

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Educational Administration: Theses, Dissertations,
and Student Research

Educational Administration, Department of

Spring 4-18-2013

Institutional Crisis Readiness as Perceived by Small College and University Senior Student Affairs Officers at NASPA Member Institutions

Philip D. Covington

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, covingtp@yahoo.com

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cehsedaddiss>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Covington, Philip D., "Institutional Crisis Readiness as Perceived by Small College and University Senior Student Affairs Officers at NASPA Member Institutions" (2013). *Educational Administration: Theses, Dissertations, and Student Research*. 146.
<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cehsedaddiss/146>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Educational Administration, Department of at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Educational Administration: Theses, Dissertations, and Student Research by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

Institutional Crisis Readiness as Perceived by Small College and University Senior
Student Affairs Officers at NASPA Member Institutions

By

Philip D. Covington

A DISSERTATION

Presented to the Faculty of
The Graduate College at the University of Nebraska
In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements
Of the Degree of Doctor of Education

Major: Educational Studies
(Educational Leadership and Higher Education)

Under the Supervision of Professor Richard Hoover

Lincoln, Nebraska

April, 2013

Institutional Crisis Readiness as Perceived by Small College and University Senior
Student Affairs Officers at NASPA Member Institutions

Philip D. Covington, Ed.D.

University of Nebraska, 2013

Advisor: Richard E. Hoover

The purpose of this study was to examine current readiness plans of small colleges and universities through the eyes of Senior Student Affairs Officers and develop recommendations for institutional use. Plans were examined across both institutional size and type to gauge institutional readiness, and commonalities were sought in the areas of plan development and maintenance. This explanatory mixed-methods study utilized survey research methodology and phone interviews. Following the initial survey administration, five respondents participated in phone interviews focused on the development and maintenance of institutional crisis management systems. Unexpected delays in the research necessitated a second administration of the survey to provide more recent data.

The researcher focused on four primary indicators of institutional crisis preparedness: (a) identification of the types of crises addressed by institutional plans, (b) crisis phases addressed by institutional plans, (c) crisis management systems in place, and (d) level of stakeholder involvement in institutional plans.

The findings suggested that small colleges and universities generally are prepared to face crisis situations, as nearly every institution had a written crisis management plan

and an established crisis management committee. Roughly three of every four small colleges and universities had taken a broad approach to their planning, as indicated by the presence of at least one written contingency plan in each of the four major categories of crises: natural, facility, criminal, and human. Additionally, the findings suggested that planning was reactive, rather than proactive, as noted by the limited attention given by institutions to the pre-crisis phase of planning.

Private institutions were more confident in their overall level of preparedness for campus crises than public institutions. Additionally, confidence in the level of preparedness was highest at the largest institutions in the study. Interview participants focused on the level of comfort among the team of individuals charged with leading through institutional crises as critical. Lastly, interview participants acknowledged the need for outside expertise to bring focus and experience to planning.

Acknowledgements

This dissertation represents the culmination of more than a decade of my life given to the pursuit of this graduate degree. Many people nudged and encouraged me to keep plowing forward during this time. Dr. Rich Hoover, you came into my life as a faculty member, but along this road you became my advisor and then my mentor. Words cannot express my gratitude for the lengths you have gone to encourage me to push through the stresses of life and work to complete my degree. You helped me to discover strengths I was not aware of within me. This work would not have been completed without the deep care you have shown. Sincere gratitude also goes to my committee members, Dr. Alvarez, Dr. Joekel, Dr. Scalora, and Dr. Uerling. Your contributions of time, energy, and commitment to my success are deeply appreciated.

To my colleagues that span four institutions since I took my first course, I am grateful for your encouraging words and especially for the times you shouldered additional burden to allow me to focus on my doctoral pursuit. I am especially grateful for the supervisors I have had the privilege to serve students with who allowed me the space in life to carve out time to be a student.

To all who participated in my study, my work clearly was dependent upon you. Whether you responded to my survey once or twice, or agreed to be interviewed, I appreciate the time you gave to make a difference in my study and more importantly in the work we do each day.

To my extended family, thank you for your love and encouragement. Mom and Dad, you taught us to value education and where it could take us in life. The beliefs you

instilled in me allowed me to push through to this finish line. Thank you all for at least pretending that the research I was engaged in was meaningful and interesting.

To my family, you have given much to allow me to pursue this degree. While my name will appear on the paperwork, this work is just as much yours as mine. Lofton and Parson, my boys, you have both stepped up many times to be a help at home while I was hidden away working on my coursework or dissertation. I am very proud of the young men you have become and look forward to seeing what kind of marks you leave on the world. Martilee, my sweet girl, you have been my inspiration through this process. While you may not be able to walk, talk, or purposefully use your hands, you light up my life every day with your smiles and those beautiful, blue eyes. You look into my soul and encourage me to continue on. Vanessa, my amazing wife, you never let me give up. You are a rock and have weathered many storms throughout this dissertation journey. You have sacrificed many times to allow me success and I am so grateful to have the privilege of walking through this life by your side.

To my God, without you I am nothing and my life has no meaning. Thank you for giving me hope and a purpose.

Table of Contents

Chapter I—Introduction..... 1

 Purpose Statement..... 1

 Context/Background 1

 Research Questions..... 3

 Method 4

 Definition of Terms..... 4

 Assumptions..... 5

 Delimitations and Limitations..... 6

 Delimitations..... 6

 Limitations 6

 Significance..... 7

 Organization of the Dissertation 8

Chapter II—Review of the Literature 9

 Need for All-Hazards Planning in Higher Education 9

 Assessing Institutional Readiness 11

 Importance of Effective Communication..... 14

 Information Regarding Similar Studies 16

 Lack of Data Specific to Small Colleges and Universities 24

 Lack of Studies Completed Following Tragedies at Virginia Tech and Northern Illinois..... 25

 Summary..... 25

Chapter III—Methodology 27

 Population 27

Instrumentation	29
Data Collection	30
Data Analysis	35
Summary	37
Chapter IV—Findings.....	38
Types of Crises	42
Phases of Crisis	59
Crisis Management System.....	73
Stakeholder Involvement	99
Perceived Preparedness.....	112
Plan Development and Maintenance: Results of Interviews	117
Summary	127
Chapter V—Summary, Discussion, and Recommendations	129
Summary	129
Purpose of the Study	129
Methodology	130
Summary of the Findings.....	130
Discussion of the Findings.....	135
Recommendations for Practice	137
Suggestions for Future Research	139
Conclusion	140
References.....	142
Appendices.....	148

List of Tables

Table 1	Summary of Survey Respondents.....	33
Table 2	Comparison of Respondents to Population Based on Institutional Type	34
Table 3	Comparison of Respondents to Population Based on Enrollment.....	34
Table 4	Comparison of Respondents to Population Based on NASPA Region	35
Table 5	Institutions with Written Crisis Management Plans (CMP) First Administration of Questionnaire.....	40
Table 6	Institutions with Written Crisis Management Plans (CMP) Second Administration of Questionnaire.....	40
Table 7	Types of Crisis for Which Institutions had Prepared Contingency Plans by Category of Crisis Plan First Administration of Questionnaire.....	44
Table 8	Types of Crisis for Which Institutions had Prepared Contingency Plans by Category of Crisis Plan Second Administration of Questionnaire.....	45
Table 9	Natural Crisis by NASPA Region First Administration of Questionnaire	47
Table 10	Natural Crisis by NASPA Region Second Administration of Questionnaire	48
Table 11	Types of Crisis for Which Institutions had Prepared Contingency Plans by Type of Institution First Administration of Questionnaire.....	50
Table 12	Types of Crisis for Which Institutions had Prepared Contingency Plans by Type of Institution Second Administration of Questionnaire.....	51
Table 13	Types of Crisis for Which Institutions had Prepared Contingency Plans by Size of Institutional Enrollment First Administration of Questionnaire.....	52

Table 14	Types of Crisis for Which Institutions had Prepared Contingency Plans by Size of Institutional Enrollment Second Administration of Questionnaire.....	54
Table 15	Institutions with a Crisis Portfolio by Type of Institution, Size of Institutional Enrollment, and Type of Written Crisis Management Plan First Administration of Questionnaire	57
Table 16	Institutions with a Crisis Portfolio by Type of Institution, Size of Institutional Enrollment, and Type of Written Crisis Management Plan Second Administration of Questionnaire.....	58
Table 17	Phases of Crisis by Type of Written Management Plan First Administration of Questionnaire.....	60
Table 18	Phases of Crisis by Type of Written Management Plan Second Administration of Questionnaire.....	60
Table 19	Phases of Crisis Addressed in Contingency Plans by Type of Written Crisis Management Plan First Administration of Questionnaire	63
Table 20	Phases of Crisis Addressed in Contingency Plans by Type of Written Crisis Management Plan Second Administration of Questionnaire	65
Table 21	Institutions with a Quality Crisis Portfolio by Institutional Type, Size of Institutional Enrollment, and Type of Plan First Administration of Questionnaire.....	71
Table 22	Institutions with a Quality Crisis Portfolio by Institutional Type, Size of Institutional Enrollment, and Type of Plan Second Administration of Questionnaire.....	72
Table 23	Type of Written Crisis Management Plan by Institutional Type and Size of Institutional Enrollment First Administration of Questionnaire	74
Table 24	Type of Written Crisis Management Plan by Institutional Type and Size of Institutional Enrollment Second Administration of Questionnaire	75
Table 25	Crisis Response Coordinators by Type of Plan First Administration of Questionnaire.....	76

Table 26	Crisis Response Coordinators by Type of Plan Second Administration of Questionnaire.....	77
Table 27	Length of Time for Existence of Crisis Management Plans by Type of Plan First Administration of Questionnaire.....	79
Table 28	Length of Time for Existence of Crisis Management Plans by Type of Plan Second Administration of Questionnaire	79
Table 29	Frequency of Crisis Management Plan Review by Type of Plan First Administration of Questionnaire	81
Table 30	Frequency of Crisis Management Plan Review by Type of Plan Second Administration of Questionnaire.....	81
Table 31	How Crisis Management Plans were Communicated by Type of Plan First Administration of Questionnaire.....	82
Table 32	How Crisis Management Plans were Communicated by Type of Plan Second Administration of Questionnaire	83
Table 33	Critical Incident Stress Debriefings Provided to Caregivers by Type of Institution and Enrollment First Administration of Questionnaire	85
Table 34	Critical Incident Stress Debriefings Provided to Caregivers by Type of Institution and Enrollment Second Administration of Questionnaire	86
Table 35	Presence of On-Call or Duty System by Type of Institution and Enrollment First Administration of Questionnaire	87
Table 36	Presence of On-Call or Duty System by Type of Institution and Enrollment Second Administration of Questionnaire.....	88
Table 37	Frequency of Crisis Audit Conducted by Type of Crisis Management Plan First Administration of Questionnaire	89
Table 38	Frequency of Crisis Audit Conducted by Type of Crisis Management Plan Second Administration of Questionnaire.....	90
Table 39	Crisis Management Team Established by Type of Institution & Size of Institutional Enrollment First Administration of Questionnaire	91

Table 40	Crisis Management Team Established by Type of Institution & Size of Institutional Enrollment Second Administration of Questionnaire	92
Table 41	How Individuals are Assigned to Crisis Management Teams by Type of Crisis Management Plan First Administration of Questionnaire	93
Table 42	How Individuals are Assigned to Crisis Management Teams by Type of Crisis Management Plan Second Administration of Questionnaire	94
Table 43	Training Provided to Crisis Management Teams by Type of Crisis Management Plan First Administration of Questionnaire	95
Table 44	Training Provided to Crisis Management Teams by Type of Crisis Management Plan Second Administration of Questionnaire	96
Table 45	Level of Involvement of Stakeholders by Type of Crisis Management Plan First Administration of Questionnaire	101
Table 46	Level of Involvement of Stakeholders by Type of Crisis Management Plan Second Administration of Questionnaire	102
Table 47	Level of Involvement of Stakeholders by Type of Institution First Administration of Questionnaire	104
Table 48	Level of Involvement of Stakeholders by Type of Institution Second Administration of Questionnaire	105
Table 49	Level of Involvement of Stakeholders by Size of Institutional Enrollment First Administration of Questionnaire	107
Table 50	Level of Involvement of Stakeholders by Size of Institutional Enrollment Second Administration of Questionnaire	108
Table 51	Perceived Preparedness by Type of Institution First Administration of Questionnaire	113
Table 52	Perceived Preparedness by Type of Institution Second Administration of Questionnaire	114
Table 53	Perceived Preparedness by Size of Institutional Enrollment First Administration of Questionnaire	115

Table 54	Perceived Preparedness by Size of Institutional Enrollment Second Administration of Questionnaire.....	116
----------	---	-----

List of Appendices

Appendix A	Informed Consent/Invitation to Participate Email	148
Appendix B	Qualitative Interview Questions	152
Appendix C	Institutions in Target Population.....	155
Appendix D	Survey Instrument.....	163
Appendix E	Detailed Data Tables.....	171
Appendix F	Quantitative Data Codebook.....	222
Appendix G	Qualitative Data Codebook.....	229
Appendix H	Example of Coding	231

Chapter I

Introduction

The landscape of higher education changed dramatically on April 16, 2007, when a troubled student killed 32 people on the campus of Virginia Tech University. While a great number of institutions had already developed all-hazards response plans, this single event led to extensive reviews of those plans and substantial modifications that were accompanied by large price tags (Cornell, 2008). Subsequent situations involving active shooters, weather-related disasters, and public relations debacles on campuses have reinforced the sense that no campus is immune to threats targeting the institution's ability to conduct its daily business. Due to the limited scope of fiscal and human resources, small institutions may be more susceptible to struggling with the development of comprehensive plans that address all foreseeable risks to the institution and its programs.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study was to examine current readiness plans of small colleges and universities through the eyes of Senior Student Affairs Officers and to develop recommendations for institutional use. Plans were examined across both institutional size and type to gauge institutional readiness and commonalities were sought in the areas of plan development and maintenance.

Context/Background

All-hazards readiness, more commonly referred to as crisis management, goes beyond fire drills and evacuation plans. While recent campus shootings have garnered unprecedented media coverage, they also represent a very small portion of the risks faced

by colleges and universities on a daily basis. As institutions increased dependence on technology, the number of hazards increased exponentially, ranging from accidental to intentional. While there were a number of plan characteristics that were common across institutional size and type, institutional culture, environment, and program offerings dictated the need for a wide array of unique components that lead to substantial differences from one institution's plan to the next. Zdziarski (2006) noted that institutional crisis management plans typically consisted of basic plans and more specific crisis protocols. Basic plans were to cover the overall purpose of the document, information related to the individuals possessing the authority to activate the plan, and specific details regarding the deployment of resources to address the situation. Crisis protocols were focused on specific responses to the types of crises most likely to be faced by the institution.

Research of the literature demonstrated several camps of thought regarding the stages of crises. The most basic model offered three stages: precrisis, crisis, and postcrisis (Birch, 1994). Fink (1986) offered a four-stage model utilizing medical terminology that included prodromal, acute, chronic, and crisis resolution stages (p. 20). More widely known, the Federal Emergency Management Administration (FEMA) stages included mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery (FEMA, 1996). More specific to the needs of higher education institutions, Zdziarski, Rollo, and Dunkel (2007) offered a five stage cycle of planning, prevention, response, recovery, and learning. For the purpose of this study, the latter model was utilized. Regardless of which model one subscribed to, failure to plan properly in any one of the stages could spell disaster for

institutions that encountered a major hazard. Business continuity issues can go overlooked when institutions are focused on the more human elements of crisis episodes. However, institutional survival may depend on existing plans to minimize the impact of crisis on the fundamental business operations of the institution.

Research Questions

Six research questions provided the foundation for this study.

- Do small colleges and universities address characteristics considered common to all-hazards readiness in their written plans, such as the varying types and phases of crises, systems for managing crises, and stakeholder involvement?
- Do small colleges and universities address characteristics considered common to all-hazards readiness in their written plans differently across institutional size and/or type?
- What types of crises are NASPA member small colleges and universities prepared to respond to?
- Do crisis management systems at NASPA member small colleges and universities address each of the phases of crisis?
- What crisis management systems are in place at small colleges and universities with a NASPA institutional membership?
- Which stakeholders are involved or considered in crisis management at NASPA member small colleges and universities?

Method

The study utilized an explanatory mixed methods design. Initially, an electronic survey of senior student affairs officers serving at institutions enrolling 5,000 students or less, who were designated as voting delegates in the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, was conducted and survey responses were analyzed using survey research methodology. Additionally, five participants drawn from the initial sample were interviewed to glean additional information about the development and maintenance of the crisis management system on their respective campuses.

Definition of Terms

The following terms were used throughout the study:

Crisis—“A crisis is an event, which is often sudden or unexpected, that disrupts the normal operations of the institution or its educational mission and threatens the well-being of personnel, property, financial resources, and/or reputation of the institution” (Zdziarski, 2006, p. 5).

Crisis Management—“Crisis management is thinking about and planning for a wide range of crises and especially for their interactions” (Mitroff, Diamond, & Alpaslan, 2006, p. 62).

Business Continuity—Activity focused on an organization’s ability to continue to perform critical business operations through a period of institutional crisis and beyond.

Senior Student Affairs Officer—The most senior student affairs administrator “with responsibility for coordinating the crisis management activities within a student affairs division at an institution of higher education” (Zdziarski, 2001, p. 6).

Exhaustive Plan—A plan that demonstrates institutional preparation for a wide range of crises, details institutional efforts to recognize issues on the horizon that may pose a threat to institutional operations, delineates the selection and ongoing training of a crisis management team, and demands the involvement of broad ranging stakeholders in the development, operation, and maintenance of the plan (Mitroff et al., 2006).

Effective communication—The clear, consistent, and regular sharing of information with all necessary individuals and organizations.

Testing/tabletop exercises—Simulations designed to emulate situations in which an institution's all-hazards readiness plan must be put to use. Exercises may be done on a very small scale or may be massive in scope.

Small college and universities—Colleges and universities with an enrollment of fewer than 5,000 students.

Assumptions

Colleges and universities have an interest in identifying and planning for the potentially devastating impact of possible crises at the institution.

Senior Student Affairs Officers (SSAOs) selected for participation in this study were knowledgeable of their institution's all-hazards readiness plan, the process through which it was developed, and the efforts required to maintain it.

The SSAOs selected to participate in the study were willing to share the details of their institutional readiness plans.

Delimitations and Limitations

Delimitations. The use of a purposeful sample for this study was a delimitation. While a random sample would provide a more accurate picture of what is happening across the country, the amount of time necessary to obtain accurate contact information for the senior student affairs officers at each institution was problematic.

Another delimitation of the study was the choice to pursue only the student affairs perspective of institutional readiness. Professionals working in academic affairs or fiscal affairs may have provided a different perspective in responding to the survey questionnaire.

A final delimitation to note for this study was that the results are limited to moments in time. Just as April 16, 2007, changed the landscape of readiness planning, the future will undoubtedly be marked by previously unimagined challenges that shake institutions to their core.

Limitations. A limitation of this study was the limited sample size. Significant differences may exist from one institutional readiness plan to the next, depending on the expertise of the individuals responsible for its development and maintenance and the emphasis placed on readiness planning by the senior administration.

An associated limitation was that only NASPA member institutions were invited to participate in the study. Small colleges and universities that do not maintain a membership in NASPA are not represented and results may not be generalizable to them.

Another limitation was that only 19.3% of the sample represented public institutions. While response rates to both administrations of the instrument were

proportional to the sample according to institutional type, caution should exist in generalizing the results to all public small colleges and universities.

The knowledge of the SSAO regarding the all-hazards readiness plan and the associated development process was another limitation of the study. Specific areas of responsibility, organizational structures, financial resources, and the level of individual involvement of SSAOs may vary significantly across institutions.

The results of this study are also limited by the perceptions and beliefs of the SSAOs completing the questionnaire. Their interpretations of written plans may have differed from the actual plan content or intent.

A final limitation of this study was that all individuals participating in phone interviews focused on plan development and maintenance represented private institutions. Their experiences may differ significantly from their peers at public institutions.

Significance

This study has the potential to motivate administrators at small colleges and universities that are struggling with the development or refinement of all-hazards readiness plans to focus on institutional needs for crisis preparedness. Additionally, the results of the study may encourage institutions to evaluate their readiness plans to be certain they have adequately addressed all five stages of the crisis cycle. Just as institutions should learn from the travails of others, plans could be modified as a result of this study.

Organization of the Dissertation

This chapter has provided the purpose statement, discussed the context for the study, detailed the research questions, briefly described the methodology of the study, defined terminology used in the study, acknowledged the assumptions made in the conduct of the study, noted the delimitations and limitations of the study, and discussed the study's significance. Chapter II will review the literature relevant to the study. Chapter III focuses on the research methodology employed including descriptions of the population, instrumentation, data collection procedures, and data analysis. Chapter IV details the data analysis results. Chapter V summarizes the findings and conclusions, makes recommendations for practice, and provides directions for future research.

Chapter II

Review of the Literature

The purpose of this study was to examine current readiness plans of small colleges and universities through the eyes of Senior Student Affairs Officers and to develop recommendations for institutional use. Plans were examined across both institutional size and type to gauge institutional readiness and commonalities were sought in the areas of plan development and maintenance.

A review of the available literature was conducted to explore a number of avenues in support of this work. First, the need for all-hazards planning in higher education was reviewed. Another important foundation for this study was addressing the common elements necessary for more accurate assessment of an institution's readiness for a variety of crises. Additionally, the importance of effective communication through crisis plan development and maintenance was explored. Although they were few, related studies were described to share the scholarly information gathered to date. Lastly, the availability of data related specifically to small colleges and universities and to all-hazards planning in general following the tragedies at Virginia Tech on April 16, 2007, and at Northern Illinois University on February 14, 2008, was addressed.

Need for All-Hazards Planning in Higher Education

While higher education has existed in the United States for a couple of centuries, the field of crisis planning and management is in its relative infancy. Mitroff et al. (2006) pinpointed 1982 as the commonly held beginning of the field in response to Johnson and Johnson's discovery that some of its Tylenol pills were laced with cyanide.

Although the corporate and government sectors took the lead in preparedness planning, higher education has begun to embrace the process required to build such a capacity. Both natural and criminal disasters receiving unprecedented media coverage have caused many to evaluate their institutional position related to crisis preparedness and commit to developing functional plans from an all-hazards approach (Lipka, 2005, p. A28). These evaluations of preparedness over the course of the past decade have revealed just how truly unprepared many are for major crises (Dorn & Dorn, 2007).

College and university campuses have been described as self-contained cities (Kennedy, 2007). While small colleges and universities are not as likely to possess their own utility systems and other infrastructure components as their larger counterparts, they still function to a large degree like a municipality. Not unlike other cities, college and university campuses have the potential for disaster to strike and should expect things to go awry from time to time.

Additionally, just as communities and businesses have a need to be concerned about business continuity issues, colleges and universities have substantial business operations, often massive auxiliary functions, and the obvious educational activities that must be preserved for a return to normal operations as soon as possible after a crisis occurs. The process of designing a business continuity plan is extremely important, even if the plan is never needed. A solid grasp of the full, fiscal picture is necessary and should include a review of existing insurance coverage focused both on facility repair or replacement and on the interruption of normal business operations (Lipka, 2005). The collaboration and interdepartmental communication required to draft continuity plans

force individuals to think in new ways, build confidence in the organization, and reveal areas where improvement is necessary in daily operations (Golden & Oblinger, 2007).

Dorn and Dorn (2007) emphasized the need to resist the urge to focus on only one type of emergency and instead to take an all-hazards approach. They pointed out that institutional objectives in emergency planning are not designed to pacify the media, but to prepare the institution to face the myriad of challenges posed by foreseeable risks present in its environment. Kelsay (2007) added that “to measure the effectiveness of institutions’ crisis management teams’ decisions, universities must consider how these events impact the views of prospective students” (p. 8).

In an effort to guide institutions in their coordination of crisis response, Hephner, Labanc, Krepel, Johnson, and Herrmann (2010) noted,

placing the responsibility for active crisis response in the office of the senior student affairs officer (SSAO) provides a better opportunity for the employment of a comprehensive, team-based approach [and] . . . allows for more timely and complete access to information, resources, and support in a time of crisis. (p. 59)

At the heart of all that is done in academia are the people. The safety of students, faculty, and staff should be of the highest priority throughout an emergency operations plan. In the realm of business continuity, frequently, humans are the most critical backup systems during disasters (Golden & Oblinger, 2007).

Assessing Institutional Readiness

Mitroff et al. (2006) noted that effective crisis management programs focus on four key issues: varying types of crisis; mechanisms for early detection of crisis situations; an interdisciplinary crisis management team; and engagement of appropriate

stakeholders in the development and maintenance of the overall crisis management program (p. 62).

While the literature addressed the concept of crisis typology, researchers have failed to establish a generally-accepted listing of the types of crises. In 2005, Mitroff identified seven major types of crises, each type having several examples associated with it (p. 208). Mitroff et al. (2006, p. 62) provided a list of 14 crisis types most likely to impact colleges and universities. Zdziarski (2001) studied 33 specific types of crises grouped into four broad categories: natural, facility, criminal, and human.

“Administrators need to carefully consider what actions can be taken inside the campus community to reduce the likelihood of a crisis occurring or at least reduce the impact of a crisis should one occur” (Zdziarski et al., 2007, p. 48). Irvine and Millar (1996) noted that a relatively small number of crises arise suddenly, leaving organizations time to detect the incoming crisis and work to minimize its effects or avert the situation altogether (Stereotype #2 section, ¶6). Mitroff (2005) focused on two specific mechanisms for early warning of possible crises, signal detection and probing. Signal detection involved the recognition of factors present in an organization’s environment that should alert leaders to risk. Probing was described as a more intentional act of searching for defects or significant problems buried just below the surface that could erupt at any time (p. 210). Along these lines, colleges and universities were encouraged to conduct a crisis audit, during which time an analysis of likely risks to the institution and their potential impacts would be studied (Rollo & Zdziarski, 2007, p. 75).

The literature revealed numerous references to the critical need for crisis management teams (Fink, 1986; Mitroff, 2005; Mitroff et al., 2006; Mitroff, Pearson, & Harrington, 1996; Sherwood & McKelfresh, 2007; SimpsonScarborough, 2007; Zdziarski, 2006). Crisis management teams were described as multi-disciplinary teams that work well together under pressure that are charged with providing leadership to institutions through all phases of the crisis management process (Mitroff et al., 2006; Zdziarski, 2006). When solid leadership was in place and team roles and operations were clearly defined, crisis management teams were noted as effective tools in the management of crises (Sherwood & McKelfresh, 2007, p. 62). Conversely, Muffet-Willett (2010) shed light on the reality that many leaders have not spent the necessary time in reflection upon the changes in both their roles and their leadership styles from daily institutional operations to periods of institutional crisis. Mitroff et al. (2006) noted the importance of support for the crisis management team from the highest levels of institutional leadership and a need for such planning to be considered fundamental in strategic governance (p. 67).

