from each of the institutions. The following assumptions were made about this study:

1. Chosen participants were actively involved in campus safety management and were familiar with institutional policies and processes.
2. Participants had some knowledge of the state law and its application to the campus.
3. Participants were expected to be honest in their responses to survey and interview questions.
4. Records of college meetings and correspondence were obtained and represent accurate reflections of the proceedings.

Significance of the Study

The issue of campus safety is a very personal and important concern for nearly all stakeholders of higher education, especially those who are most impacted on a regular basis. Faculty, staff, and administrators of our community colleges are not only concerned for their personal safety but are also de facto guardians of the students they serve. Faculty expect a classroom that serves as a safe place to instruct and dialogue with students. Staff anticipate engaging safely with students in their offices or at events in ways that are beneficial and developmental. Administrators work to create facilities, programs, and policies that encourage growth of students and employees in a secure environment. And, trustees of the community colleges represent their institutions in ways that reflect their constituents' values and provide a public return on their private investment, with an assumption that this is all done in a safe environment.

The passage of Idaho House Bill 1254 brought focused attention to the usual assumption that our campuses are safe. This study is particularly significant because it intentionally sought to describe the impact on campus safety after the change in the concealed carry law. Experiences and perspectives from primary stakeholders provided insight into the changes made in policy,

processes, hiring, and training by each of the Idaho community colleges. Information gathered from participants can be used to inform facility, program, and policy development in ways that address the stakeholders' perception of campus safety.

Organization of the Study

This study is organized into five chapters. Chapter I includes the background, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions, research design, definition of terms, limitations, delimitations, assumptions, significance of the study, organization of the study, and the researcher's perspective. Chapter II presents the historical, current, and relevant literature related to weapons on campus and campus safety with national, state, Idaho, and Idaho community college perspectives, and the researcher's perspective. Chapter III describes the methodology used to conduct this study including the purpose, research questions, rationale for the case study design, data collection, data analysis, and validation strategies. Chapter IV presents the results of the study including a discussion of themes. Chapter V includes the discussion of the results, implications, conclusions, recommendations, and the researcher's closing perspective.

Researcher Perspective

As the researcher in this study, I have to understand and embrace personal views when conducting research on this topic, particularly as it is specific to the environment where I have been employed for years and is an issue that I have a strong connection to. I was employed by one of the community colleges in this study, the College of Southern Idaho, for 28 years in a variety of positions that had indirect responsibility for campus safety. At North Idaho College, where I am currently employed, I have specific administrative responsibility for campus safety and security. Additionally, I have the responsibility and opportunity to interact often with

students, employees, community members, trustees, and legislators, all who have considerable interest in the concealed weapon law and the issue of campus safety. I am personally familiar with many of the participants in the study, which aided in my knowledge of persons to contact and gave me additional opportunity to communicate with them. I was keenly aware that these connections provide an advantage because of my familiarity with the topic and the participants. I remained vigilant in assuring that my perceptions and familiarity did not influence the responses of the participants, thus, I specifically chose triangulation, peer review, and member checking as validation strategies that ensured the accuracy during the study (Creswell, 2013). By providing a researcher perspective throughout the study, I continually clarified researcher bias so that the reader will better understand my position.

My experiences with campus safety and weapons has varied over the 36-year span of my higher education career. When I began my career in the 1980's, campus safety seemed to be of little concern. Campus security often consisted of facilities, custodial, or student services personnel who were supposed to keep the peace and take note of any unusual events or activities. If something was deemed dangerous, the police were called, but I only recall that occurring in a few instances. In the 1990's, I had responsibility for student conduct and recalled an instance when a student had a pistol in his residence hall room. Those persons involved were not particularly alarmed and actually searched the room themselves, found the gun, and had it stored in the security office. The police were not contacted and the student was simply written up for an infraction of residence hall rules. In another incident, I adjudicated the case of two students who had been in a fight and had pulled out knives to protect themselves. Again, no one was particularly alarmed about the incident and the students were put on probation, but not expelled or cited by law enforcement.

On my current campus and in our community, there was very little conversation and concern related to campus safety. Talk of dangerous weapons often amounted to students in possession of knives or guns that they carried on their person or in their vehicles, primarily used for hunting. Campus security was unarmed and usually had no specific law enforcement training, but instead were charged with opening or securing buildings or providing a jump-start to students' or employees' vehicles with dead batteries. As a professional, I generally felt safe at work and worried little about dangerous weapons on our campus.

In the early 2000's, I still had little concern for campus safety, outside of speeding traffic on campus and occasional conduct issues associated with alcohol or marijuana use. There were two incidents that heightened my anxiety a bit and began to change my view of weapons on campus. A student was reported to have brought a loaded pistol to one of his classes and would show it off in the back row of the classroom. I contacted our local police, who intercepted the student on his way to class the next day, confiscated his weapon, and arrested him. He was suspended for the balance of the semester and there is no indication that the student ever returned, but I was secure in knowing that the student would be required to appeal if he wanted to re-enroll. In another incident, a student was appealing his college suspension that I had levied. When the student came to campus to attend the appeal hearing, I had instructed security officers to be certain that he was not armed. Outside of the hearing room where the appeal was conducted, the student pulled a revolver from his pocket, pointed it at me, and pulled the trigger. He laughed as a tiny flame proved that it was only a cigarette lighter, but I informed the appeals committee of the incident and the suspension was indefinitely sustained. In spite of these experiences, I continued to feel safe on campus and never considered the need to arm myself, but did support an initiative to better train and equip our campus security officers. It was during this

same time that we hired a director of security who had previous law enforcement experience and that knowledge made me feel more comfortable. Even though other dangerous and sometimes lethal incidents were occurring on other campuses around the nation, those seemed worlds away and had little influence on the perception of safety that I had in my world.

In 2012, my sense of campus safety changed drastically with an incident that occurred shortly after arriving to my new job at North Idaho College. As a newcomer to the area, I proactively chose to meet the chief of police in our community, not because of any incidents but simply as a gesture of collaboration and good will. During my visit to his office, I received a call that a disgruntled student had referred to our college as Columbine, that tragic Colorado high school shooting that had resulted in multiple deaths, and he was now threatening to come to our campus. When I returned to campus, we activated the emergency response protocol, which included the staffing of an incident command center and working alongside local law enforcement as they secured our campus. The accused student was apprehended in a nearby city and was suspended indefinitely from our campus. The incident caused alarm for our students and employees and was the first time that I had truly felt unsafe on a college campus. The possibility that a person could come to our campus, in unlawful, but concealed possession of a weapon and threaten the safety of our students and employees frightened me. Our policies forbid the possession of a weapon for anyone outside of law enforcement, but suddenly I felt vulnerable to those who did not care about our rules.

In 2012, a bill was introduced in the Idaho State Legislature that would have allowed for the concealed carry of weapons on Idaho college campuses, but I, along with most of my colleagues, were certain that it had no chance of passing. I followed its progression through the legislative processes, wrote in opposition to some of my legislator friends, and was surprised at

how narrowly it was defeated. With this, my perception of campus safety was further eroded, but I was relieved that weapons were still prohibited.

In 2014, House Bill 1254 was introduced in the legislature and was strongly supported by the National Rifle Association (NRA) and several key conservative legislators. My colleagues and I were worried that it had a chance for passage as it had been amended to allow for legal concealed carry of weapons on college campuses with an enhanced concealed carry permit. That change required additional training for individuals possessing such a permit, but I was still very opposed to anyone, other than law enforcement officers, being allowed to have weapons on campus. An increasing number of lethal and gun-related incidents were occurring in schools, colleges, and other public spaces around the nation further worried me about our safety in higher education environments. Despite the opposition of most law enforcement agencies, the Idaho State Board of Education, leaders of all Idaho universities, and the unanimous opposition of the three community colleges, the legislation passed and became law in July, 2014.

At this same time, I was in the early stages of enrollment in my pursuit of a doctorate degree in higher education leadership. Professors and classmates spoke often of dissertation topics and I was searching for one that I truly cared about and that would be connected to my work. It was easy then for me to determine that campus safety, and my concern for the impact of weapons being allowed on our colleges' campuses, would be my choice. In my classes like history and philosophy of higher education or higher education law, I always tried to focus my assignments on campus safety and weapons on campus. Through my studies, I became aware of the increasing number of states which were allowing weapons on campus. I retained my personal opposition to the law but I was required to navigate this new reality by developing policies and

processes on our campus that would accommodate legal possession of weapons by students, employees, and guests.

Contrary to what I ever believed would happen, I began to fear for my safety and that of our students and employees. I had always believed in our rights to purchase a weapon and possessed several myself, but felt strongly about the limitations related to where and how these were intended to be used, and a college campus was never a place that I found to be acceptable. As adamantly opposed to the idea as I had always been, I now felt both selfish and foolish that my belief might result in me being unable to protect myself or anyone else. My office was a likely target for disgruntled students, so I was at greater risk than many other employees. Contrary to my earlier convictions, I decided to at least purchase a pistol and get training for an enhanced concealed carry permit. I purchased the pistol, went through the initial training, and even purchased the holster that would allow me to conceal my weapon within my work attire. During this time, I witnessed very little change on our campus and with safety incidents around the state. In response to our concern for campus safety, I formalized an agreement with the local police which resulted in the placement of an armed officer on our campus and who has an office in our suite. Our Director of Security, whose office is adjacent to mine, carries a concealed weapon, as do several of my colleagues on campus. We have not experienced any increase in incidents associated with guns and campus safety. My perception of campus safety is better than before, not because of weapons on our campus, but because of the policies, processes, and training that we have developed. I have still not completed my enhanced concealed carry training and my pistol remains secure in my home.

Chapter Summary

Campus safety remains a primary concern for stakeholders of higher education. We are unfortunately reminded too often by stories in the media or from colleagues we meet at conferences that dangerous and lethal incidents can occur on our campus, perpetrated by students or employees familiar to us or by strangers who arrive on our campus. It is likely that these new realities have changed our perceptions of campus safety and that our policies and practices have changed to accommodate these perceptions. Where the possession of a weapon on our campus was previously prohibited, it is now legal with the proper permit. This fact may bring a new instrument of lethality to our campus, or it may bring a stronger sense of self or other protection to us. It may change our perception of campus safety toward feeling more or less secure. Those perceptions, weighed against the realities of our campus crime reports, will help to influence the perceptions of future stakeholders and guide the policy development, hiring, training, and programs that will impact our future campus safety practices.

Chapter II: Review of Literature

Introduction

Because this study was limited to the cases of campus safety at the community colleges in Idaho, the amount of previous research and writing on that specific topic was very limited and most of it was produced after the passage of the concealed carry law in 2014. The literature the researcher found specific to Idaho came primarily from local or regional news sources and consisted of articles reporting on the process of the bill's passage and the various perspectives of stakeholders. Examination of major stakeholder positions like that of the Idaho State Board of Education, Idaho law enforcement associations, and other government entities also informed this study. Part of the rationale for consideration of the new law came from experiences of individuals and organizations in other states where the issue of weapons on campus had been previously considered, thus it is appropriate that the literature review included those perspectives. Additionally, much of the debate regarding concealed carry on campus has been informed and debated by regional and national associations, so a review of their influence on the debate was also necessary. Finally, an examination of previous research and literature regarding the implications for policy development, training, and staffing on college campuses where the concealed carry has been allowed also provided a foundation for this study.

A National Perspective

While there are isolated incidents in American higher education history that few of us may recall, like the 1966 University of Texas at Austin tower shooting, the 1970 National Guard shooting at Kent State, or the protests associated with the Vietnam war in the 1960's, nothing focused the attention of the American public regarding campus safety and guns like the incident at Virginia Tech in 2007. Perhaps because of the number of fatalities, the perceived inability of

the institution to respond effectively, and the lack of connection to a rationale for the shooting, the American public and the higher education stakeholders began to take a more serious look at campus safety (Ordway, n.d.).

An increased number of similarly fatal incidents have since occurred, so the discussion has heightened and the concern for safety on our college campuses has grown. In a report commissioned by the Citizens Crime Commission of New York City, author Ashley Cannon (2016) noted that college gun violence has exploded over the past five years and reached near epidemic proportions. The Crime Commission reviewed 190 incidents at 142 colleges that spanned from 2001 through 2016 and reported a 153% increase in shooting incidents and a 241% increase in total casualties (Cannon, 2016). The increase was largest at colleges in states with increased access to guns due to less restrictive gun laws, including Tennessee, California, Georgia, North Carolina, and Florida. Sixty-four percent of the campus shootings occurred in what the commission referred to as southern states while the western states, which includes Idaho, accounted for 13%, the lowest of any region (Cannon, 2016). Of the 437 victims of gun related incidents on college campuses in that fifteen year time span, 290 were students and 40 were employees with the balance of victims not being associated with the college or unknown (Cannon, 2016). Of the 145 incidents included in the Crime Commission Report, 59% of the shooters were not associated with the college, 28% were students, and 4% employees (Cannon, 2016). Cannon (2016) concluded that these incidents will continue to increase in frequency every year and admonished that real reforms be pursued to make college campuses safer.

Second Amendment

The media, both traditional and social, has also hastened the response to these incidents as they exposed the often gruesome details of these events and provided forums for stakeholders

to vent their frustrations and opinions. From a structural point of view, higher education began a long and continuing discussion regarding policy and training to prevent or prepare for similar incidents in the future. Of course, some of the responses considered were the arming of campus security, campus employees, and students. From a philosophical point of view, these events spurred a larger discussion regarding the rights of individuals to protect themselves, regardless of the setting.

Common to the discussion of personal safety in any setting in American culture is the reference to the Second Amendment in the Bill of Rights: “A well-regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed” (U.S. Const. amend II). Because some interpretations of these rights allowed for a limitation of their application, certain facilities or spaces have been exempted from the right to bear arms, such as government buildings, airplanes, and public schools. Many colleges and universities have also used that provision to prohibit weapons on their campuses or at their activities, unless otherwise allowed for by the institution. Proponents of the second amendment argued that prohibition of weapons on campus denied individuals of a constitutionally guaranteed right to arm and protect themselves. Lysimachus (2014) argued that government officials opposed to weapons on campus presented contradictory arguments when they support citizens’ rights to carry firearms and then support a restriction of that right on a public college campus. Students for Concealed Carry on Campuses (SCCC) tout a similar rationale that citizens should be allowed similar measures of self-protection on college campuses that are legally afforded to them nearly everywhere else (Students for Concealed Carry, n.d.). Hardy (2016) cited 10 reasons for allowing weapons on campus and included among them a provision which stated that the Second Amendment does not apply to all people, except students.

While there has been frequent debate regarding whether the framers of the Bill of Rights intended the right to bear arms to be a state right or an individual right, it was never contested in the Supreme Court until June, 2008. In the case of *District of Columbia v. Heller* (2008), the U.S. Supreme Court held that the right to bear arms was an individual right. Thus, state and local governments could not ban guns, but they could regulate their use, including the prohibition from certain individuals owning guns, requiring the registration of guns, and limiting where they may be possessed. In *McDonald v. Chicago* (2010), the U.S. Supreme Court extended the individual rights interpretation to the states via the Fourteenth Amendment. As federal and state laws supersede local and institutional policy, proponents then claimed that campuses have no ability to abridge that right for a citizen to legally possess a weapon on their premises. The National Rifle Association (NRA), self-described as America's longest-standing civil rights organization, specifically cited the United State Constitution and further referenced the *District of Columbia v. Heller* case as justification for its unlimited support of the individuals' right to possess and carry weapons (National Rifle Association, n.d.).

Opponents of concealed carry countered the constitutional argument with their interpretation that nearly all rights were intended to be limited and there was precedence for not allowing possession of weapons in particular places. Like their adversaries, opponents of concealed carry also cited the Second Amendment to support their stand. In *Campus Carry and the Second Amendment*, Hogue (2016) acknowledged the *District of Columbia* case that protects the rights of an individual, but noted the opinion of Justice Scalia who proposed that the right was not unlimited. Scalia specifically wrote that the courts finding should not be construed as weakening the prohibition on the possession of firearms by certain individuals and in certain locations. Hogue further purported that concealed carry on campus was not a right specifically

based on the Second Amendment, but was instead a “legislative enactment that confers a derivative entitlement” (Hogue, 2014, p. 2). *Everytown for Gun Safety* supported a similar view by noting that support for the Second Amendment induced public safety laws that reduce gun violence by keeping guns away from certain people and places (Everytown for gun safety, n.d.). The *Brady Campaign to Prevent Gun Violence* (n.d.) also believed that the Second Amendment was intended to have limitations, and promoted gun control through background checks, regulating gun sales, and changing social views and norms.

Gun Control

Despite the fact that the majority of higher education and law enforcement associations opposed the idea of allowing weapons on campus, government leaders and state legislators throughout the country have expanded the laws or introduced new legislation to bring the gun control debate to college campuses. Proponents of allowing concealed carry of weapons on campus claimed that allowing employees and students to legally carry weapons would create a safer environment because campuses would have an additional layer of protection. Campus constituents could defend themselves and others in the event of an active shooter or imminent threat and that knowledge of armed persons on campus alone may be a deterrent for would be shooters.

The timing of law enforcement’s response to a reported gun incident was also a concern as most of the damage seemed to be done prior to law enforcement arriving. Armed constituents could and would be able to respond much more quickly. Proponents of concealed carry also argued that the legal possession of weapons on campus leveled that playing field and became an equalizer between genders, races, and abilities (Students for Concealed Carry. n.d.). Lastly, proponents of concealed carry argued that prohibitions, policies, and laws that attempted to

prevent dangerous weapons on campus were largely ineffective, so individuals must be granted the ability to protect themselves. Neither side of the argument presented enough empirical evidence to win the debate, so both sides continue to produce stories they hope will influence the political and legal future of weapons on campus.

Differing Views

Many opponents of concealed carry argued that allowing guns on campus was unnecessary, as college campuses were historically so much safer than most other environments. *The Campaign to Keep Guns off Campus* (n.d.) reported that the homicide rate was 44 times higher off campus and that 93 percent of student-related violent crimes occurred off campus. Opponents of concealed carry contended that the college environment was already too volatile to allow for possession of weapons, given the risky demographics and stressful environment of a college campus. Hogue (2016) noted that modern campuses differ greatly from their traditional and historical environments, including the provision of childcare centers for student dependents. Because the student-parents of those children may often be involved in volatile custody or divorce proceedings, allowing for possession of a gun by individuals in that campus setting added to the liability. Hogue (2016) further contended that campuses with law schools whose students were practicing their craft by representing clients in on-campus clinics were also inviting trouble if they or their clients responded to contentious issues with the threat of a gun. Hogue (2016) recognized campuses as environments that often welcomed and encouraged debate and disparate points of view. Many argued that adding guns into that mix may tragically alter the outcomes of those disagreements.

Ordway (n.d.) pointed to the unintended consequences of allowing weapons on campus, including accidental shootings and the misuse of firearms at student events, both college-

sanctioned and informal gatherings. Opponents pointed to the high rates of suicide attempts among young adults and noted that attempts made with firearms are fatal more than 90% of the time while drug overdoses, the most common form of attempt, were fatal only about 3% of the time. *The Campaign to Keep Guns off Campus* (n.d.) reported that more than 24,000 suicide attempts were made by college students and introducing guns into that environment would only increase the number of fatalities. Other arguments against allowing weapons on campus included the fear that individuals, although legally allowed to carry a weapon, lacked the necessary training and judgment to exercise the use of their weapon in a way that does not further threaten the safety of others in incidental ways. Law enforcement officials responding to an incident on campus would be unable to determine which individuals were in legal possession of a weapon and were trying to defend themselves or others versus those who are perpetrators of the incident. Opponents also cited a lack of evidence that tied a reduction of campus violence to allowing students to carry weapons. In a study conducted across four states, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Florida, and Texas, all states that allow concealed carry, researchers found no connection between concealed weapons and crime rates (Silver, 2015). This study came after the Texas legislature decided to allow concealed weapons on college campuses. Supporters of the legislation argued that concealed carry prevented crime while opponents said it amplified disagreements and created more violent outcomes (Silver, 2015). Contradicting that research was the statement by Hurley (2015) who flatly stated that workplaces where guns were allowed had homicide rates that were multiple times higher than for work settings that prohibit concealed weapons. The International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators (IACLEA) also contended that there was no credible evidence that suggested that allowing concealed carry would reduce violence on campuses (Ordway, n.d.). Instead, they argued, the unintended

consequences of allowing guns on campus may result in an increased number of fatalities as statistics show that a large percentage of firearm deaths result from accidental shootings, many more of which are likely to occur if guns were allowed and present in larger numbers on campus and at student events (Ordway, n.d.).