Several researchers have noted the importance of involving a wide variety of stakeholders, both internal and external, throughout the crisis management process (Duncan & Miser, 2000; Mitroff, 2005; Mitroff et al., 1996; Mitroff et al., 2006; Rollo & Zdziarski, 2007; Zdziarski, 2001, 2006). Mitroff (2005) defined stakeholders as “all those parties, including organizations that affect or are affected by major crises” (pp. 212-213). Stakeholders identified as important for colleges and universities included “students, faculty, staff, parents, governing bodies, regulatory agencies, vendors, and

athletic organizations” (Mitroff et al., 2006, p. 64). Duncan and Miser (2000) specifically noted the value of involving student leaders in the response and recovery stages of crisis situations, given their ability to understand the needs of their peers (p. 469). While stakeholder engagement was described as important throughout the crisis management process, it was viewed as particularly important when conducting crisis audits and in the midst of the crisis response (Rollo & Zdziarski, 2007, p. 75). Fink (1986) identified the media as an extremely influential external stakeholder and pointed out the reality that crisis managers cannot control the media, but they can control, to a degree, the message that is fed to the media regarding the crisis situation (p. 93).

“There is no fill-in-the-blank crisis management plan outline or turnkey software solution that can adequately address the characteristics and culture of the campus community” (Rollo & Zdziarski, 2007, p. 74). Mitroff et al. (2006) suggested that systemic approaches to crisis management were required because both the crises institutions were likely to face and the nature of their impacts were systemic (p. 66).

Importance of Effective Communication

While all the portions of emergency plans are important, none is more critical than an institution’s communication protocols (Dorn & Dorn, 2007; Joly, 2008; Lipka, 2005). Quick and adequate communication focused on target audiences in the midst of crisis situations has been noted as a critical component of college and university crisis preparedness (Alden & Kafer, 2010; Lawson, 2007; Mitroff et al., 2006; Paterson, 2006). Recent crises have demonstrated, in particular, the need for effective web communications for students, faculty, staff, parents, other family members, and the media

as situations unfold and new information needs to be released. Ornate sites are not necessary and should be scrapped for basic, blog-style sites that allow writers and readers to have their needs met in the communication process. Templates for such sites should be designed and tested on a regular basis to ensure their functionality when the time comes (Joly, 2008, p. 62).

Poor communication with stakeholders has served to erode confidence in the administrative capacity of an institution to survive a crisis. Lawson (2007) noted the need for institutions to communicate to all stakeholders that administrators have a system in place to handle crises that arise (p. 106). Focusing specifically on the news media, she noted, “the manner in which an institution responds to media inquiries may make a real difference in how the institution’s responsiveness or professionalism is portrayed to each of its target audiences and the general public” (p. 107). Proper planning for a sizable media presence on campus may help the institution prevent further traumatization of the community in the face of tragedy (Alden & Kafer, 2010).

Paterson (2006) detailed the need for focus on both internal and external communication (p. 32). Technological advances in communication added a plethora of means for crisis managers to communicate with affected audiences, whether media-centered or otherwise. Despite the wide variety of communication tools available for use, Lawson (2007) advised that communication processes be created in advance to maximize the likelihood of timely and appropriate information being shared with stakeholders (p. 99).

Another aspect of the communication protocol involves distribution of and training on the written plans of the institution with all appropriate stakeholders. The quality of a written plan is meaningless if it fails to reach the hands of those charged with carrying out its prescribed work (Golden & Oblinger, 2007, p. 11). LaPorte (2007) recommended ongoing, intensive training for the senior leadership of the institution and others with responsibility for carrying out the written plans.

The objective would be to give members of likely initial response teams a chance to discover their own propensities in the face of very unusual situations and increase their skills at working with novel combinations of institutional and community leaders. (p. 62)

Fink (1986) noted that an organization's chief communicator should always be a part of the crisis management team (p. 96). He went on to say, "no matter how good your crisis management team is, no matter how complete your crisis management plan, if you cannot communicate your message during a crisis, you have failed. And failed needlessly" (p. 96). Duncan and Miser (2000) detailed the need for this individual to have a thorough understanding of the situation, its context, and the response of the institution if he or she was to be effective (p. 459).

Information Regarding Similar Studies

Several studies undertaken in recent years focused on the preparedness of American colleges and universities and administrative perceptions of institutional levels of preparedness (Catullo, 2008; Mitroff, et al., 2006; SimpsonScarborough, 2007; Zdziarski, 2001). However, beyond these studies, very little has been done other than anecdotal pieces reframing the experiences of an individual or institution that recently endured a crisis situation on campus and conveying the lessons learned to colleagues at

other institutions (Brown, 2000; Cavanaugh, 2006). Zdziarski noted in 2001 that “there are no published empirical data to provide an insight into the current state of crisis preparedness in higher education” (p. 6).

To address this shortage of available information, Zdziarski conducted a study in 2001 to “assess the current state of crisis preparedness in higher education from a student affairs perspective” (p. 4). He narrowed his research even further to focus on four critical indicators of preparedness identified by Mitroff et al. (1996), which included the types of crisis an organization prepares for, the phases of a crisis an organization prepares for, the existing systems an organizations has in place to respond to crisis, and the individuals and organizations involved and considered in the preparation of the plans. Utilizing survey research methodology, his study zeroed in on four-year colleges and universities holding institutional membership in the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) with a full-time student enrollment of at least 8,000 students in the Spring 2001 semester.

With research questions tied to the four aforementioned critical indicators of preparedness, Zdziarski (2001) achieved a response rate of nearly 70% of the eligible institutions (p. 49). He found institutional crisis management practices that focused very little on pre-crisis preparation and left institutions in a mode of reacting to situations (pp. 104-105). Even though his study included most of the largest institutions of higher education in the country, he found more than half of survey respondents to be lacking in relation to the quality of their crisis portfolios, meaning they did not adequately address each phase of crisis in contingency plans for the four major categories of crisis (p. 105).

Additionally, Zdziarski (2001) applauded his survey respondents for their establishment of written plans, crisis management teams, and training protocols. However, he found fewer institutions than expected utilizing crisis simulations and tabletop exercises that require institutional officials to practice the written plans (p. 105). In general, several stakeholders were found to be involved on nearly every campus in the preparation and practice of crisis management, while others were very clearly dictated by the unique culture and characteristics of the responding institution.

Lastly, Zdziarski's (2001) survey was targeted at SSAOs and specifically asked them to gauge the preparation level of their divisional staff for responding to the myriad of possibilities that could constitute a crisis on their campuses. The responding SSAOs felt strongly that their staff members were adequately prepared for appropriate and effective response (p. 104).

As noted above, Zdziarski's (2001) work was limited to institutions enrolling more than 8,000 students, so readers should be careful not to generalize results across all institutional sizes. Additionally, responses provided to his research likely contained bias as they merely reflected perceptions of individuals responding and were not independently verified through institutional plan reviews.

Zdziarski (2001) acknowledged a few challenges with the structure and flow of his questionnaire that he would change before utilizing the instrument again (p. 113). And lastly, his work was based on a student affairs perspective that was not confirmed by surveying other senior administrators at the participating institutions. As a result, the reader is encouraged to keep the study's results in the proper context.

Seeking a perspective from individuals outside Student Affairs, Mitroff et al. (2006) conducted a survey of provosts at American colleges and universities during the fall 2004 academic term. Seeking to test the relationship between institutional crisis preparedness and institutional crisis experience, the study revealed that the colleges and universities represented in the survey were primarily only prepared for crises that the institution had already faced (p. 65). Furthermore, survey data exposed the reality that very few of the responding institutions were prepared for a broad range of crisis situations (p. 66). The narrow focus of preparedness led the researchers to also conclude that the institutions' crisis management teams were lacking the recommended breadth of institutional representation from a variety of stakeholder groups (p. 66).

SimpsonScarborough (2007) sought to answer a number of questions related to institutional crisis preparedness. More specifically, SimpsonScarborough explored institutional definitions of "crisis," existence of written crisis plans, testing and review procedures, the types of events addressed in the plans, and individual responsibility for the development and maintenance of the institutional crisis plan (p. 1).

Utilizing a web-based survey, SimpsonScarborough (2007) collected usable data from 93 members of the National Association of Presidential Assistants in Higher Education in the third quarter of 2007 (p. 1). The researchers found that nearly every responding institution had both a written crisis plan and a functioning crisis management team (p. 2). However, the study revealed that only 43% of the institutions had actually tested their written plans in any way (p. 2). They also uncovered that of the institutions testing their plans, one in four were not even testing once per year (p. 2). Additionally,

only 22% of the responding institutions scheduled regular meetings of their crisis management teams at least twice per year (p. 2).

Not surprisingly, SimpsonScarborough's (2007) work pointed out that crisis management plan development and maintenance responsibilities rested with a wide variety of individuals across the participant pool. At just more than half of the participating institutions, the individual responsible for leading the plan development process was also tasked with plan maintenance and operation (p. 2). Although institutional presidents are undoubtedly involved in the selection of the crisis team leader, only 25% of survey respondents noted that their president was likely to turn to this leader for advice when a campus crisis really occurred (p. 3).

When asked to rate the preparedness of their institutions, survey respondents at institutions with written plans averaged a rating of 5.2 on a seven point scale, while institutions without a written plan averaged 4.4 (SimpsonScarborough, 2007). Less than 10% of respondents gauged institutional preparedness as a seven, or very well prepared (p. 3).

The limited sample size of this study, 93 respondents, created difficulties in generalizing its results as representative of the full population of American colleges and universities. Additionally, no information was provided to establish the individuals to whom the survey was given as being highly qualified at their respective institutions to effectively respond to the survey items included. Lastly, the reliability of the results can be questioned as responses were not verified by a review of institutional plans and

practices or by obtaining the perspective of another individual at each participating institution.

In 2008, Catullo worked to build off and replicate Zdziarski's 2001 study. Her focus was on the period of time between the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks and the April 16, 2007 massacre at Virginia Tech. Despite the fact that she was replicating a previous study, Catullo (2008) expanded the population to doctoral granting institutions with residential facilities that had a student population of at least 5,000 students during the spring 2007 semester and held an institutional membership in NASPA (p. 3). She achieved a response rate of 49.4% with 158 senior student affairs officers responding (p. 3). Not unlike Zdziarski, the chief student affairs officers responding to her survey instrument indicated a firm belief that their institutions stood ready to respond effectively to crisis situations (p. 73). However, Catullo summed up her research intent when stating, "there is a deficiency in information regarding how prepared student affairs administrators are today to handle crises at residential universities although there is an increased need for student affairs administrators to be able to measure their level of preparedness" (p. 5).

When drawing the comparison to the 2001 study, Catullo (2008) did not find a statistically significant difference in survey respondents' perceptions of their student affairs divisions' preparedness for crisis (p. 73). However, Catullo did find some changes in the list of most common crisis types for which institutions were prepared. Statistically significant increases from the 2001 study to the 2007 data collection in preparedness

existed for campus evacuations, chemical leaks, data loss or corruption, utility losses, threats of terrorism, and infectious diseases (p. 79).

As it pertained to addressing the three phases of crisis, Catullo (2008) found significant increases had been made in both the number of institutions formally addressing the pre-crisis phase and the number of institutions reporting the existence of a written plan that addressed all three phases of crisis (p. 74). In addition to an increased number of institutions having written plans, the data also revealed a significant increase in the number that had conducted a crisis audit on campus and the number that made their crisis plans available for viewing on the internet (p. 79).

Catullo (2008) found few changes, and none statistically significant, to the composition of university crisis management teams from the 2001 study to her data collection in 2007 (p. 75). However, she did find a significant increase in the number of crisis management teams undergoing training related to the utilization of their crisis plans, including both tabletop exercises and crisis simulations or drills (p. 76).

Both Zdziarski's 2001 study and the work by Catullo in 2008 looked at the involvement of both internal and external stakeholders in university crisis management plans. A number of changes were evident over the passing of six years' time. While Catullo (2008) found no increase in the amount of involvement of external stakeholders, she did note some changes to the list of external stakeholders most likely to be involved in crisis management at the institutions surveyed (p. 76). The Federal Bureau of Investigation, local fire department, state fire marshal, local health department, state health department, state division of mental health, local emergency management officials,

and other local government officials were all more involved in the 2007 survey than were involved in 2001 (p. 78).

The internal stakeholders that were noted as more involved in 2007 than in 2001 were the Vice President of Academic Affairs, Vice President of Administrative Affairs, Environment Health Office, academic deans, Human Resources Office, Student Health Office, and Employee Assistance Program (Catullo, 2008, p. 77).

In an effort to go beyond simply replicating Zdziarski's study, Catullo (2008) also sought to explore differences that existed in the ranking of crisis types based on the demographic characteristics of the participating institutions (p. 6). She found very few significant differences across the demographic characteristics analyzed (p. 78). Not surprisingly, institutions in the southeast were more focused on hurricane preparedness than other geographic regions and those in the Midwest were more prepared for tornadoes. Geography also made a difference in the level of importance placed on and preparedness given to hate crimes issues. Institutions in the northeast and on the west coast focused more on hate crimes than those in the Rocky Mountain region or the Midwest.

Lastly, Catullo (2008) studied "the ratings of preparedness on specific types of crisis differ among institutions who report that they are well-prepared overall versus institutions who report that they are less than well-prepared" (p. 78). Her analysis revealed that the respondent ratings on specific types of crisis were consistent with the overall rating given to the institution's preparedness (p. 79).

Catullo's (2008) work was limited in a number of ways. Perhaps most notably, responses were gathered prior to the tragic shooting rampage at Virginia Tech on April 16, 2007. This event caused Catullo to discontinue her data collection, leaving her with a response rate below 50% (p. 47). This low response rate decreases the validity of the study's results. Because of the magnitude of the situation at Virginia Tech, institutions across the country have been pressed from all sides to redouble efforts to effectively manage crises on campus (Dungy, 2008, p. 44).

Catullo (2008) had no assurance that the Senior Student Affairs Officers responding to her survey in 2007 were the same individuals who responded to the survey put forth in 2001 by Zdziarski. Given that the survey depended on individuals' perceptions, this concern increases the difficulty in making a true comparison in the results from these two separate data collections.

Lastly, readers must be careful in generalizing the results of Catullo's (2008) study as it only reflects the perceptions of the senior student affairs officers responding, not an external review of institutional documents that would be more likely to present a truer picture of institutional preparedness.

Lack of Data Specific to Small Colleges and Universities

While these studies are beneficial to having a better understanding of institutional preparedness levels, it should be noted that Zdziarski (2001) specifically focused on institutions with enrollment exceeding 8000 students. While replicating the Zdziarski study, Catullo (2008) expanded her scope to include institutions with an enrolled student population of at least 5000. One missing piece of the puzzle is clearly the small colleges

and universities with enrollments below 5000 students. Interestingly, NASPA noted that nearly two-thirds of its member institutions are classified as small colleges and universities (NASPA, 2009). Zdziarski (2001) and Catullo (2008) each made use of NASPA for access to survey participants.

Lack of Studies Completed Following Tragedies at Virginia Tech and Northern Illinois

As noted, Catullo's (2008) study focused on the timeframe from the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 to April 15, 2007, the day before the tragic shooting spree at Virginia Tech University. The landscape of higher education disaster planning was altered by these shootings as well as those on February 14, 2008, at Northern Illinois University. With each horrific incident, the scope of the planning required has broadened.

While conducted after the notable tragedies at Virginia Tech and Northern Illinois, Muffet-Willett's (2010) dissertation work on crisis leadership styles concluded that "the frequency of university-wide crisis events makes a difference in crisis preparation activities, and top administrative leadership, accountability, and actual participation in the university crisis management system is imperative to the success of the university crisis management system" (p. 127).

Summary

Though the field of crisis preparedness is rooted in the corporate and government realms, higher education has appropriately added crisis planning to its plate of critical functions. A review of the relevant literature revealed four common elements addressed

by effective crisis management programs: addressing varying types of crises, delineating mechanisms for detecting crisis situations as early as possible, building an interdisciplinary crisis management team, and engaging appropriate stakeholders when developing and maintaining the overall crisis management program. Excellent communication with all stakeholders throughout all phases of crisis management was noted as a must for colleges and universities. Poor communication can lead stakeholders to believe that the institution is faring far worse in the face of crisis than it really is.

Related studies were reviewed and it was noted that little scholarly information exists. No studies were found that pertained to the specific challenges facing small colleges and universities. Additionally, no scholarly work was found to have been conducted following the tragic shootings at Virginia Tech in 2007 and at Northern Illinois University in 2008.

The purpose of this study was to make use of the four common elements of effective crisis management programs noted in the literature review to gauge the current readiness level of small colleges and universities through the lens of the Senior Student Affairs Officer and to develop recommendations for institutional use. Comparing the perceptions of the SSAOs with the identified elements may pinpoint areas in which small colleges and universities can improve their overall readiness for the myriad of crises they could face.

The next chapter focuses on the research methodology employed including descriptions of the population, instrumentation, data collection procedures, and data analysis.

Chapter III

Methodology

The purpose of this study was to examine current readiness plans of small colleges and universities through the eyes of Senior Student Affairs Officers and to develop recommendations for institutional use. Plans were examined across both institutional size and type to gauge institutional readiness, and commonalities were sought in the areas of plan development and maintenance. Explanatory mixed methods design was employed for collecting and reporting data in this study. More specifically, the study utilized survey research methodology to gauge perceptions of senior student affairs officers serving at small colleges and universities. The cross-sectional survey design framework employed emerged from the work of Zdziarski (2001). As a follow-up to the initial administration of the survey, five participants were selected for interviews focused specifically on the development and maintenance of their institutional crisis management systems. Unexpected delays in the research necessitated a second administration of the survey to provide for more recent quantitative data. This chapter provides details on the research population, the survey instrumentation, the procedures employed for collecting data, and the methods used to analyze the data.

Population

The focus of this study was on perceptions of senior student affairs officers serving at small colleges and universities holding institutional membership in NASPA, one of the major national organizations for student affairs professionals (Taylor & von Destinon, 2000). NASPA boasts more than 13,000 members from 29 countries and

eight U.S. Territories (NASPA, 2013). The association's membership is divided among seven geographic regions. Like other professional associations, NASPA utilizes institutional memberships. For governance purposes, each institutional member denotes one individual, usually the most senior student affairs officer, as its voting delegate. Voting delegates participate in association business generated by the Board of Directors that calls for a vote (NASPA, 2007).

The target population was further specified as four-year colleges and universities with a headcount enrollment of 5,000 students or fewer during the fall 2007 academic term and included both public and private institutions. Institutions enrolling more than 5,000 students were studied by Catullo (2008) and institutions of greater than 8,000 students were studied by Zdziarski (2001).

A list of all four-year colleges and universities in the United States enrolling 5,000 or fewer students in the Fall 2007 semester ($N = 2145$) was obtained from the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). Comparing the NCES list and NASPA membership rolls yielded a target population of 487 institutions holding an institutional membership with a voting delegate designated. The target population included 393 (80.7%) private institutions and 94 (19.3%) public institutions. Institutional size comparisons revealed 159 (32.6%) institutions enrolling 1 to 1,500 students, 204 (41.9%) institutions enrolling 1,501 to 3,000 students, and 124 (25.5%) institutions enrolling 3,001 to 5,000 students.

The voting delegates at these 487 NASPA member four-year colleges and universities with a Fall 2007 enrollment of 5,000 or fewer students were asked to participate in this study. The second administration of the survey instrument targeted the NASPA voting delegate or the most senior student affairs officer at the same 487 institutions.

Instrumentation

The survey questionnaire developed by Zdziarski (2001) was utilized with minor modifications. The instrument was divided into three distinct sections. Part one consisted of 14 questions. Twelve of the questions focused on the systems of crisis management utilized by the respondent institutions. One question requested an overall rating of how well prepared respondents felt their student affairs divisions were to respond to crises on campus using a ten-point Likert scale. The remaining question addressed the varying phases of crisis.

Part two of the survey gathered information on the involvement and consideration given in planning to a wide variety of stakeholders. The scaled questions provided five options for respondents to describe the involvement of each stakeholder noted, ranging from representation on the crisis management team to not being significant to planning and response efforts. Respondents could also identify stakeholders that did not exist on their respective campuses.

Part three of the instrument addressed the specific types of crises for which institutions were prepared. Additionally, it requested information regarding the existence of written plans for each type that detail efforts through pre-crisis, crisis, and post-crisis

phases. Zdziarski (2001) built this set of questions around four broad categories of crisis typology: natural, facility, criminal, and human.

Zdziarski (2001) went to considerable lengths to validate the content of the instrument. He detailed the literature employed to justify all the questions in part one. A panel of experts was organized to evaluate the instrument for both validity and clarity and to provide input on which specific crisis types to include. A review of available institutional crisis management plans was conducted to generate items for inclusion on the list of crisis types. Additionally, he conducted a pilot study of ten institutions that would not be surveyed in the formal study. Modifications to the instrument were made as a result of the feedback received in the pilot study. Lastly, based on the high percentage of responding institutions with plans that address each of the crisis types, he concluded that the typology utilized in the study was a true representation of the planning conducted in higher education across the country. The multifaceted approach Zdziarski used included a significant number of the methods recommended by Creswell (2005) for testing validity and reliability.

Five respondents were selected to participate further in the study through telephone interviews. Structured questions were posed to respondents with probes prepared to elicit more detailed information. A list of the questions utilized in the interviews can be found in Appendix B.

Data Collection

For each administration of the survey, a hyperlink to the electronic survey was sent by electronic mail to the 487 voting delegates of the NASPA member institutions in

the population. Institutions in the target population are listed in Appendix C. Voting delegates, typically the SSAOs, are the individuals designated by institutional members of the association to cast votes on behalf of the institution in association business matters. The NASPA membership database was used to gather contact information for each voting delegate. Demographic characteristics of each institution in the population were obtained from the IPEDS.

In accordance with the guidance offered by Dillman (2000), a personalized email was utilized to introduce the research opportunity and urge members to participate in the study. This first contact was sent from the researcher's email address and served as a prenotice of the opportunity to participate in the study. The next day an email was sent from the web survey host, which was SurveyMonkey, to each voting delegate. A hyperlink was embedded to direct participants to the electronic survey. The email addressed the importance of the study, provided a desired date for survey completion, and included instructions regarding the availability of the results of the study. This email, which can be found in Appendix A, also contained the informed consent information, detailing the voluntary nature of the study, the right to withdraw at any time, the purpose of the study, the procedures to be utilized in data collection, the participant rights to ask questions about the study, the confidentiality of responses and participant identity, the risks associated with participation, and information about the investigator (Creswell, 2005, p. 152). Given the electronic delivery of the survey, participation in the study implied consent on the part of the voting delegates. The initial email generated 51

responses during the initial administration of the survey instrument and 57 responses during the second administration.

One week after the first email including the hyperlink was sent, a thank you email was sent directly from the researcher. This note thanked those who had already responded to the survey and served as a reminder of the importance of the research for those who had yet to respond. An additional 37 responses were received following this contact for the initial survey administration and 55 for the second administration.

One week prior to the noted deadline for completion, an email was sent to all who had yet to respond to the survey from the web survey host. Sixteen more responses resulted from this effort for the first administration and 29 during the second. Two days following the stated deadline, a final contact email was sent to non-respondents encouraging them to participate by completing the survey. This final plea generated the final 21 responses of the first survey administration and final 19 of the second administration. These follow-up messages included the embedded hyperlink to the electronic survey.

Of the 487 NASPA voting delegates identified for participation, 125 responded to the survey the first time, yielding a response rate of 25.7%. The second administration yielded a response rate of 32.9%, with 160 respondents. There were 28 voting delegates who declined to participate in the study initially and 3 for the second administration.

Table 1 reports a summary of the responses across the two administrations of the survey.

Table 1

Summary of Survey Respondents

	Initial Email	Thank You	Reminder	Follow-Up	Total Sample	Population	Return %
First Administration	51	37	16	21	125	487	25.7%
Second Administration	57	55	29	19	160	487	32.9%

The demographics of the respondents and the study population are compared in Tables 2 through 4. Comparisons of the percentage of total across both institutional type and size indicated a respondent pool that very closely mirrored the study population. However, some variance was distinguishable when comparing geographically through the use of NASPA's regions. Voting delegates in Region III and Region IV-East responded at a rate slightly higher than their percentage prevalence in the study population in both administrations of the questionnaire and Region IV-West and Region V also responded at a disproportionately high rate. Conversely, voting delegates from Region I and Region II responded at a slightly lower rate than their percentage of prevalence in the study population in the first administration and the rate of response for Region I was again disproportionately low in the second administration. While present, these variances did not appear large enough to result in a biased study.

Telephone interviews were conducted with five selected survey respondents. These individuals were contacted by email to seek their consent to participate in the interview. The interviews were digitally recorded to maximize the opportunity to extract

Table 2

Comparison of Respondents to Population Based on Institutional Type

Enrollment	Respondents to First Administration		Respondents to Second Administration		Population	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Private	97	77.6%	126	78.8%	393	80.7%
Public	28	22.4%	34	21.3%	94	19.3%
Total	125	100.0%	160	100.0%	487	100.0%

Table 3

Comparison of Respondents to Population Based on Enrollment

Enrollment	Respondents to First Administration		Respondents to Second Administration		Population	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1-1500 students	43	34.4%	51	31.9%	159	32.6%
1501-3000 students	51	40.8%	68	42.5%	204	41.9%
3001-5000 Students	31	24.8%	41	25.6%	124	25.5%
Total	125	100.0%	160	100.0%	487	100.0%

Table 4

Comparison of Respondents to Population Based on NASPA Region

Region	Respondents to First Administration		Respondents to Second Administration		Population	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
I (CT, MA, ME, NH, RI, VT)	12	9.6%	8	5.0%	65	13.3%
II (DC, DE, MD, NJ, NY, PA, WV)	22	17.6%	33	20.6%	105	21.6%
III (AL, FL, GA, KY, LA, MS, NC, SC, TN, TX, VA)	32	25.6%	40	25.0%	106	21.8%
IV-East (IA, IL, IN, MI, MN, OH, WI)	29	23.2%	32	20.0%	94	19.3%
IV-West (AR, CO, KS, MO, ND, NE, NM, OK, SD, WY)	12	9.6%	24	15.0%	49	10.1%
V (AK, ID, MT, NV, OR, UT, WA)	11	8.8%	12	7.5%	31	6.4%
VI (AZ, CA, HI)	7	5.6%	11	6.9%	37	7.6%
Total	125	100.0%	160	100.0%	487	100.0%

all usable data obtained. Interview protocols were utilized to record information during the interviews, as recommended by Creswell (2005).

Data Analysis

Data scoring was completed when the instrument was converted to its electronic format by the web surveying software and a codebook was created to track the coding of each specific variable. The codebook can be found in Appendix F. Data input by respondents were validated while the survey was being completed, as invalid answers

were rejected upon entry. However, data input was not validated by any outside source. Participant responses to the survey questionnaire were downloaded from the survey's web host in spreadsheet format. Each column of cells in the spreadsheet corresponded with a specific variable in the electronic questionnaire. Each institution in the target population was assigned an identification number that allowed a connection between the demographic data gleaned from the IPEDS and the survey response data. Survey responses remained confidential and were only reported as summary findings. Data was imported into Excel for descriptive statistical analysis, including frequency tables and comparisons of the means of different data groupings.

The qualitative analysis performed followed the methods offered by Creswell (2005). Recordings from the interviews were transcribed into Word documents to produce the text data required for analysis. The transcriptions were checked against the recordings multiple times to assure accuracy. The text data was then read several times as a means of preliminary exploratory analysis, with notes taken in the margins to begin the process of identifying potential themes and codes. The transcripts were coded into segments of text, organized through the creation of a coding table, and refined until a small number of themes emerged for reporting. The coding table that was developed and an example of coding from one interview can be found in Appendix G and Appendix H, respectively. A narrative discussion followed detailing what was gleaned from the interviews. Member checking was utilized to validate findings from the qualitative portion of this study.

Summary

This chapter reported the research methodology that was utilized in the study, including descriptions of the population, instrumentation, data collection procedures, and data analysis. The next chapter focuses on the results of the data analysis from the two administrations of the questionnaire and the phone interviews.

Chapter IV

Findings

The purpose of this study was to examine current readiness plans of small colleges and universities through the eyes of Senior Student Affairs Officers and to develop recommendations for institutional use. Plans were examined across both institutional size and type to gauge institutional readiness and commonalities were sought in the areas of plan development and maintenance. The study focused on four primary indicators of institutional crisis preparedness: (a) identification of the types of crises addressed by institutional plans, (b) crisis phases addressed by institutional plans, (c) crisis management systems in place, and (d) level of stakeholder involvement in institutional plans.

A questionnaire, developed by Zdziarski (2001), was administered twice to the senior student affairs officer at each of 487 institutions. The first administration occurred in April and May of 2010. The second administration was conducted in December 2012 and January 2013. Additionally, seven respondents were selected following the initial administration of the survey for interviews focused specifically on the development and maintenance of their institutional crisis management systems. Interviews were conducted with five participants by phone in January and February of 2012. All five participants served in the role of Vice President at their respective private institutions. Two additional Senior Student Affairs Officers from public institutions were invited to participate, but did not respond to any of the four attempts at contact. The participant group included three females and two males. Two of the participants served at institutions enrolling 1 to 1500 students, two at institutions enrolling 1501 to 3000

students, and one at an institution enrolling 3001 to 5000 students. The five participants each represented a unique region of NASPA, including Region I (Northeast U.S.), Region II (Middle Atlantic U.S.), Region IV-East (Eastern Middle U.S.), Region IV-West (Western Middle U.S.), and Region VI (Southwest and Pacific U.S.).

Respondents to the questionnaire were asked if their college or university had a written crisis management plan addressing campus crises. Additionally, respondents were asked if their student affairs division had a separate, written crisis management plan addressing campus crises. Tables 5 and 6 report both frequency counts and valid percentages of the institutions responding to these two questions in the two administrations of the questionnaire. In the first administration of the questionnaire, 116 (92.8%) of the 125 institutions submitting usable surveys noted they had at least one of the two identified types of written crisis management plans, while nine (7.2%) institutions indicated having neither type of written crisis management plan. The second administration of the questionnaire produced a total of 154 (96.3%) of the 160 institutions submitting usable surveys noting they had at least one of the two types of written crisis management plans, while six (3.8%) institutions indicated having neither type of written crisis management plan. Of the 116 institutions with a written crisis management plan in the first administration, 111 indicated they had a university crisis management plan and 35 indicated they had a separate student affairs crisis management plan. In the second administration, 151 of the 154 institutions with a crisis management plan indicated they had a university crisis management plan and 43 indicated they had a separate student affairs crisis management plan.

Table 5

Institutions with Written Crisis Management Plans (CMP) First Administration of Questionnaire

		University CMP		Student Affairs CMP		Either Type of Plan	
		Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Valid	Yes	111	93.3%	35	28.5%	116	92.8%
	No	8	6.7%	88	71.5%	9	7.2%
	Total	119	100.0%	123	100.0%	125	100.0%
Missing Values		6		2		0	
Total		125		125		125	

Table 6

Institutions with Written Crisis Management Plans (CMP) Second Administration of Questionnaire

		University CMP		Student Affairs CMP		Either Type of Plan	
		Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Valid	Yes	151	95.0%	43	27.0%	154	96.3%
	No	8	5.0%	116	73.0%	6	3.8%
	Total	159	100.0%	159	100.0%	160	100.0%
Missing Values		1		1		0	
Total		160		160		160	

Because the study focused on the Senior Student Affairs Officer's perceptions of institutional crisis preparedness, respondents were asked to respond to the remaining

questions as they related to their student affairs crisis management plan. If they did not have a written student affairs crisis management plan, then they were asked to respond to the remaining questions as they related only to their university crisis management plan. Respondents at institutions without a written plan of any type were instructed to answer as many of the remaining questions as possible. As such, data were analyzed in three groups for each administration of the questionnaire. The first administration yielded 35 institutions with a student affairs crisis management plan, 81 institutions with only a university crisis management plan, 30 institutions with both plan types, and nine institutions with neither type of plan. The second administration yielded 43 institutions with a student affairs crisis management plan, 111 institutions with only a university crisis management plan, 40 institutions with both plan types, and six institutions with neither type of plan.

This chapter first reports the analysis of the responses to the two administrations of the questionnaire. The descriptive quantitative analysis is broken into five sections. The first four sections reflect the research questions that form the basis of this study:

1. Do small colleges and universities address characteristics considered common to all-hazards readiness in their written plans, such as the varying types and phases of crises, systems for managing crises, and stakeholder involvement?
2. Do small colleges and universities address characteristics considered common to all-hazards readiness in their written plans differently across institutional size and/or type?

3. What types of crises are NASPA member small colleges and universities prepared to respond to?
4. Do crisis management systems at NASPA member small colleges and universities address each of the phases of crisis?
5. What crisis management systems are in place at small colleges and universities with a NASPA institutional membership?
6. Which stakeholders are involved or considered in crisis management at NASPA member small colleges and universities?

The final section of the quantitative analysis addresses the perceived level of preparedness on the part of the institution's student affairs division to respond to campus crisis as noted by respondents.

This chapter concludes with qualitative analysis of the phone interviews conducted with five participants that explored the development and ongoing maintenance of institutional crisis management systems.

In an effort to prevent the reader from being overwhelmed by data, many tables were condensed to address the highlighted data only. However, every table in this chapter can be found in its full form in Appendix E.

Types of Crises

The first of the four primary research questions focused on the types of crises to which NASPA member small colleges and universities were prepared to respond. The questionnaire asked respondents to identify the types of crises for which their institution had created a specific contingency plan. A contingency plan was defined in the

questionnaire as a written procedure or checklist that supplements a basic crisis management plan and addresses unique circumstances or issues for a specific type of crisis. Respondents were provided with a list of 32 types of crises divided across four broad categories of crisis: natural, facility, criminal, and human.

Table 7 reveals the four types of crises for which institutions most frequently reported having prepared contingency plans in the first administration: suicide (73.6%), severe weather (72.8%), fire (72.8%), and sexual assault or rape (72.8%). Each of the four categories of crises is represented in this group.

The four types of crises for which institutions least frequently reported having prepared contingency plans in the first administration were: hurricane (33.6%), kidnapping or abduction (39.2%), earthquake (41.6%), and flood (45.6%).

Table 8 reports the types of crises for which institutions most frequently reported having prepared contingency plans in the second administration: evacuation of buildings (76.9%), sexual assault or rape (76.9%), severe weather (76.3%), and a tie between fire and sexual harassment (75%). Three of the four categories of crisis (natural, facility, and criminal) are represented in this top group of crises.

The four types of crises for which institutions least frequently reported having prepared contingency plans in the second administration were: hurricane (40%), kidnapping or abduction (42.5%), earthquake (48.8%), and domestic abuse (48.8%).

Through both administrations of the questionnaire the frequencies for which contingency plans were prepared for the different types of crises were relatively

Table 7

Types of Crisis for which Institutions Had Prepared Contingency Plans by Category of Crisis Plan First Administration of Questionnaire¹

Types	Student Affairs Plan (N = 35)		University Plan Only (N = 81)		No Plan Indicated (N = 9)		Total (N = 125)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Natural								
Hurricane	13	37.1%	27	33.3%	2	22.2%	42 #	33.6%
Earthquake	16	45.7%	35	43.2%	1	11.1%	52 #	41.6%
Flood	19	54.3%	36	44.4%	2	22.2%	57 #	45.6%
Severe weather	26	74.3%	61	75.3%	4	44.4%	91 *	72.8%
Facility								
Fire	28	80.0%	60	74.1%	3	33.3%	91 *	72.8%
Criminal								
Sexual Assault/Rape	26	74.3%	60	74.1%	5	55.6%	91 *	72.8%
Kidnapping/Abduction	12	34.3%	36	44.4%	1	11.1%	49 #	39.2%
Human								
Suicide	28	80.0%	59	72.8%	5	55.6%	92 *	73.6%

¹ Table 7, expanded, can be seen in Appendix E

* = high frequency

= low frequency

Table 8

Types of Crisis for which Institutions Had Prepared Contingency Plans by Category of Crisis Plan Second Administration of Questionnaire¹

Types	Student Affairs Plan (N = 43)		University Plan Only (N = 111)		No Plan Indicated (N = 6)		Total (N = 160)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Natural								
Hurricane	20	46.5%	42	37.8%	2	33.3%	64 #	40.0%
Earthquake	23	53.5%	53	47.7%	2	33.3%	78 #	48.8%
Severe weather	35	81.4%	83	74.8%	4	66.7%	122 *	76.3%
Facility								
Fire	35	81.4%	81	73.0%	4	66.7%	120 *	75.0%
Evacuation of Buildings	36	83.7%	83	74.8%	4	66.7%	123 *	76.9%
Criminal								
Sexual Assault/Rape	36	83.7%	84	75.7%	3	50.0%	123 *	76.9%
Sexual Harassment	34	79.1%	83	74.8%	3	50.0%	120 *	75.0%
Domestic Abuse	26	60.5%	50	45.0%	2	33.3%	78 #	48.8%
Kidnapping/Abduction	21	48.8%	45	40.5%	2	33.3%	68 #	42.5%

¹ Table 8, expanded, can be seen in Appendix E

* = high frequency

= low frequency

consistent across the two types of written crisis plans. Exceptions in the first administration with discrepancies of greater than 10% were tornado and kidnapping/abduction. Exceptions in the second administration with discrepancies of greater than 10% were explosion, domestic abuse, hate crime, and suicide.

Logic dictates that the geographic location of the responding institutions might influence the frequency with which the institutions prepared for the different types of natural crises. Tables 9 and 10 report both the frequency and percentages for the types of natural crisis that institutions had prepared for by NASPA region. In the first administration, the Midwest regions of NASPA, Region 4W (83.3%) and Region 4E (72.4%), reported the largest percentages of institutions having a contingency plan for tornadoes. In the second administration, Region 4E (84.4%) was outpaced by Region 3 (87.5%), the Southeast region, for the largest percentage of institutions having a contingency plan for tornadoes. The first administration saw hurricane contingency plans reported most frequently in Region 2 (54.5%), followed closely by a tie between Region 1 (50%) and Region 3 (50%). The second administration resulted in hurricane contingency plans being reported most frequently in Region 1 (75%) and Region 3 (75%). Not surprisingly, the west coast regions, Region 5 (63.6%) and Region 6 (57.1%), reported the highest prevalence of institutions with contingency plans for earthquakes in the first administration. This pattern repeated itself in the second administration with Region 6 (72.7%) and Region 5 (66.7%) reporting the largest percentages of institutions with contingency plans for earthquakes. The first administration revealed flood preparation as most prevalent in Region 2 (59.1%), followed closely by a tie between Region 1 (58.3%) and Region 4W (58.3%). The second administration revealed a small change with Region 3 (70%) and Region 1 (62.5%) reporting the highest percentages of institutions with a contingency plan

Table 9

Natural Crisis by NASPA Region First Administration of Questionnaire

Region		Tornado	Hurricane	Earthquake	Flood	Severe Weather	Other
1	Freq.	5	6 *	6	7 *	8	3
(N = 12)	%	41.7%	50.0%	50.0%	58.3%	66.7%	25.0%
2	Freq.	13	12 *	11	13 *	15	5
(N = 22)	%	59.1%	54.5%	50.0%	59.1%	68.2%	22.7%
3	Freq.	21	16 *	11	15	26 *	3
(N = 32)	%	65.6%	50.0%	34.4%	46.9%	81.3%	9.4%
4E	Freq.	21 *	4	8	10	22	0
(N = 29)	%	72.4%	13.8%	27.6%	34.5%	75.9%	0.0%
4W	Freq.	10 *	1	5	7 *	11 *	0
(N = 12)	%	83.3%	8.3%	41.7%	58.3%	91.7%	0.0%
5	Freq.	2	1	7 *	3	6	1
(N = 11)	%	18.2%	9.1%	63.6%	27.3%	54.5%	9.1%
6	Freq.	1	2	4 *	2	3	2
(N = 7)	%	14.3%	28.6%	57.1%	28.6%	42.9%	28.6%
Total	Freq.	73	42	52	57	91	14
	%	58.4%	33.6%	41.6%	45.6%	72.8%	11.2%

* = high frequency

Table 10

Natural Crisis by NASPA Region Second Administration of Questionnaire

Region		Tornado	Hurricane	Earthquake	Flood	Severe Weather	Other
1	Freq.	5	6 *	4	5 *	7 *	2
(N = 8)	%	62.5%	75.0%	50.0%	62.5%	87.5%	25.0%
2	Freq.	18	16	15	16	19	5
(N = 33)	%	54.5%	48.5%	45.5%	48.5%	57.6%	15.2%
3	Freq.	35 *	30 *	21	28 *	37 *	3
(N = 40)	%	87.5%	75.0%	52.5%	70.0%	92.5%	7.5%
4E	Freq.	27 *	5	11	15	27	3
(N = 32)	%	84.4%	15.6%	34.4%	46.9%	84.4%	9.4%
4W	Freq.	19	3	11	12	18	2
(N = 24)	%	79.2%	12.5%	45.8%	50.0%	75.0%	8.3%
5	Freq.	2	2	8 *	3	8	1
(N = 12)	%	16.7%	16.7%	66.7%	25.0%	66.7%	8.3%
6	Freq.	2	2	8 *	5	6	2
(N = 11)	%	18.2%	18.2%	72.7%	45.5%	54.5%	18.2%
Total	Freq.	108	64	78	84	122	18
	%	67.5%	40.0%	48.8%	52.5%	76.3%	11.3%

* = high frequency

prepared for floods. Severe weather contingency plans were reported most frequently in the first administration for Region 4W (91.7%) and Region 3 (81.3%). The second administration's respondents reported severe weather contingency plans with the highest frequency for Region 3 (92.5%) and Region 1 (87.5%).

Frequencies and percentages for the varying types of crisis for which institutions had prepared contingency plans are presented in Tables 11 and 12, broken down by type of institution. With the exception of flood in the first administration, a comparison of the frequencies across every type of crisis respondents were asked to address revealed that private institutions were more likely to have prepared a contingency plan than their counterparts at public institutions. In the first administration, the highest frequency reports for public institutions were severe weather (64.3%), sexual assault or rape (60.7%), student death (60.7%), and six other types of crisis (fire, evacuation of buildings, suicide, emotional/psychological crisis, alcohol/drug overdose, and infectious disease) tied at 57.1%. The highest frequencies for private institutions were for suicide (78.4%), fire (77.3%), sexual assault or rape (76.3%), and evacuation of buildings (76.3%). The second administration produced very similar results for private institutions only. Public institutions reported the highest frequencies for severe weather (70.6%), evacuation of buildings (70.6%), evacuation of campus (67.6%), and sexual assault or rape (67.6%). The highest frequencies for private institutions were for fire (79.4%), sexual assault or rape (79.4%), evacuation of buildings (78.6%), and a tie between severe weather and sexual harassment (77.8%).

Tables 13 and 14 show a comparison of frequencies and percentages of the varying types of crisis for which institutions reported having prepared contingency plans by size of institutional enrollment. A broad scan of the data for the first administration reveals that the smallest institutions, with enrollments ranging from 1 to 1500 students,

Table 11

Types of Crisis for which Institutions Had Prepared Contingency Plans by Type of Institution First Administration of Questionnaire¹

Types	Public (N = 28)		Private (N = 97)		Total (N = 125)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Natural						
Severe weather	18 *	64.3%	73	75.3%	91	72.8%
Facility						
Fire	16	57.1%	75 *	77.3%	91	72.8%
Evacuation of Buildings	16	57.1%	74 *	76.3%	90	72.0%
Criminal						
Sexual Assault/Rape	17 *	60.7%	74 *	76.3%	91	72.8%
Human						
Student Death	17 *	60.7%	73	75.3%	90	72.0%
Suicide	16	57.1%	76 *	78.4%	92	73.6%
Emotional/Psychological Crisis	16	57.1%	70	72.2%	86	68.8%
Alcohol/Drug Overdose	16	57.1%	66	68.0%	82	65.6%
Infectious Disease	16	57.1%	66	68.0%	82	65.6%

¹ Table 11, expanded, can be seen in Appendix E

* = high frequency

Table 12

Types of Crisis for which Institutions Had Prepared Contingency Plans by Type of Institution Second Administration of Questionnaire¹

Types	Public (N = 34)		Private (N = 126)		Total (N = 160)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Natural						
Severe weather	24 *	70.6%	98 *	77.8%	122	76.3%
Facility						
Fire	20	58.8%	100 *	79.4%	120	75.0%
Evacuation of Campus	23 *	67.6%	91	72.2%	114	71.3%
Evacuation of Buildings	24 *	70.6%	99 *	78.6%	123	76.9%
Criminal						
Sexual Assault/Rape	23 *	67.6%	100 *	79.4%	123	76.9%
Sexual Harassment	22	64.7%	98 *	77.8%	120	75.0%

¹ Table 12, expanded, can be seen in Appendix E

* = high frequency

Table 13

Types of Crisis for which Institutions Had Prepared Contingency Plans by Size of Institutional Enrollment First Administration of Questionnaire

Types	1-1500 (N = 43)		1501-3000 (N = 51)		3001-5000 (N = 31)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Natural						
Tornado	28	65.1%	29	56.9%	17	54.8%
Hurricane	13	30.2%	18	35.3%	11	35.5%
Earthquake	23	53.5%	17	33.3%	12	38.7%
Flood	19	44.2%	24	47.1%	14	45.2%
Severe weather	33	76.7%	36	70.6%	22	71.0%
Other	6	14.0%	5	9.8%	4	12.9%
Facility						
Fire	35	81.4%	35	68.6%	21	67.7%
Explosion	29	67.4%	32	62.7%	18	58.1%
Chemical Leak	28	65.1%	35	68.6%	17	54.8%
Evacuation of Campus	25	58.1%	33	64.7%	19	61.3%
Evacuation of Buildings	33	76.7%	37	72.5%	20	64.5%
Corruption/Loss of Computer Data	27	62.8%	27	52.9%	17	54.8%
Other	4	9.3%	4	7.8%	3	9.7%
Criminal						
Homicide	28	65.1%	34	66.7%	19	61.3%
Assault	28	65.1%	33	64.7%	20	64.5%
Sexual Assault/Rape	33	76.7%	37	72.5%	21	67.7%
Sexual Harassment	32	74.4%	35	68.6%	15	48.4%

Table 13 continues

Types	1-1500 (N = 43)		1501-3000 (N = 51)		3001-5000 (N = 31)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Criminal (cont'd)						
Domestic Abuse	20	46.5%	30	58.8%	12	38.7%
Burglary/Robbery	28	65.1%	30	58.8%	13	41.9%
Kidnapping/Abduction	16	37.2%	24	47.1%	9	29.0%
Hate Crime	25	58.1%	31	60.8%	16	51.6%
Terroristic Threat	24	55.8%	27	52.9%	16	51.6%
Vandalism	25	58.1%	29	56.9%	15	48.4%
Other	3	7.0%	5	9.8%	2	6.5%
Human						
Student Death	33	76.7%	36	70.6%	21	67.7%
Faculty/Staff Death	25	58.1%	32	62.7%	17	54.8%
Student Injury	32	74.4%	35	68.6%	18	58.1%
Faculty/Staff Injury	21	48.8%	32	62.7%	17	54.8%
Suicide	34	79.1%	37	72.5%	21	67.7%
Emotional/Psychological Crisis	30	69.8%	36	70.6%	20	64.5%
Missing Person	29	67.4%	37	72.5%	19	61.3%
Alcohol/Drug Overdose	28	65.1%	34	66.7%	20	64.5%
Infectious Disease	29	67.4%	35	68.6%	19	61.3%
Racial Incident	21	48.8%	29	56.9%	16	51.6%
Campus Disturbance/Demonstration	25	58.1%	29	56.9%	17	54.8%
Other	4	9.3%	7	13.7%	2	6.5%

Table 14

Types of Crisis for which Institutions Had Prepared Contingency Plans by Size of Institutional Enrollment Second Administration of Questionnaire

Types	1-1500 (N = 51)		1501-3000 (N = 68)		3001-5000 (N = 41)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Natural						
Tornado	37	72.5%	47	69.1%	24	58.5%
Hurricane	24	47.1%	23	33.8%	17	41.5%
Earthquake	28	54.9%	29	42.6%	21	51.2%
Flood	27	52.9%	36	52.9%	21	51.2%
Severe weather	39	76.5%	55	80.9%	28	68.3%
Other	7	13.7%	6	8.8%	5	12.2%
Facility						
Fire	40	78.4%	54	79.4%	26	63.4%
Explosion	34	66.7%	47	69.1%	23	56.1%
Chemical Leak	33	64.7%	50	73.5%	25	61.0%
Evacuation of Campus	36	70.6%	50	73.5%	28	68.3%
Evacuation of Buildings	37	72.5%	57	83.8%	29	70.7%
Corruption/Loss of Computer Data	26	51.0%	42	61.8%	24	58.5%
Other	4	7.8%	6	8.8%	2	4.9%
Criminal						
Homicide	31	60.8%	45	66.2%	22	53.7%
Assault	32	62.7%	53	77.9%	26	63.4%
Sexual Assault/Rape	39	76.5%	56	82.4%	28	68.3%
Sexual Harassment	39	76.5%	54	79.4%	27	65.9%
Domestic Abuse	23	45.1%	37	54.4%	17	41.5%

Table 14 continues

Types	1-1500 (N = 51)		1501-3000 (N = 68)		3001-5000 (N = 41)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Criminal (cont'd)						
Burglary/Robbery	29	56.9%	43	63.2%	21	51.2%
Kidnapping/Abduction	20	39.2%	30	44.1%	18	43.9%
Hate Crime	31	60.8%	44	64.7%	26	63.4%
Terroristic Threat	28	54.9%	36	52.9%	22	53.7%
Vandalism	27	52.9%	40	58.8%	20	48.8%
Other	6	11.8%	6	8.8%	2	4.9%
Human						
Student Death	39	76.5%	54	79.4%	24	58.5%
Faculty/Staff Death	31	60.8%	43	63.2%	20	48.8%
Student Injury	38	74.5%	48	70.6%	24	58.5%
Faculty/Staff Injury	35	68.6%	42	61.8%	24	58.5%
Suicide	38	74.5%	51	75.0%	28	68.3%
Emotional/Psychological Crisis	36	70.6%	49	72.1%	25	61.0%
Missing Person	32	62.7%	54	79.4%	28	68.3%
Alcohol/Drug Overdose	36	70.6%	46	67.6%	25	61.0%
Infectious Disease	30	58.8%	51	75.0%	27	65.9%
Racial Incident	26	51.0%	45	66.2%	25	61.0%
Campus Disturbance/Demonstration	28	54.9%	42	61.8%	26	63.4%
Other	2	3.9%	4	5.9%	2	4.9%

had prepared contingency plans across the different types of crisis more frequently than the institutions in the middle or largest enrollment groupings. In the second administration the mid-sized institutions, with enrollments ranging from 1501 to 3000

students, most frequently reported the highest likelihood of having prepared a contingency plan for each of the different crisis types.

Tables 15 and 16 report, by type of institution and size of institutional enrollment, the frequencies and percentages of institutions with a crisis portfolio, meaning the institutions had at least one contingency plan in each of the four broad categories of crisis (natural, facility, criminal, and human). In the first administration, 93 (74.4%) of the 125 responding institutions reported having at least one contingency plan in each of the crisis categories. In the second administration, 126 (78.8%) of the 160 responding institutions reported having at least one contingency plan in each of the categories of crisis. The first administration showed that 76 (78.4%) of the 97 responding private institutions and 17 (60.7%) of the 28 public institutions reported having at least one contingency plan in each of the crisis categories. The second administration showed a smaller gap between the two institutional types, with 101 (80.2%) of the 126 private institutions and 25 (73.5%) of the 34 public institutions having at least one contingency plan in each of the categories of crisis. An analysis by enrollment of the institutions reveals that the institutions enrolling 1 to 1500 students (79.1%) were most likely to have at least one contingency plan in each of the categories of crisis in the first administration and the institutions enrolling 1501 to 3000 students (83.8%) were most likely to have at least one contingency plan in each of the categories of crisis in the second administration. Both administrations of the questionnaire resulted in institutions with a written Student Affairs crisis management plan being most likely to have at least one contingency plan in each of the categories of crisis, with 28 (80.0%) of 35 and 36 (83.7%) of 43 respectively.

Table 15

Institutions with a Crisis Portfolio by Type of Institution, Size of Institutional Enrollment, and Type of Written Crisis Management Plan First Administration of Questionnaire

	Crisis Portfolio	
	Freq.	%
Type		
Public	17	60.7%
Private	76 *	78.4%
Total	93	74.4%
Enrollment		
1-1500	34 *	79.1%
1501-3000	38	74.5%
3001-5000	21	67.7%
Total	93	74.4%
Plan		
Student Affairs	28 *	80.0%
University Only	61	75.3%
No plan	4	44.4%
Total	93	74.4%

* = high frequency

Table 16

Institutions with a Crisis Portfolio by Type of Institution, Size of Institutional Enrollment, and Type of Written Crisis Management Plan Second Administration of Questionnaire

	Crisis Portfolio	
	Freq.	%
Type		
Public	25	73.5%
Private	101 *	80.2%
Total	126	78.8%
Enrollment		
1-1500	40	78.4%
1501-3000	57 *	83.8%
3001-5000	29	70.7%
Total	126	78.8%
Plan		
Student Affairs	36 *	83.7%
University Only	87	78.4%
No plan	3	50.0%
Total	126	78.8%

* = high frequency

This focus on the types of crises to which NASPA member small colleges and universities were prepared to respond revealed that institutions had developed exhaustive plans and were prepared for a breadth of crises which they could face. Some differences surfaced between the two administrations of the questionnaire. However, generally

speaking, institutions were balanced in their crisis planning across the four primary categories of crises. The most comprehensive plans were identified as existing at private institutions with 3000 or fewer students, and where a separate student affairs crisis management plan existed.

Phases of Crisis

The second primary research question concentrated on the phases of crisis that crisis management systems at NASPA member small colleges and universities address. The questionnaire asked respondents to indicate which of the phases of crisis (pre-crisis, crisis, and post-crisis) the procedures in their crisis management plans addressed. The pre-crisis phase was defined as actions to take prior to the onset of a crisis, including such things as preventative measures, preparation activities, and ways to detect potential crisis. The crisis phase was defined as actions to take during a crisis event, including such things as activation of response procedures, means of containing a crisis, and steps to resume normal operations. The post-crisis phase was defined as actions to take after a crisis. These actions may include such things as methods for verifying that a crisis has passed, follow-up communications with stakeholders, and mechanisms to revise or improve procedures for the next crisis.