In an extensive study conducted at Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, researchers flatly concluded that right to carry laws do not decrease mass shootings, mass shootings primarily occur in places where guns were allowed (versus gun-free zones), and they were very rarely stopped by gun-wielding and law-abiding citizens (Webster, et al, 2016). Finally, opponents of concealed carry contended that allowing guns on campus threatened the college's ability to maintain a safe environment and thus increased the institutions liability. Courts, they argued, have found that institutions had a "duty of care" which was compromised when an institution cannot prohibit actions that they perceived threatened campus safety. Not only was there more institutional liability, but the costs of adding and training staff, as well as preparing policy, signage, and effective communications were typically being borne from already austere institutional budgets without additional state or federal support. While directed more at K-12 public education system, US Secretary of Education Betsy DeVos was reported to support the use of federal funds to purchase guns for teachers, but Andy Pelosi, Executive Director of the Campaign to Keep Guns off Campus strongly voiced his organization's opposition to such a move claiming that federal funds were already diminishing and should only be used to support the best education possible, not to provide firearms for teachers (The Campaign to Keep Guns off Campus, 2018). The Brady Campaign, Students for Gun Free Campuses (SGFC), Everytown for Gun Safety, Coalition to Stop Gun Violence, Sandy Hook Promise, Americans for Responsible Solutions and the Violence Policy Center are primary

organizations that oppose the possession of weapons on campus and work across the nation to support this point of view.

The current debate on gun control has ebbed and flowed in response to recent incidents and political maneuvering. In 1993, a survey of American citizens found that 34% wanted their gun rights protected while 57% wanted some controls on gun ownership (Rosentiel, 2011). In a 2014 Pew Research Center survey, 52% of the respondents wanted their gun rights protected and 46% believed gun ownership should be controlled (Growing Public Support for Gun Rights, 2014). Most recently, and following the mass shooting at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida, a February, 2018 Quinnipiac Poll reported that 66% of American voters supported stricter gun control laws (Mark, 2018). Proponents typically called for background checks and protections against certain individuals, including the mentally ill, from being able to buy guns. Opponents of increased gun control refuted the idea that more and stricter laws would prevent future shootings, and they accused proponents of gun control of politicizing the issues by using past tragedies involving a gun as leverage (History of Gun Control, 2019).

States' Status

While the federal government has not waded into the debate about allowing weapons on campus, a number of states have taken up the issue and legislated different versions of the law as it applies to public higher education in their states. Hurley (2015) confirmed that due to Congress' refusal to consistently address gun control from a federal perspective, the debate and determination was likely left to the states.

The status of the law and policy governing the possession of weapons on higher education campuses varies considerably across the United States. All 50 states allow citizens to

carry concealed weapons if they meet certain state requirements, but there are currently 16 states that ban carrying a concealed weapon on a college campus. In 23 states, the decision to ban or allow concealed carry weapons on campuses is made by each college or university individually. Because of recent state legislation and court rulings, 10 states now have provisions allowing the carrying of concealed weapons on public postsecondary campuses.

Utah is the only state where public colleges and universities, by code, do not specifically have the authority to ban concealed carry weapons, and thus, all 10 public institutions in Utah allow concealed weapons on their property. Recently passed Kansas legislation created a provision that colleges and universities could not prohibit concealed carry unless a building has adequate security measures. Governing boards of the institutions, however, may still request an exemption to prohibit conceal carry for up to four years. Wisconsin legislation created a provision that colleges and universities must allow concealed carry on campus grounds. Campuses can, however, prohibit weapons from campus buildings if signs are posted at every entrance explicitly stating that weapons are prohibited, similar to the Idaho exemption. Like the Idaho law, legislation passed in Mississippi in 2011 created an exception to allow concealed carry on college campuses for those who have taken a voluntary course on the safe handling and use of firearms by a certified instructor (National Conference of State Legislators, 2018). The most recent status of each state can be viewed in Appendix A.

Campus Stakeholders

On the college campuses, there seems to be consistent opposition to allowing concealed carry. In a study reported in the *Journal of Community Health*, 791 faculty from 15 randomly selected universities in five Great lakes states, the vast majority of the faculty (98%) reported

they felt safe on their campuses and were not supportive (94%) of allowing people to carry concealed handguns on their campus (Thompson, Proce, Dake, & Teeple, 2013).

In a study reported in the *Journal of American College Health* (Price, Khubchandani, & Teeple, 2014), 900 college or university presidents were randomly surveyed to determine their perception regarding the carrying of concealed handguns on college campuses. Of the 46% who responded, 95% were not supportive of allowing concealed handguns on campuses (Price, Khubchandani, & Teeple, 2014).

Dahl, Bonham, and Reddington (2016) reported that 1889 community college faculty were surveyed and the majority felt safe on their campuses and were not supportive of allowing concealed carry by faculty, staff, students, or visitors. Similarly, Patten, Thomas, and Wada (2103) published findings from a survey of over 2,100 college students, staff, faculty, and administrators on two different college campuses. The analysis of data revealed that over 70% of the respondents were opposed to allowing concealed carry and believed that more guns on campus only decreased the sense of safety.

Of the primary stakeholder groups on college campuses, only students are represented by an organization, Students for Concealed Carry (SCC), which has advocated for legal concealed carry on college campuses. SCC has stated that concealed carry permit holders should be allowed the same measure of personal protection on campuses as is afforded to them nearly everywhere else.

The State of Idaho Perspective

Weapons and Idaho have a long history of association going all the way back to its origins. Guns were a common possession of Idaho citizens from early in the state's history. Whether it was explorers seeking new riches and resources, government agents attempting to

manage difficult relationships, or individuals hunting for wild game or protecting personal property, Idahoans have long been proud of their ability to defend and protect themselves. It comes, then, as no surprise that there has been strong resentment of some public places being able to prohibit the possession of weapons on their premises. Idaho has long been an open carry state and has allowed people with concealed-weapons permits to carry their firearms on them except in courthouses, juvenile detention facilities, prisons, jails, and at public and private schools. As gun incidents on college campuses in other states fueled a growing debate, Idaho and several other states contemplated some changes in the law.

Guns in Idaho

Holm (2018) noted that Idaho ranked in the top ten states in the nation in gun ownership coming in slightly behind Alaska and Arkansas. Nationally, about one in every three Americans owns a gun, and in Idaho, it is about three in every five (Holm, 2018). Idaho is considered a gun-friendly state given its firearms-friendly consumer and regulatory environment. Unlike many other states, Idaho does not have purchase permits, gun registration, or gun owner licensing requirements and private gun sales are legal. The state does not invoke limits on magazine capacity, weapon types, and has no waiting period for firearm purchases. Concealed carry licenses are not required for an individual to carry a concealed weapon outside of a city limits. Additionally, an Idaho resident over 21 years can conceal carry in city limits, and open carry is legal. In addition to these user-friendly laws, Idaho also honors permits from all other states and the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. There are also 37 states that honor an Idaho permit (Idaho gun laws, n.d.). Other Idaho gun-friendly laws include:

- A firearm can be concealed in an establishment that serves alcohol, but concealed carry is not legal while intoxicated.

- Possession of a firearm on school property while it is being used for school purposes or while riding school transportation is prohibited, but a firearm in a vehicle on school property is allowed.
- A loaded firearm is allowed in your vehicle as long as it is not concealed. If it is concealed, it must be unloaded.
- It is legal to carry a loaded firearm in your own home, your own place of business, on your own property or someone else's property with their permission.
- Idaho does not prohibit open or concealed carry of weapons within the public area of airports (Idaho Gun Laws (n.d.); Idaho Statutes: Firearms, explosives, and other deadly weapons, (2013).

Idaho also has a very friendly regulatory environment for the manufacturing and sale of guns and ammunition. Boise State Public Radio (Saunders, 2014) reported that there were more than 180 firearms and ammunition makers in Idaho and the state would like to create an environment to encourage more. The Idaho Department of Commerce pitch to recreation technology companies targeted firearms and accessories manufacturers by demonstrating that Idaho has not enacted more stringent levels of regulation beyond what the Federal government already restricts. Beyond the relaxed regulatory environment, prospective businesses also like the prospect of a labor market that is both a consumer of the product and a strong proponent of the right (Your Guide to Idaho's Gun and Ammunition Industry, n.d.).

Higher Education

In 2008, Idaho State Senator Curt McKenzie sponsored Senate Bill 1441 which expanded concealed carry rights, but continued to allow college and university administrators to regulate guns on their campuses (Associated Press, 2014b). By 2011, Idaho law still allowed college and

university presidents to prohibit firearms on campus and all Idaho public institutions had adopted their own regulations. During the 2011 legislative session, Republican State Representative Erik Simpson sponsored legislation that would have allowed students, employees, and visitors to lawfully carry firearms anywhere on campus except in undergraduate residence halls. Like many of his fellow citizens, Simpson claimed that his law would enhance safety on Idaho college campuses as law abiding and gun carrying campus constituents could help prevent a violent crime on campus. Opponents of the measure countered that allowing guns on campus would create a sense of fear and just accelerate conflict (Anderson, 2011). The National Rifle Association-backed bill passed in the Idaho House by a vote of 41-28 and headed to the Senate for approval (Zuckerman, 2011). In a Senate State Affairs Committee meeting, the bill was defeated on a 3-6 vote following emotional testimony given by committee member and Senate Majority Leader Bart Davis. Senator Davis recalled the tragedy of his son's death, who as a Boise State University student, had been shot and killed by a concealed weapon permit holder (Russell, 2011).

The Idaho Legislature, at the urging of the NRA and represented by paid lobbyist Dakota Moore again revisited the weapons on campus issue during the 2014 session (Millward & Forman, 2014). Idaho State Senator Curt McKenzie introduced the new bill, S1254, which would allow certain people to carry guns on Idaho public college campuses. This version authorized retired police and anyone 21 or older who had completed the state's enhanced concealed carry training course to legally carry a gun on an Idaho campus. The bill excluded residence halls and venues where more than 1000 people could gather (Graff, 2014). The bill passed the Senate and then was approved in the House on March 6. Gov. C. L. "Butch" Otter signed the bill into law less than a week later on March 12, 2014, despite opposition from all of Idaho's college and

university presidents. Boise State University President Bob Kustra said that lawmakers were ignoring the objections of the people who would be most adversely affected by this law (Saunders, 2014). University of Idaho President Don Burnett noted that research did not show increased safety on college campuses if the number of weapons allowed on campus increased and that proliferation of weapons only complicated the law enforcement response (Russell, 2014).

In response to the Idaho college Presidents' opposition, Idaho State Representative Vito Barbieri expressed disbelief with the opposition to a law that would only make the campuses safer. Senator McKenzie followed that he understood the Presidents' desire to control what happened on their campuses, but that should not include denying Idaho citizens the right to protect themselves on publicly owned land (Russell, 2014). Idaho State Board of Education member, Rod Lewis, expressed his concern that the law could be interpreted as allowing open carry on campuses, which would make it impossible to differentiate a criminal shooter from a student legally carrying a gun with no intentions of committing a crime (Terhune, 2014). Lewis and his fellow trustees on the State Board of Education voted unanimously to oppose the bill, citing a concern that the law could create confusion in the event of a shooting on campus, as responders would not be able to tell the difference between the good and bad guys (Associated Press, 2014a). Then Idaho State Board President, Don Soltman, noted that Idaho's campuses were already safe places and contended that the bill was not truly about safety (Prentice, 2014). Despite these objections from nearly all stakeholders directly involved or employed within higher education, the law went into effect July 1, 2014.

Law Enforcement

The law enforcement community in Idaho shared a mixed review of the proposed change in concealed carry law. Multiple police chiefs and other law enforcement officers from across the state opposed the change in laws including Boise Police Chief Mike Masterson who argued that concealed carry permit holders wouldn't have the training and expertise that is needed to react correctly to a mass shooting. Masterson signed up to testify at an Idaho State Senate Affairs Committee hearing, but was not allowed to speak prior to the committee meeting (Associated Press, 2014b). Moscow Police Chief David Duke expressed his concern that if the bill passed, law enforcement would have to change all of their training because they would not know who was bad and who was good in the case of a campus shooting (Prentice, 2014). Likewise, Bannock County Sheriff Lorin Nielsen, while recognizing the different opinions from some of his peers based on Second Amendment arguments, suggested that the legislation would hurt some of Idaho communities, because he did not see the legislation as a logical decision (Associated Press, 2014f).

In contrast, the Idaho Sheriff's Association threw their support behind the bill. According to Adams County Sheriff Ryan Zollman, a vast majority of the 38 Idaho sheriffs backed the new legislation because they believed that allowing guns in the hands of law-abiding citizens on college campuses would allow them to better protect themselves (Associated Press, 2014e). Bryan Lovell, president of the Fraternal Order of Police and a Bonneville County Sheriff's deputy, supported a similar view of wanting people to have the right to defend themselves, even on a college campus (Terhune, 2014).

Faculty View

Much like other primary stakeholders, Idaho college and university faculty generally opposed the new law. The Idaho State University Faculty Senate voted unanimously against the measure and a subsequent informal e-mail poll of faculty there showed 55 percent of the respondents opposed to concealed weapons on campus (Associated Press, 2014f). University of Idaho faculty, through their association with the American Federation of Teachers, actively opposed the legislation by suggesting both structural and satirical ways that faculty could demonstrate their disapproval. Boise State University biology professor Hampikian doubted that the classroom atmosphere will change much, but expressed that college officials will see increased injuries due to gun accidents. He considered it unfortunate that the new law was taking a safe place and making it harder for law enforcement when they are called upon to do their job (Tyson, 2014). University of Idaho physics professor Machleidt estimated that 90 percent of the faculty there opposed the bill, but felt that faculty had very little leverage to change the outcome (Tyson, 2014). When the bill was debated in the Senate State Affairs Committee, proponents, including a BSU psychology professor who described her fear when a former student had threatened to kill her, were outnumbered at a ratio of four to one (Associated Press, 2014c).

Student View

Students in the Idaho higher education system got involved in the issue and shared their views with the governor, members of the Idaho legislature, and other stakeholders. A delegation of students from across the state met with the governor's staff to express their opposition to the bill. Bryon Vlok, Boise State University (BSU) student body president and a spokesperson for the group, shared his belief that legislators were not listening to the most effected stakeholders (Robinson, 2014). BSU student body vice president Cassie Sullivan shared that they had

signatures on petitions from all over the state from Idahoans who opposed weapons on campus (Associated Press, 2014f). BSU student Angel Hernandez stated emphatically that college should be a place where you go to learn and improve your life and not have to deal with the stress of worrying about someone having a gun in the classroom (Millward & Forman, 2014). Josh Sayer, a pharmacy student at Idaho State University, shared that he thought only law enforcement and members of the military should be able to carry concealed weapons on campus, because there was no other way to distinguish who was a responsible gun holder (Johnson, 2014). University of Idaho student body president Max Cowan reported that spirited dialogue had occurred on his campus and that the strongest sentiment was for these decisions to be made close to home and with autonomy (Prentice, 2014).

On the other side of the student argument, Kelby Monks, a BSU student and son of one of the Idaho state legislators, favored the new law because he believed that someone legally carrying a concealed gun in a classroom could stop a would-be mass shooter well before law enforcement could ever respond to the threat (Terhune, 2014). Eastern Idaho Technical College student Ryan Wassom reported that he believed most people just didn't understand the benefits of allowing weapons on campus because, as he claimed, states that don't allow concealed carry have much higher crime rates (Johnson, 2014). Similarly, Derek Sommer, a student at Idaho State University (ISU), was glad that the new law allowed him to legally carry his concealed handgun onto the ISU campus. He had not liked the fact that campus used to be a place where one didn't have the right to protect himself (Millward & Forman, 2014).

In the Idaho debate, the national and state organization, *Students for Concealed Carry*, supported the new law and noted that predictions of gloom and doom with the passage of similar

laws in other states have never come to pass and predicted nor would they in Idaho (Tyson, 2014).

Financial Implications

In addition to the concerns related to safety, Idaho colleges and universities attempted to appeal to the fiscally conservative side of the legislature by expressing the need for additional funds if the law were to change. According to institutional representatives, allowing concealed carry on campus would require considerable changes in staffing, training, equipment, and other safety practices (Robinson, 2014).

BSU head of security and police services, Jon Uda, was one of the first to present estimated costs to upgrade their security services. Uda stated that training and equipment for staff would require \$895,000 for the first year and then \$1.42 million for each of the next two years. Because of the provision on the law that prohibited guns in environment with a capacity of more than a 1000 people, Uda also projected costs for metal detectors and staffing at venues like the Taco Bell Arena (\$350,000), the Morrison Center (\$129,000), and at Bronco Stadium (\$275,000) (Graff, 2014). Officials at Idaho State University estimated that it would cost \$600,000 to bolster their campus security in the first year and that the cost would rise considerably to bring the university into compliance with federal regulations associated with the nuclear research program on their campus (Associated Press, 2014f). North Idaho College (NIC) estimated an additional cost of approximately \$250,000 annually. Mark Browning, spokesman for NIC commented that legislators were putting millions of dollars of expense back to the institutions who would have to pass that along to students and local taxpayers (Robinson, 2014).

Approximately a year later, five of Idaho's colleges and universities reported that they had spent more than \$1.5 million for additional security. In the 2015 legislative session, public

higher education institutions requested over \$3.7 million to help with rising security expenses. Those requests were not included in the Governor's budget and legislators chose to deny any new funds in their post-secondary appropriation (Associated Press, 2015).

The Idaho Community College Perspective

Stakeholders of the Idaho community colleges responded much the same way as their counterparts at the four-year institutions. Community college faculty, staff, and administrators were generally opposed and each of their locally elected Boards voted to oppose the legislation. Because their governance does not fall directly under the Idaho State Board of Education, regional leaders felt even more strongly about maintaining local control. According to North Idaho College President Joe Dunlap, community colleges in Idaho already had locally developed policies that did not allow weapons on their campuses and the new bill ignored a basic and traditional Idaho value of local control of government (Goins, 2014).

President Dunlap of NIC noted that current policies did not allow guns on campus and that should not be pre-empted by state law, as prescribed in SB 1254. His NIC trustees supported that view by voting in opposition to the bill, saying that it superseded local law and policy (Villagomez, 2014). The President of the College of Southern Idaho (CSI), Jeff Fox, reported that his Board and faculty senate had previously polled students on the concealed-carry law and results had been nearly unanimous against allowing guns on campus (Russell, 2014). College of Western Idaho President Bert Glandon complained that his campus did not have lockdown capabilities, security, or other necessary resources. He did not believe that the new law would keep his campus safe and secure (Yak Max, 2014).

New Policies, Processes, and Personnel

To comply with the new state law, the College of Southern Idaho (CSI) Board of Trustees passed a new campus weapons policy at its meeting on June 16, 2014. The policy (see Appendix B) provided definitions, a policy statement, and an extensive question and answer section. Only slight modifications were made to the policy by the Board before it was passed unanimously (College of Southern Idaho, 2014). CSI President Fox said that the new policy definitely made it clear that the college discourages people from bringing weapons to campus. He doesn't expect people coming to campus with weapons and causing problems and expects that those who are carrying will be law abiding. CSI has no plan to arm their security officers and expect costs for upgrading their department to be approximately \$200,000 (Wootton, 2014). Tom Carter, Twin Falls County Sheriff, reported that his agency was ready for the new law and the CSI policy because they always train for a worst case scenario. He said that more guns on campus may, or may not, stop a more serious incident from occurring (Martin, 2015).

At North Idaho College, the Senate, part of their governance structure consisting of faculty, staff, and students, reviewed a major revision to their Dangerous Weapons on Campus Policy (see Appendix C) and passed it at their May 15, 2014 meeting (North Idaho College Senate, 2014). At the May 28, 2014 meeting of the NIC Board of Trustees, the same policy and an accompanying procedure was passed unanimously after an extensive discussion and one amendment (North Idaho College, 2014). As a result of the new law, NIC planned to provide their security officers with bulletproof vests, more specific training, and adding more officers to their security force (Campus Safety, 2014).

Trustees from the College of Western Idaho (CWI) passed their revised safety policy (see Appendix D) at a special meeting on July 7, 2014. After one amendment, the policy passed on a

four-to-one vote with plans to further review open carry laws and policies (College of Western Idaho, 2014). CWI President Glandon expected the policy and procedures to be a work in progress and promised to work with the Senator McKenzie, the bill sponsor, to clarify some questions. Trustees were particularly concerned with the definition of weapon, which Glandon promised to address with McKenzie.