Tables 17 and 18 report the frequencies and percentages of the phases of crisis addressed by type of written crisis management plan for each administration of the questionnaire. Because the question focused specifically on written crisis management plans, institutions reporting they had no written plan were excluded from these analyses. For both administrations of the questionnaire, the crisis phase was the most commonly

Table 17

Phases of Crisis by Type of Written Crisis Management Plan First Administration of Questionnaire

Phases	Student Affairs Plan (N = 35)		University Plan Only (N = 81)		Total (N = 116)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Pre-Crisis	21	60.0%	55	67.9%	76	65.5%
Crisis	31 *	88.6%	75 *	92.6%	106 *	91.4%
Post-Crisis	30	85.7%	62	76.5%	92	79.3%
All Phases	19	54.3%	50	61.7%	69	59.5%

* = high frequency

Table 18

Phases of Crisis by Type of Written Crisis Management Plan Second Administration of Questionnaire

Phases	Student Affairs Plan (N = 43)		University Plan Only (N = 111)		Total (N = 154)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Pre-Crisis	30	69.8%	83	74.8%	113	73.4%
Crisis	40 *	93.0%	104 *	93.7%	144 *	93.5%
Post-Crisis	37	86.0%	87	78.4%	120	77.9%
All Phases	27	62.8%	72	64.9%	99	64.3%

* = high frequency

reported phase addressed, with 106 (91.4%) of 116 institutions and 144 (93.5%) of 154 institutions respectively. In the first administration of the questionnaire, 31 (88.6%) respondents with a written student affairs crisis management plan and 75 (92.6%) respondents with only a written university crisis management plan addressed the crisis phase. In the second administration, 40 (93.0%) respondents with a written student affairs crisis management plan and 104 (93.7%) respondents with only a written university crisis management plan addressed the crisis phase. The pre-crisis phase was the least commonly reported phase addressed across both administrations of the questionnaire. Respondents reported addressing the pre-crisis phase at 76 (65.5%) of the 116 institutions in the first administration, including 21 (60.0%) respondents with a written student affairs crisis management plan and 55 (67.9%) respondents with only a written university crisis management plan. In the second administration, respondents reported addressing the pre-crisis phase at 113 (73.4%) of the 154 institutions, including 30 (69.8%) respondents with a written student affairs crisis management plan and 83 (74.8%) respondents with only a written university crisis management plan. Respondents reported addressing the post-crisis phase at 92 (79.3%) of the 116 institutions in the first administration, including 30 (85.7%) respondents with a written student affairs crisis management plan and 62 (76.5%) respondents with only a written university crisis management plan. In the second administration, respondents reported addressing the pre-crisis phase at 120 (77.9%) of the 154 institutions, including 37 (86.0%) respondents with a written student affairs crisis management plan and 87 (78.4%) respondents with only a written university crisis management plan. Across both administrations of the

questionnaire, more institutions with only a written university crisis management plan reported addressing the pre-crisis and crisis phases, while more institutions with a written student affairs crisis management plan reported addressing the post-crisis phase.

As a means of determining how thorough responding institutions were, the data were also analyzed to reveal the number of institutions that addressed all three phases of crisis in their written crisis management plans. Sixty-nine (59.5%) of the 116 institutions responding to the first administration addressed all three phases of crisis, including 19 (54.3%) institutions with a written student affairs crisis management plan and 50 (61.7%) institutions with a written university crisis management plan only. In the second administration, 99 (64.3%) of the 154 institutions addressed all three phases of crisis in their written procedures, including 27 (62.8%) institutions with only a written student affairs crisis management plan and 72 (64.9%) institutions with only a written university crisis management plan.

As an added measure of the propensity of institutions to address the three phases of crisis, respondents were asked to specifically identify which phases of crisis were addressed in their contingency plans for each different type of crisis. Tables 19 and 20 report the frequencies and percentages for the phases of crisis addressed in the contingency plans by type of written crisis management plan.

In the first administration of the questionnaire, the four types of crisis that institutions most frequently reported having addressed in the pre-crisis phase in their

Table 19

Phases of Crisis Addressed in Contingency Plans by Type of Written Crisis Management Plan First Administration of Questionnaire¹

Types	Student Affairs Plan (N = 35)		University Plan Only (N = 81)		No Plan Indicated (N = 9)		Total (N = 125)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Natural								
Hurricane								
Pre-Crisis	7	20.0%	20	24.7%	2	22.2%	29 #	23.2%
Crisis	12	34.3%	25	30.9%	2	22.2%	39 #	31.2%
Post-Crisis	9	25.7%	21	25.9%	2	22.2%	32 #	25.6%
All Phases	6	17.1%	16	19.8%	2	22.2%	24 #	19.2%
Earthquake								
Pre-Crisis	10	28.6%	25	30.9%	0	0.0%	35 #	28.0%
Crisis	15	42.9%	35	43.2%	1	11.1%	51 #	40.8%
Post-Crisis	13	37.1%	27	33.3%	1	11.1%	41 #	32.8%
All Phases	9	25.7%	22	27.2%	0	0.0%	31 #	24.8%
Flood								
Pre-Crisis	13	37.1%	25	30.9%	2	22.2%	40 #	32.0%
Crisis	18	51.4%	35	43.2%	2	22.2%	55 #	44.0%
Severe weather								
Pre-Crisis	22	62.9%	50	61.7%	4	44.4%	76 *	60.8%
Crisis	25	71.4%	59	72.8%	3	33.3%	87 *	69.6%
Post-Crisis	23	65.7%	51	63.0%	3	33.3%	77 *	61.6%
All Phases	20	57.1%	45	55.6%	3	33.3%	68 *	54.4%

Table 19 continues

Types	Student Affairs Plan (N = 35)		University Plan Only (N = 81)		No Plan Indicated (N = 9)		Total (N = 125)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Facility								
Fire								
Pre-Crisis	23	65.7%	50	61.7%	3	33.3%	76 *	60.8%
Crisis	27	77.1%	58	71.6%	2	22.2%	87 *	69.6%
Post-Crisis	23	65.7%	51	63.0%	2	22.2%	76 *	60.8%
All Phases	21	60.0%	45	55.6%	2	22.2%	68 *	54.4%
Evacuation of Buildings								
Pre-Crisis	21	60.0%	47	58.0%	3	33.3%	71 *	56.8%
Criminal								
Sexual Assault/Rape								
Pre-Crisis	20	57.1%	49	60.5%	4	44.4%	73 *	58.4%
Crisis	25	71.4%	58	71.6%	2	22.2%	85 *	68.0%
Post-Crisis	23	65.7%	52	64.2%	2	22.2%	77 *	61.6%
Domestic Abuse								
Post-Crisis	15	42.9%	28	34.6%	2	22.2%	45 #	36.0%
All Phases	11	31.4%	21	25.9%	2	22.2%	34 #	27.2%
Kidnapping/Abduction								
Pre-Crisis	5	14.3%	22	27.2%	1	11.1%	28 #	22.4%
Crisis	12	34.3%	35	43.2%	0	0.0%	47 #	37.6%
Post-Crisis	10	28.6%	30	37.0%	0	0.0%	40 #	32.0%
All Phases	5	14.3%	21	25.9%	0	0.0%	26 #	20.8%
Terroristic Threat								
Pre-Crisis	9	25.7%	29	35.8%	2	22.2%	40 #	32.0%

Table 19 continues

Types	Student Affairs Plan (N = 35)		University Plan Only (N = 81)		No Plan Indicated (N = 9)		Total (N = 125)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Human								
Student Death								
Post-Crisis	24	68.6%	52	64.2%	4	44.4%	80 *	64.0%
Suicide								
Crisis	27	77.1%	57	70.4%	4	44.4%	88 *	70.4%
Post-Crisis	25	71.4%	53	65.4%	4	44.4%	82 *	65.6%
All Phases	19	54.3%	41	50.6%	4	44.4%	64 *	51.2%

¹ Table 19, expanded, can be seen in Appendix E

* = high frequency

= low frequency

Table 20

Phases of Crisis Addressed in Contingency Plans by Type of Written Crisis Management

Plan Second Administration of Questionnaire¹

Types	Student Affairs Plan (N = 43)		University Plan Only (N = 111)		No Plan Indicated (N = 6)		Total (N = 160)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Natural								
Hurricane								
Pre-Crisis	17	39.5%	26	23.4%	2	33.3%	45 #	28.1%
Crisis	19	44.2%	40	36.0%	2	33.3%	61 #	38.1%
Post-Crisis	18	41.9%	26	23.4%	1	16.7%	45 #	28.1%
All Phases	16	37.2%	23	20.7%	1	16.7%	40 #	25.0%

Table 20 continues

Types	Student Affairs Plan (N = 43)		University Plan Only (N = 111)		No Plan Indicated (N = 6)		Total (N = 160)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Earthquake								
Pre-Crisis	17	39.5%	29	26.1%	1	16.7%	47 #	29.4%
Crisis	22	51.2%	50	45.0%	2	33.3%	74 #	46.3%
Post-Crisis	20	46.5%	30	27.0%	1	16.7%	51 #	31.9%
All Phases	15	34.9%	23	20.7%	1	16.7%	39 #	24.4%
Severe weather								
Pre-Crisis	31	72.1%	66	59.5%	2	33.3%	99 *	61.9%
Crisis	33	76.7%	79	71.2%	4	66.7%	116 *	72.5%
Post-Crisis	29	67.4%	59	53.2%	1	16.7%	89	55.6%
All Phases	26	60.5%	51	45.9%	1	16.7%	78 *	48.8%
Facility								
Evacuation of Buildings								
Crisis	36	83.7%	77	69.4%	4	66.7%	117 *	73.1%
Criminal								
Sexual Assault/Rape								
Pre-Crisis	32	74.4%	66	59.5%	3	50.0%	101 *	63.1%
Crisis	35	81.4%	80	72.1%	3	50.0%	118 *	73.8%
Post-Crisis	33	76.7%	69	62.2%	2	33.3%	104 *	65.0%
All Phases	30	69.8%	59	53.2%	2	33.3%	91 *	56.9%
Sexual Harassment								
Pre-Crisis	30	69.8%	67	60.4%	3	50.0%	100 *	62.5%
Crisis	34	79.1%	79	71.2%	3	50.0%	116 *	72.5%
Post-Crisis	31	72.1%	65	58.6%	2	33.3%	98 *	61.3%
All Phases	29	67.4%	58	52.3%	2	33.3%	89 *	55.6%
All Phases	16	37.2%	23	20.7%	1	16.7%	40 #	25.0%

Table 20 continues

Types	Student Affairs Plan (N = 43)		University Plan Only (N = 111)		No Plan Indicated (N = 6)		Total (N = 160)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Domestic Abuse								
Pre-Crisis	18	41.9%	33	29.7%	1	16.7%	52 #	32.5%
Crisis	25	58.1%	45	40.5%	2	33.3%	72 #	45.0%
Post-Crisis	22	51.2%	32	28.8%	1	16.7%	55 #	34.4%
All Phases	16	37.2%	25	22.5%	1	16.7%	42 #	26.3%
Kidnapping/Abduction								
Pre-Crisis	12	27.9%	25	22.5%	1	16.7%	38 #	23.8%
Crisis	21	48.8%	43	38.7%	2	33.3%	66 #	41.3%
Post-Crisis	19	44.2%	29	26.1%	1	16.7%	49 #	30.6%
All Phases	12	27.9%	18	16.2%	1	16.7%	31 #	19.4%
Human								
Student Death								
Post-Crisis	33	76.7%	60	54.1%	2	33.3%	95 *	59.4%
Suicide								
Pre-Crisis	32	74.4%	61	55.0%	2	33.3%	95 *	59.4%
Post-Crisis	34	79.1%	64	57.7%	2	33.3%	100 *	62.5%
All Phases	31	72.1%	54	48.6%	2	33.3%	87 *	54.4%

¹ Table 20, expanded, can be seen in Appendix E

* = high frequency

= low frequency

contingency plans were: severe weather (60.8%), fire (60.8%), sexual assault or rape (58.4%), and evacuation of buildings (56.8%). In the second administration, the pre-crisis phase was addressed most frequently for sexual assault or rape (63.1%), sexual harassment (62.5%), severe weather (61.9%), and suicide (59.4%).

The crisis phase was reported as being addressed most frequently in the first administration for suicide (70.4%), severe weather (69.6%), fire (69.6%), and sexual assault or rape (69.6%). In the second administration of the questionnaire, respondents reported having addressed sexual assault or rape (73.8%), evacuation of buildings (73.1%), sexual harassment (72.5%), and severe weather (72.5%) most frequently for the crisis phase.

In the first administration of the questionnaire, the four types of crisis that institutions most frequently reported having addressed in the post-crisis phase in their contingency plans were: suicide (65.6%), student death (64.0%), severe weather (61.6%), and fire (60.8%). In the second administration of the questionnaire, the four types of crisis that institutions most frequently reported having addressed the post-crisis phase in their contingency plans were: sexual assault or rape (65.0%), suicide (62.5%), sexual harassment (61.3%), and student death (59.4%).

In the first administration of the questionnaire, the four types of crisis for which institutions most frequently reported having addressed all three phases of crisis in their contingency plans were: severe weather (54.4%), fire (54.4%), sexual assault or rape (52.8%), and suicide (51.2%). In the second administration of the questionnaire, the four types of crisis for which institutions most frequently reported having addressed all three phases of crisis in their contingency plans were: sexual assault or rape (56.9%), sexual harassment (55.6%), suicide (54.4%), and severe weather (48.8%).

In the first administration of the questionnaire, the types of crisis that institutions least frequently reported having addressed in the pre-crisis phase in their contingency

plans were: kidnapping or abduction (22.4%), hurricane (23.2%), earthquake (28.0%), and a tie between flood and terroristic threat (32.0%). In the second administration of the questionnaire, the four types of crisis that institutions least frequently reported having addressed the pre-crisis phase in their contingency plans were: kidnapping or abduction (23.8%), hurricane (28.1%), earthquake (29.4%), and domestic abuse (32.5%).

In the first administration of the questionnaire, the four types of crisis that institutions least frequently reported having addressed in the crisis phase in their contingency plans were: hurricane (31.2%), kidnapping or abduction (37.6%), earthquake (40.8%), and flood (44.0%). In the second administration of the questionnaire, the four types of crisis that institutions least frequently reported having addressed the crisis phase in their contingency plans were: hurricane (38.1%), kidnapping or abduction (41.3%), domestic abuse (45.0%), and earthquake (46.3%).

In the first administration of the questionnaire, the four types of crisis that institutions least frequently reported having addressed the post-crisis phase in their contingency plans were: hurricane (25.6%), kidnapping or abduction (32.0%), earthquake (32.8%), and domestic abuse (36.0%). In the second administration of the questionnaire, the four types of crisis that institutions least frequently reported having addressed the post-crisis phase in their contingency plans were: hurricane (28.1%), kidnapping or abduction (30.6%), earthquake (31.9%), and domestic abuse (34.4%).

In the first administration of the questionnaire, the four types of crisis for which institutions least frequently reported having addressed all three phases of crisis in their contingency plans were: hurricane (19.2%), kidnapping or abduction (20.8%), earthquake

(24.8%), and domestic abuse (27.2%). In the second administration of the questionnaire, the four types of crisis for which institutions least frequently reported having addressed all three phases of crisis in their contingency plans were: kidnapping or abduction (19.4%), earthquake (24.4%), hurricane (25.0%), and domestic abuse (26.3%).

To measure the quality of crisis portfolios existing at responding institutions, data were analyzed to indicate how frequently institutions reported having at least one contingency plan in each of the four categories of crisis that addressed all three phases of crisis. Tables 21 and 22 show the frequencies and percentages of responding institutions reporting the existence of a quality crisis portfolio by type of institution, enrollment, and type of written crisis management plan. In the first administration, private institutions (50.5%) were more likely than public institutions (42.9%) to have a quality crisis portfolio. Across the three enrollment size categories, institutions with 1 to 1500 students (55.8%) were most likely to have a quality crisis portfolio. And when considering the type of written crisis management plan that exists at responding institutions, those with only a written university crisis management plan (51.9%) were most likely to have a quality crisis portfolio. In the second administration, private institutions (50.0%) were more likely than public institutions (41.2%) to have a quality crisis portfolio. Across the three enrollment size categories, institutions with 1501 to 3000 students (51.5%) were most likely to have a quality crisis portfolio. And when considering the type of written crisis management plan that exists at responding institutions, those with a written student affairs crisis management plan (58.1%) were most likely to have a quality crisis portfolio.

Table 21

Institutions with a Quality Crisis Portfolio by Institutional Type, Size of Institutional Enrollment, and Type of Plan First Administration of Questionnaire

	Quality Crisis Portfolio	
	Freq.	%
Type		
Public	12	42.9%
Private	49 *	50.5%
Total	61	48.8%
Enrollment		
1-1500	24 *	55.8%
1501-3000	22	43.1%
3001-5000	15	48.4%
Total	61	48.8%
Plan		
Student Affairs	16	45.7%
University Only	42 *	51.9%
No plan	3	33.3%
Total	61	48.8%

* = high frequency

Table 22

Institutions with a Quality Crisis Portfolio by Institutional Type, Size of Institutional Enrollment, and Type of Plan Second Administration of Questionnaire

	Quality Crisis Portfolio	
	Freq.	%
Type		
Public	14	41.2%
Private	63 *	50.0%
Total	77	48.1%
Enrollment		
1-1500	22	43.1%
1501-3000	35 *	51.5%
3001-5000	20	48.8%
Total	77	48.1%
Plan		
Student Affairs	25 *	58.1%
University Only	51	45.9%
No plan	1	16.7%
Total	77	48.1%

* = high frequency

Concentrating on the phases of crisis that crisis management systems at NASPA member small colleges and universities address demonstrated that responding institutions were most ready for the crisis phase and least prepared for the pre-crisis phase.

Additionally, the time that passed between administrations of the questionnaire allowed

institutions to develop more robust planning across the three phases of crisis.

Respondents at private institutions generally reported more robust crisis management systems, but the two administrations of the questionnaire produced different results for institutional type and enrollment size.

Crisis Management Systems

The third primary research question focused on what crisis management systems were in place at small colleges and universities with a NASPA institutional membership. The questionnaire directed respondents to provide a variety of information regarding the crisis management systems in place at their institutions, focusing on the frameworks and structures utilized to develop and maintain institutional capacity for addressing crises. The series of questions with this focus began with questions about whether or not the institution had a written university crisis management plan addressing campus crises and whether or not the institution's student affairs division had a separate, written crisis management plan addressing campus crises.

Tables 23 and 24 report the frequencies and percentages of each type of written crisis management plan by both type of institution and enrollment. In the first administration of the questionnaire, private institutions (89.7%) were slightly more likely to have a written university plan than public institutions (85.7%). Almost no difference existed between private institutions (27.8%) and public institutions (28.6%) for having a written student affairs plan. In the second administration of the questionnaire, almost no difference existed between private institutions (94.4%) and public institutions (94.1%) for

Table 23

Type of Written Crisis Management Plan by Institutional Type and Size of Institutional Enrollment First Administration of Questionnaire

	University Plan		Student Affairs Plan		Either Type of Written Plan	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Type						
Public	24	85.7%	8 *	28.6%	26	92.9%
Private	87 *	89.7%	27	27.8%	90	92.8%
Total	111	88.8%	35	28.0%	116	92.8%
Enrollment						
1-1500	40	93.0%	8 #	18.6%	41	95.3%
1501-3000	42 #	82.4%	18 *	35.3%	46	90.2%
3001-5000	29 *	93.5%	9	29.0%	29	93.5%
Total	111	88.8%	35	28.0%	116	92.8%

* = high frequency

= low frequency

having a written university plan. However, private institutions (30.2%) were much more likely to have a written student affairs plan than public institutions (14.7%).

The first administration of the questionnaire revealed that institutions with 1501 to 3000 students (82.4%) were the least likely of the enrollment categories to have a written university plan, while institutions with 1 to 1500 students (93.0%) and institutions with 3001 to 5000 students (93.5%) were nearly identical in frequency. Greater disparity

Table 24

Type of Written Crisis Management Plan by Institutional Type and Size of Institutional Enrollment Second Administration of Questionnaire

	University Plan		Student Affairs Plan		Either Type of Written Plan	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Type						
Public	32	94.1%	5	14.7%	33	97.1%
Private	119 *	94.4%	38 *	30.2%	121	96.0%
Total	151	94.4%	43	26.9%	154	96.3%
Enrollment						
1-1500	48	94.1%	14	27.5%	49	96.1%
1501-3000	62 #	91.2%	20 *	29.4%	64	94.1%
3001-5000	41 *	100.0%	9 #	22.0%	41	100.0%
Total	151	94.4%	43	26.9%	154	96.3%

* = high frequency

= low frequency

existed within the reporting of a written student affairs plan. Institutions with 1501 to 3000 students (35.3%) were most likely to have such a plan, followed by institutions with 3001 to 5000 students (29.0%) and institutions with 1 to 1500 students (18.6%). The second administration of the questionnaire showed that every institution with 3001 to 5000 students (100.0%) had a written university plan, while institutions with 1 to 1500 students (94.1%) and institutions with 1501 to 3000 students (91.2%) were not far behind. Institutions with 1501 to 3000 students (29.4%) were most likely to have a

written student affairs plan, followed by institutions with 1 to 1500 students (27.5%) and institutions with 3001 to 5000 students (22.0%).

In line with the two questions already mentioned, respondents were asked to indicate the individual who coordinated the university response to campus crises and, where a written student affairs plan exists, who coordinated the student affairs response to campus crises. Respondents were presented with 12 common university positions and an option of “Other” to choose from for the coordinator of the university response. Additionally, they selected from a list of 7 common student affairs positions and an option of “Other” for the coordinator of the student affairs response. The frequencies and percentages of responses for the coordinator of the university plan and the coordinator of the student affairs plan are shown in Tables 25 and 26.

Table 25

Crisis Response Coordinators by Type of Plan First Administration of Questionnaire

Position	University Plan Only (N = 81)		Student Affairs Plan (N = 35)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
VP Administration/Business Affairs	10 *	12.3%	NA	NA
VP Student Affairs	23 *	28.4%	18 *	51.4%
Chief/Director University Police	13 *	16.0%	2 *	5.7%
Dean of Students	3	3.7%	9 *	25.7%
Other	18 *	22.2%	4 *	11.4%

* = high frequency

Table 26

Crisis Response Coordinators by Type of Plan Second Administration of Questionnaire

Position	University Plan Only (N = 111)		Student Affairs Plan (N = 43)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
VP Administration/Business Affairs	13 *	11.7%	NA	NA
VP Student Affairs	25 *	22.5%	24 *	55.8%
Chief/Director University Police	23 *	20.7%	2 *	4.7%
Dean of Students	5	4.5%	10 *	23.3%
Other	27 *	24.3%	9 *	20.9%

* = high frequency

In the first administration of the questionnaire, the Vice President of Student Affairs was the most likely person to coordinate both the university response (28.4%) and the student affairs response (51.4%). The next most common responses for the university response were “Other” (22.2%), Chief/Director of University Police (16.0%), and Vice President of Administration/Business Affairs (12.3%). A review of the 18 descriptions provided for “Other” reveal very little commonality, but included mid-level managers with student affairs, facilities, or human resources responsibilities, two responses indicating the leadership depends on the nature of the crisis, and four responses noting a position at the institution solely focused on risk management. The second most common response for the student affairs response was Dean of Students (25.7%), followed by “Other” (11.4%) and Chief/Director of University Police (5.7%).

In the second administration of the questionnaire, the most common response for the university response was “Other” (24.3%). A review of the 27 descriptions provided for “Other” revealed a variety of responses, but included six responses noting that a team or committee shares the coordination responsibility, five responses noting a specific position at the institution at the institution focused on risk management, five responses with some variation related to a Director of Campus Security, and four responses indicating the leadership depends on the nature of the crisis. The next most common response was the Vice President of Student Affairs (22.5%), followed by the Chief/Director of University Police (20.7%) and the Vice President of Administration/Business Affairs (11.7%). The Vice President of Student Affairs was the most likely person to coordinate the student affairs response (55.8%). The second most common response for the student affairs response was Dean of Students (23.3%), followed by “Other” (20.9%) and Chief/Director of University Police (4.7%).

Tables 27 and 28 report the frequencies and percentages of valid responses to a question about the length of time for the existence of written crisis management plans by type of plan. In the first administration of the questionnaire, 32 institutions provided a valid response for the length of time their student affairs plan had been in place. Of these 32 institutions, 19 (59.4%) reported having their student affairs plan in place for 1 to 5 years, with only 2 (6.3%) reporting their plan had been in place for 1 year or less. Seventy-six institutions provided a valid response for the length of time their university plan had been in place, with 44 (57.9%) reporting it had been in place for 1 to 5 years.

Table 27

Length of Time for Existence of Crisis Management Plans by Type of Plan First Administration of Questionnaire

	Student Affairs Plan		University Plan Only		Total	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
1 year or less	2 #	6.3%	4 #	5.3%	6	5.6%
1 to 5 years	19 *	59.4%	44 *	57.9%	63	58.3%
5 to 10 years	5	15.6%	20	26.3%	25	23.1%
More than 10 years	6	18.8%	8	10.5%	14	13.0%
Total	32	100.0%	76	100.0%	108	100.0%
Missing Values	3		5		8	
Total	35		81		116	

* = high frequency

= low frequency

Table 28

Length of Time for Existence of Crisis Management Plans by Type of Plan Second Administration of Questionnaire

	Student Affairs Plan		University Plan Only		Total	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
1 year or less	1 #	2.4%	4 #	3.9%	5	3.4%
1 to 5 years	23 *	54.8%	37	35.9%	60	41.4%
5 to 10 years	11	26.2%	50 *	48.5%	61	42.1%
More than 10 years	7	16.7%	12	11.7%	19	13.1%
Total	42	100.0%	103	100.0%	145	100.0%
Missing Values	1		8		9	
Total	43		111		154	

* = high frequency

= low frequency

Only 4 institutions (5.3%) reported their university plan had been in place for 1 year or less. In the second administration of the questionnaire, 42 institutions provided a valid response for the length of time their student affairs plan had been in place. Of these 42 institutions, 23 (54.8%) reported having their student affairs plan in place for 1 to 5 years, with only 1 (2.4%) reporting their plan had been in place for 1 year or less. One hundred three institutions provided a valid response for the length of time their university plan had been in place, with 50 (48.5%) reporting it had been in place for 5 to 10 years. Only 4 institutions (3.9%) reported their university plan had been in place for 1 year or less.

The series of questions continued with respondents being asked to indicate how frequently the crisis management plan is reviewed. Tables 29 and 30 delineate the frequencies and percentages of valid responses for this question by type of written crisis management plan. The first administration of the questionnaire generated 32 valid responses for the student affairs plan and 76 for the university plan. The second administration yielded 42 valid responses for the student affairs plan and 105 valid responses for the university plan. The overwhelming majority of valid responses across both types of plans and both administrations of the questionnaire indicated crisis management plans were reviewed annually. For the first administration, 26 (81.3%) student affairs plan responses noted an annual review, with 59 (77.6%) such responses for the university plan. In the second administration of the questionnaire, 34 (81.0%) institutions responded that their student affairs plan was reviewed annually and 81 (77.1%) institutions indicated their university plan was reviewed annually.

Table 29

Frequency of Crisis Management Plan Review by Type of Plan First Administration of Questionnaire

	Student Affairs Plan		University Plan Only		Total	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Annually	26 *	81.3%	59 *	77.6%	85	78.7%
Every 3 years	3	9.4%	9	11.8%	12	11.1%
Every 5 years	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Other	3	9.4%	8	10.5%	11	10.2%
Total	32	100.0%	76	100.0%	108	100.0%
Missing Values	3		5		8	
Total	35		81		116	

* = high frequency

Table 30

Frequency of Crisis Management Plan Review by Type of Plan Second Administration of Questionnaire

	Student Affairs Plan		University Plan Only		Total	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Annually	34 *	81.0%	81 *	77.1%	115	78.2%
Every 3 years	4	9.5%	6	5.7%	10	6.8%
Every 5 years	1	2.4%	2	1.9%	3	2.0%
Other	3	7.1%	16	15.2%	19	12.9%
Total	42	100.0%	105	100.0%	147	100.0%
Missing Values	1		6		7	
Total	43		111		154	

* = high frequency

Tables 31 and 32 share results of respondents being asked to identify the methods utilized at their institutions for communicating the crisis management plan to members of the campus community by type of plan. Respondents were encouraged to select all of the nine specific options that applied to their institution, with the addition of an “Other” option that provided an opportunity for description.

Table 31

*How Crisis Management Plans were Communicated by Type of Plan First**Administration of Questionnaire¹*

Response	Student Affairs Plan (N = 35)		University Plan Only (N = 81)		Total (N = 116)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Not communicated	3	8.6%	4	4.9%	7	6.0%
Copy of plan available upon request	20 *	57.1%	29 *	35.8%	49	42.2%
Plan accessible on the web	14 *	40.0%	39 *	48.1%	53	45.7%
New employee orientation	11 *	31.4%	23 *	28.4%	34	29.3%
Drills and exercises	26 *	74.3%	46 *	56.8%	72	62.1%

¹ Table 31, expanded, can be seen in Appendix E

* = high frequency

In the first administration of the questionnaire, the most common response given by institutions with a student affairs plan was “drills and exercises” (74.3%), followed by “copy of plan available upon request” (57.1%), “plan accessible on the web” (40.0%), and “new employee orientation” (31.4%). Three institutions (8.6%) reported “not communicated” as their response. The highest frequency response for institutions with a

Table 32

How Crisis Management Plans were Communicated by Type of Plan Second Administration of Questionnaire¹

Response	Student Affairs Plan (N = 43)		University Plan Only (N = 111)		Total (N = 154)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Not communicated	5	11.6%	4	3.6%	9	5.8%
Copy of plan available upon request	25 *	58.1%	50 *	45.0%	75	48.7%
Plan accessible on the web	15 *	34.9%	66 *	59.5%	81	52.6%
Annual notification	15 *	34.9%	34	30.6%	49	31.8%
New employee orientation	10	23.3%	42 *	37.8%	52	33.8%
Required CM training sessions	15 *	34.9%	26	23.4%	41	26.6%
Drills and exercises	32 *	74.4%	66 *	59.5%	98	63.6%

¹ Table 32, expanded, can be seen in Appendix E

* = high frequency

university plan was also “drills and exercises” (56.8%), followed by “plan accessible on the web” (48.1%), “copy of plan available upon request” (35.8%), and “new employee orientation” (28.4%). Four institutions (4.9%) reported “not communicated” as their response.

In the second administration, the most common response given by institutions with a student affairs plan was “drills and exercises” (74.4%), followed by “copy of plan available upon request” (58.1%), and a three-way tie among “plan accessible on the web,” “annual notification,” and “required crisis management training sessions” (34.9%). Five institutions (11.6%) reported “not communicated” as their response. The highest frequency responses for institutions with a university plan were “drills and exercises”

(59.5%) and “plan accessible on the web” (59.5%), followed by “copy of plan available upon request” (45.0%), and “new employee orientation” (37.8%). Four institutions (3.6%) reported “not communicated” as their response.

Recognizing the importance of the mental/emotional health of university caregivers who respond to campus crises, the questionnaire next asked respondents to identify whether or not their institution provided Critical Incident Stress debriefings for these caregivers. Tables 33 and 34 summarize the responses for this question, providing frequencies and percentages of responses by both institutional type and size of institutional enrollment. In the first administration of the questionnaire, public institutions (69.6%) reported providing debriefings at a higher rate than private institutions (53.9%). Additionally, respondents indicated that the likelihood of providing the debriefings increased as institutional size increased. Institutions of 3001 to 5000 students (78.3%) reported providing debriefings at the highest rate, followed by institutions of 1501 to 3000 students (66.0%), and institutions of 1 to 1500 students (35.7%). The second administration yielded slightly different results. Public institutions (50.0%) narrowly outpaced the rate of providing debriefings over private institutions (47.9%). While institutions of 3001 to 5000 students (59.0%) reported providing debriefings at the highest rate, they were followed in the second administration by institutions of 1 to 1500 students (51.0%) and institutions of 1501 to 3000 students (39.7%).

Table 33

Critical Incident Stress Debriefings Provided to Caregivers by Type of Institution and Enrollment First Administration of Questionnaire

	Critical Incident Stress Debriefings for Caregivers					
	Yes		No		Total	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Type						
Public	16 *	69.6%	7	30.4%	23	100.0%
Private	48	53.9%	41	46.1%	89	100.0%
Total	64	57.1%	48	42.9%	112	100.0%
Enrollment						
1-1500	15	35.7%	27	64.3%	42	100.0%
1501-3000	31	66.0%	16	34.0%	47	100.0%
3001-5000	18 *	78.3%	5	21.7%	23	100.0%
Total	64	57.1%	48	42.9%	112	100.0%

* = high frequency

Next, the questionnaire turned attention to the presence of an “On-Call” or “Duty” system at responding institutions. The questionnaire defined an “On-Call” or “Duty” system as a system in which a particular individual is identified as the initial or primary contact to be notified with the responsibility of serving as the initial or primary contact rotating to another individual at specified time intervals (e.g., weekly, monthly, etc.). Tables 35 and 36 provide the frequencies and percentages for responses to this question by institutional type and size of institutional enrollment. Across the two administrations of the questionnaire and both measures, there was little variation in the frequency of respondents noting the presence of such a system. In the first

Table 34

Critical Incident Stress Debriefings Provided to Caregivers by Type of Institution and Enrollment Second Administration of Questionnaire

	Critical Incident Stress Debriefings for Caregivers					
	Yes		No		Total	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Type						
Public	15 *	50.0%	15	50.0%	30	100.0%
Private	58	47.9%	63	52.1%	121	100.0%
Total	73	48.3%	78	51.7%	151	100.0%
Enrollment						
1-1500	25	51.0%	24	49.0%	49	100.0%
1501-3000	25	39.7%	38	60.3%	63	100.0%
3001-5000	23 *	59.0%	16	41.0%	39	100.0%
Total	73	48.3%	78	51.7%	151	100.0%

* = high frequency

administration, private institutions (77.5%) were slightly more likely to report having such a system in place than public institutions (73.9%). Institutions with 1501 to 3000 students (79.2%) reported the highest rate of having an “On-Call” or “Duty” system in place, followed by institutions serving 1 to 1500 students (76.2%) and institutions with 3001 to 5000 students (72.7%). In the second administration, private institutions (77.2%) were slightly more likely to report having such a system in place than public institutions (69.0%). Institutions with 3001 to 5000 students (82.1%) reported the highest rate of having an “On-Call” or “Duty” system in place, followed by institutions serving 1501 to 3000 students (74.6%) and institutions with 1 to 1500 students (72.0%).

Table 35

Presence of On-Call or Duty System by Type of Institution and Enrollment First Administration of Questionnaire

	On-Call or Duty System				Total	
	Yes		No			
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Type						
Public	17	73.9%	6	26.1%	23	100.0%
Private	69 *	77.5%	20	22.5%	89	100.0%
Total	86	76.8%	26	23.2%	112	100.0%
Enrollment						
1-1500	32	76.2%	10	23.8%	42	100.0%
1501-3000	38 *	79.2%	10	20.8%	48	100.0%
3001-5000	16	72.7%	6	27.3%	22	100.0%
Total	86	76.8%	26	23.2%	112	100.0%

* = high frequency

Respondents were also asked to identify whether or not a crisis audit had been conducted on their campus and, if so, to note the frequency with which such an audit had occurred. The crisis audit was defined as the process of assessing the internal and external environment to identify potential crises and determine the impact and probability of various crises occurring. The questionnaire provided “no” as an option and five options, including “Other” with an opportunity for description, for an affirmative response. Respondents were encouraged to select all that applied.

Table 36

Presence of On-Call or Duty System by Type of Institution and Enrollment Second Administration of Questionnaire

	On-Call or Duty System				Total	
	Yes		No		Freq.	%
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%		
Type						
Public	20	69.0%	9	31.0%	29	100.0%
Private	95 *	77.2%	28	22.8%	123	100.0%
Total	115	75.7%	37	24.3%	152	100.0%
Enrollment						
1-1500	36	72.0%	14	28.0%	50	100.0%
1501-3000	47	74.6%	16	25.4%	63	100.0%
3001-5000	32 *	82.1%	7	17.9%	39	100.0%
Total	115	75.7%	37	24.3%	152	100.0%

* = high frequency

Tables 37 and 38 show the frequencies and percentages of each response being selected by type of written crisis management plan. In the first administration of the questionnaire, 27 (21.6%) responding institutions indicated they had not conducted a crisis audit. The most common affirmative response for institutions with a written student affairs plan was “each time the plan is reviewed” (31.4%), followed by “when the plan was originally created” (17.1%). For institutions with a written university plan, the most common affirmative response was “each time the plan is reviewed” (28.4%),

Table 37

*Frequency of Crisis Audit Conducted by Type of Crisis Management Plan First**Administration of Questionnaire*

	Student Affairs Plan (N = 35)		University Plan Only (N = 81)		No Plan Indicated (N = 9)		Total (N = 125)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
No	9	25.7%	18	22.2%	0	0.0%	27	21.6%
When plan was originally created	6 *	17.1%	18 *	22.2%	2	22.2%	26	20.8%
Each time plan is reviewed	11 *	31.4%	23 *	28.4%	0	0.0%	34	27.2%
Annually	4	11.4%	18 *	22.2%	0	0.0%	22	17.6%
Whenever a crisis occurs	4	11.4%	14	17.3%	1	11.1%	19	15.2%
Other	3	8.6%	4	4.9%	2	22.2%	9	7.2%

* = high frequency

followed by “when the plan was originally created” (22.2%) and “annually” (22.2%). In the second administration of the questionnaire, 38 (23.8%) responding institutions indicated they had not conducted a crisis audit. The most common affirmative response for institutions with a written student affairs plan was “each time the plan is reviewed” (32.6%), followed by “whenever a crisis occurs” (25.6%). For institutions with a written university plan, the most common affirmative response was “each time the plan is reviewed” (23.4%), followed by “annually” (20.7%).

Table 38

*Frequency of Crisis Audit Conducted by Type of Crisis Management Plan Second**Administration of Questionnaire*

	Student Affairs Plan (N = 43)		University Plan Only (N = 111)		No Plan Indicated (N = 6)		Total (N = 160)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
No	8	18.6%	26	23.4%	4	66.7%	38	23.8%
When plan was originally created	9	20.9%	17	15.3%	0	0.0%	26	16.3%
Each time plan is reviewed	14 *	32.6%	26 *	23.4%	1	16.7%	41	25.6%
Annually	8	18.6%	23 *	20.7%	0	0.0%	31	19.4%
Whenever a crisis occurs	11 *	25.6%	12	10.8%	0	0.0%	23	14.4%
Other	6	14.0%	13	11.7%	1	16.7%	20	12.5%

* = high frequency

The next subsection of the questionnaire focused on the presence of a committee or team of individuals identified to respond to campus crises. First, respondents were simply asked to indicate whether or not their institution had identified such a committee or team. Tables 39 and 40 show the frequencies and percentages of this question by institutional type and size of institutional enrollment. Across both administrations of the questionnaire there was little difference based upon institutional type. The comparison by enrollment revealed that the likelihood of an affirmative response increased as the institutional enrollment increased. With 113 of the 125 total responding institutions answering this question in the first administration, public institutions (95.7%) were

Table 39

Crisis Management Team Established by Type of Institution & Size of Institutional Enrollment First Administration of Questionnaire

	Crisis Management Team					
	Yes		No		Total	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Type						
Public	22 *	95.7%	1	4.3%	23	100.0%
Private	83	92.2%	7	7.8%	90	100.0%
Total	105	92.9%	8	7.1%	113	100.0%
Enrollment						
1-1500	36	85.7%	6	14.3%	42	100.0%
1501-3000	46	95.8%	2	4.2%	48	100.0%
3001-5000	23 *	100.0%	0	0.0%	23	100.0%
Total	105	92.9%	8	7.1%	113	100.0%

* = high frequency

slightly more likely to have a committee or team than private institutions (92.2%). Every institution with enrollment of 3001 to 5000 students (100.0%) reported having a committee or team established, followed by institutions with 1501 to 3000 students (95.8%) and institutions with 1 to 1500 students (85.7%). With 152 of the 160 total responding institutions answering this question in the second administration, private institutions (96.7%) were slightly more likely to have a committee or team than public institutions (93.3%). Every institution with enrollment of 3001 to 5000 students (100.0%) reported having a committee or team established, followed by institutions with 1501 to 3000 students (96.9%) and institutions with 1 to 1500 students (92.0%).

Table 40

Crisis Management Team Established by Type of Institution & Size of Institutional Enrollment Second Administration of Questionnaire

	Crisis Management Team					
	Yes		No		Total	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Type						
Public	28	93.3%	2	6.7%	30	100.0%
Private	118 *	96.7%	4	3.3%	122	100.0%
Total	146	96.1%	6	3.9%	152	100.0%
Enrollment						
1-1500	46	92.0%	4	8.0%	50	100.0%
1501-3000	62	96.9%	2	3.1%	64	100.0%
3001-5000	38 *	100.0%	0	0.0%	38	100.0%
Total	146	96.1%	6	3.9%	152	100.0%

* = high frequency

Continuing with the theme of the committee or team, respondents were asked to identify how those serving on the committee or team were assigned this membership. The questionnaire directed respondents to identify only one of the six options provided, which included an “Other” with an opportunity for description. Tables 41 and 42 show the frequencies and percentages of valid responses to this question by type of written crisis management plan. In the first administration, 104 of the 125 institutions provided a valid response. For institutions with a written student affairs plan, the most common

Table 41

*How Individuals are Assigned to Crisis Management Teams by Type of Crisis**Management Plan First Administration of Questionnaire*

How Assigned	Student Affairs Plan		University Plan Only		No Plan Indicated		Total	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Self-appointed	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Volunteer	0	0.0%	1	1.4%	0	0.0%	1	1.0%
Appointed by Superior	12 *	41.4%	40 *	56.3%	0	0.0%	52	50.0%
Specified in Job Description	10 *	34.5%	19 *	26.8%	2	50.0%	31	29.8%
Recruited	1	3.4%	4	5.6%	1	25.0%	6	5.8%
Other	6	20.7%	7	9.9%	1	25.0%	14	13.5%
Total	29	100.0%	71	100.0%	4	100.0%	104	100.0%
Missing	6		10		5		21	
Total	35		81		9		125	

* = high frequency

response was “appointed by superior” (41.4%), followed by “specified in job description” (34.5%). The most common responses for institutions with a written university plan were “appointed by superior” (56.3%) and “specified in job description” (26.8%). There were not enough responses from institutions indicating no written plan to make meaningful comparisons. In the second administration, 146 of the 160 institutions provided a valid response. For institutions with a written student affairs plan, the most common response was “appointed by superior” (51.3%), followed by “specified in job description” (30.8%). The most common responses for institutions with a written university plan were

Table 42

*How Individuals are Assigned to Crisis Management Teams by Type of Crisis**Management Plan Second Administration of Questionnaire*

How Assigned	Student Affairs Plan		University Plan Only		No Plan Indicated		Total	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Self-appointed	0	0.0%	1	1.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.7%
Volunteer	0	0.0%	1	1.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.7%
Appointed by Superior	20 *	51.3%	47 *	46.1%	3	60.0%	70	47.9%
Specified in Job Description	12 *	30.8%	29 *	28.4%	0	0.0%	41	28.1%
Recruited	2	5.1%	6	5.9%	1	20.0%	9	6.2%
Other	5	12.8%	18	17.6%	1	20.0%	24	16.4%
Total	39	100.0%	102	100.0%	5	100.0%	146	100.0%
Missing	3		9		1		13	
Total	42		111		6		159	

* = high frequency

“appointed by superior” (46.1%) and “specified in job description” (28.4%). There were not enough responses from institutions indicating no written plan to make meaningful comparisons.

The last of the three questions focused on the committee or team asked respondents to identify the types of training provided to crisis management team members or individuals involved in responding to campus crises. Respondents were provided with a list of 16 choices, including an “Other” option with an opportunity for description, and were encouraged to select all that applied. Tables 43 and 44 display the

Table 43

*Training Provided to Crisis Management Teams by Type of Crisis Management Plan
First Administration of Questionnaire¹*

Training	Student Affairs Plan (N = 35)		University Plan Only (N = 81)		No Plan Indicated (N = 9)		Total (N = 125)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Crisis Management (campus procedures)	28 *	80.0%	64 *	79.0%	4	44.4%	96	76.8%
Crisis Management (general)	25 *	71.4%	41	50.6%	4	44.4%	70	56.0%
Working with Law Enforcement & Emergency Personnel	21 *	60.0%	43 *	53.1%	2	22.2%	66	52.8%
Responding to Civil Disturbance or Demonstration	3 #	8.6%	6 #	7.4%	1	11.1%	10	8.0%
Substance Abuse	11 #	31.4%	19 #	23.5%	2	22.2%	32	25.6%
Grieving Process	12 #	34.3%	11 #	13.6%	0	0.0%	23	18.4%
Orientation to Community & County Agency Assistance	9 #	25.7%	21 #	25.9%	2	22.2%	32	25.6%
Table-top exercises	23 *	65.7%	45 *	55.6%	4	44.4%	72	57.6%
Crisis simulations or drills	19	54.3%	42 *	51.9%	2	22.2%	63	50.4%

¹ Table 43, expanded, can be seen in Appendix E

* = high frequency

= low frequency

frequencies and percentages for responses to this question by type of written crisis management plan.

In the first administration, the four most commonly reported training methods for institutions with a written student affairs plan were: “crisis management (campus

Table 44

*Training Provided to Crisis Management Teams by Type of Crisis Management Plan
Second Administration of Questionnaire¹*

Training	Student Affairs Plan (N = 43)		University Plan Only (N = 111)		No Plan Indicated (N = 6)		Total (N = 160)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Crisis Management (campus procedures)	34 *	79.1%	83 *	74.8%	3	50.0%	120	75.0%
Crisis Management (general)	27 *	62.8%	62 *	55.9%	4	66.7%	93	58.1%
Working with Law Enforcement & Emergency Personnel	24 *	55.8%	54 *	48.6%	4	66.7%	82	51.3%
Responding to Civil Disturbance or Demonstration	3 #	7.0%	7 #	6.3%	1	16.7%	11	6.9%
Substance Abuse	15	34.9%	21 #	18.9%	2	33.3%	38	23.8%
Grieving Process	11 #	25.6%	15 #	13.5%	1	16.7%	27	16.9%
Orientation to Community & County Agency Assistance	7 #	16.3%	26	23.4%	1	16.7%	34	21.3%
Critical Incident Stress Management/Debriefing	14 #	32.6%	24 #	21.6%	2	33.3%	40	25.0%
Table-top exercises	29 *	67.4%	68 *	61.3%	2	33.3%	99	61.9%

¹ Table 44, expanded, can be seen in Appendix E

* = high frequency

= low frequency

procedures)” with 80.0%, “crisis management (general)” with 71.4%, “table-top exercises” with 65.7%, and “working with law enforcement & emergency personnel” with 60.0%. Excluding the one institution reporting “no training provided” and the two institutions reporting “other,” the least commonly reported training methods for institutions with a written student affairs plan were: “responding to civil disturbance or

demonstration” (8.6%), “orientation to community & county agency assistance” (25.7%), “substance abuse” (31.4%), and “grieving process” (34.3%). For institutions with a written university plan, the four most commonly reported training methods were: “crisis management (campus procedures)” with 79.0%, “table-top exercises” with 55.6%, “working with law enforcement & emergency personnel” with 53.1%, and “crisis simulations or drills” with 51.9%. Excluding the one institution reporting “no training provided” and the four institutions reporting “other,” the least commonly reported training methods for institutions with a written university plan were: “responding to civil disturbance or demonstration” (7.4%), “grieving process” (13.6%), “substance abuse” (23.5%), and “orientation to community & county agency assistance” (25.9%).

In the second administration, the four most commonly reported training methods for institutions with a written student affairs plan were: “crisis management (campus procedures)” with 79.1%, “table-top exercises” with 67.4%, “crisis management (general)” with 62.8%, and “working with law enforcement & emergency personnel” with 55.8%. Excluding the one institution reporting “no training provided” and the three institutions reporting “other,” the least commonly reported training methods for institutions with a written student affairs plan were: “responding to civil disturbance or demonstration” (7.0%), “orientation to community & county agency assistance” (16.3%), “grieving process” (25.6%), and “critical incident stress management/debriefing” (32.6%). For institutions with a written university plan, the four most commonly reported training methods were: “crisis management (campus procedures)” with 74.8%, “table-top exercises” with 61.3%, “crisis management (general)” with 55.9%, and

“working with law enforcement & emergency personnel” with 48.6%. Excluding the six institutions reporting “no training provided” and the 11 institutions reporting “other,” the least commonly reported training methods for institutions with a written university plan were: “responding to civil disturbance or demonstration” (6.3%), “grieving process” (13.5%), “substance abuse” (18.9%), and “critical incident stress management/debriefing” (21.6%).

A focus on what crisis management systems were in place at small colleges and universities with a NASPA institutional membership provided an opportunity to assess the frameworks and structures utilized to develop and maintain institutional capacity for addressing crises. Across both types of plans and both administrations of the questionnaire, the Vice President for Student Affairs was consistently the most likely to lead institutional efforts in crisis management. Respondents reported their plans being relatively young with student affairs plans having been in place for one to five years and university plans being existent for one to five years in the first administration and five to ten years in the second administration. Regardless of plan type, respondents shared that crisis management plans were reviewed annually and communicated most frequently through conducting drills and exercises.

Public institutions and institutions enrolling 3001 to 5000 students were most likely to provide for the mental health needs of institutional responders following a crisis incident. On-call structures were reported as being most common at private institutions in both administrations of the questionnaire, while being more prevalent at institutions enrolling 1501 to 3000 students in the first administration and institutions enrolling 3001

to 5000 students in the second administration. Crisis audits were consistently reported across plan types and administrations of the questionnaire to be conducted each time the plan was reviewed. Nearly all participating institutions reported having a crisis management committee made up of individuals most likely appointed by a superior at the institution. Crisis management committees were most frequently reported at institutions enrolling 3001 to 5000 students and receive training on institutional crisis management procedures more frequently than all other training options presented.

Stakeholder Involvement

The last of the four primary research questions addressed which stakeholders were involved or considered in crisis management at NASPA member small colleges and universities. One primary portion of the questionnaire focused on the level of involvement of both internal and external stakeholders in institutional crisis management planning. Stakeholders were defined in the questionnaire as individuals or organizations that were affected by crisis or could affect an institution's ability to respond to a crisis. Respondents were asked to score the involvement of each stakeholder on a five-point scale: (a) stakeholder is represented on the crisis management committee or team; (b) stakeholder is involved in the planning/response as needed; (c) the impact or consequences of the crisis on the stakeholder is routinely considered; (d) stakeholder is not significant to the crisis planning/response process; and (e) does not exist at his/her institution. A list of 22 internal stakeholders and a list of 20 external stakeholders, each with an "Other" option, were provided to respondents. Campus Ministers appear on both the internal and external stakeholder list because of the roles they play across differing

institutional types. Tables 45 and 46 summarize the mean responses for each of the stakeholders represented on the two lists by type of written crisis management plan.

In the first administration of the questionnaire, the internal stakeholders with the lowest mean rating and greatest level of involvement at institutions with a written student affairs plan were: University Relations/PIO ($M = 1.27$, $SD = 0.78$), University Police ($M = 1.37$, $SD = 1.03$), President ($M = 1.43$, $SD = 0.68$), and VP Student Affairs ($M = 1.43$, $SD = 1.22$). The internal stakeholders with the lowest mean rating and greatest level of involvement at institutions with a written university plan were: University Relations/PIO ($M = 1.42$, $SD = 0.93$), Physical Plant ($M = 1.47$, $SD = 0.85$), Residence Life ($M = 1.56$, $SD = 0.95$), and President ($M = 1.70$, $SD = 0.72$).

In the second administration of the questionnaire, the internal stakeholders with the lowest mean rating and greatest level of involvement at institutions with a written student affairs plan were: University Relations ($M = 1.18$, $SD = 0.56$), Physical Plant ($M = 1.40$, $SD = 0.59$), University Police ($M = 1.41$, $SD = 1.09$), and Residence Life ($M = 1.44$, $SD = 0.59$). The internal stakeholders with the lowest mean rating and greatest level of involvement at institutions with a written university plan were: Physical Plant ($M = 1.29$, $SD = 0.58$), University Relations/PIO ($M = 1.46$, $SD = 1.01$), University Police ($M = 1.56$, $SD = 1.29$), and President ($M = 1.65$, $SD = 0.80$).

The external stakeholders with the lowest mean rating and greatest level of involvement at institutions with a written student affairs plan in the first administration were: Local Fire Department ($M = 2.20$, $SD = 0.41$), Local Police/Sheriff ($M = 2.23$,

Table 45

Level of Involvement of Stakeholders by Type of Crisis Management Plan First Administration of Questionnaire¹

Stakeholders	Student Affairs Plan			University Plan Only			No Plan Indicated			Total		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Internal												
President	30	1.43 *	0.68	67	1.70 *	0.72	5	2.40	1.14	102	1.66	0.75
VP Student Affairs	30	1.43 *	1.22	68	1.76	1.40	5	2.60	1.52	103	1.71	1.37
University Police	30	1.37 *	1.03	67	1.82	1.54	6	2.00	1.67	103	1.70	1.42
University Relations/PIO	30	1.27 *	0.78	66	1.42 *	0.93	5	1.60	0.89	101	1.39	0.88
Physical Plant	29	1.62	0.94	68	1.47 *	0.85	6	1.50	0.84	103	1.51	0.87
Residence Life	28	1.50	0.58	66	1.56 *	0.95	6	2.33	1.63	100	1.59	0.92
External												
Local Police/Sheriff	30	2.23 *	0.43	66	2.30 *	0.68	5	2.80	0.84	101	2.31	0.63
Local Fire Department	30	2.20 *	0.41	67	2.22 *	0.67	4	2.75	0.50	101	2.24	0.60
Local Hospitals	30	2.53 *	0.68	67	2.70	0.84	4	2.50	0.58	101	2.64	0.78
Local Health Department	30	2.60	0.89	67	2.69 *	0.99	5	2.40	0.55	102	2.65	0.94
Local Emergency Mgmt.	30	2.37 *	0.61	66	2.38 *	0.87	5	2.40	0.55	101	2.38	0.79

¹ Table 45, expanded, can be seen in Appendix E

* = high involvement

Table 46

Level of Involvement of Stakeholders by Type of Crisis Management Plan Second Administration of Questionnaire¹

Stakeholders	Student Affairs Plan			University Plan Only			No Plan Indicated			Total		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Internal												
President	41	1.73	0.87	99	1.65 *	0.80	6	1.83	1.17	146	1.68	0.83
University Police	41	1.41 *	1.09	96	1.56 *	1.29	6	1.83	1.60	143	1.53	1.24
University Relations/PIO	39	1.18 *	0.56	95	1.46 *	1.01	6	1.83	1.17	140	1.40	0.92
Physical Plant	40	1.40 *	0.59	97	1.29 *	0.58	6	1.67	0.52	143	1.34	0.58
Residence Life	41	1.44 *	0.59	96	1.69	1.15	6	2.17	1.60	143	1.64	1.05
External												
Local Police/Sheriff	39	2.41 *	0.91	98	2.24 *	0.73	5	1.80	0.84	142	2.27	0.79
Local Fire Department	41	2.32 *	0.96	97	2.31 *	0.70	5	2.00	0.71	143	2.30	0.78
Local Hospitals	39	2.85 *	0.93	94	2.68 *	0.81	5	3.40	1.14	138	2.75	0.86
Local Emergency Mgmt.	40	2.48 *	0.96	95	2.52 *	0.85	5	2.00	0.71	140	2.49	0.88

¹ Table 46, expanded, can be seen in Appendix E

* = high involvement

SD = 0.43), Local Emergency Management (M = 2.37, SD = 0.61), and Local Hospitals (M = 2.53, SD = 0.68). For institutions with a written university plan, the external stakeholders with the lowest mean rating and greatest level of institutional involvement were: Local Fire Department (M = 2.22, SD = 0.67), Local Police/Sheriff (M = 2.30, SD = 0.68), Local Emergency Management (M = 2.38, SD = 0.87), and Local Health Department (M = 2.69, SD = 0.99).