Researcher Perspective

The researcher had numerous expectations of the outcomes of conducting the literature review on this topic and while many of them were realized exactly as expected, there were a few surprises. The researcher anticipated that there would be volumes of information on a variety of topics related to guns or dangerous weapons in the United States, and expected a smaller but still generous number of studies and reports about guns on campus. The researcher further expected that most of the literature would be focused on the quantitative side of the topic, detailing primarily the numbers of states that enacted conceal carry legislation on college campuses, incidents, deaths, and similar statistics. All of those expectations were met as the researcher reviewed information that had been presented in previous doctoral classes and finding more of the same information in current literature was easy. While the researcher reported some of that data in the literature review as a means to provide a very broad foundation for the prevalence and scope of the topic of weapons in American culture and politics, the researcher wanted this literature review to focus on community colleges, which considerably narrowed the availability of previous research. Next, the researcher was mostly looking for studies that were connected to the impact on campus safety in the community college environment, so the search for previous research became even less productive. Finally, the researcher looked for previous research that addressed campus safety at community colleges in Idaho and found none. Instead, the researcher

was able to report on the politics, people, and process of changing the law as captured primarily through the lens of journalists. While there was no previous research done on implications for policy development, processes, hiring, and training, the researcher did find accounts of policy development conducted by each Idaho community college. Additionally, media reports referenced community college officials estimating potential costs for new equipment and training.

The researcher was not surprised that the literature review found numerous sources that sustained the usual arguments and claimed that one point of view was more accurate than the other. Depending on the sources and the authors, the contention was made that weapons, particularly guns, in our American society either made us more or less safe. The more safe side always used stories, testimonies, and statistics that centered on one's constitutional rights, deterrence, and the ability to protect one's self and others. The less safe side used similar means to tell a story of limited rights, increased risk, and additional costs. In this review of literature, neither side could provide conclusive evidence that linked guns to a more or less safe environment in any setting. The statistics were usually inconsistent and could never be linked specifically to guns alone as a reason for changes in crime rates. Consequently, the researcher concluded from this review of the literature that neither side was consistently right or wrong, but that the topic was a very subjective, and that many more years of careful research will likely be necessary reveal the truth to either side. Just as the researcher's opinion of allowing weapons on campus had evolved through this study and over these last few years, so will the impacts on campus safety and the resulting actions evolve among the stakeholders of Idaho community colleges. This awareness of the impacts on campus safety as presented through this study is

important as future leaders create communication, training, policies, and processes for future stakeholders.

Chapter Summary

The review of literature provided substantial evidence of the increase in the number of weapons-related incidents occurring in America and on higher education campuses. Consequently, the number and nature of studies seems to have increased along with the public interest in this topic. Advocacy groups on both sides of the issue led and supported much of the discussion while policy makers and politicians add to the stories with their strong actions and opinions. Victims and their family members add their experiences and emotions to the literature primarily by sharing their stories through the lenses of journalists.

The review of literature in this chapter captured some of the important foundational facts and current status of gun-related laws across the United States. It examined the evolution and current state of gun laws in Idaho with a focus on the passage and impact of Senate Bill 1254 in 2014. Finally, the review of available information related to the impact of conceal carry legislation on Idaho community colleges and their stakeholders was primarily detailed through institutional documents and reports filed by state and regional media outlets. All of this information revealed an enormous research gap regarding the impact of this new law in Idaho. This leaves a void of information that could be used to shape policy, training, and resourcing for future employees and leaders in Idaho and at Idaho higher education institutions.

Chapter III: Research Methodology

Introduction

In this chapter of the study, the researcher has defined the purpose of the study and further detailed the research questions. Rationale for using a multi-case study design and methodology including explanations of the unit of analysis, the institutional contexts, and introduction of the participants is also provided. This chapter also presents the plan for data collection which includes the design and use of the survey questionnaire, interviews, direct and participant observation, and document review. A discussion of data analysis is presented next and followed by a discussion of triangulation, peer review, and member checking as validation strategies utilized in the study.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this multiple-case study is to describe and better understand the impact of concealed carry weapons legislation on campus safety as perceived by stakeholders at Idaho community colleges. Though governed by a locally elected Board of Trustees, Idaho community colleges are required to comply with this new state law. Consequently, their policies and practices had to change to address the impact of Senate Bill 1254 on campus safety. Key campus stakeholders are charged with assessing, changing, communicating, and executing changes in policy, processes, hiring, and training. This qualitative study collected data from primary campus stakeholders and archived documents at each of the Idaho community colleges. The results from each campus yielded valuable information that can be used to inform policy and practice changes that support enhanced campus safety. A cross case analysis of the findings from each of the community colleges or cases also informed the development of best practices at Idaho community colleges as related to campus safety. This analysis also yielded consistent evaluations

of personnel and fiscal impacts. The results of this study may then be used to provide more comprehensive information to inform policymakers of the impacts of changes in public law on higher education campuses.

Research Questions

Research questions for this study were focused on the impact on campus safety at Idaho's community colleges given the legalization of concealed carry weapons on campus. Primary research questions include:

Q1: How did the legalization of concealed carry weapons impact campus safety at Idaho community colleges?

SQ1: How did the legalization of concealed carry weapons impact development of campus safety policy and processes?

SQ2: How did the legalization of concealed carry weapons impact the hiring, training, recruitment, and retention of employees and students?

SQ3: How did the legalization of concealed carry weapons impact campus safety preparedness, perception, and crime statistics?

The purpose of the main research question in this study was to better understand how primary campus stakeholders perceived the impact on campus safety after the passage of the concealed carry weapons law. Participants responded to this question from their unique campus perspective. The sub-questions address the participants' knowledge, experiences, and feelings about campus safety given the passage of the conceal carry law and asked them to cite or describe experiences to support their responses and feelings. Additional sub-questions addressed the participants' engagement and experience in the process of changing campus policy and practices after the passage of the law and asked them to cite or describe specific examples. The

last sub-question asked participants to forecast the needs for improving campus safety given the change in policy. Additionally, this last question sought to understand the participants' perspective on the impact the new policy had on actual campus crime rates and their current sense of campus safety for themselves and other stakeholders. Responses to these questions from participants led to a general description of the stakeholders' perception of impact on campus safety with the introduction of concealed carry weapons. The collection of additional evidence from document review, direct observation, and participant observation added rich and comprehensive details to inform the answers to the research questions.

Research Design

For the purposes of this study, a qualitative multi-case study was determined to be the most effective approach, because the researcher explored the impact on campus safety given the legalization of concealed carry weapons as described by particular stakeholders within and among the Idaho public community colleges. As the researcher in a case study, I served as the primary instrument of data collection as I surveyed and interviewed the participants, made direct observations, and reviewed related documents. This case study design allowed the researcher to analyze the collected data to search for patterns in responses that led to a greater understanding of the impact that a change in the law had on campus safety. Consistent with case study methodology, this research investigated a contemporary issue within a real-world context (Yin, 2018). The issue of weapons on campus was not the dominant focus of the study, but the impact on campus safety and provisions made by the community colleges to adapt was of primary interest.

This research fits the definition of a case study as it provided an in-depth description and analysis of a system that was bound by time and place, and the data collected came from

participants within that bounded system (Creswell, 2013). This multi-case methodology allowed the researcher to explore in greater depth the impact on campus safety as described by participants from specific institutions who were impacted by a specific change in the law. This design was ideal for this research as it provided a greater understanding of a complex and contemporary phenomenon that is still evolving.

Methodology

This study employed a qualitative methodology with an exploratory case study design to study the impact on campus safety on the Idaho community college campuses given the passage of the concealed carry weapons law. As the intent of this study was to explore and more fully understand the impacts on campus safety, the findings were instrumental in creating a description and better understanding of the issues and impacts (Creswell, 2013). Because the study involved all four Idaho community colleges, it was necessary for this research to include a within case analysis of each institution followed by a cross case analysis.

Unit of Analysis

In conducting this case study, it was critical to consider the unit of analysis to be employed in the study. Given the topic of this study, it would have been easy for both the researcher and prospective readers of the study to focus on the issue of weapons on campus rather than the impacts reported by the participants regarding campus safety. Weapons on campus were not the focus of the study, but rather the focus was on the impact on campus safety because of the change in law. The unit of analysis was not reported as a statistic or a political opinion on the issue, but rather as impacts on campus safety at each one of the campuses or cases. This unit of analysis was indicated and drawn from the research questions as they clearly

pointed to impacts on campus safety at each of the Idaho community colleges, not on particular individuals' perceptions of safety.

Institutional Contexts

Because the purpose of this research was to study how campus safety at Idaho community colleges had been impacted with the legalization of concealed carry weapons, the researcher chose the bounded system of Idaho's four public community colleges: the College of Eastern Idaho (CEI), the College of Southern Idaho (CSI), the College of Western Idaho (CWI), and North Idaho College (NIC). These institutions were chosen because they have similar missions, serve similar demographics, and have a similar structure. Within this bounded system, it was also important to note that the system of governance was similar among the four colleges so that the participant's roles were similar. Each college has a publicly elected five-member Board of Trustees which has responsibility for hiring the President and approving institutional policy.

Participants

Participants in the case study were from the four public Idaho community colleges and were chosen because of their role at each of the colleges and the assumption that they are connected in some way to the development, communication, and execution of policies, processes, hiring, and training. A total of 24 individuals participated in the study, six per institution, and represented the constituent groups of faculty, staff, administrators, and trustees. The purposeful identification of participants in the sample was accomplished through the techniques of criterion sampling, snowball or chain sampling, and politically important sampling (Creswell, 2013). These techniques allowed the researcher to develop a sample of participants

who met the criterion, who were in critical leadership positions, and who were familiar with and actively engaged in campus safety.

The collection of interview data came from an equal number of participants (6) representing similar stakeholder groups at each one of Idaho's public community colleges. The stakeholder representatives included the institutional president, chief financial officer, chief student services officer, chief human resource officer, chief security officer, and the chair of the Board of Trustees. Data was gathered through the use of electronic surveys followed by personal in-depth interviews. Other data related to the participants was gathered from transcripts of campus meetings and events, records of public hearings, and reports from local, regional, and state media.

Data Collection

In order to present an in-depth understanding of this case, it was necessary for the researcher to collect several forms of data. Often that included interviews, observations, surveys, and review of documents and audiovisual materials (Creswell, 2013). For this study, the researcher initially utilized a survey of the participants, one-on-one interviews with each of the participants, print and electronic documents supplied by the institutions, documents from the State of Idaho Legislature and other state government entities, and documents from local and regional Idaho news media outlets. The researcher also visited each campus in order to make direct observations of campus safety communication, equipment, facilities, and staffing. As a participant observer, the researcher also utilized data obtained from personal interaction with colleagues.

Yin (2018) discussed the four principles of data collection that will help to establish and maintain the construct validity and reliability of the evidence gathered through several methods.

The first principle was satisfied by using multiple sources of evidence gathered through surveys, interviews, document review, direct observation, and participant observation which supported the need to conduct an in-depth and contextual study. Information obtained through these multiple sources helped produce convergent evidence that supported data triangulation and strengthened the construct validity of my study (Yin, 2018).

Yin's (2018) second principle was satisfied by developing and utilizing a case study database. All of the sources of evidence, as well as collected notes and narratives, were stored and categorized in electronic Word and Excel files, thus making the organization and retrieval of complex data easier to understand and access. All of the data was stored in two separate locations and both were password protected. The management of these databases helped to further increase the reliability of this research study.

The third principle of data collection involved maintaining a chain of evidence. Yin (2018) suggested that a linkage needed to be established and maintained that allows the reader to connect evidence from initial research questions to the conclusions of the case study. The reader of this study should be able to connect questions to process, process to sources, sources to evidence, evidence to a database, and the database to conclusions. The gathering of data, the purposeful coding and sorting of data into themes, the identification of themes to cases, and the comparison of cases to each other yielded findings that tied all of the processes together. Because this was achieved, construct validity was further enhanced (Yin, 2018).

Yin's (2018) fourth principle suggested that the researcher exercise caution when using data from social media sources. The volume, credibility, and accuracy of information and sources collected via social media platforms is regarded as difficult to navigate (Yin, 2018). While the researcher was aware of much information that could be obtained through social media

sources, suspicious of its validity, convinced the researcher not use information derived from these sources in this study.

In addition to observing Yin's (2018) principles, the researcher was certain to share with the participants prior to surveying or interviewing them the nature of this multiple case study in writing (See Appendix G) and asked for their informed consent to participate (Yin, 2018). Prior to conducting each of the face-to-face interviews, the researcher again explained the purpose of the study and asked for their consent. Prior to approaching any of the participants, the researcher also received permission from the institutional presidents for their participation in the study.

Surveys

Initial data for this study was first obtained through an online emailed questionnaire.. This was considered an effective technique for gathering preliminary information in a case study as it often produces data that can provide a foundation for understanding the participants' level of engagement and knowledge of an issue (Yin, 2018). The information gathered through the survey or questionnaire was used to inform and refine the one-on-one interview questions asked later in the study. The initial questionnaire consisted of five questions that gathered descriptive information that affirmed the participants' position, length of employment, and connection to campus safety impacts, so that their participation fit the study parameters established by the researcher. These questions included the following:

1. What is your position at the college?
2. How long have you been working at the college in this position?
3. Are you aware the policies at your campus regarding possession of a weapon? Can you briefly describe it?

4. Do you have a direct or indirect role on your campus for developing policies or processes that impact campus safety? Please cite any examples.
5. Are you directly or indirectly involved in the hiring or training of employees? Please cite any examples.

The researcher carefully reviewed and organized the responses to the survey, so that the information could be sorted into clusters that represented emerging meanings or themes. Responses from participants helped inform the one-on-one interview questions and provided an opportunity to refine and differentiate the interview questions.

Interviews

Additional data for this study was obtained through open-ended, one-on-one interviews with the participants. This technique allowed for personal conversations with the participants where the content of their responses could be recorded as well as their informal responses observed. Semi-structured interviews were conducted on the campuses where the participants were employed and in a setting of their choosing, preferably an office, conference room, or space that was both comfortable and confidential. The researcher acted as a participant observer during the interviews as my role and engagement with the issue was often very similar to many of the participants. This helped me establish a strong rapport and gain insider views and subjective data (Creswell, 2013).

Questions that guided the interviews included:

1. How familiar are you with the state law that allows for concealed carry of weapons on campus? What are its provisions?

2. How were you involved in providing testimony or recommendations to the administration, Board of Trustees, State Board of Education, or state legislative committees regarding the law?
3. Will you describe your feelings or concerns regarding the change in law as it relates to the impact on safety of your campus?
4. What are some of the changes in policy and processes on your campus since the passage of the new law? Have you been directly involved in the development or implementation of those policies?
5. What are some of the changes in hiring or training of employees since the passage of the new law? Have you been directly involved in the development of new hiring and training processes?
6. How have your feelings about having weapons on campus changed as a result of this law?
7. Do you feel safe on your campus?

These questions provided greater meaning and insight to the perception of safety by each of the participants and their levels of engagement in developing the institution's response to campus safety concerns caused by the legalization of concealed carry weapons. Interview responses were audio-recorded utilizing a digital voice recorder and later transcribed by an online vendor. If participants were not comfortable with being recorded, the researcher was prepared to take detailed notes on my tablet. Additionally, time to complete these interviews was kept flexible in case a participant chose to change, delay, or withdraw from the interview.

Document Review

In addition to the data obtained through participant surveys and interviews, case studies are often informed by the examination of electronic and printed documents including reports, agendas, minutes, correspondence, and media records (Yin, 2018). These sources of information may corroborate information gained from surveys and interviews and further validate other observations and data. The researcher obtained records of agendas, minutes, policies, press releases, media interviews, and internal communications from each of the campuses, their constituent groups, and board meetings, related to the topic of campus safety and the introduction of concealed weapons on campus. While it was not necessary, I could have utilized the public records requests to gain access to information that was not readily available. These documents were made available and were examined for further evidence of the actions, opinions, and engagement expressed by the participants in this study. The findings further corroborated results from the surveys and one-on-one interviews. Information and data obtained from the document review was categorized and indexed into the corresponding themes.

Direct Observation

Because the impact on campus safety and the resulting response from the community college campuses is likely to be directly observable in the real world setting of the cases, the researcher visited each campus and conducted both formal and casual observations (Yin, 2018). Formally, I looked for and photographed environmental examples of signage, postings, equipment, technology, and facilities that appeared to be connected to campus safety measures. More casually, I noted through interaction with the participants and their colleagues in their campus environs, any evidence that was linked to campus safety including apparel, radios, weapons, beacons, metal detectors, and security cameras.

Participant Observation

Because of the researchers direct and sustained involvement in the campus safety issues at two of the Idaho community colleges and my networking with peers at all four institutions, I have already been actively involved as a participant. As a participant observer in this study, the researcher had the advantage of easily gaining access to the participants and information. Additionally, I was able to develop perceptions from the viewpoint of being inside the case rather than coming as an external and uninformed observer. These advantages, as a participant observer, had the potential for producing biases in my findings by causing me to be too close or too supportive of my peers, or to not be a good observer because of my desire to participate (Yin, 2018).

Data Analysis

In a qualitative study like this, the data analysis consists of preparing and organizing the data for analysis, sorting or clustering the data into themes through a process of open coding, and finally presenting the findings of the study through a discussion, tables, or figures (Creswell, 2013). Within this study, the data was thoroughly analyzed for emerging themes, recorded interviews were carefully transcribed, examined, and clustered into themes, documents were reviewed for data that was clustered into themes, and observation notes were similarly coded. As suggested by Yin (2018), the researcher began working the data by putting it into different arrays that were indicated by certain discovered themes and subthemes. The researcher created visual displays or tables that also represented groupings of the data and allowed readers to better see the themes (See Appendix H; Yin, 2018). The researcher employed open coding to originally sort the data into these broad themes and then employed axial coding to look for relations between the identified themes. After playing and arraying the research data in such ways, the researcher

proceeded to a general analytic strategy. Yin (2018) suggested four different strategies and I proposed utilizing the first of those which is relying on theoretical propositions. The original propositions of this case study, as reflected in the research questions and literature review, was that the legalization of concealed carry weapons on campus impacted campus safety, with particular regard to policy development, process changes, and hiring and training of personnel. Those theoretical propositions yielded a particular data collection plan and analytic priorities (Yin, 2018).

The presentation and discussion of the data emerged into patterns or themes allowed the researcher the pursuit of further analysis through cross-case synthesis. As this was a multiple case study, cross-case synthesis helped to examine and retain the integrity of the entire case while comparing and synthesizing any within-case patterns noted across all four cases. Conclusions were then drawn about each of the individual cases and the entire study. This analysis resulted in an in-depth and shared description of the impact on campus safety at Idaho's community colleges following the enactment of Idaho House Bill 1254. The discussion also provided context for additional research and the formulation of new policies, processes, training, and hiring programs. The impacts on campus safety could also be compared to the actual campus safety incidents at the respective institutions during the same time frame, particularly if the incident involved use of a weapon. The results of that comparison in another study could also contribute to the knowledge of individuals, groups, organizations, and systems regarding the perception of campus safety versus the actual as indicated through campus crime reports (See Appendix I).

Validation Strategies

It was important to validate the accuracy of the findings from this study through a number of strategies. According to Angen (2000), “validation is a judgement of the trustworthiness or goodness of a piece of research” (p. 387). She further suggested that research should have transformative value that might lead to action and change. In order for this research to be trusted, a number of validation strategies were employed that may lead to a transformation in at least perceptions and possibly translate into actions. Angen (2000) spoke of substantive validation, which was demonstrated by reporting on the researcher’s perspective and experience. Substantive validation required that the researcher demonstrate an understanding of the topic, be able to interpret and understand information from other sources, and present all of that in a written study that will resonate with the intended audience. In addition to this substantive validity, the research also employed other recognized strategies that further demonstrated the accuracy of this study, including triangulation, peer review, and member checking.

Triangulation

One method of validation used in this research was triangulation. This process involved the collection of data from different sources which provided corroborating evidence and supported the resulting themes. Data triangulation was accomplished in this study as the data was derived from different participants at different institutions and resulted in similar themes. Methodological triangulation also resulted in increased validity of this study as different data collection methods such as surveying, interviewing, observing, and document reviewing were employed. The use of multiple methods to collect the data added to the confidence in the findings of the data collected in this study and helped control for researcher bias, especially as the data was consistent from each source or participant regardless of the method used.

Peer Review

Another method of validation employed was peer review. Two colleagues with extensive experience in higher education and research reviewed my research. Both provided a critical analysis and valuable feedback regarding the methods, meanings, and interpretations of this research. Their contributions provided added validity to this study.

Member Checking

Another validation strategy employed was member checking. As the researcher is closely connected by profession, issue, and employer with each of the participants, it was easy, and expected, for me to share the data, analyses, interpretations, and conclusions of this study with many of the participants. Some of the participants examined the rough drafts of the interviews and their observations and suggestions confirmed or added to the credibility to the study.

Chapter Summary

This exploratory multi-case study design was ideal for this type of research as it involved an issue within an actual and contemporary context. The issue of campus safety in higher education is critical one and of great concern to the American public. In Idaho, the passage of House Bill 1254, which allowed for the concealed carry of weapons on a college campus, has created new dynamics and perceptions of campus safety. At the community colleges in Idaho, local boards, administrators, faculty, and staff have been challenged by a new reality that has changed their approach to campus safety for themselves and their constituents. This intensive collection of data gathered through surveys, interviews, observations, and a review of pertinent documents provided an in-depth look at the impact of the conceal carry on campus safety, how it evolved, and what it may mean for our future, all as seen and reported through the eyes of important campus stakeholders.

Chapter IV: Results

Institutional Profiles

The four public community colleges in Idaho chosen as the subjects for this study were treated as separate cases as they do not fall within a singular system that could be studied as a whole. As provided in Idaho Code, each Idaho public community college represents a particular region and is partially funded by a taxing district whose patrons have agreed to tax themselves accordingly. Additional funding is provided by the state of Idaho and collection of tuition, fees, grants, and other auxiliary enterprises. Funding from the state is determined by the legislature and is separate from the appropriation given to the four-year colleges and universities. The community college appropriation is specifically separated by institution and not provided as a system allocation.

Each community college has a distinct governing board of trustees that consists of five trustees, each serving four-year terms, and all of whom are publicly elected. Trustees are responsible for approving policy, budget, and hiring of the executive officer or president. The Idaho State Board of Education retains some jurisdiction for approval of instructional programs at the community colleges, but most other policies and practices are developed and implemented locally, though they are usually complimentary to each other and to their senior higher education partners. The Idaho public community colleges are compelled by law to abide by state code which made adoption and enforcement of Senate Bill 1254 applicable to each of their campuses.

Idaho's four community colleges have quite distinct histories. The oldest of the four, North Idaho College, was founded in 1933 and serves a five county region with a main campus in Coeur d'Alene and outreach campuses in Post Falls, Kellogg, Sandpoint, and Bonners Ferry. NIC's current enrollment is approximately 12,532. The College of Southern Idaho was founded

in 1964 and serves an eight county region with a main campus in Twin Falls and outreach centers in Burley, Gooding, and Hailey. CSI's current enrollment is approximately 19,751. The College of Western Idaho was founded in 2009 and serves a four county region with outreach centers in Boise, Nampa, and Caldwell. CWI's current enrollment is 31,636. The College of Eastern Idaho is the newest community college and was founded in 2017. It serves a nine county region and has an enrollment of 17,103.

Participant Profiles

Participants in the study were chosen through purposeful sampling and included a member of the board of trustees, the institutional president, the chief financial officer, the chief student services officer, the chief human resources officer, and the chief campus safety officer. These individuals were referred to the researcher by the institutional president who had knowledge of the nature of this study. Each of the participants were connected in some regard to aspects of campus safety through development and approval of policy, funding and execution of campus safety protocol, and hiring and training of personnel. The title and responsibilities of the participants varied slightly and their degree of engagement in campus safety varied considerably both within and across the cases.

The researcher received permission from each institutional president to invite identified personnel to participate after which an email was sent to each explaining the study, inviting their participation, and asking for their informed consent to participate. Nineteen of the 24 invited participants responded to the questionnaire and all 24 participated in one-on-one interviews directly with the researcher.

Questionnaire

Analysis of the questionnaire provided to the participants produced responses that affirmed the researcher's choice of these participants in the study. Beyond the descriptive data obtained regarding position and years of service at that institution, each participant responded affirmatively to the question regarding familiarity with policies on their respective campuses regarding possession of a weapon. Participants cited examples of their knowledge of the policy as well as describing their respective roles in the development of policies and processes that may affect campus safety.

Participants also responded to their perception of the roles they played in hiring and training of employees and were asked to cite examples of their involvement in those roles. With the researcher's knowledge of the roles and duties traditionally assigned to the participant titles, responses to questions were appropriate and affirming. Trustees, for example, consistently affirmed their knowledge of the policies and the role they played in approving them, while noting their lack of engagement in hiring (with the exception of the president) and training of employees.

Similarly, positions that are more closely associated with campus safety like the chief officers of human resources, student services, and security, provided more detailed and extensive responses to questions regarding the knowledge and development of weapons policy and processes. Not surprisingly, chief human resource officers typically provided the most detailed and extensive engagement in hiring and training processes at their institutions.

Further comparison of the responses made by participants in the same or similar positions at the different community colleges revealed similar levels of knowledge and engagement, with the exception of a comparison of responses from chief security officers who were employed by the

college to that of a contracted chief security officer. That observation was later affirmed through one-on-one interviews.

Interviews

At each of the institutions, the researcher asked the participants the same open-ended questions regarding the impact of the legalization of concealed carry weapons on campus safety at their institutions. Participants were asked to identify their knowledge of the enhanced concealed carry law and associated campus policy, their level of engagement in the development of campus safety policy and process, their perceptions of the impacts on hiring, training, and recruitment and retention of students or employees, and anticipated needs for further enhancing campus safety. Finally, participants were asked if they and other constituents feel safe on campus and their perception of campus crime rates prior to and after the change in weapons policy.

The researcher interviewed 20 of the participants in one-on-one settings at their respective workplaces and the remaining four were interviewed on the phone. All interviews were recorded, transcribed, reviewed, coded, and sorted into tables prepared by the researcher (See Appendix H). Participant responses were clustered by case into five themes that were associated with the original research questions.

Document Review

The researcher gathered information pertinent to the study primarily from retrieval of related records on each college website. Agendas and minutes of Board of Trustee meetings were easily accessed and actions of the Board and testimony of study participants was collected and analyzed for consistency with evidence gathered through other means. In some cases, agendas and minutes of other college constituent groups was retrievable and examination yielded

evidence consistent with descriptions of process and outcomes derived from one-on-one interviews.

The researcher also relied extensively upon information obtained through electronic and print documents from media and government sources that described the debate and testimony associated with the passage of Senate Bill 1254. In many cases, this review informed additional dialogue with the participants, confirmed descriptions they provided of their involvement in the debate, and substantiated claims made by participants of the enactment of new campus safety policy and processes at their colleges.

Other important document review included retrieval and examination of college weapons policies (See Appendices B, C, D, & E), associated processes and procedures, and related campus safety instructions and promotions. Examination of weapons policies revealed succinct statements that closely mirrored the state law. In many cases, accompanying procedures and information further addressed questions that constituents may have relative to the policy. In all cases, examination of these documents was consistent with information obtained through interviews.

Direct Observation

By visiting each of the colleges and being intentional in observing and photographing the environments, the researcher captured images and information that further informed the impact of changes in campus safety policy and practices. Postings were noted in campus buildings that informed visitors of the presence of video surveillance, emergency procedures and contacts, and in some cases, the prohibition of weapons. At one college, the researcher noted the extensive presence of beacons and digital screens used to provide emergency notification. Observable evidence of electronic locks was only noted at two of the colleges, which was consistent with

information gathered through interviews. Surveillance cameras and supporting equipment was observed at each of the colleges, but the presence of cameras varied considerably at each college and the monitoring equipment ranged from non-existent to highly complex. This observation was affirmed through participant testimony. Some participants noted that their institution had invested heavily in cameras and surveillance while others lamented their lack of investment in monitoring technology.

The researcher noted that the appearance of campus security personnel varied considerably among the colleges. At one college, security personnel were dressed and equipped very similarly to traditional law enforcement. At two other institutions security personnel were dressed neatly in consistent but casual attire which aligned with their customer-service driven philosophy as espoused by the campus participants interviewed for this study. Security personnel from another college were dressed in traditional law enforcement-style shirts which were fit poorly and appeared unprofessional, which was also noted by their peer participants.

Participant Observer

The researcher utilized his professional role which provided for a special mode of observation and information gathering. At his college, the researcher was directly involved in nearly all facets of the study. The researcher provided testimony to the legislature and state board of education members prior to the passage of the weapons law, assisted in the development and writing of the policy and processes at his college, was directly involved in hiring and training campus security employees, and provided resources for and administration of future campus safety practices. Yin (2018) described a participant observer as someone who may serve as a staff member in an organization and as a key decision maker, both of which are attributes of the researcher.

The researcher as participant observer in this study also benefitted from his extensive knowledge of the community colleges in the state and was familiar with many of the study participants. This allowed him access to key individuals and a rapport with participants that was already established. Yin (2018) further noted that the researcher as a participant observer has a distinct opportunity to produce a more accurate account of a case study by being able to look at the case from the inside. Yin (2018) cautioned the researcher about the potential biases that can result from participant observation, but the independence and status of individuals interviewed within and among the cases, and the static nature of document review and direct observations, helped to assure an accurate gathering of data.

Within-case Analyses

After collecting and sorting through the data from each case, the researcher focused on identifying and discussing key issues or themes within each case (Creswell, 2013). This embedded analysis of each case resulted in detailed descriptions of varied impacts that the legalization of concealed carry weapons had on each college. These are discussed in the following narratives and categorized in subsequent tables.

College 1.

Impact on the development of campus safety policy and processes.

Four of six of the participants from College 1 were in their positions during the time that Senate Bill 1254 was debated and passed and their knowledge of the law and subsequent changes to policy on their campus was extensive. The remaining two respondents from this institution were less familiar with the law but all were equally familiar with the existing policy and processes. All of the participants recognized that the formulation of the policy was dictated by the change in state law and that there was essentially no discretion possible in shaping its

content. At least three of the participants were directly involved in providing feedback to legislators, members of the state board, or the board of trustees. Each of those three expressed a frustration that the opinions and experiences of stakeholders, like themselves and others, were not heard or given credibility in the legislative policy-making process. All of the participants expressed their opposition to the allowance for weapons on campus. One participant noted:

The whole idea of being on a college campus where emotions and everything runs crazy, and then putting your faculty in that position of someone concealed carry in their classroom when you've seen what's happened across the nation. It's like you purposely brought the danger to their door, and so there were points in the law that we are very much opposed to. Identify this respondent with the code you developed for each person interviewed.

All of the participants could cite exceptions to facilities at College 1 where weapons were prohibited and the researcher noted the signage on those buildings. Additionally, it was common knowledge among all the participants that the policy had received review from college legal counsel and that the policy and related procedure had received unanimous board of trustee approval, which was confirmed through a review of the appropriate minutes.

Direct observation of the College 1 also yielded evidence that coincided with findings from the interviews. Surveillance cameras were readily evident, both inside and outside of buildings. The observation of a school resource officer, his uniform and equipment, and his clearly marked patrol vehicle was a clear signal of law enforcement presence that did not result from the change in policy, but participants claimed this provided considerable reassurance of safety. The researcher observed beacons and digital displays in nearly all building which

participants confirmed were for providing emergency notification for active shooter and other critical events.

Impact on the hiring and training of employees and the recruitment and retention of employees and students

In interviews with the participants from College 1, the researcher found that there was a common perception that the qualifications for being hired as a security officer had been changed and upgraded as officers seemed much more professional. The supervisor claimed that hiring qualifications had not changed and that a preference for having law enforcement experience has been standard and nearly all officers hired for the past several years met that qualification.

Nearly all of the participants confirmed a substantial impact on the amount of safety training that they have participated in, including active shooter scenarios. Review of the college website and additional conversations confirmed both the additional trainings offered and the expressed need for more. Additionally, two of the participants noted that they receive extensive training on an annual basis for emergency threat response and violence prevention.

In the literature review, the researcher had noted that during the debate regarding the law, many claims were made regarding the impact that weapons on campus may have on the recruitment and retention of employees and students. Several of the participants acknowledged either having heard that or believing it for themselves. In the interviews, none of the participants could recall ever hearing or knowing of any employees or students whose employment or attendance had been impacted by the change in law and policy. A participant commented:

I really thought it may happen, that an employee may quit because of the law, or that a family would tell us that they would not let their son or daughter attend here because of

guns on campus. That has never happened that I am aware of, so I don't think it's had an impact.

Impact on the campus safety preparedness, perception of safety, and crime rates.

Frequent responses to questions regarding the most effective and needed responses to campus safety concerns centered around surveillance cameras, inside locks on doors, and electronic locks with the ability to control all of them from one place. College 1 has invested considerably in each of these areas as was evidenced through interviews and direct observation.

Half of the participants focused on the need for more mental health support for students and employees. This issue seems to be getting traction as participants claimed that an additional mental health therapist was being hired in the next fiscal year and additional financial support was set aside for mental health first aid training for employees and students.

Two of the participants from College 1 spoke at length to the need for remodeling facilities with campus safety in mind and to be certain that all new facilities are designed through a specific campus safety lens. For existing facilities, needs ranged from internal locks to more cameras. New construction concerns were primarily centered on eliminating the use of transparent glass, utilizing bulletproof glass, and utilizing electronic means for locking doors and communicating emergency notifications.

Each participant was asked by the researcher to describe their sense of safety on campus for themselves and other constituents, given the current policy. All responded that they felt safe and believed that the college had made considerable efforts to insure that outcome. Asked if they believed that campus crimes rates had been impacted by the change in law and policy, all respondents agreed that there was no or little impact, which was supported by a review of the

campus crime statistics. While participants expressed a general sense of safety, nearly all of them acknowledged the need to stay prepared and be attentive. A participant cautioned:

I think from an overall campus safety standpoint, we have to be more thoughtful about how we work and what an open campus looks like in the future. I can't tell you who's on my campus at any time. I can't tell you if people are coming or going. That's an interesting aspect to put up against the fact that colleges are known for their open environment and this idea that learning is open to all of them. It rubs up against some philosophical things.

The table below identifies major themes and cites examples for College 1.

Table 4.1

College 1 Major Themes

Theme	Examples
Knowledge of law and policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All were generally or very familiar • Three of six provided testimony to legislators and State Board of Education members • Two of six were displeased with legislative disregard for stakeholder input
Knowledge of changes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addition of school resource officer • Addition of locks and cameras • Beacons and digital displays
Impact on hiring and training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved quality of security personnel • Increased opportunity for training • More integration of services
Recruitment and retention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No impact
Campus safety preparedness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased and consistent training • Surveillance cameras • Inside and electronic locks • Increased mental health services • Improved facilities

Campus safety perception	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All expressed sense of safety • None expressed feeling less safe because of the policy
Campus crime statistics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perception of little change • Actual little change

College 2.

Impact on development of campus safety policy and processes.

Only two of the six participants from College 2 were in their positions during the time that Senate Bill 1254 was debated and passed, so their knowledge of the law and subsequent changes to policy on their campus was extensive. The remaining four respondents were very familiar with the law but all were equally familiar with the existing policy and processes. All of the participants recognized that the formulation of the policy was dictated by the change in state law and that there was essentially no discretion possible in shaping its content. Only one of the participants were directly involved in providing feedback to legislators, members of the state board, or the board of trustees. Two of the respondents expressed a frustration that the opinions and experiences of stakeholders, like themselves and others, were not heard or given credence in the legislative policy-making process. One of those continually shared his disappointment in the highly political, partisan, and polarizing process. One expressed the sentiment that she had felt shunned in the process:

Our concerns at the time really were that no one in higher education, not a trustee, not a student, not a staff, not an administrator had been asked or informed, or were warned about this coming up. The legislation proposed was written without any input from education. The routing slip came up at 8:00 on a Tuesday morning without any warning.

All of the participants could cite exceptions to facilities at College 2 where weapons were prohibited and most were aware of additional security being required at large events for conducting searches of bags. Participants knew that the policy had received review from college legal counsel and that the policy had received unanimous board of trustee approval, which was confirmed through a review of the board minutes.

Direct observation of College 2 also yielded evidence that coincided with findings from the interviews. Surveillance cameras were rarely observable and the researcher was unable to observe any electronic locks, reinforcing the expressed need for funding from the Department of Public Works (DPW). The observation of security officers revealed very casual but neat and professional attire, which was consistent with the image advocated by most participants to promote a customer service and community-policing model. Specific mention was made of the security vehicle that was college branded to further create a sense of familiarity, pride, and safety.

Impact on the hiring and training of employees and the recruitment and retention of employees and students.

In interviews with the participants from College 2, the researcher found that there was a common perception that the philosophy had moved from a campus police to a campus safety model, including a change in structure with security now reporting to Student Services. One participant commented:

I think that move has been a positive one in both advocating for campus safety and enhancing the safety experience of our students, faculty, and staff. Now, our campus security employees work on building relationships with their peers, students, and visitors to the campus.

Security employees are hired for their customer service skills but are not qualified to address situations which may put them at risk. Nearly all of the participants confirmed a strong need for additional training to increase their awareness and preparation for responding to emergencies. Several participants suggested the use of tabletop exercises where stakeholders work through possible scenarios and then evaluate their responses and readiness. All of the participants spoke to the confidence that the members of the college community had in its local law enforcement agencies and their ability to respond quickly to emergency needs. The researcher confirmed that there had been informal conversations about locating local law enforcement on the campus, but that had yet to occur.

The need to expand security to monitor large events was commonly reported by participants and one suggested that there had been discussion regarding the use of metal detectors, but the desire for a more interactive, customer-service intervention prevailed. Several participants were specific in their opposition to security wearing protective vests or being armed in any way, which was observed as becoming the norm for security personnel. Review of the college website revealed essential components for campus safety support and compliance while maintaining a culture of trust and openness.

Relative to impacts on the recruitment and retention of employees and students, all participants denied that there had been any noticeable impact related to campus safety on either group. Two of the participants claimed that constituents had adjusted to a new norm and were just numb or desensitized to acts or threats of violence. A participant explained:

I have not heard that enrollment has been effected. We do a little training in elementary school for our own grandchildren or our own children are actually having training in case there should be a shooter in their school, which is unbelievable. And, so we have become

numb to the devastation that could be happening and in that numbness, I don't think people are going to a campus or not going to a campus because of that issue. Who?

Impact on campus safety preparedness, perception of safety, and crime rates.

Like College 1, College 2 participants most frequent replies to questions regarding the most effective and needed responses to campus safety concerns centered around the development of a robust and integrated surveillance system, a card swipe and electronic access system, and strengthening the connection with local law enforcement agencies. Approval of funds from DPW will assist the college in making progress toward these ends. Expanded and continued training was also mentioned by all of the participants.

Two of the participants focused on the need for more mental health support for students in transition and employees affected by this changing culture. Unlike any other respondents, one of the participants was particularly concerned about the safety of students and employees in the off campus centers where security measures are absent or left to the owner of the property from which the space is leased, often public school districts. None of the participants mentioned a concern for facilities outside of the addition of locks, camera systems, and a proposal for adding space to accommodate a local law enforcement agency office.

Each participant was asked by the researcher about their sense of safety on campus for themselves and other constituents, given the current policy. All responded that they felt safe and that the college had a good track record, and that the training and increased awareness had provided a sense of openness and security. Asked if they believed that campus crimes rates had been impacted by the change in law and policy, all respondents agreed that there was no or neutral impact, which was supported by a review of the campus crime statistics. Participants expressed the belief that the new law and policy had only slightly increased the number of people

on campus with weapons as many were likely in possession before the law and policy changed. One participant commented that the discussion and controversy was much ado about nothing. Looking forward, particular areas of concern identified by College 2 participants were the proposal for decreasing the minimum age for concealed carry to 18 years and the increasing presence of minors on campuses because of dual credit expansion and shared use of facilities. A participant said:

I think one of our big vulnerable points are minors, in combination with dual credit students on campus, and at off-campus centers, and shared facilities with middle schools and all of those pieces. The proper care of minors concerns me a great deal and we need to address that.

The following table identifies the major themes and cites examples for each at College 2.

Table 4.2

College 2 Major themes

Theme	Examples
Knowledge of law and policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All were generally or very familiar • One provided testimony to legislators and State Board of education • Two were displeased with legislative disregard for stakeholder input
Knowledge of changes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasis on customer service • Increased needs for large groups • Additional trainings
Impact on hiring and training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on customer service • Increased opportunity for training • No support for arming security
Recruitment and retention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No impact
Campus safety preparedness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased and consistent training • Robust surveillance system • Swipe cards and electronic locks

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased mental health services • Focus on minors • Focus on off campus centers
Campus safety perception	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All expressed sense of safety • None expressed feeling less safe because of policy
Campus crime statistics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perception of little change • Actual little change

College 3.

Impact on development of campus safety policy and processes.

None of the six participants from College 3 were in their positions during the time that Senate Bill 1254 was debated and passed, but their knowledge of the law and subsequent changes to policy on their campus was extensive. Four of the participants were directly involved with the formulation and revisions to the existing policy and processes. All of the participants recognized that the formulation of the policy was dictated by the change in state law and that there was essentially no discretion possible in shaping its content without adding further complexity. None of the participants were directly involved in providing feedback to legislators, members of the state board, or the board of trustees, so there was no expression of dissatisfaction or support for the process. Three of the participants had little concern about the allowance of weapons on campus as it was common to Idaho, regional culture, and their background. One of those participants, who was adamant in his support for weapons on campus and his disdain for gun free zones, said:

Honestly, the way I look at it is the more people that have guns is a major deterrent for the one person that wants to do something stupid. Because if you don't know how many people in that room have a gun, you're less likely to take one in there with bad intentions.