The external stakeholders with the lowest mean rating and greatest level of involvement at institutions with a written student affairs plan in the second administration were: Local Fire Department (M = 2.32, SD = 0.96), Local Police/Sheriff (M = 2.41, SD = 0.91), Local Emergency Management (M = 2.48, SD = 0.96), and Local Hospitals (M = 2.85, SD = 0.93). For institutions with a written university plan, the external stakeholders with the lowest mean rating and greatest level of institutional involvement were: Local Police/Sheriff (M = 2.24, SD = 0.73), Local Fire Department (M = 2.31, SD = 0.70), Local Emergency Management (M = 2.52, SD = 0.85), and Local Hospitals (M = 2.68, SD = 0.81).

Tables 47 and 48 summarize the mean responses for both internal and external stakeholders by institutional type. The internal stakeholder with the largest difference in mean responses in the first administration of the questionnaire was the Campus Ministers (Public M = 3.80, SD = 1.32; Private M = 2.85, SD = 1.47), followed by "Other" (Public M = 4.00, SD = 1.29; Private M = 3.46, SD = 1.67), Environmental Health (Public M = 2.74, SD = 1.69; Private M = 3.15, SD = 1.78), and University Police (Public

Table 47

Level of Involvement of Stakeholders by Type of Institution First Administration of Questionnaire¹

Stakeholders	Public			Private			Total		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Internal									
University Police	20	1.45 *	1.23	83	1.76 *	1.46	103	1.70	1.42
Environmental Health	19	2.74 *	1.69	78	3.15 *	1.78	97	3.07	1.76
Campus Ministers	20	3.80 *	1.32	79	2.85 *	1.47	99	3.04	1.48
Other	7	4.00 *	1.29	35	3.46 *	1.67	42	3.55	1.61
External									
FBI	19	4.11 *	0.88	78	3.50 *	1.07	97	3.62	1.06
State Mental Health	20	3.50 *	0.89	79	3.15 *	0.93	99	3.22	0.93
Campus Ministers	20	3.65 *	1.39	82	2.99 *	1.38	102	3.12	1.40
Red Cross	20	2.85 *	0.75	81	3.09 *	1.05	101	3.04	1.00

¹ Table 47, expanded, can be seen in Appendix E

* = high difference in involvement

M = 1.45, SD = 1.23; Private M = 1.76, SD = 1.46). The external stakeholder with the largest difference in mean responses was also Campus Ministers (Public M = 3.65, SD = 1.39; Private M = 2.99, SD = 1.38), followed by FBI (Public M = 4.11, SD = 0.88; Private M = 3.50, SD = 1.07), State Mental Health (Public M = 3.50, SD = 0.89; Private M = 3.15, SD = 0.93), and Red Cross (Public M = 2.85, SD = 0.75; Private M = 3.09, SD = 1.05).

Table 48

Level of Involvement of Stakeholders by Type of Institution Second Administration of Questionnaire¹

Stakeholders	Public			Private			Total		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Internal									
Environmental Health	27	2.70 *	1.75	107	3.32 *	1.82	134	3.19	1.81
Dean of Faculties	26	3.69 *	1.54	105	3.12 *	1.74	131	3.24	1.71
Campus Ministers	28	3.79 *	1.47	112	2.73 *	1.21	140	2.94	1.33
Other	9	4.56 *	1.01	54	3.63 *	1.53	63	3.76	1.50
External									
FBI	26	3.42 *	0.95	111	3.76 *	1.09	137	3.69	1.07
State Health Department	28	2.89 *	0.88	109	3.33 *	0.95	137	3.24	0.95
Local Mental Health	28	2.57 *	0.74	111	2.91 *	0.96	139	2.84	0.93
State Mental Health	28	3.14 *	0.80	108	3.54 *	0.93	136	3.46	0.92
Campus Ministers	28	4.04 *	1.26	112	2.83 *	1.22	140	3.07	1.32

¹ Table 48, expanded, can be seen in Appendix E

* = high difference in involvement

In the second administration, the results were very similar. The internal stakeholder with the largest difference in mean responses was Campus Ministers (Public M = 3.79, SD = 1.47; Private M = 2.73, SD = 1.21), followed by “Other” (Public M = 4.56, SD = 1.01; Private M = 3.63, SD = 1.53), Environmental Health (Public M = 2.70, SD = 1.75; Private M = 3.32, SD = 1.82), and Dean of Faculties (Public M = 3.69, SD = 1.54; Private M = 3.12, SD = 1.74). The external stakeholder with the largest difference in mean responses was also Campus Ministers (Public M = 4.04, SD = 1.26; Private M = 2.83, SD = 1.22), followed by State Health Department (Public

M = 2.89, SD = 0.88; Private M = 3.33, SD = 0.95), State Mental Health (Public M = 3.14, SD = 0.80; Private M = 3.54, SD = 0.93), and a tie between FBI (Public M = 3.80, SD = 1.32; Private M = 2.85, SD = 1.47) and Local Mental Health (Public M = 3.42, SD = 0.95; Private M = 3.76, SD = 1.09).

The final comparison of mean responses for the internal and external stakeholders was performed by size of institutional enrollment. Tables 49 and 50 summarize the mean responses across the two administrations of the questionnaire. The most notable difference in the first administration was the discrepancy across the institutional sizes for the involvement of Environmental Health. The institutions enrolling 1 to 1500 students (M = 3.80, SD = 1.64) were much less likely to involve Environmental Health as an internal stakeholder than institutions with 1501 to 3000 students (M = 2.70, SD = 1.74) and those with 3001 to 5000 students (M = 2.59, SD = 1.68). The second most notable difference was for University Police, with institutions enrolling 1 to 1500 students (M = 2.38, SD = 1.82) less likely to involve University Police as an internal stakeholder than institutions with 1501 to 3000 students (M = 1.29, SD = 0.93) and those with 3001 to 5000 students (M = 1.26, SD = 0.86). The third most notable difference was for Employee Assistance, with institutions enrolling 1 to 1500 students (M = 4.15, SD = 1.18) less likely to involve Employee Assistance as an internal stakeholder than institutions with 1501 to 3000 students (M = 3.08, SD = 1.48) and those with 3001 to 5000 students (M = 3.05, SD = 1.46). And the fourth most notable difference was for Campus Ministers, with institutions enrolling 1 to 1500 students (M = 3.50, SD = 1.47)

Table 49

Level of Involvement of Stakeholders by Size of Institutional Enrollment First Administration of Questionnaire

Stakeholder	1-1500			1501-3000			3001-5000			Total		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Internal												
University Police	39	2.38 *	1.82	41	1.29	0.93	23	1.26 *	0.86	103	1.70	1.42
Environmental Health	35	3.80 *	1.64	40	2.70	1.74	22	2.59 *	1.68	97	3.07	1.76
Employee Assistance	33	4.15 *	1.18	37	3.08	1.48	22	3.05 *	1.46	92	3.46	1.46
Campus Ministers	38	3.50 *	1.47	39	2.54 *	1.41	22	3.14	1.42	99	3.04	1.48
External												
Local Health Department	38	2.89 *	1.06	41	2.61	0.92	23	2.30 *	0.63	102	2.65	0.94
Campus Ministers	38	3.61 *	1.39	41	2.59 *	1.28	23	3.26	1.36	102	3.12	1.40
Red Cross	37	3.05	1.03	41	3.27 *	1.03	23	2.61 *	0.78	101	3.04	1.00
Hometown Alumni Clubs	37	4.19 *	0.84	41	3.76	0.92	23	3.61 *	0.89	101	3.88	0.91

¹ Table 49, expanded, can be seen in Appendix E

* = high difference in involvement

Table 50

Level of Involvement of Stakeholders by Size of Institutional Enrollment Second Administration of Questionnaire

Stakeholder	1-1500			1501-3000			3001-5000			Total		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Internal												
VP Administrative Affairs	46	2.70 *	1.81	60	1.97 *	1.43	32	2.03	1.53	138	2.22	1.61
University Police	46	1.96 *	1.65	62	1.42	1.12	35	1.17 *	0.45	143	1.53	1.24
Environmental Health	43	3.88 *	1.65	58	2.81 *	1.80	33	2.97	1.83	134	3.19	1.81
Employee Assistance	42	3.76 *	1.43	60	3.58	1.32	33	3.03 *	1.57	135	3.50	1.43
External												
State Police	48	3.04	1.07	58	3.26 *	0.98	35	2.63 *	0.94	141	3.03	1.03
State Fire Marshal	45	3.20 *	1.04	58	3.16	0.91	34	2.79 *	1.01	137	3.08	0.99
Local Mental Health	45	2.87	0.99	59	3.00 *	0.96	35	2.54 *	0.70	139	2.84	0.93
Campus Ministers	46	3.22 *	1.40	59	3.15	1.31	35	2.74 *	1.20	140	3.07	1.32

¹ Table 50, expanded, can be seen in Appendix E

* = high difference in involvement

less likely to involve Campus Ministers as an internal stakeholder than institutions with 3001 to 5000 students ($M = 3.14$, $SD = 1.42$) and those with 1501 to 3000 students ($M = 2.54$, $SD = 1.41$).

The most notable difference among external stakeholders in the first administration was the discrepancy across the institutional sizes for the involvement of Campus Ministers. The institutions enrolling 1 to 1500 students ($M = 3.61$, $SD = 1.39$) were much less likely to involve Campus Ministers as an external stakeholder than institutions with 3001 to 5000 students ($M = 3.26$, $SD = 1.26$) and those with 1501 to 3000 students ($M = 2.59$, $SD = 1.28$). The second most notable difference was for the Red Cross, with institutions enrolling 1501 to 3000 students ($M = 3.27$, $SD = 1.03$) less likely to involve Red Cross as an external stakeholder than institutions with 1 to 1500 students ($M = 3.05$, $SD = 1.03$) and those with 3001 to 5000 students ($M = 2.61$, $SD = 0.78$). The third most notable difference was for the Local Health Department, with institutions enrolling 1 to 1500 students ($M = 2.89$, $SD = 1.06$) less likely to involve the Local Health Department as an external stakeholder than institutions with 1501 to 3000 students ($M = 2.61$, $SD = 0.92$) and those with 3001 to 5000 students ($M = 2.30$, $SD = 0.63$). And the fourth most notable difference was for Hometown Alumni Clubs, with institutions enrolling 1 to 1500 students ($M = 4.19$, $SD = 0.84$) less likely to involve Hometown Alumni Clubs as an external stakeholder than institutions with 3001 to 5000 students ($M = 3.76$, $SD = 0.92$) and those with 1501 to 3000 students ($M = 3.61$, $SD = 0.89$).

In the second administration, the institutions enrolling 1 to 1500 students ($M = 3.88$, $SD = 1.65$) were much less likely to involve Environmental Health as an internal stakeholder than institutions with 3001 to 5000 students ($M = 2.97$, $SD = 1.83$) and those with 1501 to 3000 students ($M = 2.81$, $SD = 1.80$). The second most notable difference was for University Police, with institutions enrolling 1 to 1500 students ($M = 1.96$, $SD = 1.65$) less likely to involve University Police as an internal stakeholder than institutions with 1501 to 3000 students ($M = 1.42$, $SD = 1.12$) and those with 3001 to 5000 students ($M = 1.17$, $SD = 0.45$). Two internal stakeholders tied for the third most notable difference. One of these internal stakeholders was Employee Assistance, with institutions enrolling 1 to 1500 students ($M = 3.76$, $SD = 1.43$) less likely to involve Employee Assistance as an internal stakeholder than institutions with 1501 to 3000 students ($M = 3.58$, $SD = 1.32$) and those with 3001 to 5000 students ($M = 3.03$, $SD = 1.57$). The other internal stakeholder tied for the third most notable difference was the Vice President for Administrative Affairs, with institutions enrolling 1 to 1500 students ($M = 2.70$, $SD = 1.81$) less likely to involve the Vice President for Administrative Affairs as an internal stakeholder than institutions with 3001 to 5000 students ($M = 2.03$, $SD = 1.53$) and those with 1501 to 3000 students ($M = 1.97$, $SD = 1.43$).

The greatest difference among external stakeholders in the second administration belonged to State Police. The institutions enrolling 1501 to 3000 students ($M = 3.26$, $SD = 0.98$) were less likely to involve State Police as an external stakeholder than institutions with 1 to 1500 students ($M = 3.04$, $SD = 1.07$) and those with 3001 to 5000

students ($M = 2.63$, $SD = 0.94$). The second most notable difference was for the Campus Ministers, with institutions enrolling 1 to 1500 students ($M = 3.22$, $SD = 1.40$) less likely to involve Campus Ministers as an external stakeholder than institutions with 1501 to 3000 students ($M = 3.15$, $SD = 1.31$) and those with 3001 to 5000 students ($M = 2.74$, $SD = 1.20$). The third most notable difference was for Local Mental Health, with institutions enrolling 1501 to 3000 students ($M = 3.00$, $SD = 0.96$) less likely to involve Local Mental Health as an external stakeholder than institutions with 1 to 1500 students ($M = 2.87$, $SD = 0.99$) and those with 3001 to 5000 students ($M = 2.54$, $SD = 0.70$). And the fourth most notable difference was for the State Fire Marshal, with institutions enrolling 1 to 1500 students ($M = 3.20$, $SD = 1.04$) less likely to involve the State Fire Marshal as an external stakeholder than institutions with 1501 to 3000 students ($M = 3.16$, $SD = 0.91$) and those with 3001 to 5000 students ($M = 2.79$, $SD = 1.01$).

Scoring which internal and external stakeholders were involved or considered in crisis management at NASPA member small colleges and universities in institutional crisis management planning was the focus of one primary portion of the questionnaire. Regardless of plan type, the most frequently involved internal stakeholder was reported as University Relations and the local fire department was the most frequently involved external stakeholder. When comparing stakeholder involvement across institutional types, respondents noted campus ministers as both the internal and external stakeholder most likely to be involved differently at public institutions than at private institutions. Across the three established categories of institutional enrollment size, Environmental Health was noted in both administrations of the questionnaire as the internal stakeholder

most likely to be utilized differently. The external stakeholder noted as most likely to be involved differently was campus ministers for the first administration and state police for the second administration.

Perceived Preparedness

In an effort to get at the heart of this study, respondents were asked to indicate how prepared their student affairs division was to respond to campus crises. A scale of one to ten, with one representing unprepared and ten representing well prepared, was utilized. Tables 51 and 52 show the frequencies, valid percentages, means, and standard deviations for the ratings of perceived preparedness by institutional type.

In the first administration, 122 valid responses were collected with an overall mean rating of 7.57 (SD = 1.57). Responses were in the range of 3 to 10. Private institutions (N = 94, M = 7.59, SD = 1.55) had a slightly higher mean rating than public institutions (N = 28, M = 7.50, SD = 1.67). In the second administration, 157 valid responses were collected with an overall mean rating of 7.45 (SD = 1.49). Responses ranged from a low of 2 to a high of 10. Again, private institutions (N = 123, M = 7.48, SD = 1.47) had a slightly higher mean rating than public institutions (N = 34, M = 7.32, SD = 1.57).

Respondents in the first administration scored the preparedness of their student affairs division to respond to campus crises with a rating of eight or higher 60.6% of the time, with private institutions (62.8%) exuding this confidence at a higher rate than public institutions (53.6%). In the second administration of the questionnaire, 53.5% of

Table 51

Perceived Preparedness by Type of Institution First Administration of Questionnaire

Preparedness Rating	Public		Private		Total	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
3	1	3.6%	2	2.1%	3	2.5%
4	0	0.0%	2	2.1%	2	1.6%
5	3	10.7%	8	8.5%	11	9.0%
6	1	3.6%	6	6.4%	7	5.7%
7	8	28.6%	17	18.1%	25	20.5%
8	9	32.1%	33	35.1%	42	34.4%
9	2	7.1%	20	21.3%	22	18.0%
10	4	14.3%	6	6.4%	10	8.2%
Total	28	100.0%	94	100.0%	122	100.0%
Missing	0		3		3	
M	7.50		7.59 *		7.57	
SD	1.67		1.55		1.57	

* = high rating

Table 52

Perceived Preparedness by Type of Institution Second Administration of Questionnaire

Preparedness Rating	Public		Private		Total	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
2	1	2.9%	1	0.8%	2	1.3%
3	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
4	0	0.0%	1	0.8%	1	0.6%
5	4	11.8%	13	10.6%	17	10.8%
6	2	5.9%	11	8.9%	13	8.3%
7	9	26.5%	31	25.2%	40	25.5%
8	10	29.4%	36	29.3%	46	29.3%
9	8	23.5%	22	17.9%	30	19.1%
10	0	0.0%	8	6.5%	8	5.1%
Total	34	100.0%	123	100.0%	157	100.0%
Missing	0		3		3	
M	7.32		7.48 *		7.45	
SD	1.57		1.47		1.49	

* = high rating

respondents scored the preparedness of their student affairs division to respond to campus crises with a rating of eight or higher, with private institutions (53.7%) narrowly outpacing public institutions (52.9).

Tables 53 and 54 also focus on the perceived preparedness question and provide frequencies, valid percentages, means, and standard deviations for the ratings of perceived preparedness by size of institutional enrollment. In the first administration of

Table 53

Perceived Preparedness by Size of Institutional Enrollment First Administration of Questionnaire

Preparedness Rating	1-1500		1501-3000		3001-5000		Total	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
3	1	2.3%	1	2.0%	1	3.3%	3	2.5%
4	1	2.3%	1	2.0%	0	0.0%	2	1.6%
5	4	9.3%	3	6.1%	4	13.3%	11	9.0%
6	4	9.3%	2	4.1%	1	3.3%	7	5.7%
7	7	16.3%	13	26.5%	5	16.7%	25	20.5%
8	17	39.5%	17	34.7%	8	26.7%	42	34.4%
9	8	18.6%	8	16.3%	6	20.0%	22	18.0%
10	1	2.3%	4	8.2%	5	16.7%	10	8.2%
Total	43	100.0%	49	100.0%	30	100.0%	122	100.0%
Missing	0		2		1		3	
M	7.40		7.61		7.73 *		7.57	
SD	1.51		1.48		1.80		1.57	

* = high rating

Table 54

Perceived Preparedness by Size of Institutional Enrollment Second Administration of Questionnaire

Preparedness Rating	1-1500		1501-3000		3001-5000		Total	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
2	1	2.0%	1	1.5%	0	0.0%	2	1.3%
3	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
4	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	2.4%	1	0.6%
5	9	18.0%	5	7.6%	3	7.3%	17	10.8%
6	4	8.0%	7	10.6%	2	4.9%	13	8.3%
7	14	28.0%	18	27.3%	8	19.5%	40	25.5%
8	15	30.0%	20	30.3%	11	26.8%	46	29.3%
9	5	10.0%	12	18.2%	13	31.7%	30	19.1%
10	2	4.0%	3	4.5%	3	7.3%	8	5.1%
Total	50	100.0%	66	100.0%	41	100.0%	157	100.0%
Missing	1		2		0		3	
M	7.08		7.47		7.85 *		7.45	
SD	1.55		1.43		1.44		1.49	

* = high rating

the questionnaire, the highest mean rating of perceived preparedness was reported by institutions enrolling 3001 to 5000 students (N = 30, M = 7.73, SD = 1.80), followed by institutions enrolling 1501 to 3000 students (N = 49, M = 7.61, SD = 1.48), and finally institutions enrolling 1 to 1500 students (N = 43, M = 7.40, SD = 1.51). For the second administration, the highest mean rating of perceived preparedness was reported by institutions enrolling 3001 to 5000 students (N = 41, M = 7.85, SD = 1.44), followed by

institutions enrolling 1501 to 3000 students ($N = 66$, $M = 7.47$, $SD = 1.43$), and finally institutions enrolling 1 to 1500 students ($N = 50$, $M = 7.08$, $SD = 1.55$).

Respondents in the first administration scored the preparedness of their student affairs division to respond to campus crises with a rating of eight or higher most frequently at institutions enrolling 3001 to 5000 students (63.3%), followed by institutions enrolling 1 to 1500 students (60.5%) and institutions enrolling 1501 to 3000 students (59.2%). In the second administration of the questionnaire, respondents most frequently scored the preparedness of their student affairs division to respond to campus crises with a rating of eight or higher at institutions enrolling 3001 to 5000 students (65.9%), followed by institutions enrolling 1501 to 3000 students (53.0%) and institutions enrolling 1 to 1500 students (44.0%).

This analysis of the respondents' perceptions of the preparedness of their respective institutions to respond to campus crises revealed that respondents at private institutions were more confident than their public institution counterparts. Additionally, respondents at institutions enrolling 3001 to 5000 students recorded the highest mean rating of perceived preparedness across the three distinct enrollment categories of small colleges and universities.

Plan Development and Maintenance: Results of Interviews

Seven respondents to the initial administration of the questionnaire, representing each of the seven geographic regions of NASPA and balanced by both institutional size and type, were contacted and five provided consent to participate in phone interviews to explore plan development and maintenance at their respective institutions. A series of

questions was asked of each participant to elicit responses to frame institutional culture and to explore opinions about plans and processes. Analysis of the data produced from the recorded interviews yielded several themes focused around the development and maintenance of crisis management plans. The anonymity of those interviewed was assured, thus necessitating a pseudonym other than each participant's name for reporting.

Four of the five participants spoke from a frame of some authority as they were in their senior student affairs officer role at their institution and were involved in the process when the crisis management plan was initially developed. The one participant who was not employed at his institution for the initial development of the institutional plan had the opportunity to participate in subsequent reviews and new drafts of the plan.

SSAO1 served as Vice President at a private institution in Region II of NASPA and in the largest enrollment category of 3001 to 5000 students. He reported having been at the institution as the senior student affairs officer when the initial university crisis management plan for the institution was developed. He noted, "We brought in a consultant of sorts to guide us through the process of trying to anticipate every conceivable need and then to go from there." The consultant was given the authorization by the members of the President's cabinet to identify and form the initial crisis management team for the institution.

When asked about the individuals involved in the ongoing maintenance of the plan, he mellowed considerably and bemoaned a lack of individual leadership, saying, "I wish I could tell you we were maintaining it well." However, he rebounded quickly to point out a new hire at the institution who would eventually accept comprehensive

responsibility for the overall crisis management plan. In an attempt to describe the individual recently hired, SSAO1 dwelled on the perceived benefits to be gained from the individual's "excellent relationships" with leaders in both county and state emergency management organizations.

He added that the President's cabinet feels comfortable with the plan and confident in the team's ability to handle most foreseeable situations the institution might face. He did, though, acknowledge a need for greater intentionality in the team's efforts to sharpen institutional abilities to respond to a broad array of incidents. SSAO1 elaborated on these thoughts by saying,

I think the things that different persons and the roles that must exist on a team when it's functioning, when there's a major crisis on the campus, lock down residence halls, do this, do that, communicate with wide sources and so on, I think much of that is scripted pretty well and the like but if you were to call any one of us, we'd all say we need to redo that red manual. I can see it from here and can't tell you the last time that I was into it.

Given the opportunity to reflect on what could or should have been done differently in the institution's development of its crisis management plan, he noted he would change very little. Rapid growth at the institution brought challenges not foreseeable at the time of initial drafting. When probed about the utilization of the consultant, he immediately acknowledged it was the right move for the institution at the time. He continued by noting the egos possessed by the members of the President's cabinet at the time would have created a logjam of self-perceived experts and the consultant was able to bring legitimate expertise to the table.

SSAO1's final thoughts were directed toward higher education crisis planning in general and the industry's inability or unwillingness to recognize and program for the

ongoing need for significant mental health resources to assist members of institutional communities in their recovery, both immediately following an incident and longer term. He specifically noted a need for greater focus on self-care by the individuals responding on behalf of the institution as they deal with their own emotions surrounding the incident, stating, “We can all get overwhelmed with our own shock. We’re not always going to be more resilient than the students or their parents.” He also shared concerns associated with liability issues created by media and others seeking scapegoats for anything less than perfect performance through the institutional response. Without noting any specific examples, he addressed the propensity of the media and the legal system to attempt to reconstruct a timeline of institutional knowledge of a crisis incident and the associated decision-making in an effort to find fault.

SSAO2 served as Vice President at a private institution in Region IV-West of NASPA and in the smallest enrollment category of 1 to 1500 students. She also reported having been in her senior student affairs officer role at the institution during the initial development of the university crisis management plan. A consulting firm was hired by the institution to provide guidance on the creation of the safety office and its responsibilities. Following the office’s creation, SSAO2 was one of the individuals recommended by the institution’s Director of Safety and approved by the President to form the initial crisis management team.

She noted the Director of Safety, who reports to her at the institution and also serves in some student affairs capacities, has the responsibility for coordinating the ongoing maintenance of the plan. Additionally, she was confident that the right

stakeholders were regularly at the table to discuss the plan and its ongoing refinement. She was pleased to report that the Director of Safety was spending 15% to 20% of his time on the institution's plan but recent commitments to crisis planning by the institution would shift that time commitment to approximately 40%.

When asked to share her perspective on the overall quality of the institution's plan, her sentiments were mixed. She noted,

Emergency planning and emergency management is really one of those issues that I don't know that anybody feels like they are right on top of it. I feel like at least we know what we need to do and we have an individual who has the background and the training to lead us through that process and we do have some of the basics in, but there is much we need to do.

She considered her institution fortunate to have an individual with the background and experience to lead their efforts, given that most small colleges and universities do not have such a luxury. She said, "So often at the small college, somebody just gets this dumped on them."

SSAO2 offered up two items that her institution would have done differently if given the opportunity to start again. The first was that the institutional crisis management leadership role played by the Director of Safety would have been established as a direct reporting relationship to the President. "I think in the future, I think that is definitely the way that it will be that maybe had we done that initially that might have taken on a little bit more purpose and priority." The second change focused on the need for greater depth of personnel in the management of the plan. A two-year military deployment of the Director of Safety exposed a weakness the institution had not previously recognized and

underscored the need for cross-training and the involvement of a larger number of institutional officials.