If you look at the school shootings and things like that, they've all happened in areas that are very, very strict on gun control.

Most of the participants knew that there were no exceptions for the policy at College 3 as no facilities there qualified for an exemption. Additionally, it was common knowledge among all the participants that the policy had received review from college legal counsel and that the policy and related procedure had received unanimous board of trustee approval, which was confirmed through a review of the appropriate minutes. Several of the participants mentioned that the board had been mostly uninvolved and deferred to the recommendations of legal counsel and administration.

Direct observation of the College 3 also yielded evidence that coincided with findings from the interviews. Surveillance cameras were rarely evident, but signage regarding electronic surveillance was plentiful inside of buildings. Postings from the security office were prevalent, but they were obviously branded as belonging to a contracted service. The observation of security officers in their office area, along with conversations that the researcher had with several of the officers, affirmed the comments of many of the participants that security seemed to be unprofessional, unprepared, and unable to do much beyond reporting incidents and securing buildings. Many of the participants indicated support for a new model of security with additional resources, given the anticipated rapid growth of the institution.

Impact on the hiring and training of employees and the recruitment and retention of employees and students.

In interviews with the participants from College 3, the researcher found that there was a common perception that the existing model of contracted security was not serving the college well. Two of the participants noted though that the college was getting exactly what it had paid

for with its contracted model of security, though upgrades were available at an additional cost. Several participants expressed the need for a thorough assessment and consultation with experts and other higher education institutions. Nearly all of the participants confirmed a substantial impact on the amount of safety training that they have participated in, and shared the need for more training to include de-escalation strategies, active shooter training, and carefully planned tabletop drills. Review of the college website revealed very little information regarding campus safety, beyond outdated documents and reports required for compliance.

Regarding impacts of the campus safety policy on college or student recruitment and retention, all participants believed it has been negligible given the demographics of their constituents which include more adults. A participant noted that:

Most of the students who come here are older adults that are here for a reason. These are not the passionate, brand new high school graduates who have different issues than these, so the demographic of our students our different and this is just a tiny bit of their life experience.

Another participant shared that the primary focus for potential employees in the last few years has been on salary and benefits and that no one has ever asked about weapons. A participant added though that in 2014 when the law had just changed and people were concerned about the impact, the question about employee safety came up often. This participant said:

But five years later, I think everybody's adapted to a new kind of environment. It's just a given that you have weapons on campus, so I don't know that the question comes up much anymore. Now, there are other issues that they ask about that don't have anything to do with safety.

Impact on campus safety preparedness, perception of safety, and crime rates.

Similar to the feedback shared by respondents from other colleges, frequent responses to questions regarding the most effective and needed responses to campus safety concerns centered around an integrated and live surveillance system and locks on doors. Unlike testimony from other college respondents, suggestions were made for improvements in lighting and support for an evening escort service for students accessing their vehicles. Rather than a concern for the safety of individuals given the presence of weapons, several participants noted that a greater concern for campus safety should be directed toward incidents of stalking, theft, and vandalism.

Half of the participants focused on the need for more mental health support for students and employees. The college had recently expanded mental health care services and continues to look for ways to add additional capacity through their hiring qualifications and processes. One participant was particularly focused on providing support for veterans who may present with needs connected to post traumatic stress syndrome (PTSD).

Each participant was asked by the researcher about their sense of safety on campus for themselves and other constituents, given the current policy. All responded that they felt safe and many noted that a small campus like theirs added to their sense of familiarity and security. Asked if they believed that campus crimes rates had been impacted by the change in law and policy, all respondents agreed that there was no or little impact, which was supported by a review of the campus crime statistics. One participant noted that campus crime rates may be impacted by a cultural bias against reporting:

I really believe that in Idaho, there is a cultural bias against reporting. I think people don't want to deal with other people's problems, so they are reluctant to share what could be

important information. That means that some of our data is probably not an accurate reflection.

While participants expressed a general sense of safety, nearly all of them acknowledged the necessity of staying vigilant, because of changes in their culture and the anticipated growth of their institution. A participant expressed the concern that:

It's just discouraging to see that we even have to deal with this. I mean that a college or high school should be a safe place, some place that nobody can feel like they are threatened. I worry about the pressures that students are under and the impact of social media and what that seems to do to young people's minds. The threat level certainly goes up.

Table 4.3 below details the themes and examples from College 3.

Table 4.3

College 3 Major themes

Theme	Examples
Knowledge of law and policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All were generally or very familiar • None provided testimony to legislators and State Board of Education • None were in their positions when the law change
Knowledge of changes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in trainings • Greater concern about existing security model • Addition of silent alarms and cameras • Need for assessment and review of current model
Impact on hiring and training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased mental health care capacity • Consult with agencies and other institutions • Increased opportunities for training
Recruitment and retention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No impact

Campus safety preparedness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased and consistent training • Live access surveillance cameras • Escort services • Increased mental health services • Improved lighting
Campus safety perception	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All expressed sense of safety • Concern for addressing other campus crimes
Campus crime statistics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perception of little change • Actual little change

College 4.

Impact on development of campus safety policy and processes.

Five of the six participants from College 4 were in their positions during the time that Senate Bill 1254 was debated and passed, so their knowledge of the law and subsequent changes to policy on their campus was extensive. The remaining respondent was much less familiar with the law, but was equally familiar with the existing policy and processes. All of the participants recognized that the formulation of the policy was dictated by the state and simply followed the letter of the law in its development and adoption. Two of the participants were directly involved in providing feedback to legislators, members of the state board, or the board of trustees and both expressed considerable frustration that the opinions and experiences of stakeholders like themselves and others were not heard or given credence in the legislative policy-making process. Representatives from College 4 were additionally concerned about the lack of resources provided by the state to address changes necessitated by the new law. One participant shared:

I raised my concerns with some legislators and they basically nodded and said, we appreciate your thoughts. And, I was just shocked that they didn't care about our

influence and issues. That was really frustrating for me that they didn't seem to care about our needs.

Participants knew that the policy had received review from college legal counsel and had received unanimous board of trustee approval, which the researcher confirmed through a review of the board minutes. The primary concern with adopting the new policy was communicating it in effective ways to students and employees without evoking unnecessary fear.

Direct observation of College 4 also yielded evidence that coincided with findings from the interviews. Surveillance cameras and a monitoring station was observable and the researcher noted electronic locks in several locations. Because the campus of College 4 has multiple sites, the researcher was unable to meet or observe a security officer, though their supervisor indicated that they wore casual uniforms, followed a customer service model, but were certified to carry and use pepper spray. Review of the college website revealed a fairly robust presence of information relative to campus safety.

Impact on the hiring and training of employees and the recruitment and retention of employees and students.

In interviews with the participants from College 4, all were aware that campus security was contracted and that they had received updated training after the change in policy. Like College 3 and its use of contracted services, security reports to the finance and facilities division with frequent interaction among student services personnel. Confidence was consistently expressed in the ability and knowledge of the security supervisor.

Nearly all of the participants confirmed having received additional training, but all indicated a strong need for additional training, including tabletop exercises, increasing awareness, and emergency preparedness. One of the participants confirmed the ability for the

campus to electronically lock down all sites and all indicated the addition of, but need for more, panic buttons. Nearly all of the participants spoke of the cooperation with local law enforcement agencies and their confidence in their ability to respond quickly to emergency needs.

Relative to impacts on the recruitment and retention of employees and students, all participants denied that there had been any impact on either group. Several of the participants claimed that constituents had adjusted to a new norm and the weapons policy was relatively unimportant. One participant explained that:

It's just become part of our culture as we know it and people don't even think about it anymore. I've had other changes in policy that got a much bigger reaction, like changes in our casual Friday attire expectation.

Impact on campus safety preparedness, perception of safety, and crime rates.

While participants expressed confidence in the current state of campus safety at College 4, there was a consistent reminder of the need for continuous improvement in trainings and awareness. In terms of equipment, there was a stated need for additional cameras in appropriate and strategic places, panic buttons, better signage, and updated apps to improve communication. Nearly all of the participants expressed a critical need for additional mental health training and provision, including a specific urging to address psychological needs and anger issues. None of the participants mentioned a concern for facilities outside of managing critical situations at multiple locations that are often a considerable distance from each other.

Each participant was asked by the researcher for their sense of safety on campus for themselves and other constituents, given the current policy. All responded that they felt safe and that the college had a good track record of safety. Asked if they believed that campus crimes rates had been impacted by the change in law and policy, all respondents agreed with no or

neutral impact, which was supported by a review of the campus crime statistics. Some participants shared concerns about managing safety at a commuter campus with so much open access. One participant commented that the discussion is not so much about weapons on campus as it was about a change in culture and sense of safety and awareness anywhere on campus. The participant shared:

I've learned to become more aware of my surrounding. I don't think that the fact that we have guns on campus has necessarily made me feel anymore unsafe coming to work as compared to any other places that I go.

The major themes and examples from College 4 are cited in Table 4.4 below.

Table 4.4

College 4 Major themes

Theme	Examples
Knowledge of law and policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All were generally or very familiar • Two provided testimony to legislators and State Board of education • Two were very displeased with legislative disregard for stakeholder input
Knowledge of changes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasis on communication – strong website • Updated training • Concern for safety at multiple sites
Impact on hiring and training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on expanded training • Huge emphasis on mental health needs • Collaboration with local agencies
Recruitment and retention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No impact
Campus safety preparedness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need for consult and assessment • Expansion of training • Expand surveillance system • Panic buttons and electronic locks • Increased mental health services

Campus safety perception	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need for central dispatch
Campus crime statistics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All expressed sense of safety • None expressed feeling less safe because of policy • Perception of little change • Actual little change

Cross-case Analysis

According to Creswell (2013), after preparing a description of each case in a multiple case study such as this, the researcher should look for differences and similarities across the cases through a thematic analysis. In choosing this multiple case study design, the researcher chose to follow a replication design by carefully choosing cases that he believed would result in a literal replication (Yin, 2018). Instead of pooling all of the data from the multiple cases, similar design, data collection and analysis occurred for each case and the resulting themes were analyzed and conclusions drawn as to similarities and differences across the cases.

How does the legalization of concealed carry weapons impact development of campus safety policy and processes?

Two primary themes emerged from each of the case studies relative to legalization of concealed carry weapons and the development of campus safety policy and processes.

Familiarity with the law and policy.

With no exceptions, all 24 of the participants expressed and demonstrated a solid knowledge of the provisions of Senate Bill 1254. Although 10 of the 24 participants were not employed at their respective colleges when the law was debated and passed, all were familiar with the essential components of the law which included legalization of possession of firearms

on an Idaho higher education campus if the individual possessed an enhanced concealed carry permit and the allowed exception of facilities with capacities of 1000 or more.

Similarly, all of the participants were familiar with the current provisions of their institutional policy governing possession of weapons, though many of them were not involved in the process of revising the existing policy when the law changed. All of the colleges followed similar processes for developing and approving the changes in policy, including review by constituents and constituent groups, consultation with college legal counsel, and eventual approval by the board of trustees. The time frame of approval processes was very similar at three of the four colleges as they were all faced with the July 1, 2014 effect date of the legislation. The other college was not recognized at the time as a community college with an elected board, so their policy changes did not occur until 2017 when they achieved community college status.

Participants at all of the colleges attributed the similar content of their weapons policy to the lack of options available under the law. Because two of the colleges do not have facilities for more than a 1000 people, there are no exceptions to their provisions for enhanced concealed carry. Three of the four colleges noted that some of their classes and programs are housed in leased facilities that require prohibition of possession of weapons.

Engagement in the process.

While all participants in the study were familiar with the law and the process to develop or amend policies on their respective campuses, there was great variance in the level of engagement in the process, at the legislative and institutional levels. Active engagement in the legislative process was generally attributed to presidents and trustees, but that was reserved to those who were in their current positions in 2014 and who had a longer history and familiarity with state board members and legislators.

In 2014, only two of the colleges had extensive history in the state, so it was no surprise that their board members and administration were more actively engaged in the debate and discussion of the proposed law. A common feeling among those participants who were actively engaged in the legislative process was the displeasure and frustration for the disregard of stakeholder input into the law-making process. Participants from three of the colleges provided direct testimony to the state board, legislature, and media and all felt like their opinions, shared on behalf of their boards and employees, were unheard, unheeded, and disregarded. The review of media reports contained in Chapter 2 provided similar accounts from college officials and other stakeholder representatives.

How does the legalization of concealed carry weapons impact the hiring, training, recruitment and retention of employees and students?

Three primary themes emerged from each of the case studies relative to the impact on hiring, training, recruitment and retention.

Qualifications of security staff.

The model and staffing of security services at each of the colleges varied widely as was evidenced through results from the interviews and direct observation. One college only hired officers with previous law enforcement experience while one of the others looked primarily for personnel with strong customer-service orientation and skills. The remaining two colleges utilized contracted services, so they had less influence on the qualifications of the security staff. The focus on hiring for contracted security at one college was customer-service oriented, while the other was entry level and minimum wage. The uniforms and accessorizing of security staff at each campus was also dissimilar and ranged from traditional law enforcement apparel and equipment to a casual, comfortable, and unassuming appearance.

Common to all colleges was the lack of lethal weapons carried by any security, but two colleges allowed non-lethal arms including tasers and pepper spray for officers with corresponding certifications. Two of the colleges provided seven day, 24-hour staffing with central dispatching, while the remaining two only provided traditional work-day staffing with limited or contracted response after hours.

Need for additional and specific trainings.

Of all impacts associated with the change in law and policy, the most agreed upon need among all of the community college respondents was for a substantial increase in the type and frequency of training for all employees and students. In the first year of the policy change, each of the existing campuses provided substantial notification of changes in policy and opportunities for training. Training commonly included scenarios for active-shooter responses and procedures for campus lockdowns. At two of the colleges, specific provision was made for inside locks, electronic locks, and the ability to remotely lock down all of the campus electronically; associated training and practice followed. One of the campuses invested extensively in an integrated surveillance system, while the three others made modest gains in surveillance capability while expressing a desire for much more. One of the colleges had invested extensively in emergency notification software, processes, and trainings, two of the others had modest systems and trainings in place, and the fourth made little or no mention of such capability or training. Each of the colleges had developed their relationships and cooperation with local law enforcement agencies which range from a contracted school resource officer to occasional meetings and referrals. All of the colleges express a need and desire for a more extensive relationship with local law enforcement agencies including the desire for regular and integrated tabletop exercises.

Impact on recruitment and retention.

Though some sources in Chapter 3 warned that a change in the campus weapons policy may impact the recruitment and retention of employees and students, none of the participants were aware of any impacts on their campuses. Many of the chief human resource officers and chief student services officers had heard similar predictions of substantial recruitment and retention impact, but all denied having any conversations with current or prospective employees or students whose decisions were impacted by the weapons policy. In the first year of the policy change, a part of the employee on-boarding process and new student orientations included specific mention of the weapons policy. All colleges now admitted that no specific mention was made of the policy at new employee or student events, as weapons in public places seems to be the new normal.

How does the legalization of concealed carry weapons impact campus safety preparedness, perception, and crime statistics?

Three primary themes emerged from each of the case studies relative to the impact on campus safety preparedness, perception, and crime statistics:

Increased need for mental health support.

While the interviews with participants did not ask for a response to a question regarding mental health services, representatives from each of the colleges were gravely concerned about the need for more capacity to provide mental health services to both employees and students. Examples of employees and students in mental health crisis were frequently cited and participants were joined in support for needing more mental health therapists. Each of the campuses has recently added to their mental health counseling staff, yet all expressed the need for more. Two of the campuses were providing initial response through mental health first-aid

training for employees and students while others were advocating for training on de-escalation strategies and referring individuals for assistance.

Also common among the responses from participants at each of the colleges was a desire for panic buttons or live cameras that would allow for immediate response to a crisis situation. At two of the colleges, specific mention was made of the increasing number of veterans and students with disabilities who may present a greater risk and need for enhanced mental health support.

Need for campus safety infrastructure.

One college was decidedly advanced in its attention to facility and technology to support campus safety, part of which was attributed to the change in policy. This college had an integrated, live surveillance system with cameras in strategic locations both in and outside of facilities. This same college has expanded its use of electronic locks and has the ability to lock down most buildings from a remote location. This same college had retrofitted old buildings with new locks and designed new buildings through a campus safety lens including consideration for walls, bulletproof glass, and barriers. The other three colleges use surveillance cameras less extensively, but all express a strong need for investment in a much more robust security system. The four colleges also varied dramatically in the access to and presence of campus safety processes, reporting, and information on their college websites.

Impact on campus crime statistics.

Most of the debate regarding weapons in the higher education setting centers on whether legalization would make the environment more or less safe, and that is often revealed in campus crime statistics. As noted in the literature review, during the Idaho debate, the individuals on either side mirrored the usual stances. Like the national debate, some said that putting weapons

in the hands of college students in a volatile setting will have tragic results while others said that arming students and employees will deter crimes and potentially save lives.

Across all of the colleges in this study, and among all of the participants, there was either a known outcome or a perceived belief, that the change in law and policy had any substantive impact on campus safety. Various references from participants were made to the question as being a “non-starter,” “no issue,” or “much ado about nothing.” All participants either knew or believed that campus crime rates had been practically unchanged since July 1, 2014. A review of the campus crime statistics at each of the institutions confirmed the responses of the participants.

Table 4.5

Cross Case Major Themes

Theme	Examples
Familiarity with the law and policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All were generally or very familiar with both the law and policy • All were familiar with the process for developing and approving policy
Engagement in the Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Great variance in the level of engagement • Active engagement by experienced presidents and trustees • A strong reaction to legislative disregard for stakeholder input
Qualifications of security staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Great variance in levels of qualification, training, and appearance • No institutions allowed lethally armed security staff • Two colleges utilized contracted security
Need for additional and specific trainings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All colleges expressed need for expanded training including active shooter • Extensive variance of capabilities and training for surveillance and locking • Expressed need for agency collaboration
Impact on recruitment and retention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All colleges expressed no impact • All colleges reported impact on employee

	onboarding and student orientation in the first year of policy enactment, but little mention since
Increased need for mental health support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All colleges expressed an extensive need for mental health therapists • All participants expressed a need for employee mental health training • Two colleges expressed needs for services to veteran and disabled students
Need for infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive variance in campus safety equipment • All expressed a need for substantial enhancement of surveillance and locking equipment • Variance in website information
Impact on campus crime statistics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All participants perceive no impact • All participants feel safe • No impact on campus crime rates

Researcher Perspective

As the researcher and a participant observer in many aspects of this study, the researcher anticipated few surprises that would come from this research and the analysis of data gathered. The researcher was after all, quite familiar with the issue, most of the participants, and all of the colleges. Those circumstances provided enhanced access and perhaps more depth to the data collected, but it soon became clear that there were other issues that surprised the researcher and resulted in findings and unanticipated themes. While the researcher had known that some of the participants had participated in the Senate Bill 1254 debate, the researcher was caught off guard by the depth of resentment many of them still held for the disregard by legislators of their input and opinions. Five years after the passage of the law, many of the participants still recalled exact details of their discussions and debates with legislators.

The study and interview questions were focused on impacts from the legalization of concealed carry weapons, but conversations with participants almost always turned to the critical need for additional mental health services. In the initial debate of the law, there was occasional mention of the danger of individuals with mental health problems being in possession of a weapon, but in this study, there was an almost desperate plea for adding mental-health resources. Very little of that need seemed to be precipitated by the legalization of weapons, but rather the growing evidence of students and employees presenting with mental health issues. Weapons were usually not connected to that discussion, but participants consistently identified mental health as the most emergent impact on campus safety.

The researcher was particularly intrigued by the data related to the contracting of security services. As a proponent of contracted services in higher education, the researcher was anxious to get stakeholder testimonies regarding their effectiveness. The data obtained from the two colleges with contracted services led the researcher to believe that those services had not been very effective and I would not be surprised to see both colleges change their models soon.

The researcher was impressed with the degree that all of the colleges were consulting with local and regional public safety agencies and planned to enhance those relationships. My experience with public safety agencies and their levels of training and preparedness has convinced me that we need to enlist their assistance even further and defer to their expertise. Tabletop exercises were mentioned by many of the participants as an effective means for reviewing, integrating, practicing, and addressing security scenarios with local law enforcement and public service agencies.

Analysis of the data from the four colleges gave the researcher a perspective about how my institution stacked up against the others. The results have given me reason to compliment

some of our providers, further identify and address some of our gaps, and pay closer attention to the impacts that new laws and policies will have on our campus safety.