SSAO3 was Vice President at a private institution in Region I of NASPA and in the enrollment category of 1501 to 3000 students. She, too, had been in her senior student affairs officer role for the initial development of her institution's university crisis management plan. Additionally, she was one of the individuals with specific expertise designated by the executive staff of the institution to serve on the initial crisis management team.

SSAO3 reported that responsibility for the ongoing maintenance of the institution's plan falls to one of her colleagues on the executive staff. However, she was willing to note that he spends very little of his time, likely less than 5%, on this responsibility.

Given the opportunity to reflect on her thoughts about the overall quality of the crisis management plan, she shared, "I feel comfortable with the people that we have involved on the crisis management team, knowing that it is a really smart group of people, really diligent group of people, and people that are really up on current news." She reported the team regularly reviewed incidents from other institutions to frame what their institutional response would have been and what adjustments might be necessary to their plan as they evaluated needs.

She continued down the line of her comfort level with the assembled team when asked about what she would do differently if given the opportunity to start fresh, highlighting the involvement of external stakeholders like the Red Cross, fire department,

and police department in their planning. The only item she mentioned for change was to seek legal advice regarding any institutional exposure to liability created by the framework of their plan.

SSAO4 was Vice President at a private institution in Region IV-East of NASPA and in the smallest enrollment category of 1 to 1500 students. Despite his decade of service in the role, he was the one senior student affairs officer interviewed who was not at the institution when its initial university crisis management plan was developed as a project outsourced to a third-party vendor. However, he has been involved in reviews and drafts of the more recent plan. He reported that decisions were made by the cabinet regarding which individuals should serve on the institution's crisis management team, focusing on both expertise and position held at the institution.

He reported having the institutional responsibility for coordinating the ongoing maintenance of the institution's plan, "as sort of chair of the crisis management team and sort of a go-to administrator on all these documents and what we've put together." He went on to explain that the responsibility had shifted to him following a change in the organizational structure of the institution and he was the logical choice given the primarily undergraduate, residential nature of the institution. Because of significant time spent on the plan a couple of years prior to the interview, he reported spending minimal time and effort on regular maintenance issues related to the plan.

Reflecting on the overall quality of the institution's plan, SSAO4 reported being very confident that their plan was much more extensive than other institutions their size, based on regular conversations with peers at other small colleges and universities. He

noted going so far as offering his materials as a framework or template for other institutions to implement. He added,

Anecdotally what I would share and it feels good when you have children of other college presidents, at your institution and both the kids and parents are part of the communication plan around a certain crisis on your campus and that president then is disseminating all that information to their peers and leadership team as note this is how it ought to be done, I mean that's reinforcement to that, I think we have a pretty good model in place.

When asked if there was anything the institution would do differently if given the opportunity, he pointed exclusively to a concern about the "dissemination of this information in terms of campus education and campus awareness that it's even here." While he reported being confident in their communication plans to constituents in the midst of crises, he recognized the importance of fostering a peace of mind amongst members of the institutional community at those times. He also reflected on the good fortune of the institution in the receipt of grants and other funds to procure technology focused on crisis management.

The final interviewee, SSAO5, was Vice President at a private institution in Region VI of NASPA and in the mid-sized enrollment category of institutions with 1501 to 3000 students. She did acknowledge having been at her institution in the senior student affairs officer role when the institution's original university crisis management plan was drafted and that she and others from student affairs held seats on the crisis management response committee, which was appointed by the President's cabinet.

SSAO5 intimated a lack of trust when asked about the individuals responsible for ongoing maintenance of the plan, stating, "the two people that sort of carry the policy are two people that I think are not necessarily experienced enough to sort of to be responsible

for the whole institution.” She went on to share that the President had asked each Vice President to put forward their own plans given his level of concern for a narrowly-focused institutional plan. Because of geography, the institutional plan focused almost exclusively on earthquake preparedness.

When asked to reflect on the overall quality of the institution’s plan, she pointed out that the location of the institution in a large, urban center and the fact that the overwhelming majority of students live on-campus added to the likelihood of incidents occurring on or immediately surrounding their campus. Again, the narrow focus of the existing plan was identified as a weakness.

In reflecting on what she would recommend the institution had done differently if given the opportunity to start again, SSAO5 criticized herself and admitted, “I should have been much more assertive, I mean I was, and so my staff and I tried to you know there are some people that believe that they know more than everyone else and so I think, so that’s why I think that I would have been much more assertive.”

Two primary themes emerged from the analysis of the phone interviews. The first theme focused on a comfort level with the ability of self and team that outweighs any missing pieces in institutional planning. The second theme highlights the benefit of relying on expertise from outside the executive cabinet in the development and/or maintenance of crisis management plans.

All five interviewees spent time addressing, to some degree, their level of comfort with their own ability or that of their team to address the wide array of crises the institution might face, all while acknowledging they still had room for improvement with

their crisis management plans. SSAO1 noted, “I think the things that different persons and the roles that must exist on a team when it’s functioning . . . is scripted pretty well.” SSAO2 shared confidence in both the general plan and the leadership of the institutional team, all the while acknowledging there was so much more the institution could focus on to increase readiness. As noted earlier, SSAO3 trusted the awareness and the intellect of the people on the crisis management team at her institution. SSAO4 talked extensively about his confidence in his ability to lead the institutional team through crisis, even when faced by unique challenges like those potentially posed by a busy rail line running through the heart of campus that carries 18 to 24 trains per day. Although SSAO5 shared concerns about the institutional plan, she doted on the work done by the student affairs division with its own plan and her team’s readiness to address issues likely to face students, noting, “This is something we think about all the time.”

Four of the five senior student affairs officers participating in the interviews also expounded on the benefit of relying on expertise from outside the executive cabinet in the development and/or maintenance of crisis management plans, which is the second identified theme. SSAO5 backed into this theme when recognizing that amongst her executive cabinet “there are some people that believe that they know more than everyone else” about crisis management and egos get in the way of progress. She noted being chastised by an executive colleague when he recognized that her divisional plan was better than the institutional plan. However, he subsequently apologized when he recognized that she attempted to share her divisional plan but was shut down by a louder

ego. While focused on the importance of his institution's use of a consultant to frame their initial plan, SSAO1 shared,

Absolutely a right choice, we would have all been experts in this. The body that dealt with this initially is the primary advisory group to the president, which are four vice presidents and institutional research and some key other persons and none of us are shy about our expertise, I think on this one saying we really need to get someone here who does this for a living and has had a track record of some form. I would not approach that differently and we're not a big, we're a relatively small place and the utilization of consultants is not something we do every time an issue comes up.

SSAO2 shared sentiments about two important players from outside the executive committee, a consultant and a mid-level staff member charged with leading the institutional team. The consultant was hired to develop the office now headed by the second individual mentioned. SSAO2 reported, "That's the part where I feel like we are ahead of the game because at least we have somebody who is designated and has the background and the experience." She emphasized the importance of this individual not being on the cabinet, as the lower level position at the institution allows him to focus on the crisis management leadership; instead of wearing so many hats that nothing gets done well. SSAO4 noted his institution's initial plan "was actually outsourced to a third party vendor specializing in crisis management." Subsequent reviews of the plan have intentionally included folks outside the cabinet with expertise in campus logistics.

Summary

This chapter shared the results of two administrations of a questionnaire focused on four primary indicators of institutional crisis preparedness. The indicators were analyzed by institutional size and type to explore differences. Additionally, information from phone interviews conducted with five survey respondents was shared that identified

two themes connected to the development and maintenance of institutional crisis management plans. The implications of these findings are discussed in the next chapter.

Chapter V

Summary, Discussion, and Recommendations

This chapter provides a summary of the purpose, methodology, findings, and significance of the findings of this study. The summary is followed by recommendations for practice, suggestions for future research, and a conclusion.

Summary

Purpose of the study. The purpose of this study was to examine current readiness plans of small colleges and universities through the eyes of Senior Student Affairs Officers and to develop recommendations for institutional use. Plans were examined across both institutional size and type to gauge institutional readiness and commonalities were sought in the areas of plan development and maintenance.

Six research questions provided the foundation for this study:

1. Do small colleges and universities address characteristics considered common to all-hazards readiness in their written plans, such as the varying types and phases of crises, systems for managing crises, and stakeholder involvement?
2. Do small colleges and universities address characteristics considered common to all-hazards readiness in their written plans differently across institutional size and/or type?
3. What types of crises are NASPA member small colleges and universities prepared to respond to?
4. Do crisis management systems at NASPA member small colleges and universities address each of the phases of crisis?

5. What crisis management systems are in place at small colleges and universities with a NASPA institutional membership?
6. Which stakeholders are involved or considered in crisis management at NASPA member small colleges and universities?

Methodology. Explanatory mixed methods design was employed for collecting and reporting data in this study. More specifically, the study utilized survey research methodology to gauge perceptions of senior student affairs officers serving at NASPA member small colleges and universities with an enrollment of 5000 students or fewer in the Fall 2007 academic term. As a follow-up to the initial administration of the survey, seven respondents were selected; yielding five participants for interviews focused specifically on the development and maintenance of their institutional crisis management systems. Unexpected delays in the research necessitated a second administration of the survey to provide for more recent quantitative data. The first administration of the questionnaire, conducted in April and May of 2010, produced 125 responses, for a response rate of 25.7%. The second administration, which was conducted in December 2012 and January 2013, produced 160 responses, for a response rate of 32.9%.

Summary of the findings.

1. Do small colleges and universities address characteristics considered common to all hazards readiness in their written plans, such as the varying types and phases of crises, systems for managing crises, and stakeholder involvement?
 - Analysis of each of the four primary questions embedded within this comprehensive question indicated that varying types and phases of crises,

systems for managing crises, and appropriate stakeholder involvement were addressed in the written plans of the participating institutions.

2. Do small colleges and universities address characteristics considered common to all-hazards readiness in their written plans differently across institutional size and/or type?

- Respondents at private institutions generally reported more robust crisis management systems.
- Public institutions and institutions enrolling 3001 to 5000 students were most likely to provide for the mental health needs of institutional responders following a crisis incident.
- On-call structures were reported as being most common at private institutions in both administrations of the questionnaire, while being more prevalent at institutions enrolling 1501 to 3000 students in the first administration and institutions enrolling 3001 to 5000 students in the second administration.
- Crisis management committees were most frequently reported at institutions enrolling 3001 to 5000 students and receive training on institutional crisis management procedures more frequently than all other training options presented.
- When comparing stakeholder involvement across institutional types, respondents noted campus ministers as both the internal and external

stakeholder most likely to have a different level of involvement in crisis management at public institutions than at private institutions.

- Across the three established categories of institutional enrollment size, Environmental Health was noted in both administrations of the questionnaire as the internal stakeholder most likely to have a different level of involvement. The external stakeholder noted as most likely to have a different level of involvement was campus ministers for the first administration and state police for the second administration.
3. What types of crises are NASPA member small colleges and universities prepared to respond to?
- Institutions were prepared for a breadth of crises which they could face, with some differences surfacing between the two administrations of the questionnaire. Most notable was that the percentage of responding institutions reporting contingency plans for different types of crises generally increased from the first to second administration in the natural, facility, and human categories, while the criminal category of crises saw a decline.
 - The four types of crisis for which institutions had prepared contingency plans in the first administration of the questionnaire were suicide, severe weather, fire, and sexual assault or rape.
 - The types of crisis for which institutions most frequently reported having prepared contingency plans in the second administration were evacuation

of buildings, sexual assault or rape, severe weather, fire and sexual harassment.

- Generally speaking, institutions were balanced in their crisis planning across the four primary categories of crisis (natural, facility, criminal, and human). In the first administration, 74.4% of the responding institutions had prepared at least one contingency plan in each of the four categories. In the second administration, 78.8% of the responding institutions had prepared at least one contingency plan in each of the four categories.
4. Do crisis management systems at NASPA member small colleges and universities address each of the phases of crisis?
- Responding institutions were most prepared for the crisis phase and least prepared for the pre-crisis phase.
 - The second administration yielded a greater percentage of responding institutions that had addressed all three phases of crisis in their written crisis management plans.
5. What crisis management systems are in place at small colleges and universities with a NASPA institutional membership?
- Across both types of plans (Student Affairs plans and University plans) and both administrations of the questionnaire, the Vice President for Student Affairs was consistently the most likely to lead institutional efforts in crisis management.

- Most Student Affairs plans had been in place for one to five years and university plans had existed for one to five years in the first administration and five to ten years in the second administration.
 - Across both plan types, crisis management plans were reviewed annually and communicated most frequently through conducting drills and exercises.
 - Crisis audits were consistently reported across plan types and administrations of the questionnaire to be conducted each time the plan was reviewed.
 - Nearly all participating institutions reported having a crisis management committee made up of individuals most likely appointed by a superior at the institution.
6. Which stakeholders are involved or considered in crisis management at NASPA member small colleges and universities?
- Internal stakeholders were reported as being much more involved in institutional crisis management plans than external stakeholders.
 - The most frequently involved internal stakeholders across the plan types were reported as University Relations, Physical Plant, Residence Life, President, and University Police.
 - The most frequently involved external stakeholders were the local fire department, local police/sheriff, local emergency management, and local hospitals.

Discussion of the findings. The results of this study suggested that small colleges and universities generally are prepared to face crisis situations as evidenced by the written crisis management documents containing contingency plans that address the appropriate types of crises, span the phases of crisis, employ necessary frameworks and structures for managing crises, and involve the necessary internal and external stakeholders in all aspects of crisis management.

The results of this study also suggested that roughly three of every four small colleges and universities have taken a broad approach to their crisis management planning, as indicated by the presence of at least one contingency plan in each of the four major categories of crises: natural, facility, criminal, and human. While it does not mean that every foreseeable risk has an associated contingency plan, it indicates that these institutions possess the capacity to address crises, regardless of the category. Private institutions were more likely than their public counterparts to possess this quality crisis portfolio.

Given the data that small colleges and universities are most prepared for the crisis phase and least prepared for the pre-crisis phase, the study indicated an apparent unwillingness or inability to routinely prepare for foreseeable crises. The sentiment shared in phone interviews that limited human resources require many administrators at small colleges and universities to carry a greater breadth of responsibilities than can reasonably be accomplished might serve as a viable explanation for the reactive approach to crisis management.

The results of this study indicated that small college and university practice reflected the hallmarks described in the literature as nearly every institution had a written crisis management plan and an established crisis management committee. This level of compliance with crisis management system recommendations suggested that institutional leaders had learned from their own crisis management travails and those at other institutions.

Small colleges and universities have heeded the call to focus on communication efforts throughout the cycle of a crisis, as evidenced by the results of this study. The internal stakeholder with the greatest involvement in the crisis management systems at these institutions was University Relations/Public Information Officer. Individuals with responsibility for facilities, security, and overall institutional leadership were not far behind in the ratings, but the results point to an understanding that institutional responses are only as effective as the institution's ability to communicate to all constituents impacted by the situation.

Across both administrations of the questionnaire, private institutions were more confident in their overall level of preparedness for campus crises than public institutions. Additionally, confidence grew in the level of preparedness as the size of institutional enrollment grew, especially in the second administration. One possible explanation for this discrepancy rests again in the limited human resources available internally to adequately develop and maintain crisis management plans at the smallest of colleges and universities.

Lastly, the results of the study suggested that some relatively intangible qualities may define the ability of small colleges and universities to manage crises, specifically a level of comfort among the team of individuals charged with leading the institution during these times of great challenge and a willingness to recognize when external expertise is necessary. Interview participants spoke of trust, talent, awareness, and intellect when describing this ideal arrangement of team comfort. Participants also spoke of the challenges inherent when large egos collide within the crisis management team and the resulting need for outside expertise to bring focus and experience to planning that demands excellence, lest the very mission of the institution be threatened unnecessarily.

Recommendations for Practice

The literature on crisis management in higher education identified four primary areas of focus for written plans at colleges and universities. The research questions for this study of small colleges and universities emerged from these four areas.

Institutions with a high level of readiness for crises draft, implement, exercise, and revise a written crisis management plan that addresses foreseeable risks likely to impact the institution's ability to pursue its educational mission. While fundamental to crisis management and widely understood, approximately 5% of the responding institutions had no written plan. Fiscal and human resources should be prioritized by institutional leaders to develop and maintain effective written plans.

Because each crisis is unique, the literature noted that institutions with a high level of readiness for crisis consider both crisis typology and the phases of crisis. As such, institutions should have a portfolio of contingency plans, addressing the three

phases of foreseeable crises (pre-crisis, crisis, and post-crisis) that may arise in each of the four major categories of crisis: natural, facility, criminal, and human. While it is unlikely that an institution could develop a contingency plan for every foreseeable situation, preparing plans addressing each of the phases in each of the categories provides direction that likely addresses the primary concerns for other crises within the category.

Institutions with a high level of readiness for crises also give attention to the detection of oncoming crises and have written plans to provide direction throughout the crisis cycle. Institutions should conduct a crisis audit to probe for likely risks and be certain that the potential impact of each risk could affect the institution and its constituents. Conducting ongoing crisis audits should occur through the utilization of a risk assessment committee focused on upcoming events and activities, as well as students exhibiting concerning behavior. This proactive approach could lessen or even eliminate the impact of a looming crisis.

Despite the volumes of literature attesting that institutions with a high level of readiness for crises have established a multi-disciplinary crisis management team, some participating institutions acknowledged the lack of such a team on their campuses. Colleges and universities should have a crisis management team in place, made up of individuals who clearly understand their roles on the team. This team should conduct regular exercises as a means of training for potential crises and building trust in the team's capacity to handle foreseeable situations.

Lastly, institutions with a high level of readiness for crises involve appropriate internal and external stakeholders in crisis management planning. Many factors impact

the list of stakeholders that are appropriate at any given institution for inclusion, not the least of which are geographic location, institutional and host community culture, institutional type, and institutional history. Colleges and universities should resist the urge to simply adopt a model crisis management plan or that of another institution. Time and attention should be devoted to understanding the benefit and/or cost of engaging a broad spectrum of internal and external stakeholders in the institution's crisis management planning and training.

Suggestions for Future Research

This study was focused on perceptions of crisis preparedness through the eyes of the Senior Student Affairs Officer at small colleges and universities. A number of suggestions for additional research have emerged.

Although this study utilized two administrations of the questionnaire, it should be replicated to further validate the results and to add an additional point on the longitudinal spectrum of crisis management planning at small colleges and universities. Additionally, efforts should be made to expand the sample size beyond institutions that maintain an institutional membership with NASPA.

This study looked specifically at the perceptions of the Senior Student Affairs Officer at small colleges and universities. While the results demonstrated the high level of involvement of this position in crisis management planning, it must be acknowledged that all responses resulted from a look through the Student Affairs lens. Future studies could apply the lens of Academic Affairs, Fiscal Affairs, or other primary organizational units of the institution as a means of comparison to the results of this study. Additionally,

future studies could focus on the perspective of individuals responsible for directing functional areas within Student Affairs, as these individuals frequently have significant responsibilities for the implementation of institutional crisis management plans.

This study focused on small colleges and universities offering at least a bachelor's degree. Care should be taken in generalizing the findings to community and junior colleges or technical schools. Adaptations could be made to the instrument and the study conducted with a focus on these institutions to address the unique needs of each classification of institution.

Finally, this study depended on the knowledge of one individual to answer every question asked related to crisis preparedness at their employing institution. No assurance exists that answers provided actually matched existing processes or plans. While treading on ground where many institutions might prohibit access, a review of each institution's written plans could provide a more reliable data set.

Conclusion

This study also closed the loop of studying crisis management plans at four-year colleges and universities by addressing the smallest enrollment category of institutions enrolling 1 to 5000 students, following a study by Zdziarski (2001) of institutions enrolling 8000 students or more and a study by Catullo (2008) of institutions enrolling 5000 students or more.

While small colleges and universities may be more susceptible to struggling with the development of comprehensive plans that address all foreseeable risks to the institution and its programs due to the limited scope of fiscal and human resources, this

study demonstrated that these institutions have established written crisis management plans reflective of the best practices identified in the literature.

References

- Alden, R. W., III, & Kafer, H. (2010). The Provost's perspective: Campus-wide needs and responses. In B. O. Hemphill & B. Hephner Labanc (Eds.), *Enough is enough: A student affairs perspective on preparedness and response to a campus shooting* (pp. 135-148). Sterling, VA: ACPA & NASPA.
- Birch, J. (1994). New factors in crisis planning and response. *Public Relations Quarterly*, 39, 31-34.
- Brown, R. (2000, October). Not just waiting for the rainbow sign: Disaster planning 101. *NACUBO Business Officer*, 39-42.
- Catullo, L. (2008). Post –September 11, 2001 through Pre-Virginia Tech Massacre, April 16, 2007: The status of crisis management preparedness as perceived by university student affairs administrators in selected NASPA member institutions. (Doctoral dissertation, Florida Atlantic University, 2008). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 69(02). (UMI No. 3010522)
- Cavanaugh, J. C. (2006). Effectively managing major disasters. *The Psychologists Manager Journal*, 9(1), 3-11.
- Cornell, D. (2008, Winter). Threat assessment on the college campus. *Leadership Exchange*, 5(4), 8-14.
- Creswell, J. W. (2005). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Dillman, D. A. (2000). *Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method* (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

- Dorn, M., & Dorn, C. (2007, July). *When lives are at stake: Developing 3D emergency operations plans*. Crisis Planning & Management. Retrieved on January 2, 2009, from [http://www.peterli.com/cpm/resources/articles/archive.php?article_id = 1540](http://www.peterli.com/cpm/resources/articles/archive.php?article_id=1540)
- Duncan, M. A., & Miser, K. M. (2000). Dealing with campus crisis. In M. J. Barr & M. K. Desler & Associates (Eds.), *The handbook of student affairs administration* (2nd ed., pp. 453-473). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Dungy, G. J. (2008, Winter). Our existential moment. *Leadership Exchange*, 5(4), 44.
- Federal Emergency Management Agency. (1996). *State and local guide (SLG 101): Guide for all-hazard emergency operations planning*. Retrieved December 31, 2008, from <http://www.fema.gov/plan/gaheop.shtm>
- Fink, S. (1986). *Crisis management: Planning for the inevitable*. New York: AMACOM.
- Golden, C., & Oblinger, D. G. (2007, May/June). The myth about business continuity and disaster recovery: We've got backups, so we're ready for any disaster. *EDUCAUSE Review*, 10-11.
- Hephner Labanc, B., Krepel, T. L., Johnson, B. J., & Herrmann, L. V. (2010). Managing the whirlwind: Planning for and responding to a campus in crisis. In B. O. Hemphill & B. Hephner Labanc (Eds.), *Enough is enough: A student affairs perspective on preparedness and response to a campus shooting* (pp. 53-81). Sterling, VA: ACPA & NASPA.

- Irvine, R. B., & Millar, D. P. (1996). *Debunking the stereotypes of crisis management: The nature of business crises in the 1990s*. Institute for Crisis Management. Retrieved April 13, 2009, from http://www.crisisexperts.com/debunking_main.htm
- Joly, K. (2008, April). It's 2008: Is your 911 website ready? *University Business*, 61-62.
- Kelsay, L. S. (2007, Fall). Aftermath of a crisis: How colleges respond to prospective students. *Journal of College Admission*, 6-13.
- Kennedy, M. (2007, May). Crisis on campus. *American School & University*, 19-25
- LaPorte, T. R. (2007, March). Critical infrastructure in the face of a predatory future: Preparing for untoward surprise. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 15(1), 60-64.
- Lawson, C. J. (2007). Crisis communication. In E. L. Zdziarski, J. M. Rollo, N. W. Dunkel, & Associates (Eds.), *Campus crisis management: A comprehensive guide to planning, prevention, response, and recovery* (pp. 97-119). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lipka, S. (2005, October 14). After Katrina, colleges nationwide take a fresh look at disaster plans. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 52(8), A28. Retrieved January 2, 2009, from Academic Search Complete database.
- Mitroff, I. I. (2005). *Why some companies emerge stronger and better from a crisis: Seven essential lessons for surviving disaster*. New York: American Management Association.

- Mitroff, I. I., Diamond, M. A., & Alpaslan, C. M. (2006, January/February). How prepared are America's colleges and universities for major crises? Assessing the state of crisis management. *Change*, 60-67.
- Mitroff, I. I., Pearson C. M., & Harrington, L. K. (1996). *The essential guide to managing corporate crisis: A step-by-step handbook for surviving major catastrophes*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Muffet-Willett, S. (2010). Waiting for a crisis: Case studies of crisis leaders in higher education (Doctoral dissertation, University of Akron, 2010). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 72(02). (UMI No. 3437839)
- National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA). (2007). *Bylaws*. Retrieved April 15, 2009, from <http://www.naspa.org/about/bylaws.cfm>
- National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA). (2009). *Student affairs administrators in higher education: Small colleges & universities division*. Retrieved December 7, 2009, from <http://www.naspa.org/divctr/smallcoll/default.cfm>
- National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA). (2013). *Student affairs administrators in higher education*. Retrieved January 6, 2013, from <http://www.naspa.org>
- Paterson, B. G. (2006). Establishing a crisis response team: Moving from institutional to personal response. In K. S. Harper, B. G. Paterson, & E. L. Zdziarski (Eds.), *Crisis management: Responding from the heart* (pp. 25-39). Washington, DC: NASPA.

- Rollo, J. M., & Zdziarski, E. L. (2007). Developing a crisis management plan. In E. L. Zdziarski, J. M. Rollo, N. W. Dunkel, & Associates (Eds.), *Campus crisis management: A comprehensive guide to planning, prevention, response, and recovery* (pp. 73-95). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Sherwood, G. P., & McKelfresh, D. (2007). Crisis management teams. In E. L. Zdziarski, J. M. Rollo, N. W. Dunkel, & Associates (Eds.), *Campus crisis management: A comprehensive guide to planning, prevention, response, and recovery* (pp. 55-71). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- SimpsonScarborough. (2007, October 4). *When disaster strikes: How well are colleges prepared for a crisis?* Retrieved January 2, 2009, from <http://www.simpsonscarborough.com/documents/CollegeCrisisPreparednessWhitePaper.pdf>
- Taylor, S. L., & von Destinon, M. (2000). Selecting, training, supervising, and evaluating staff. In M. J. Barr, M. K. Desler, & Associates (Eds.), *The handbook of student affairs administration* (2nd ed., pp. 154-177). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Zdziarski, E. L. (2001). Institutional preparedness to respond to campus crises as perceived by student affairs administrators in selected NASPA member institutions (Doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University, 2001). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 62(11), 3714. (UMI No. 3033906)
- Zdziarski, E. L. (2006). Crisis in the context of higher education. In K. S. Harper, B. G. Paterson, & E. L. Zdziarski (Eds.), *Crisis management: Responding from the heart* (pp. 3-24). Washington, DC: NASPA.

Zdziarski, E. L, Rollo, J. M., & Dunkel, N. W. (2007). The crisis matrix. In
E. L. Zdziarski, J. M. Rollo, N. W. Dunkel, & Associates (Eds.), *Campus crisis
management: A comprehensive guide to planning, prevention, response, and
recovery* (pp. 35-51). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Appendix A

Informed Consent/Invitation to Participate Email

The incidents of the past few years have reminded us all that a crisis can strike a college or university community at any time. Whether it is a natural disaster or an intentional act of man, none of us are immune to the possibilities.