Chapter Summary

The results as gathered and presented in this chapter affirmed the use of an exploratory multiple case study design to take a comprehensive look at the impact on campus safety caused by the legalization of weapons on the community college campuses. The independent boards of trustees had varying levels of engagement, but the processes for developing the weapons policy at each campus was very similar and resulted in very similar weapons policies at each of the institutions involved in this study. The multiple methods of gathering data produced rich data sets for each college that made the development of themes rigorous and productive. Finally, the comparison of those themes from each of the colleges yielded some similarities and differences between the cases that informed not only the impacts, but also the needs to enhance campus safety at each of the Idaho community colleges.

Chapter V: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Discussion

The purpose of this multiple-case study was to describe and better understand the impact on campus safety of the legalization of concealed carry weapons at Idaho community colleges. Each of the Idaho community colleges were subjected to the same provisions of the change in state law, yet each has its own governance by a locally elected board of trustees. Therefore, it was important to study and analyze each case separately and then compare the results each of the colleges. Through the purposeful identification and interviewing of six primary stakeholders at each of the four campuses, specific personnel who are traditionally charged with assessing, changing, communicating, and executing changes in policy, processes, hiring, and training, responded to open-ended questions in a one-on-one interview format. These interviews yielded extensive data that was transcribed, analyzed, and sorted into themes that corresponded to the research questions.

Research Questions

The research questions for this study were focused on the impact on campus safety at Idaho's community colleges given the legalization of concealed carry weapons legislation on campus. Primary research questions include:

Q1: How did the legalization of concealed carry weapons impact campus safety at Idaho community colleges?

SQ1: How did the legalization of concealed carry weapons impact development of campus safety policy and processes?

SQ2: How did the legalization of concealed carry weapons impact the hiring, training, recruitment, and retention of employees and students?

SQ3: How did the legalization of concealed carry weapons impact campus safety preparedness, perception, and crime statistics?

Additional data was added to each case through direct observation of the environments on each of the campuses, an extensive review of institutional documents, and in some cases, the gathering of information as a participant observer. All of this data was clustered by institution and provided a rich description of the impact on campus safety at each of the study institutions. The examination of each case yielded some common themes and some unique contrasts. The cross analysis of the findings from each of the campuses or cases identified common practices and divergent approaches to addressing campus safety and yielded a comprehensive evaluation of personnel, physical, and fiscal impacts. Examination of campus crime statistics at each institution and comparison of those provided a quantitative picture of the actual impact on campus safety as measured by crime rates (See Appendix I).

Connection to the Literature

The literature review for this multiple case study revealed a lot of varying opinions and statistics about the impact of weapons on campus safety, but very little information or research done on how policies, processes, hiring, and retention of students and employees had been impacted by the legalization of weapons on higher education campuses. Outside of the accounts captured through the media during the Senate Bill 1254 debate and the review of documents produced by each campus to accommodate the change in law, there was no other specific research available on impacts to Idaho's community colleges. None of the participants in the interview process claimed to have experience in researching or previously experiencing impacts from a similar change in policy earlier in their career or at another institution. The changes made

in policy and process seemed to be based on a lack of options, consultation with related agencies, advice of peers, and stakeholder knowledge and experience.

Design

For the purposes of this study, a qualitative multi-case design was determined to be the most effective way to explore the impact on campus safety of the legalization of concealed carry weapons at the Idaho public community colleges. This case study design allowed for the gathering of extensive and varied data in a real world context (Yin, 2018). This research fit the definition of a case study as it provided an in-depth description and analysis of a system that is bound by time and place, and the data collected came from participants within that bounded system (Creswell, 2013). The multiple case methodology allowed an exploration and analysis in greater depth as it provided a comparison and contrast of experiences and perceptions from stakeholders at similar colleges. This design was appropriate for this research as it provided a greater understanding of a complex and contemporary phenomenon that is still evolving.

Conclusions

Besides providing a detailed description of the impact on campus safety of the legalization of concealed carry weapons at each of the four Idaho community colleges, this study used a cross-case analysis to present similarities and differences in the themes across the cases. Not surprisingly, the analysis produced a large number of similarities across all four of the cases, some similarities between pairs of colleges, and a few distinct differences. These conclusions are presented as they provide answers to the research questions:

How did the legalization of concealed carry weapons impact development of campus safety policy and processes?

Although each community college had a separate governing board, each of the colleges produced very similar weapons policies prior to and after the passage of Senate Bill 1254. The content of each policy was very similar, essentially expressing the prohibition against weapons on campus with exceptions noted for state authorized permit holders and law enforcement officers. Participants from each of the colleges were familiar with the state law and subsequent changes in their policies, and most noted that the law did not really allow for much variation in policy. The process for creating the change, with involvement from key college stakeholders and college legal counsel, and approval by the board of trustees was nearly identical at each of the four Idaho community colleges.

Communication of the change in policy was initially robust at each of the colleges with intentional notifications to employees and students and inclusion of information in onboarding, orientations, postings, publications, and college websites. Nearly all of the participants noted that five years later, there was little or no specific mention of the weapons policy at any campus events or in any campus publications. The policy and associated processes and information can be found on the websites, but only if one actively searched it out. This assertion was confirmed through direct observation and review of documents by the researcher.

An important distinction between the colleges and their connection to the change in law was the extent of their engagement in the legislative process and their feelings regarding the process and outcomes. Three of the colleges had officials, primarily board members and presidents, who were actively involved in the debate in ways ranging from meetings with individual legislators to providing testimony to the state board and comment to the media. Those

participants who were most actively engaged, from each of the colleges, were the ones who had longest standing in the higher education system and most familiarity with the primary stakeholders. Each of them shared considerable frustration, disappointment, and dismay with a process that they described as being flawed because it did not ask for, value, or respond to their concerns.

How did the legalization of concealed carry weapons impact the hiring, training, recruitment, and retention of employees and students?

The impact on hiring and training of security officers at each of the campuses varied dramatically depending on the model of security each followed. Each of the colleges seemed to seriously consider their options when the law and policy changed and much of the early discussion centered on the question of arming security officers, or at least providing them with methods of non-lethal defense or protection. These considerations further prompted discussion of security personnel qualifications, training, and certifications, all of which was connected to additional costs.

The responses from the colleges were only consistent in their agreement with not arming officers, but varied widely from there. One college chose to hire officers with prior law enforcement experience and equip and train them in traditional law enforcement manner with non-lethal means for protection including pepper spray and tasers. Another college was at the opposite end of the spectrum, choosing to hire security as entry level, inexperienced, and trained only to call for law enforcement assistance when security issues arose. The other two colleges have models that employ and train primarily security personnel for first response and emphasize a proactive and customer service, relationship-based approach. Critical to the differences in the models between the colleges was whether the security services were provided by college

employees or a contracted service. Other participants at the colleges with contracted services reported concerns for the effectiveness of their services and were actively considering a change in the model to a self-operated one.

Data from the study revealed that the change in policy most impacted all of the colleges in their need to deliver extensive and intentional training for employees and students. In the year following the change in policy, colleges reported an increase in training opportunities for all employees and students which often consisted of emergency notification and active shooter drills. All participants in the interviews supported a need for ongoing and enhanced training. All of the colleges have utilized local agencies to provide some of the training and all express a need and desire for expanding those relationships, including regular tabletop exercises where integrated services could be reviewed and practiced.

Some of the previous research had indicated that weapons policies could impact the recruitment and retention of employees and students, but the research found no examples or testimony of that occurring at any of the colleges. Most often, the response to this question centered on weapons in public places now being considered a norm in the culture, so impacts were unlikely to occur.

How did the legalization of concealed carry weapons impact campus safety preparedness, perception, and crime statistics?

Research related to the impact that the change in policy had on campus safety preparedness led to some predictable conclusions and a surprising one. Predictably, participants uniformly expressed a need for continued training and provisions for creating safer physical environments, which included electronic locks, surveillance cameras, and panic buttons. The surprise finding from the research was the grave concern expressed by most participants for

addressing the critical need for expanded mental health services for employees and students. In addition to the stated need for more mental health therapists, participants shared a need for training of all employees to identify, respond to, and refer individuals for mental health care services.

Another conclusion of the research was that the campus safety infrastructure among the colleges varied extensively, though there was agreement about the desired outcome. All of the colleges have some electronic surveillance ability, but the extent, integration, and effectiveness of those systems vary considerably. All of the colleges had desires, and some had immediate plans, for expanding and improving their camera systems. The same was true of locking systems in the colleges with varying abilities to lock inside and electronically, but with a recognized need and plan for enhancing these options.

The impact on the perception of campus safety produced a consistent response from all of the participants. Despite the initial and emotional claims of stakeholders when the law changed that they and their peers would be more or less safe, participants uniformly claimed that they felt no more or less safe than when weapons were prohibited. Further, they consistently reported that they felt safe on their campuses, not only for themselves but also for the employees and students that they represented. A few of the participants were aware of their respective college's campus crime statistics and joined their peers, both within and among the colleges, including those who were unfamiliar with the statistics, in agreeing with the finding that the change in policy had little or no impact on campus crime rates.

Key Findings of this Research

This multiple case study provided a greater understanding of a complex and contemporary phenomenon. The primary intent of the study was to address the question of how

the legalization of concealed carry weapons legislation impacted campus safety at Idaho's community colleges. Through an extensive collection and analysis of qualitative data obtained through interviews, document reviews, direct observations, and participant observations, a series of key findings were developed:

- Legislators effectively changed the weapons law but disregarded higher education stakeholders' input creating a sense of frustration and loss of trust. This study can be used to influence the public policy process in the future by reminding lawmakers of the need to consider constituent input. Additionally, the findings of this research can help inform future policy making regarding the impacts on campus safety by allowing weapons on college campuses.
- Campus security models varied widely among the community colleges and included both self-operated and contracted options. Standards and best practices need to be developed and shared among community college campuses.
- Campus safety training for employees and students was critical and needed to be continually updated, enhanced, and broadened. The training should reflect current best practices and be embedded across all sectors of campus including employees and students. Training should be continually updated and emphasized as conditions, laws, and environments change. Risk assessment studies for campus safety should be conducted annually.
- The legalization of weapons on campus had not impacted recruitment and retention of employees or students. The allowance of weapons on campus seems to have become accepted as a campus norm.

- There was a distinct need for increasing the capacity of the colleges to provide mental health services including additional training for employees and students. Fear and stress management need to have priority consideration.
- Colleges had varying degrees of facility and equipment infrastructure to support campus safety including security cameras and electronic locks, but standards and best practices need to be developed and shared among the community colleges.
- Primary stakeholders did not feel any more or less safe with the legalization of weapons on campus. The notion of individuals legally possessing weapons on campus seems to be accepted as a new norm.
- Campus crime statistics did not show any significant change since the legalization of weapons on campus (See Appendix I). The primary and most profound outcome of allowing weapons on the community college campuses was the attention and focus on campus safety practices and the resulting investment and improvement in resources, training, and preparedness.

Recommendations for Further Research

This study and its key findings provide some implications for further research on a critical topic that continues to evolve, not only in the higher education environment, but throughout American culture. The frequent occurrence of tragic events where a weapon has been used to promulgate violence and death continues to keep this issue close to the minds and hearts of Americans. Community colleges, and their university partners, will continue to be impacted and need to be proactive in developing policies and processes that will prevent or lessen the adverse impacts.

Recommendations for further research include the following.

Legislators and primary stakeholders need to work collaboratively on changes in law and policy.

The disconnect that occurred between higher education professionals and legislators when the weapons law was debated and passed presents the need for a study to determine methods for involving all stakeholders in the development and decision making process. Even if the outcome of the process does not result in an outcome that higher education representatives prefer, considerable gains can be made from their authentic inclusion in the process.

Impacts of the legalization of weapons on campus safety for students.

This study focused on the impacts on campus safety through the eyes of college employees and officials, primarily because it was focused on policy development, campus safety processes, hiring, and training which were directly tied to the student experience. Because students are the largest constituent groups on campus and are subject to a change in law and policy such as this, their experiences, opinions, and perceptions deserve additional study.

Best practices in training campus employees and students for enhancing campus safety.

One of the key findings of this study was the need for enhanced and continuing campus safety training. A study to determine some of the most effective types of trainings would inform future practices in higher education settings and would help develop standards for campus safety practices.

Best practices in equipping campuses with safety equipment.

Another key finding of this study was the need to develop standards and best practices for infrastructure to equip campuses with surveillance systems, electronic locks, and emergency

notification systems. A study of options, costs, and effectiveness of such systems would inform practices for the implementation of these systems in higher education facility.

Need for expanding mental health care services on community college campuses.

This study revealed a perceived desperate need for the expansion of mental health care services on community college campuses. An extensive study of those needs and the possible responses to the discovered needs would help inform the provision of those services on higher education campuses, including options for providing mental health training for existing employees and students.

Effectiveness of self-operated versus contracted security services.

For a variety of reasons, college campuses have been contracting some of their services to outside vendors including the bookstore, food services, security, and others. A study which compared the effectiveness and cost of these two different options would help campuses to choose options which may best fit their needs.

Assessment and response to the safety needs of students in college outreach centers.

Many higher education institutions deliver courses and services in settings and facilities apart from the main campus. The outreach centers often serve different populations with demographics that differ from that of the main campus and often provide fewer comprehensive services. A study that examined the needs of students and colleges in those settings would inform campus safety practices better designed to meet those unique needs.

Researcher Closing Perspective

Over my 38 years of working in higher education, I have prided myself in attempting to remain current on the most critical issues in our work. I have regularly attended professional conferences to stay abreast of the issues and to network with my colleagues to reinforce or

discuss my beliefs. Most of the critical issues have changed over time and my personal beliefs and professional responses have evolved with them. Campus safety has been a primary concern of mine throughout my career and it has consistently impacted my feelings, beliefs, studies, practices, and opinions. The constant though, it seemed, had been my unwavering opposition to the possession of weapons on campus for anyone, with the exception of law enforcement.

With the change of law and policy in 2014, my reality changed and with it, my practices also had to change. Initially, my stubborn opposition remained and I both believed and expected that the worst was to come. While there have been numerous impacts on campus safety as I have experienced it and as I studied it in this research, there have been few negative ones that are directly attributable to the legalization of weapons on campus. Instead of negative consequences, we have enhanced our security capabilities from staffing to infrastructure and the result seems to be a safer and more prepared campus. I have not experienced any incidents associated with a weapon since the change in policy that has either made our campus more or less safe. Our campus crime statistics remain static and I am yet to carry my weapon to campus.

Chapter Summary

The passage of Idaho Senate Bill 1254 in 2014 initially resulted in changes in campus safety policies and practices at Idaho's community colleges. This qualitative multiple case study revealed changes in campus security staffing and training along with an emphasis on surveillance systems and door locking mechanisms. It further hastened the need for training of campus personnel and students on how to respond to critical incidents, including the presence of an active shooter. College and community agencies are working more closely together on safety concerns and the remodel of existing structures or construction of new ones are often designed with a greater emphasis on campus safety. Mental health issues have become prominent in the

campus safety and welfare discussion, so the Idaho community colleges are focusing on ways to bring more training and resources to impact this emerging concern.

Through all of this, the Idaho community college campuses do not appear to be any more or less safe. Perception of safety by primary stakeholders and participants in this study remained unchanged from before the policy changed and campus crime statistics tell no different story.

The colleges need to remain attentive to campus safety issues, share their best and most successful practices with each other, and work collaboratively with their community partners.

References

2014 Legislation. (2014). Retrieved from

<https://legislature.idaho.gov/sessioninfo/2014/legislation/S1254/>

Anderson, W. (2011, July 7). Obtaining a concealed weapons permit in Idaho a simple

process. *The Argus Observer*. Retrieved from

https://www.argusobserver.com/independent/news/obtaining-a-concealed-weapons-permit-in-idaho-a-simple-process/article_5501856d-7914-58ca-87d9-425f67fe4d87.html

Angen, M. J. (2000). Evaluating interpretive inquiry: Reviewing the validity debate and opening the dialogue. *Qualitative Health Research*, 10. 378-395.

Associated Press. (2014a, February 3). Idaho education board votes to fight guns on campus bill.

Boise State Public Radio. Retrieved from

<https://www.boisestatepublicradio.org/post/idaho-education-board-votes-fight-guns-campus-bill#stream/0>

Associated Press. (2014b, February 12). Boise police chief says he was blocked from speaking against guns on campus bill. *Boise State Public Radio*. Retrieved from

<https://www.boisestatepublicradio.org/post/boise-state-allowing-guns-campus-will-cost-university-about-2-million-each-year#stream/0>

Associated Press. (2014c, February 12). Guns on campus bill makes it out of committee, Idaho senate to vote. *Boise State Public Radio*. Retrieved from

<https://www.boisestatepublicradio.org/topic/your-guide-idahos-guns-campus-debate#stream/0>

Associated Press. (2014d, March 1). Idaho house panel backs bill allowing guns on campus. *Fox*

News. Retrieved from <https://www.foxnews.com/us/idaho-house-panel-backs-bill-allowing-guns-on-campus>

Associated Press. (2014e, March 5). Idaho sheriffs' association backs guns on campus bill. *Boise State Public Radio*. Retrieved from <https://www.boisestatepublicradio.org/post/idaho-sheriffs-association-backs-guns-campus-bill#stream/0>

Associated Press. (2014f, March 6). Guns on campus bill: coalition opposes plan, but sheriffs' group likes it. *The Idaho State Journal*. Retrieved from https://www.idahostatejournal.com/news/local/guns-on-campus-bill-coalition-opposes-plan-but-sheriffs-group/article_547be83e-a4d9-11e3-b3cd-001a4bcf887a.html

Associated Press. (2015, February 3). Idaho colleges say concealed weapons law costs \$3.7 million. *Boise State Public Radio*. Retrieved from <https://www.boisestatepublicradio.org/post/idaho-colleges-say-concealed-weapons-law-costs-37-million>

Brady Campaign to Prevent Gun Violence. (n.d.). *About Brady*. Retrieved from <https://www.bradyunited.org>

Cannon, A. (2016). Aiming at students the college gun violence epidemic. Retrieved from www.nyccrimecommission.org/pdfs/CCC-Aiming-At-Students-College-Shootings-Oct2016.pdf

Campus Safety. (2014, May 29). *Idaho colleges adjust policies to comply with new gun law*. Retrieved from https://www.campussafetymagazine.com/news/idaho_colleges_adjust_policies_to_comply_with_new_gun_law/

College of Southern Idaho. (2014, June 16). *Meeting of the Board of Trustees*. Retrieved from

https://quondam.csi.edu/aboutCSI/board/minutes/2014_06_16.pdf

College of Western Idaho. (2014, July 7). *Meeting of the Board of Trustees*. Retrieved from

<http://cwidaho.cc/info/board-minutes-archive#5>

Concealed-carry.org. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://concealed-carry.org/home.html>

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design (3rd edition)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Dahl, P. P., Bonham, G., & Reddington, F. P. (2016). Community college faculty: attitudes toward guns on campus. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*.

Retrieved from <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10668926.2015.1124813>

District of Columbia v. Heller, 554 U.S. 570 (2008)

Everytown for gun safety. (n.d.). *We are everytown for gun safety*. Retrieved from

<https://everytown.org/learn/>

Goins, D. (2014, February 4). NIC reiterates opposition to on-campus gun bill. *Coeur d'Alene Press*. Retrieved from <https://www.cdapress.com/archive/article-aaac13a3-2a1c-5c69-8435-ed98625faa97.html>

Graff, S. (2014, February 24). Idaho state senator pushing for guns on university campuses says it's a basic right. *Boise State Public Radio*. Retrieved from

<https://www.boisestatepublicradio.org/post/idaho-state-senator-pushing-guns-university-campuses-says-its-basic-right#stream/0>

Growing Public Support for Gun Rights. (2014, December 10). Pew Research Center. Retrieved from <https://www.people-press.org/2014/12/10/growing-public-support-for-gun-rights/>

Guns on Campus. *Everytown for Gun Safety*. Retrieved from <https://everytownorg/learn/>

Guns on Campus' Laws for Public Colleges and Universities. (2013). Armed Campuses.

Retrieved from <http://www.armedcampuses.org/>

Guns on Campus: Overview. (2015, October 5). National Conference of State Legislatures.

Retrieved from <http://www.ncsl.org/research/education/guns-on-campus-overview.aspx>

Guns on Campus: Campus Action. (2012, March). National Conference of State Legislatures.

Retrieved from <http://www.ncsl.org/research/education/guns-on-campus-campus-action.aspx>

Hardy, M. (2016). *10 reasons concealed weapons should be allowed on campuses*. American Concealed. Retrieved from <https://americanconcealed.com/>

History of Gun Control. (2019, March 25). Retrieved from <https://gun-control.procon.org/view.resource.php?resourceID=006436>

Hogue, L. L. (2016). Campus carry and the Second Amendment. Retrieved from https://www.campussafetymagazine.com/news/idaho_colleges_adjust_policies_to_comply_with_new_gun_law/

Holm (2018, Sep. 30). Guns and borders. *The Lewiston Tribune*. Retrieved from https://lmtribune.com/northwest/guns-and-borders/article_81152274-7872-5735-a67b-61519e23bc97.html

Hurley, D. J. (2015). Countering the push for more guns on campus. *Public Purpose*. Retrieved from <http://www.aascu.org/MAP/PublicPurpose/2015/Spring/>

Idaho gun laws. (n.d.). *Guns to carry*. Retrieved from <https://www.gunstocarry.com/gun-laws-state/idaho-gun-laws/>

Idaho Legislature, Senate Bill 1254, Sixty second legislature (Idaho, 2014)

Idaho Statutes: Firearms, explosives, and other deadly weapons. (2013). Retrieved from State

of Idaho Legislature: <http://legislature.idaho.gov/idstat/Title18/T18CH33SECT18-3302D.htm>

Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act of 1990, U.S.C. 1092(f) (2018).

Johnson, K. (2014). Students have mixed views on campus gun law. *The Washington Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2014/apr/12/students-have-mixed-views-on-campus-gun-law/>

Lysimachus, A. (2014). Restoring the second amendment on college campus. *Red State*. Retrieved from https://www.redstate.com/diary/aristides_lysimachus/2014/09/11/restoring-second-amendment-college-campuses/

Mark, M. (2018, February 21). *The American public could be at a turning point on gun control*. Retrieved from <https://www.businessinsider.com/gun-control-poll-americans-support-assault-weapons-ban-after-florida-shooting-2018-2>

Martin, J. (2015). Gun control on campus, what does CSI have in place? *KMVT*. Retrieved from <https://www.kmvt.com/content/news/Gun-control-on-campus-what-does-CSI-have-in-place-330476081.html>

McDonald v. Chicago, 561 U.S. 742 (2010)

Millward, W. & Forman, C. (2014, September 1). Another state allows concealed carry on college campuses, part of growing movement. *AL.com*. Retrieved from https://www.al.com/news/index.ssf/2014/09/idaho_this_year_became_the_sev.html

National Conference of State Legislators. (2018). *Guns on campus overview*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncsl.org/research/education/guns-on-campus-overview.aspx>

- National Rifle Association. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://home.nra.org>
- North Idaho College. (2014, May 28). *Meeting of the board of trustees*. Retrieved from <https://www.nic.edu/board/books/1405.pdf>
- North Idaho College Senate. (2014, May 15). *Senate minutes*. Retrieved from <https://www.nic.edu/modules/images/websites/73/file/2013-2014/Final%20Senate%20Minutes%205-15-2014.pdf>
- Ordway, D. M. (n.d.). *'Campus carry' and the concealed carry of guns on college campuses: A collection of research*. Retrieved from <https://journalistsresource.org/studies/society/education/concealed-carry-guns-college-campus-research/>
- Patten, R., Thomas, M. O., & Wada, J. C. (2013). Packing heat: Attitudes regarding concealed weapons on college campuses. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*. Retrieved from <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs12103-012-9191-1>
- Prentice, G. (2014, February 26). Curt McKenzie's no-huddle offense. *Boise Weekly*. Retrieved from <https://www.boiseweekly.com/boise/curt-mckenzie-no-huddle-offense/Content?oid=3064265>
- Price, J. H., Khubchandani, J., & Teeple, K. (2014). *University presidents' perceptions and practice regarding the carrying of concealed handguns on college campuses*. Retrieved from <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/07448481.2014.920336>
- Robinson, J. (2014, February 28). Idaho colleges ask lawmakers to consider fiscal side of guns on campus. *Boise State Public Radio*. Retrieved from <https://www.boisestatepublicradio.org/post/idaho-colleges-ask-lawmakers-consider-fiscal-side-guns-campus#stream/0>

Robinson, J. (2014, March 11). Idaho students make last ditch effort to kill guns-on-campus-bill.

NWNNews. Retrieved from <http://www.nwnetwork.org/post/idaho-students-make-last-ditch-effort-kill-guns-campus-bill>

Rosentiel, T. (2011, January 13). *Views of gun control – a detailed demographic breakdown*.

Retrieved from <https://pewresearch.org/2011/01/13/views-of-gun-control-a-detailed-demographic-breakdown/>

Russell, B. Z. (2014, February 3). Idaho college leaders oppose guns-on-campus bill, but

lawmakers press on anyway. *The Spokesman-Review*. Retrieved from

<http://www.spokesman.com/stories/2014/feb/03/idaho-college-leaders-oppose-guns-campus-bill-lawm/>

Russell, B. Z. (2011, March 25). Idaho senators kill guns-on-campus bill. *The Spokesman*

Review. Retrieved from Silver, J. (Sept. 24, 2015). *Study: Concealed handgun permits don't affect crime rate*.

The Texas Tribune. Retrieved from <https://www.texastribune.org/2>

Students for Concealed Carry. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://concealedcampus.org/about/>.

Terhune, K. (2014, March 2). Idaho guns on campus bill moves forward, despite objections from

chiefs. *PoliceOne.com*. Retrieved from [https://www.policeone.com/Gun-Legislation-](https://www.policeone.com/Gun-Legislation-Law-Enforcement/articles/6922825-Idaho-guns-on-campus-bill-moves-forward-despite-objections-from-chiefs/)

[Law-Enforcement/articles/6922825-Idaho-guns-on-campus-bill-moves-forward-despite-objections-from-chiefs/](https://www.policeone.com/Gun-Legislation-Law-Enforcement/articles/6922825-Idaho-guns-on-campus-bill-moves-forward-despite-objections-from-chiefs/)

The Campaign to Keep Guns off Campus. (n.d.). *About us*. Retrieved from

<https://keepgunsoffcampus.org>

The Campaign to Keep Guns off Campus. (Aug. 23, 2018). *Campaign to keep guns off campus*

- condemns Secretary DeVos' proposal to use federal funds to arm teachers*. Retrieved from <https://keepgunsoffcampus.org/blog/2018/08/23/campaign-keep-guns-off-campus-condemns-secretary-devos-proposal-use-federal-funds-arm-teachers/>
- Thompson, A., Proce, J. H., Dake, J., & Teeple, K. (April, 2013). *Faculty perceptions and practices regarding carrying concealed handguns on university campuses*. Retrieved from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23089903>
- Tyson, C. (2014, June 16). Outgunned, for now. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2014/06/16/idaho-faculty-weigh-options-campus-gun-law-goes-effect>
- U.S. Const. amend. II. Retrieved from <https://constitutioncenter.org/interactive-constitution/amendments/amendment-ii>
- Villagomez, C. (2014, January 30). Campus trustees to oppose guns on campus. *The Sentinel*. Retrieved from <http://www.nicsentinel.com/2014/01/campus-trustees-to-oppose-allowing-guns-on-campus/>
- Webster, D. W., Donohue, J. J., Klarevas, L., Crifasi, C. K., Vernick, J. S., Jernigan, D., & McGinty, E. E. (2016). *Firearms on college campuses: Research evidence and policy implications*. Retrieved from <https://www.jhsph.edu/research/centers-and-institutes/johns-hopkins-center-for-gun-policy-and-research/pdfs/GunsOnCampus.pdf>
- Wootton, J. (2014, June 8). CSI gears up for new guns on campus law. *The Times News*. Retrieved from https://magicvalley.com/news/local/csi-gears-up-for-new-guns-on-campus-law/article_ca11bf38-9409-5723-8135-1612e7cd1587.html
- Yak Max, (n.d.). Education leaders say Idaho gun bill has a bad shot at improving safety.

Retrieved from <https://yakmax.com/education-leaders-say-idaho-gun-bill-has-a-bad-shot-at-improving-safety/>

Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications (6th edition)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc

Your Guide To Idaho's Gun And Ammunition Industry. (n.d.). Boise State Public Radio. Retrieved From <http://www.boisestatepublicradio.org/topic/your-guide-idahos-gun-and-ammunition-industry#stream/0>

Zuckerman, L. (2011, March 16). Idaho house votes to allow guns on college campuses. *Reuters*. Retrieved from <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-idaho-guns/idaho-house-votes-to-allow-guns-on-college-campuses-idUSTRE72F8GR20110316>

Appendix A – States’ Status

Status of States Campus Carry Laws

STATE	BANS CONCEALED CARRY ON CAMPUS	ALLOWS CONCEALED CARRY ON CAMPUS	DECISION LEFT TO INSTITUTION
Alabama			√
Alaska			√
Arizona			√
Arkansas			√
California	√		
Colorado		√	
Connecticut			√
Delaware			√
Florida	√		
Georgia	√		
Hawaii			√
Idaho		√	
Illinois	√		
Indiana			√
Iowa			√
Kansas		√	

Kentucky			√
Louisiana	√		
Maine			√
Maryland			√
Massachusetts	√		
Michigan	√		
Minnesota			√
Mississippi		√	
Missouri	√		
Montana			√
Nebraska	√		
Nevada	√		
New Hampshire			√
New Jersey	√		
New Mexico	√		
New York	√		
North Carolina	√		
North Dakota			√
Ohio	√		
Oklahoma			√
Oregon		√	

Pennsylvania			√
Rhode Island			√
South Carolina	√		
South Dakota			√
Tennessee	√		
Texas		√	
Utah		√	
Vermont			√
Virginia			√
Washington			√
West Virginia			√
Wisconsin		√	
Wyoming	√		

Appendix B – College of Southern Idaho Policy

College of Southern Idaho Weapons Policy

Approved By CSI Board: June 16,

2014

PURPOSE

An environment of safety and security is critical for educational institutions to cultivate a climate conducive to knowledge and learning. Therefore, this policy prohibits the possession and use of dangerous weapons on CSI property or at CSI sponsored events by students, faculty, staff and visitors except for those persons authorized by state law or campus administration to carry concealed firearms and ammunition. In order to provide a safe and positive campus environment for teaching, learning and working, this policy strongly discourages bringing a firearm onto the CSI campus or events even when permitted by law to do so.

DEFINITIONS

1. Dangerous Weapon: An object, device, instrument, material or substance that is used for or is readily capable of causing death or serious bodily injury. This term does not include a pocket knife with a blade of less than 2 ½ inches in length. Firearms are included in this category as are incendiary devices and explosives.
2. Firearm: A dangerous weapon (including a starter gun) which will or is designed to or may readily be converted to expel a projectile by the action of an explosive.
3. Concealed Firearm: A firearm which is carried upon one's person so as not to be readily discernible by ordinary observation.
4. Upon One's Person: The physical carrying of a firearm in clothing or handbag as well as having the weapon in close proximity, readily available for prompt use.

5. Open Carry: Carrying a firearm upon your person or in your vehicle when it is clearly visible.

POLICY

1. Open carrying of firearms (including in vehicles) is prohibited at all times anywhere on CSI property or CSI sponsored events except for sworn peace officers or others who have been approved by campus administration.
2. The possession, wearing, carrying, transporting or use of a dangerous weapon is strictly prohibited on college owned or controlled premises, including vehicles parked upon these premises. The only exceptions to this policy are the following categories of individuals who have been authorized by state law or college administration to carry a concealed firearm on CSI property/events.
 - a. Full-time sworn peace officers
 - b. Qualified retired law enforcement officers
 - c. Persons who hold an “Enhanced” Idaho Concealed Weapons License
 - d. Those individuals who have been granted specific permission from CSI administration
3. It is unlawful and a violation of this policy to carry a concealed firearm while under the influence of alcohol.
4. Concealed weapons shall not be carried into or possessed within the following CSI facilities:
 - a. Eagle Hall dormitory
 - b. Gymnasium
 - c. Fine Arts Building
 - d. Expo Center

- e. CSI Off-Campus Centers (Blaine County, Mini-Cassia and Northside)
- 5. An individual who discharges or purposely exhibits any firearm in a rude, angry or threatening manner is in violation of this policy.
- 6. Students, staff, faculty and visitors shall produce their credentials to carry a concealed firearm (under one of the categories above in Item #2) when requested to do so by a representative of the CSI Security Department or law enforcement personnel.
- 7. Violations of this policy may result in disciplinary action up to and including: expulsion for student offenses, termination for employee offenses, and a trespass from campus for offending community members. Criminal violations will be referred to local law enforcement.
- 8. Unless an employee of the college is required by the CSI President or Vice President of Administration to carry a firearm as a part of that employee's job duties, any possession or use of a firearm is not within the course and scope of employment with the college. Therefore, any civil or criminal litigation stemming from such possession or use will not be covered or defended by the college.

Appendix C – North Idaho College Policy

Policy

Policy # 7.04.01

Effective Date: 3/26/03

Revised: 7/1/14

(Impact Area – Dept. Name) Students, Employees, Visitors	(General Subject Area) Weapons	(Specific Subject Area) Weapons on College Property
	Author: Office of Student Services	Supersedes Policy #
Relates to Procedure # 7.04.01 and 5.06	Impact: Students, Employees, Visitors	
Legal Citation (if any) United States Code Title 18, Section 921, 930 Idaho Code 18-3302		
North Idaho College		

STATEMENT

In an effort to provide a safe and positive educational environment, North Idaho College prohibits the possession or use of weapons on College property or at College activities.

WEAPONS POLICY

Possession or use of weapons (as defined in the associated procedure), including firearms, while upon properties owned or controlled by the College or where College activities occur, is prohibited. Exceptions to this weapons policy exist where authorized by state law or where specifically authorized by North Idaho College. Violations of this policy may result in discipline, including, as applicable, student suspension or expulsion, termination of employment or exclusion from the College. Violators may also be subject to prosecution under applicable laws.

Procedure Narrative

INTENT

It is the intent of NIC's Weapons Policy to ensure a safe and positive educational environment at North Idaho College. The College prohibits the possession or use of weapons on College property or at College activities, subject to the limitations imposed by state and federal law and as expressly authorized by North Idaho College.

ENFORCEMENT

The Vice President for Student Services or his designee will enforce the Weapons Policy through the Office of Campus Security and/or other law enforcement personnel.

GENERAL PROHIBITION

The possession or use of weapons, including firearms, while upon properties owned or controlled by the College or where College activities occur, is prohibited.

Exceptions

The following situations are exceptions to the general prohibition of weapons at North Idaho College:

The lawful possession of weapons by law enforcement officers or officials.

1. Weapons in the possession of North Idaho College security officers while acting pursuant to the express written authority of the Vice President for Student Services or his designee.
2. Individuals required to possess weapons in order to participate in programs sanctioned by the College.
3. The lawful possession, carrying, or transporting of firearms or Ammunition concealed on a person licensed under section 18-3302H or 18-3302K, Idaho Code, regarding enhanced concealed carry permit holders and qualified retired law enforcement officers.
 - A. Individuals authorized under Idaho Code 18-3302H or 18-3302K **are not** permitted to carry firearms in the North Idaho College Residence Hall, Boswell Hall, or Christianson Gymnasium. Entrances to these facilities will be clearly posted for the prohibition of firearms.
 - B. It is unlawful for a person to be under the influence of alcohol or drugs and carry a firearm in a concealed manner.

The Vice President for Student Services or his designee may grant further written exceptions.

PRIVATELY OWNED PROPERTY

Individuals must also comply with all posted signs and occupancy rules on private property being leased and used by NIC.

NIC DAYCARE

All individuals must comply with Idaho Department of Health and Welfare or other applicable authorities regarding the handling and storage of weapons.

EMPLOYMENT

Unless an employee is required by the Vice President for Student Services to carry a firearm as a part of that employee's job duties, any possession or use of a firearm is **not within the course and scope of employment** with the College.

VIOLATION

Any College employee, student or member of the public who has been found in violation of this policy may be subject to disciplinary action including, as applicable, student suspension or expulsion, termination of employment or exclusion from the Procedure # 7.04.01

DEFINITIONS

1. Weapon: means a weapon, device, instrument, material, or substance, animate or inanimate, that is used for, appears to be or is readily capable of causing death or serious bodily injury, except that such term does not include a pocket knife with a blade of less than 2 1/2 inches in length.
2. Firearm: as defined by Idaho Code section 18-3302H.
3. Ammunition: means ammunition or cartridge cases, primers, bullets, or propellant powder designed for use in any firearm.

4. Concealed: means that the firearm is located on an individual's body (or immediate extensions thereof such as a purse or backpack), is not readily ascertainable and is hidden from the ordinary sight of another person. A firearm is not concealed when it is viewable by another person, even if the revealing of the firearm is inadvertent and/or unintentional by the carrier.

Appendix D – College of Western Idaho Policy

FIREARMS AND WEAPONS ON CAMPUS	
Policy Number: OP-050	Responsible Department: Facilities Planning and Management
Effective Date: 10/30/2014	Last Revision Date: 11/14/2016

PURPOSE:

To establish guidelines regarding the possession of firearms and other weapons on CWI-owned or controlled properties or in CWI vehicles.

SCOPE:

Applies to all firearms/weapons on CWI-owned or controlled properties or in CWI vehicles.

DEFINITIONS:

Weapons: Any device, instrument, material or substance used for, or is readily capable of causing death or serious bodily injury, including firearms, knives, explosives or incendiary devices.

CWI owned or controlled properties: All College owned or leased buildings and surrounding areas such as sidewalks, driveways and parking lots. This policy applies also to College vehicles, regardless of whether they are on College property at the time.

Firearms: Any weapon that will, is designed to or may readily be converted to expel a projectile by the action of an explosive.

POLICY

A safe and secure environment is fundamental to fulfilling CWI's educational mission. CWI is committed to maintaining an environment free of violence. This commitment includes

restricting recognized hazards from the CWI community that contribute to violence and may result in serious harm. Accordingly, the possession of firearms/weapons on CWI properties or in CWI vehicles is subject to the guidelines set forth below.

GUIDELINES

The possession, wearing, carrying, transporting, or use of weapons, including firearms, while upon properties owned or controlled by CWI, in CWI vehicles or where CWI activities occur, is strictly prohibited, except for authorized law enforcement officers, authorized campus security officers, and persons exempt under Idaho State law. “Persons exempt under Idaho State law” means any person licensed to carry an enhanced concealed weapon permit under Idaho Code §§ 18-3302H or 18-3301K.

Revised: 11/14/2016

EXCEPTIONS

Individual Exceptions: Prior specific written permission from the Executive Director of the Facilities, Planning & Management Department to bring any weapon on campus may be obtained for certain activities or legitimate purposes, *e.g.*, class projects or demonstrations, or displays of antique firearms or art objects.

Program Exceptions: Some students or instructors regularly use tools which fall under the definition of weapons. Such tools, when applied directly to a legitimate use in College programs, are exempt from this policy. Questions are to be directed to the Executive Director of the Facilities, Planning & Management Department.

SCREENING

CWI may conduct weapons screening to meet the requirements of this policy. Campus security, in consultation with venue security, will determine the appropriate security

screening procedures to be used on a case-by-case basis for events on campus. Screening procedures may include but are not limited to visual inspection, the use of magnetometer devices (including wands and walkthrough metal detectors), bag size limitations, and bag inspections. Discovery of a weapon during screening procedures may require a law enforcement assessment of the situation.

VIOLATIONS

Violations of this policy may result in the following sanctions: (i) exclusion or expulsion in the case of students; (ii) termination of employment in the case of faculty and staff; (iii) exclusion from campus in the case of members of the public; and (iv) prosecution under appropriate local, state or federal laws.

Appendix E – College of Eastern Idaho Policy

Excerpt from the College of Eastern Idaho Student Handbook (p.42):

11. Weapons, including firearms, knives, and explosives are not allowed on the College Grounds. The sole exception is firearms and ammunition allowed by holders of licenses described in section 18-3309(2), Idaho Code, and then only under the conditions and limitations set out in that section.

Appendix F – Idaho Senate Bill 1254

LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF IDAHO
Sixty-second Legislature Second Regular Session - 2014

IN THE SENATE

SENATE BILL NO. 1254

BY STATE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

AN ACT

RELATING TO FIREARMS REGULATION; PROVIDING LEGISLATIVE INTENT; AMENDING SECTION 18-3302B, IDAHO CODE, TO PROVIDE PENALTIES FOR CARRYING CONCEALED WEAPONS UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF ALCOHOL OR DRUGS ON A COLLEGE CAMPUS; AMENDING SECTION 18-3302J, IDAHO CODE, TO REVISE THE PREEMPTION OF FIREARMS REGULATION REGARDING COLLEGE CAMPUSES; AMENDING CHAPTER 33, TITLE 18, IDAHO CODE, BY THE ADDITION OF A NEW SECTION 18-3309, IDAHO CODE, TO PROVIDE AUTHORITY OF GOVERNING BOARDS OF PUBLIC COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES REGARDING FIREARMS; AND AMENDING CHAPTER 3, TITLE 5, IDAHO CODE, BY THE ADDITION OF A NEW SECTION 5-343, IDAHO CODE, TO PROVIDE CIVIL IMMUNITY OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES ALLOWING FIREARMS.

Be It Enacted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho:

SECTION 1. LEGISLATIVE INTENT. The Legislature finds that uniform laws, regulations and policies regarding firearms and weapons on state college and university campuses are necessary for public safety. It is the intent of this Legislature to provide for the safety of students, faculty and staff of state colleges and universities to allow for the possession or carrying of firearms by certain licensed persons on state college and university campuses, with the exception of carrying within student dormitories and residence halls, and within public entertainment facilities, as defined.

SECTION 2. That Section 18-3302B, Idaho Code, be, and the same is hereby amended to read as follows:

18-3302B. CARRYING CONCEALED WEAPONS UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF ALCOHOL OR DRUGS. (1) It shall be unlawful for any person to carry a concealed weapon on or about his person when intoxicated or under the influence of an intoxicating drink or drug. Any violation of the provisions of this section shall be a misdemeanor.

(2) In addition to any other penalty, any person who enters a plea of guilty, who is found guilty or who is convicted of a violation of subsection (1) of this section when such violation occurs on a college or university campus shall have any and all licenses issued pursuant to section 18-3302, 18-3302H or 18-3302K, Idaho Code, revoked for a period of three (3) years and such person shall be ineligible to obtain or renew any such license or use any other license recognized by this state for the same period.

SECTION 3. That Section 18-3302J, Idaho Code, be, and the same is hereby amended to read as follows:

18-3302J. PREEMPTION OF FIREARMS REGULATION. (1) The legislature finds that uniform laws regulating firearms are necessary to protect the individual citizen's right to bear arms guaranteed by amendment 2 of the United States Constitution and section 11, article I of the constitution of

Appendix G – Informed Consent Statement

Introduction:

Idaho State University Institutional Review Board has approved this dissertation project on behalf of Graydon Stanley, who is participating in the Degree of Doctor of Education in Higher Education Administration in the College of Education. You are being invited to participate in this research project to explore your experiences in your institution's campus safety program.

Title of Research Project:

The Impact on Campus Safety of Allowing Concealed Carry of Weapons at Idaho Community Colleges: A Case Study.

Purpose of the Study:

The purpose of this multiple-case study is to describe and better understand the impact on campus safety given the legalization of concealed carry weapons at Idaho community colleges. Though governed by a locally elected Board of Trustees, Idaho community colleges are subject to complying with this change in state law, so their policies and practices had to change to address the impact of Idaho Senate Bill 1254 on campus safety. Key campus stakeholders are charged with assessing, changing, communicating, and executing changes in policy, processes, hiring, and training, so this qualitative study will collect data from those campuses and those primary campus stakeholders. The results from each campus will yield valuable information that can be used to inform future changes necessary to support campus safety.

Benefits:

A cross analysis of the findings from each of the campuses or cases will inform an assessment of best practices in addressing campus safety and yield consistent evaluations of

personnel and fiscal impacts. The results of this study may then be used to provide more comprehensive information to inform policy makers of the impacts of changes in public law on campus safety at higher education campuses..

Procedures to be followed:

You are being asked to respond to a questionnaire and participate in an interview to answer a series of open-ended questions related to the impact on your institution's campus safety program from the legalization of concealed carry weapons. Follow-up questions which may come to light during the conversation may also occur. If you agree to participate, the brief confidential questionnaire will be a link sent to you via email and one on one interviews will occur either in person or on the telephone. The interviews will be recorded and later transcribed, and if follow-up interviews are necessary to clarify or confirm any information, those will be conducted via email. The interview should not take more than an hour. Recordings and transcripts will not contain personally identifiable information and both will be destroyed within a year from completion of the study.

Risks:

Your participation is completely voluntary. There are no identifiable risks beyond those experienced in normal, everyday life. However, the researcher bears the responsibility of carrying out research that accurately describes the impact of concealed carry weapons on campus safety policy and practices to contribute to the literature researched.

For this study, you must be 18 years of age or older to consent to participate in this research. If you feel uncomfortable at any time during the interview or follow-up process, you are free to refuse to answer any questions or stop the interview at any point. If you choose to withdraw from the research, there will be no penalties associated with the withdrawal.

Statement of Confidentiality:

The interviewer will not ask for information that would identify the participant to the responses other than the general title of your department or role you represent. Your responses will be recorded anonymously, with no mention of your name or the name of the institution. The title and references made to participants in the study will refer to your institution as an Idaho public community college.

Right to Ask Questions:

The researcher conducting this study is Graydon Stanley. You may ask any questions now or during the interview process. If you later have questions, concerns, or complaints about the research, please call me at (208) 659-3160, or if you prefer, you may call my advisor for this research, Dr. Paul Watkins, Idaho State University, (208) 282-3273. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant, you may contact Idaho State University Office for Research, Outreach, and Compliance at (208) 282-2179.

Compensation:

No compensation is awarded for participating in this research project.

Investigator: Graydon A. Stanley, Student

Idaho State University

Coeur d' Alene, ID 83814

stangray@isu.edu or gastanley@nic.edu

Faculty Advisor: Paul Watkins, PhD

School Psychology & Educational Leadership

College of Education

Idaho State University

Pocatello, ID 83209-8059

watkpaul@isu.edu

Participation in this questionnaire and interview implies that you have read the information in this form and consent to participate in the research. Please keep this form for your records or future reference.

Appendix H – Data Tables

Table 1 – College 1

Familiarity with the state law and campus policy regarding weapons on campus

Participant	Summary of Participant Responses
Trustee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very familiar including knowledge of exceptions to the law • Provided testimony to legislators and State Board of education • Highly displeased with legislative disregard for stakeholder input
President	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally familiar with the law and campus policy • Very supportive of policy but was not present for testimony or input
Chief Financial Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally familiar with the law and policy. • Supported revisions in policy • No positive outlet from a risk management view
Chief Student Services Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highly familiar with the law and assisted in development of the policy • Was actively involved in providing testimony to the State Board, Board of Trustees, and legislature. • Was highly critical of legislative disregard for stakeholder input.
Chief Human Resources Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was generally familiar with policy and not familiar with state law.
Chief Security Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was intimately familiar with state law and wrote the policy • Testified to the Board of Trustees.

Table 2 – College 1

Knowledge of Changes in campus safety policy and processes

Participant	Summary of Participant Responses
Trustee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No room for debate, we just had to adjust • We were ahead of the law because of hiring an SRO

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budgeted for locks and security cameras • Concern for new buildings
President	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uninvolved in initial process, concerned for future changes • Very supportive of current practices and proactive approach • Advocates for communication, intentionality, and practice
Chief Financial Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was very supportive of changes • Highly supportive of resources for personnel and facility safety upgrades • Facility master plan changes with locks, cameras, walls, and glass
Chief Student Services Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Helped write the policy • Actively supported changes in structure, leadership, and philosophy
Chief Human Resources Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports greater awareness of policy and campus safety processes for employees. • Participates in Safe Campus • Supported cameras
Chief Security Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leads changes in policy and processes • Dramatically expanded awareness and preparation

Table 3 – College 1

Impacts on Hiring, Training, Recruitment and Retention

Participant	Summary of Participant Responses
Trustee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the SRO and community partners • Emphasis on mental health training • Acknowledges arguments on both sides for recruitment and retention
President	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports more qualified personnel in security • Much greater employee concern for safety • Believes that there is no impact on Recruitment and retention
Chief Financial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognized need to address equipment and facilities

Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported need for continual training • No impact on recruitment and retention
Chief Student Services Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater concern for continually addressing safety • Involve students in training and discussions • Hire and retain more experienced security personnel • Invest heavily in training • No impact on recruitment and retention
Chief Human Resources Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasis on quality of campus safety personnel • Clear communication to employees of policy and processes • Little impact on recruitment and retention
Chief Security Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hiring and qualifications of security personnel was not changed • Need for regular training • No impact on recruitment and retention • No need for lethal response ability

Table 4 – College 1

Proposed changes in Campus Safety Preparedness

Participant	Summary of Participant Responses
Trustee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hire mental health professionals • Use bulletproof glass in new construction • Focus on red flag laws • Move security to the center of campus
President	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasis on training and communication • More locks and surveillance cameras. • Emphasize emergency preparedness and response
Chief Financial Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit the use of glass in buildings • Concern for vehicular access as a weapon • Emphasis on “how” we work
Chief Student Services Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More training of students and employees • More electronic locks and cameras • More collaboration with community partners • Hire mental health professionals
Chief Human	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background checks on new employees

Resources Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasis on training and support
Chief Security Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investment in training • Additional collaboration with community partners • More surveillance cameras

Table 5 – College 1

Perceptions of campus safety

Participant	Summary of Participant Responses
Trustee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safest campus in the state • Enhancements in security • School Resource Officer model • Building improvements • Relationship with local police • Much better than before
President	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safe but worried • Must remain proactive • Feels safe but worried about what is beyond our control
Chief Financial Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safe because of our investments and his knowledge • Much improved because of changes in structure and awareness • Surprised that there have not been more issues
Chief Student Services Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safe but worried about the future given mission, culture, and demographics • Highly improved and proactive, integrated model
Chief Human Resources Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very safe because of continual awareness and investments • More people are carrying
Chief Security Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very safe because of proactive leadership and investment in training • No effect on crime rates • Good communication of policies and expectations

Table 1 – College 2

Familiarity with the state law and campus policy regarding weapons on campus

Participant	Summary of Participant Responses
Trustee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally familiar with the law and campus policy • Highly displeased with legislative disregard for stakeholder input, felt like they had been “shunned”
President	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very familiar with the law and campus policy • Gave testimony to the State Board, met directly with legislators, participated in news conference to declare opposition to the law on behalf of higher education • Very displeased that no higher education representatives had been asked or informed about the pending legislation.
Chief Financial Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally familiar with the law and policy. • Supported revisions in policy • Was aware that the law was passed with little input from stakeholders
Chief Student Services Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally familiar with the law but not involved with policy development • Responsible for campus safety department and processes • Recognize this as our new normal
Chief Human Resources Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very familiar with the law and policy although was hired just after the change • Was primarily concerned with educating employees and alleviating fear
Chief Security Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was intimately familiar with state law as a law enforcement retiree and law enforcement instructor • Concerned about lack of training for permit holders

Table 4 – College 2

Proposed changes in Campus Safety Preparedness

Participant	Summary of Participant Responses
Trustee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aware of emphasis on locks and cameras • Advocating for more mental health and transition support
President	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposing a swipe card system and electronic locks • More connection to local agencies • More awareness training
Chief Financial Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grants for a campus electronic locking system • Integrated camera system
Chief Student Services Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased staffing security • Electronic locks to replace hard key system • Expanded surveillance system • Police presence on campus
Chief Human Resources Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wants electronic key access and electronic locking system • Wants a robust, reliable surveillance system • Consider a city police officer stationed on campus
Chief Security Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electronic locking system and access cards • Integrated camera system

Table 5 – College 2

Perceptions of campus safety

Participant	Summary of Participant Responses
Trustee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change in campus crime rates • They don't feel unsafe • Concern about changing culture
President	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They feel as safe here as any place • Training and awareness has provided sense of openness and security • A track record of safety • No changes in crime rates, cited two examples since the law changed

Chief Financial Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supportive of enhanced concealed carry • Neutral effect on campus crime rates • Stakeholders feel safe
Chief Student Services Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimal changes in campus crime rates • Believes there is a small increase in campus carry, but still a very small percentage • New law just legitimized existing carriers • Concerned about proper care of minors on campuses
Chief Human Resources Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neutral impact on campus crime rates • Zero impact of the law • Concerned about costs of campus safety provisions
Chief Security Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about age change in concealed carry law • Believes that all of the discussion was much ado about nothing • Worried about open carry laws

Table 1 – College 3

Familiarity with the state law and campus policy regarding weapons on campus

Participant	Summary of Participant Responses
Trustee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally familiar with the law and campus policy • Depended upon administration for guidance • Was not involved in testimony • No option for policy development – had to conform to the law
President	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very familiar with the law and campus policy • Worked closely with HR and legal counsel, don't add complexity • Trustees were new and unfamiliar • Followed traditional policy process • Not involved in giving testimony. • Change in law legitimized current carriers
Chief Financial Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very familiar with the law and policy. • Responsible for campus safety department • Did not give testimony • Bare minimum of compliance

Chief Student Services Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally familiar with the law but not involved with policy development, but supported process development • Manages conduct issues but not campus safety • Responsible for campus safety department and processes • Pro-gun and pro-gun control
Chief Human Resources Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very familiar with the law and policy and helped develop original and revisions • Shepherded the development and communication process • Not a proponent of guns on campus
Chief Security Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • COO of contracted provider • Was intimately familiar with state law and college policy • Provided only level one services • Strong advocate for guns on campus

Table 2 – College 3

Knowledge of Changes in campus safety policy and processes

Participant	Summary of Participant Responses
Trustee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unfamiliar with changes but trusted administration, deferred to the president • Very concerned with mental health issues on campus; PTSD of veterans • Concerned about image and culture of the institution if security was armed
President	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trustees didn't have strong opinions and didn't want to add complexity • Inherited campus security model and considering changes • Consulted with legal counsel • Working on lighting and escort services
Chief Financial Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supervises contract security and uncomfortable with current status • Does not want current security to be armed; unqualified • Would support a non-lethal means of force like mace • Plans to consult with state and other institutions
Chief Student Services Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports changes in processes • Advocates for expansion of mental health counseling

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Works closely with safety committee • Recognizes need for active shooter and campus readiness training • Supports a new model for security and additional resources given anticipated growth
Chief Human Resources Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary driver of changes to policy • Concerned about training and certification level of security personnel • Purchased door locks, silent alarms, and cameras
Chief Security Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly advocate for level 2 services • Told to handle issues at their discretion • Opposes gun free zones

Table 3– College 3

Impacts on Hiring, Training, Recruitment and Retention

Participant	Summary of Participant Responses
Trustee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong need for more mental health assistance and services for veterans • Worried about the image and culture with heightened security • No constituents express concern for student or employee safety • Supports working with other colleges and agencies
President	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need for cooperation and support of local agencies • Assess current contracted services • Demographics are different with more adults here and are less volatile, not passionate brand new high school graduates
Chief Financial Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brought in agency representatives for training • Depends upon safety committee • Concerned about lack of training and qualification of existing staff • No specific communication or training for policy implications • Need training in de-escalation techniques
Chief Student Services Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supportive a new model • Strongly advocates for mental health counseling expansion • Supports an interaction and engagement model • Strongly supports need for more training in active shooter and campus readiness • No impact on recruitment and retention given demographics

Chief Human Resources Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly opposed to weapons on campus • Supports security force with proper training and certification • No impact on employee recruitment or retention; primary interests are salary and benefits
Chief Security Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prefer higher level of security • Advocates for weapons on campus • Wants more cameras with live access to them

Table 4 – College 3

Proposed changes in Campus Safety Preparedness

Participant	Summary of Participant Responses
Trustee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interested in other college's training, locks, cameras, and SRO • Advocating for more mental health and veteran support
President	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment of current model and finding resources for improving services • Changes in lighting and escort services • Visit other institutions to view their models • Work closely with state and other agencies
Chief Financial Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess current model and consider changes • More training and tabletop exercises
Chief Student Services Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess current model • Add mental health and support services • More active shooter and campus readiness training • Increased resources to accommodate anticipated rapid growth
Chief Human Resources Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More cameras, locks, silent alarms • Additional training for employees • Continual review and updating of policies and processes
Chief Security Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Live integrated camera system • Upgrade and expand services

Table 5 – College 3

Perceptions of campus safety

Participant	Summary of Participant Responses
Trustee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change in campus crime rates • They don't feel unsafe • Discouraged that we have to be so concerned about this
President	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students and employees feel safe • Not much happening around here • No changes in crime rates
Chief Financial Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neutral effect on campus crime rates • I think it's a safe campus • Concerned more about stalking, theft, and vandalism • Not comfortable with current contractor
Chief Student Services Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No changes in campus crime rates • Safe campus and safe community • Cultural bias against reporting
Chief Human Resources Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It feels safe • Small campus and familiarity adds to sense of security and increases awareness • No impact on campus crime rates
Chief Security Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggests stagnant campus crime rates • Legitimize and legalize campus carry, like weed

Table 1 – College 4

Familiarity with the state law and campus policy regarding weapons on campus

Participant	Summary of Participant Responses
Trustee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very familiar with the law and campus policy • Gave substantial testimony to legislators who didn't ask for or disregarded input; "they just didn't care" • Especially concerned about securing multiple sites
President	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally familiar with the law and campus policy

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gave testimony to the State Board and legislators, participated in news conference to declare opposition to the law on behalf of higher education • Very displeased there was little collegial discussion prior to passage of the law • Concerned about lack of resources given to accommodate the new law
Chief Financial Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally familiar with the law and policy. • Supported revisions in policy • Was aware that the law was passed with little input from stakeholders
Chief Student Services Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally familiar with the law but not involved with policy development • Responsible for campus safety department and processes • Recognize this as our new normal
Chief Human Resources Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very familiar with the law and policy although was hired just after the change • Was primarily concerned with educating employees and alleviating fear
Chief Security Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was very familiar with state law • Didn't give testimony but consulted with many different stakeholders • Policy just has to follow the letter of the law

Table 2 – College 4

Knowledge of Changes in campus safety policy and processes

Participant	Summary of Participant Responses
Trustee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about multiple sites, leased buildings, and multiple tenants • Concern for hiring additional personnel and arming personnel • Increase in institutional liabilities
President	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about unintended consequences • Worried about employees and students' increased anxiety • Lack of coverage at all sites • Better collaboration with local agencies
Chief Financial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little impact on budget, maybe some for signage

Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No changes in contract • Consideration for ISP or other officer on campus
Chief Student Services Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not directly involved in security supervision • Focus on general liabilities and risk management • Hosted active shooter training
Chief Human Resources Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on intent of concealed carry violations • Concerned about difficult conversations with employees • Worried about safety of her employees
Chief Security Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy just followed the letter of the law • Updated contract security training • Certified security to use OC spray • Focus on customer service model

Table 3– College 4

Impacts on Hiring, Training, Recruitment and Retention

Participant	Summary of Participant Responses
Trustee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More awareness and increased training • Heard some conversations about students not coming because of guns
President	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need for panic button and locks • Active shooter trainings and lockdown in multiple settings • No impact on recruitment because new issues come along • Emphasis on education, communication, and awareness
Chief Financial Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No budget implications • Zero impact on recruitment and retention • Very confident in chief security officer
Chief Student Services Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Never once heard of recruitment and retention impacts • Need for regular training • Focus on mental health first aid • Concerned about emotional and psychological safety
Chief Human Resources Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informed employees of new policy but not call out since • Other policies had much greater impact and reaction • More training, more panic buttons • No impact on employee recruitment or retention

Chief Security Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developed an electronic lockdown system • Option of wearing bulletproof vests • “Non-starter” about impact on recruitment and retention
------------------------	---

Table 4 – College 4

Proposed changes in Campus Safety Preparedness

Participant	Summary of Participant Responses
Trustee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment of contract security • Aware of emphasis on locks and cameras • Advocating for more mental health and transition support
President	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better communication • Concerned about support for mental health and domestic violence needs • Focus on alert apps and communication • Emphasis on ability to lock down • Need for panic buttons
Chief Financial Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Put cameras in the appropriate places • Better signage • Focus on overall campus security • Emphasis on training
Chief Student Services Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More emphasis on regular training • Address mental health and psychological needs • Increased staffing security • Better integration with student services
Chief Human Resources Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More panic buttons at every desk • Increased active shooter trainings • Get in front of mental health and anger issues

Table 5 – College 4

Perceptions of campus safety

Participant	Summary of Participant Responses
Trustee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campus is as safe as anywhere • People are numb and don't think about safety • Concern about changing laws
President	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They feel as safe here as any place • Concerned about commuter campus and open access • Believed that we have become numb • No change in crime rates
Chief Financial Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feels safe and comfortable • Confident that we are in a good place • No effect on campus crime rates
Chief Student Services Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Almost nothing changed in campus crime rates • Worried about students responding emotionally • Policy is clear and understood – common sense-based
Chief Human Resources Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have felt unsafe but not because of weapons law • Neutral impact on campus crime rates • Highly concerned about mental health issues
Chief Security Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about age change in concealed carry law • Believed that all of the discussion was much ado about nothing • Worried about open carry laws

Appendix I – Campus Crime Report Comparisons

Survey CC	Murder/	Negligent n	Rape	Fondling	Incest	Statutory r.	Robbery	Aggravatec	Burglary	Motor vehi	Arson
2014 CEI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
2014 CSI	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	4	2	0
2014 CWI	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0
2014 CWI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2014 CWI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2014 NIC	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2015 CEI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
2015 CSI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
2015 CWI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
2015 CWI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2015 CWI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2015 NIC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
2016 CEI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
2016 CSI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0
2016 CWI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2016 CWI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2016 CWI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
2016 NIC	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0
2017 CEI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
2017 CSI	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	0
2017 CWI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2017 CWI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
2017 CWI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2017 NIC	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	0