Given their limited financial and human resources to devote to crisis readiness, small colleges and universities can be particularly vulnerable to the wide range of situations that can arise. To make matters worse, the student affairs literature is severely lacking in crisis preparedness information related to smaller institutions.

The following hyperlink will take you to a survey that you are asked to complete ([url here](#)). Survey completion should take approximately 15 minutes. The purpose of this study is to examine current crisis readiness plans of small colleges and universities through the eyes of Senior Student Affairs Officers. Plans will be examined across both institutional size and type to gauge institutional readiness and commonalities will be sought in the areas of plan development and maintenance. This survey was initially administered in Spring 2010 and is being administered a second time to gauge changes made at participating institutions in the intervening time. Only voting delegates at NASPA member institutions with enrollments of fewer than 5000 students for Fall 2007 were asked to participate in the initial administration. This follow-up administration is being sent to the individuals occupying those roles at the same institutions, so every response is critical to the success of the study. Your response is requested **by (date here)**.

Please know that your participation in the study is voluntary and you are free to withdraw from participation at any time. Though participants will be asked to divulge

information about their employing institutions that may reflect poorly on the institution, all data provided will remain confidential and will only be reported within aggregate data in the study. Participants will contribute to a greater understanding of crisis readiness of small colleges and universities. Results of this study may assist participants and others in their work to develop, refine, and/or maintain their institution's crisis readiness plans. A small number of participants were contacted by email and asked to participate further in the study through a phone interview following the initial administration of this survey. Receiving the electronic delivery of the survey, as well as completion and submission of the survey will imply consent on your part to participate in this study.

Should you have any questions about the study at any point, please contact the primary investigator by phone at 605-677-5069 or by email at philip.covington@usd.edu, or the secondary investigator, Dr. Richard Hoover, at 402-472-3058 or rhoover2@unl.edu. Additionally, I will be happy to share the results of the study with you upon its completion, if you request it.

If you have questions that were unanswered by the researchers or if you have questions about participants' rights, the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Institutional Review Board can be reached at 402-472-6965.

I appreciate the limited amount of time that your work as a senior student affairs officer allows for participation in projects such as this and know that you receive many similar requests. However, I believe the impact of this study could be very significant to the work at small colleges and universities and it needs to be shared within the profession. I look forward to your participation and thank you for your time.

Primary Investigator
Philip D. Covington
Associate Dean of Students
University of South Dakota
phone: 605-677-5069
philip.covington@usd.edu

Secondary Investigator
Richard E. Hoover, PhD
Chair, Dissertation Committee
University of Nebraska Lincoln
phone: 402-472-3058
rhoover2@unl.edu

Appendix B

Qualitative Interview Questions

QUALITATIVE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Were you involved in the development of your institution's crisis management program? If yes, what was your position at the institution at that time?
2. How were participants selected to be involved in developing the crisis management plan?
 - a. Were individuals more likely selected as a result of their title or of their expertise and ability to contribute? Please explain.
 - b. Who made the selections of individuals to be involved in the development of the crisis management plan?
3. What individuals are most involved in the maintenance of the crisis management plan? Why does this responsibility fall to them?
 - a. Is it in their job description and/or simply a good fit for utilizing their talents? Please explain.
 - b. What departments or individuals at your institution should be involved in the maintenance of the plan but are not? Please explain.
4. How much time would you estimate this person spends on maintenance of the plan in an average week?

or

What percentage of this person's work time would you estimate is spent on maintenance of the plan?
5. What are your thoughts about the overall quality of your crisis management plan?

6. If you had the opportunity to start over with your crisis management plan, what would you do differently?

Appendix C

Institutions in Target Population

INSTITUTIONS IN TARGET POPULATION

Region I

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. American International College | 34. Massachusetts College of
Pharmacy and Health Sciences |
| 2. Anna Maria College | 35. Merrimack College |
| 3. Assumption College | 36. Mitchell College |
| 4. Babson College | 37. Mount Ida College |
| 5. Bard College at Simon's Rock | 38. New England College |
| 6. Bay Path College | 39. Newbury College-Brookline |
| 7. Bay State College | 40. Nichols College |
| 8. Benjamin Franklin Institute of
Technology | 41. Regis College |
| 9. Berklee College of Music | 42. Rhode Island School of Design |
| 10. Bowdoin College | 43. Rivier College |
| 11. Bryant University | 44. Roger Williams University |
| 12. Castleton State College | 45. Saint Anselm College |
| 13. Champlain College | 46. Saint Joseph College |
| 14. Clark University | 47. School of the Museum of Fine
Arts-Boston |
| 15. Colby College | 48. Simmons College |
| 16. Colby-Sawyer College | 49. Springfield College |
| 17. College of the Atlantic | 50. Stonehill College |
| 18. College of the Holy Cross | 51. Thomas College |
| 19. Curry College | 52. Unity College |
| 20. Daniel Webster College | 53. University of Bridgeport |
| 21. Dean College | 54. University of Maine at
Farmington |
| 22. Emerson College | 55. University of Maine at Machias |
| 23. Emmanuel College | 56. University of New England |
| 24. Endicott College | 57. University of New Haven |
| 25. Fairfield University | 58. Vermont Law School |
| 26. Fisher College | 59. Wellesley College |
| 27. Franklin W. Olin College of
Engineering | 60. Wentworth Institute of
Technology |
| 28. Gordon-Conwell Theological
Seminary | 61. Wesleyan University |
| 29. Green Mountain College | 62. Western New England College |
| 30. Husson College | 63. Wheaton College |
| 31. Maine Maritime Academy | 64. Wheelock College |
| 32. Massachusetts College of Art and
Design | 65. Worcester Polytechnic Institute |
| 33. Massachusetts College of Liberal
Arts | |

Region II

1. Albright College
2. Alderson Broaddus College
3. Alfred University
4. Allegheny College
5. Alvernia College
6. Arcadia University
7. Baptist Bible College and Seminary
8. Bard College
9. Berkeley College
10. Berkeley College
11. Bloomfield College
12. Bluefield State College
13. Briarcliffe College
14. Cabrini College
15. Caldwell College
16. Canisius College
17. Cazenovia College
18. Centenary College
19. Clarkson University
20. Colgate University
21. College of Mount Saint Vincent
22. Cooper Union for the Advancement of Science and Art
23. Corcoran College of Art and Design
24. Daemen College
25. Delaware State University
26. Delaware Valley College
27. DeSales University
28. Dickinson College
29. Drew University
30. Eastern University
31. Elmira College
32. Frostburg State University
33. Georgian Court University
34. Gettysburg College
35. Glenville State College
36. Goucher College
37. Grove City College
38. Gwynedd Mercy College
39. Hamilton College
40. Hartwick College
41. Hilbert College
42. Immaculata University
43. Iona College
44. Juniata College
45. King's College
46. Laboratory Institute of Merchandising
47. Lafayette College
48. Le Moyne College
49. Lebanon Valley College
50. Lincoln University of Pennsylvania
51. Lycoming College
52. Manhattan School of Music
53. Manhattanville College
54. Maryland Institute College of Art
55. Marymount Manhattan College
56. Marywood University
57. McDaniel College
58. Medaille College
59. Messiah College
60. Molloy College
61. Moravian College and Moravian Theological Seminary
62. Mount Saint Mary College
63. Mount St Mary's University
64. Nazareth College
65. New York Institute of Technology-Manhattan Campus
66. Niagara University
67. Pennsylvania State University-Penn State Erie-Behrend College
68. Philadelphia University
69. Point Park University
70. Pratt Institute-Main
71. Rosemont College
72. Sage College of Albany
73. Saint Bonaventure University
74. Saint John Fisher College
75. Saint Peters College
76. Sarah Lawrence College
77. Seton Hill University

- | | |
|--|--|
| 78. Shepherd University | 92. University of Pittsburgh-Bradford |
| 79. Siena College | 93. University of Pittsburgh-Greensburg |
| 80. Skidmore College | 94. University of the Sciences in Philadelphia |
| 81. St Mary's College of Maryland | 95. Ursinus College |
| 82. SUNY College at Old Westbury | 96. Utica College |
| 83. SUNY College of Technology at Delhi | 97. Vassar College |
| 84. SUNY Institute of Technology at Utica-Rome | 98. Washington & Jefferson College |
| 85. SUNY Maritime College | 99. Washington College |
| 86. Susquehanna University | 100. Wells College |
| 87. Swarthmore College | 101. Wesley College |
| 88. Thiel College | 102. West Liberty State College |
| 89. Thomas Jefferson University | 103. West Virginia State University |
| 90. Union College | 104. Westminster College |
| 91. University of Maryland Eastern Shore | 105. Widener University-Main Campus |

Region III

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Agnes Scott College | 25. Eckerd College |
| 2. Albany State University | 26. Elizabeth City State University |
| 3. American InterContinental University | 27. Emory and Henry College |
| 4. Austin College | 28. Ferrum College |
| 5. Baylor College of Medicine | 29. Florida College |
| 6. Bellarmine University | 30. Florida Memorial University |
| 7. Bennett College for Women | 31. Florida Southern College |
| 8. Berea College | 32. Francis Marion University |
| 9. Berry College | 33. Freed-Hardeman University |
| 10. Bethel College | 34. Furman University |
| 11. Birmingham Southern College | 35. Georgia Southwestern State University |
| 12. Brevard College | 36. Hampden-Sydney College |
| 13. Catawba College | 37. Hodges University |
| 14. Centenary College of Louisiana | 38. Hollins University |
| 15. Centre College | 39. Houston Baptist University |
| 16. Charleston Southern University | 40. Huston-Tillotson University |
| 17. Chipola College | 41. Jacksonville University |
| 18. Christian Brothers University | 42. Jefferson College of Health Sciences |
| 19. Coker College | 43. Johnson & Wales University-Charlotte |
| 20. Cumberland University | 44. Johnson C Smith University |
| 21. Dalton State College | 45. Lander University |
| 22. Davidson College | 46. Lenoir-Rhyne University |
| 23. Dillard University | |
| 24. Eastern Mennonite University | |

- | | |
|--|--|
| 47. Limestone College | 78. Spring Hill College |
| 48. Louisiana College | 79. St Marys University |
| 49. Louisiana State University-
Shreveport | 80. Stetson University |
| 50. Loyola University New Orleans | 81. Sweet Briar College |
| 51. Lynchburg College | 82. Texas A&M Health Science
Center |
| 52. Marymount University | 83. Texas Lutheran University |
| 53. Maryville College | 84. Texas Tech University Health
Sciences Center |
| 54. McMurry University | 85. The Art Institute of Atlanta |
| 55. Medical College of Georgia | 86. The University of Virginia's
College at Wise |
| 56. Mississippi University for
Women | 87. Thomas More College |
| 57. Mississippi Valley State
University | 88. Transylvania University |
| 58. Morris College | 89. Trevecca Nazarene University |
| 59. North Carolina Wesleyan
College | 90. Trinity University |
| 60. Oglethorpe University | 91. University of Mary Washington |
| 61. Palm Beach Atlantic University-
West Palm Beach | 92. University of Mississippi
Medical Center |
| 62. Presbyterian College | 93. University of Montevallo |
| 63. Queens University of Charlotte | 94. University of North Carolina at
Asheville |
| 64. Randolph College | 95. University of North Texas
Health Science Center |
| 65. Regent University | 96. University of Richmond |
| 66. Roanoke College | 97. University of South Carolina-
Aiken |
| 67. Rollins College | 98. University of South Carolina-
Beaufort |
| 68. Saint Thomas University | 99. University of West Alabama |
| 69. Salem College | 100. Virginia Wesleyan College |
| 70. Samford University | 101. Washington and Lee University |
| 71. Schreiner University | 102. Wesleyan College |
| 72. Shenandoah University | 103. William Carey University |
| 73. Southern Polytechnic State
University | 104. Wingate University |
| 74. Southern University at New
Orleans | 105. Wofford College |
| 75. Southwestern University | 106. Xavier University of Louisiana |
| 76. Spalding University | |
| 77. Spelman College | |

Region IV-East

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------|
| 1. Adrian College | 4. Alma College |
| 2. Air Force Institute of
Technology-Graduate School of
Engineering & Management | 5. Alverno College |
| 3. Albion College | 6. Baldwin-Wallace College |
| | 7. Beloit College |
| | 8. Bemidji State University |

9. Blackburn College
10. Briar Cliff University
11. Calvin College
12. Carleton College
13. Carthage College
14. Central College
15. Clarke College
16. Coe College
17. College of Saint Benedict
18. Columbus College of Art and Design
19. Concordia College at Moorhead
20. Cornell College
21. Denison University
22. DePauw University
23. Dominican University
24. Earlham College
25. Edgewood College
26. Elmhurst College
27. Franklin College
28. Goshen College
29. Graceland University-Lamoni
30. Gustavus Adolphus College
31. Hanover College
32. Heidelberg College
33. Hiram College
34. Hope College
35. Illinois College
36. Illinois Wesleyan University
37. Indiana University-Kokomo
38. Iowa Wesleyan College
39. John Carroll University
40. Kalamazoo College
41. Kendall College
42. Kenyon College
43. Knox College
44. Lake Erie College
45. Lake Forest College
46. Lake Superior State University
47. Lakeland College
48. Lawrence University
49. Loras College
50. Lourdes College
51. Luther College
52. Macalester College
53. MacMurray College
54. Marian University-Wisconsin
55. Marietta College
56. McKendree University
57. Miami University-Hamilton
58. Midwestern University
59. Millikin University
60. Milwaukee School of Engineering
61. Minneapolis College of Art and Design
62. Monmouth College
63. Morningside College
64. Mount Union College
65. Muskingum College
66. North Central College
67. Notre Dame College
68. Oberlin College
69. Ohio Dominican University
70. Ohio State University-Mansfield Campus
71. Ohio Wesleyan University
72. Otterbein College
73. Principia College
74. Quincy University
75. Saint Josephs College
76. Saint Mary-of-the-Woods College
77. Saint Mary's College
78. Saint Norbert College
79. School of the Art Institute of Chicago
80. Shawnee State University
81. Siena Heights University
82. Simpson College
83. St. Olaf College
84. The Art Institutes International Minnesota
85. The Illinois Institute of Art-Chicago
86. The Illinois Institute of Art-Schaumburg
87. University of Evansville
88. University of Illinois at Springfield
89. University of Indianapolis
90. University of Minnesota-Morris

- | | |
|--|---------------------------|
| 91. University of Saint Francis-Ft Wayne | 94. Valparaiso University |
| 92. University of Wisconsin-Parkside | 95. Viterbo University |
| 93. Ursuline College | 96. Wabash College |
| | 97. Wartburg College |

Region IV-West

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. A T Still University of Health Sciences | 29. National American University-Rapid City |
| 2. Augustana College | 30. Nebraska Wesleyan University |
| 3. Benedictine College | 31. New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology |
| 4. Bethel College | 32. Northern State University |
| 5. Black Hills State University | 33. Northwestern Oklahoma State University |
| 6. College of Saint Mary | 34. Oklahoma City University |
| 7. College of Santa Fe | 35. Oklahoma State University Center for Health Sciences |
| 8. Colorado College | 36. Peru State College |
| 9. Colorado School of Mines | 37. Philander Smith College |
| 10. Culver-Stockton College | 38. Rogers State University |
| 11. Dakota State University | 39. South Dakota School of Mines and Technology |
| 12. Doane College | 40. Southeastern Oklahoma State University |
| 13. Drury University | 41. Southern Arkansas University Main Campus |
| 14. Fontbonne University | 42. University of Arkansas at Monticello |
| 15. Fort Lewis College | 43. University of Mary |
| 16. Friends University | 44. University of Science and Arts of Oklahoma |
| 17. Harris-Stowe State University | 45. University of Tulsa |
| 18. Henderson State University | 46. Valley City State University |
| 19. Hendrix College | 47. Western State College of Colorado |
| 20. Johnson & Wales University-Denver | 48. Westminster College |
| 21. Lincoln University | 49. William Woods University |
| 22. Logan College of Chiropractic | |
| 23. Lyon College | |
| 24. Maryville University of Saint Louis | |
| 25. Mayville State University | |
| 26. McPherson College | |
| 27. Midland Lutheran College | |
| 28. Naropa University | |

Region V

- | | |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. Alaska Pacific University | 5. Eastern Oregon University |
| 2. Antioch University Seattle | 6. Great Basin College |
| 3. Concordia University | 7. Lewis & Clark College |
| 4. DeVry University-Washington | 8. Lewis-Clark State College |

- | | |
|---|--|
| 9. Linfield College | 20. The College of Idaho |
| 10. Montana State University-
Billings | 21. The Evergreen State College |
| 11. National College of Natural
Medicine | 22. University of Alaska Southeast |
| 12. Oregon Institute of Technology | 23. University of Great Falls |
| 13. Pacific Lutheran University | 24. University of Portland |
| 14. Pacific Northwest College of
Art | 25. University of Puget Sound |
| 15. Pacific University | 26. Warner Pacific College |
| 16. Reed College | 27. Western Oregon University |
| 17. Saint Martin's University | 28. Western States Chiropractic
College |
| 18. Seattle Pacific University | 29. Westminster College |
| 19. Southern Oregon University | 30. Whitman College |
| | 31. Whitworth University |

Region VI

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Alliant International University | 18. Midwestern University |
| 2. Art Center College of Design | 19. Mount St Mary's College |
| 3. Bethany University | 20. Notre Dame de Namur
University |
| 4. Brigham Young University-
Hawaii | 21. Occidental College |
| 5. California Institute of Integral
Studies | 22. Otis College of Art and Design |
| 6. California Institute of
Technology | 23. Pardee Rand Graduate School of
Policy Studies |
| 7. California Lutheran University | 24. Pitzer College |
| 8. California Maritime Academy | 25. Pomona College |
| 9. California State University-
Channel Islands | 26. Saint Marys College of
California |
| 10. California State University-
Monterey Bay | 27. Samuel Merritt University |
| 11. Claremont McKenna College | 28. San Francisco Art Institute |
| 12. Concordia University | 29. Scripps College |
| 13. Embry Riddle Aeronautical
University-Prescott | 30. Soka University of America |
| 14. Ex-Pression College for Digital
Arts | 31. University of Advancing
Technology |
| 15. Harvey Mudd College | 32. University of California-Merced |
| 16. Holy Names University | 33. University of Hawaii at Hilo |
| 17. La Sierra University | 34. University of Redlands |
| | 35. Westmont College |
| | 36. Whittier College |
| | 37. Woodbury University |

Appendix D

Survey Instrument

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

CAMPUS CRISIS MANAGEMENT

The purpose of this instrument is to gain insight into the current crisis management practices in student affairs. Approximately 490 senior student affairs officers at four-year NASPA member institutions are being surveyed, so every response is critical. Your responses to this survey will remain confidential. Your name or the name of your institution will not be identified in any published report or article. By responding to this survey you are giving your consent to participate in this study.

Please respond to each question by checking the appropriate box(es). This survey should take approximately 15 minutes to complete. When you are finished please click the submit button.

[INSERT IRB INFORMATION HERE]

PART 1

Please respond to each question by checking the appropriate box(es).

1. On a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 is unprepared and 10 is well-prepared, please indicate how prepared your student affairs division is to respond to campus crises.

Unprepared 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Well-prepared

2. Does your university have a written crisis management plan addressing campus crises?

Yes No

3. Who coordinates your university's response to campus crises? (*Check only one.*)

President

Dean of Students

VP Academic Affairs/Provost

Director of Student Counseling

VP Administration/Business Affairs

Director of Student Health Services

VP Student Affairs

Director of Residence Life

Chief/Director University Police

Director of Student Activities

Director Public

Other

Information/Relations

Director of Health & Safety

4. Does your student affairs division have a separate, written crisis management plan addressing campus crises?

Yes No

If yes, please indicate who coordinates the student affairs response to campus crises. (*Check only one.*)

VP Student Affairs

Director of Residence Life

Chief/Director University Police

Director of Student Activities

Dean of Students

Other

Director of Student Counseling

Director of Student Health Services

Please respond to the remaining questions as they relate to your student affairs crisis management plan. If you do not have a written student affairs crisis management plan, then respond to the remaining questions as they relate to your university crisis management plan. If you do not have a written plan of any type, please answer as many of the remaining questions as possible.

5. How long has this crisis management plan existed?
- | | |
|----------------|--------------------|
| 1 year or less | 5 to 10 years |
| 1 to 5 years | More than 10 years |
6. How often is the crisis management plan reviewed?
- | | |
|---------------|-------|
| Annually | Other |
| Every 3 years | _____ |
| Every 5 years | |
7. A crisis audit refers to the process of assessing the internal and external environment to identify potential crises, and determine the impact and probability of various crises occurring. Has a crisis audit been conducted on your campus? (*Check all that apply.*)
- | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| No | Whenever a crisis occurs |
| When the plan was originally created | Other |
| Each time the plan is reviewed | _____ |
| Annually | |
8. Please indicate whether the procedures in your crisis management plan address one or more of the following phases of crisis. (*Check all that apply.*)
- Pre-crisis: Actions to take prior to the onset of a crisis. These actions may include such things as preventative measures, preparation activities, and ways to detect potential crisis.
- Crisis: Actions to take during a crisis event. These actions may include such things as activation of response procedures, means of containing a crisis, and steps to resume normal operations.
- Post-crisis: Actions to take after a crisis. These actions may include such things as methods for verifying that a crisis has past, follow-up communications with stakeholders, and mechanisms to revise or improve procedures for the next crisis.
9. How is the crisis management plan communicated to members of the campus community? (*Check all that apply.*)
- | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Not communicated | Optional crisis management training sessions |
| Copy of plan available upon request | Required crisis management training sessions |
| Plan accessible on the web | Drills and exercises |
| Annual notification | Other |
| New employee orientation | _____ |
| New student orientation | |

10. Does your crisis management plan address the mental/emotional health of university caregivers that respond to campus crisis by providing Critical Incident Stress debriefings?
 Yes No

11. An “On-Call” or “Duty” system is a system in which a particular individual is identified as the initial or primary contact rotates to another individual at specified time intervals (e.g. weekly, monthly, etc.). Is there an “On-Call” or “Duty” system in place to respond to campus crises?
 Yes No

12. Is there an established committee or team of individuals identified to respond to campus crises?
 Yes No (*Skip to Part 2*)

13. How are individuals assigned to the crisis management committee or team? (*Check only one.*)

- | | |
|------------------------------|-----------|
| Self-appointed | Recruited |
| Volunteer | Other |
| Appointed by Superior | _____ |
| Specified in Job Description | |

14. What type of training is provided to crisis management team members or individuals involved in responding to campus crises? (*Check all that apply.*)

- | | |
|--|---|
| No training provided | Campus Violence Issues |
| Crisis Management (campus procedures) | Substance Abuse |
| Crisis Management (general) | Grieving Process |
| Legal Issues/Risk Management | Orientation to Community & County Agency Assistance |
| Working with Law Enforcement & Emergency Personnel | Critical Incident Stress Management/Debriefing |
| Responding to Civil Disturbance or Demonstration | Table-top exercises |
| Suicide Intervention | Crisis simulations or drills |
| Media Relations | Other |
| | _____ |

PART 2

Stakeholders are individuals or organizations that are affected by a crisis or could affect an institution's ability to respond to a crisis. Please indicate the level of involvement of each of the internal and external stakeholders listed below. *Check only one level of involvement for each stakeholder.*

Internal Stakeholders	Level 1 Represented on Crisis Management Committee or Team	Level 2 Involved in Planning/Response as Needed	Level 3 Impact/Consequences of Crisis on this Stakeholder is Routinely Considered	Level 4 Not Significant to Crisis Planning/Response	Level 5 Does Not Exist
President					
VP Academic Affairs					
VP Administrative Affairs					
VP Student Affairs					
General Counsel					
University Police					
University Relations/PIO					
Physical Plant					
Environmental Health					
Dean of Students					
Dean of Faculties					
Human Resources					
Student Health Services					
Student Counseling Services					
Employee Assistance					
Residence Life					
Student Activities					
Athletics					
International Student Services					
Campus Ministers					
Students					
Faculty					
Other:					

External Stakeholders	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
	Represented on Crisis Management Committee or Team	Involved in Planning/Response as Needed	Impact/Consequences of Crisis on this Stakeholder is Routinely Considered	Not Significant to Crisis Planning/Response	Does Not Exist
FBI					
Local Police/Sheriff					
State Police					
Local Fire Department					
State Fire Marshal					
Local Hospitals					
Local Health Department					
State Health Department					
Local Mental Health					
State Mental Health					
Local Emergency Mgmt.					
Campus Ministers					
Red Cross					
Victims Assistance Program					
Local Gov. Officials					
State Gov. Officials					
Alumni Association					
Hometown Alumni Clubs					
Parents					
Local Community Members					
Other:					

PART 3

A contingency plan is a written procedure or checklist that supplements a basic crisis management plan and addresses unique circumstances or issues for a specific type of crisis. Please identify each type of crisis for which individual contingency plans exist and each phase of crisis addressed. As noted earlier, the phases of crisis are defined as:

- Pre-crisis: Actions to take prior to the onset of a crisis. These actions may include such things as preventative measures, preparation activities, and ways to detect potential crisis.
- Crisis: Actions to take during a crisis event. These actions may include such things as activation of response procedures, means of containing a crisis, and steps to resume normal operations.
- Post-crisis: Actions to take after a crisis. These actions may include such things as methods for verifying that a crisis has past, follow-up communications with stakeholders, and mechanisms to revise or improve procedures for the next crisis.

Type of Crisis (Check all that apply)	Phase of Crisis Addressed (Check all that apply)		
	Pre-Crisis	Crisis	Post-Crisis
Natural			
Tornado			
Hurricane			
Earthquake			
Flood			
Severe weather			
Other			
Facility			
Fire			
Explosion			
Chemical Leak			
Evacuation of Campus			
Evacuation of Buildings			
Corruption/Loss of Computer Data			
Other			
Criminal			
Homicide			
Assault			
Sexual Assault/Rape			
Sexual Harassment			
Domestic Abuse			
Burglary/Robbery			
Kidnapping/Abduction			
Hate Crime			
Terroristic Threat			
Vandalism			
Other			
Human			
Student Death			
Faculty/Staff Death			
Student Injury			
Faculty/Staff Injury			
Suicide			
Emotional/Psychological Crisis			
Missing Person			
Alcohol/Drug Overdose			
Infectious Disease			
Racial Incident			
Campus Disturbance/Demonstration			
Other			

Appendix E

Detailed Data Tables

Table 7

Types of Crisis for which Institutions Had Prepared Contingency Plans by Category of Crisis Plan First Administration of Questionnaire

Types	Student Affairs Plan (N = 35)		University Plan Only (N = 81)		No Plan Indicated (N = 9)		Total (N = 125)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Natural								
Tornado	19	54.3%	54	66.7%	1	11.1%	74	59.2%
Hurricane	13	37.1%	27	33.3%	2	22.2%	42 #	33.6%
Earthquake	16	45.7%	35	43.2%	1	11.1%	52 #	41.6%
Flood	19	54.3%	36	44.4%	2	22.2%	57 #	45.6%
Severe weather	26	74.3%	61	75.3%	4	44.4%	91 *	72.8%
Other	4	11.4%	11	13.6%	0	0.0%	15	12.0%
Facility								
Fire	28	80.0%	60	74.1%	3	33.3%	91 *	72.8%
Explosion	21	60.0%	55	67.9%	3	33.3%	79	63.2%
Chemical Leak	22	62.9%	54	66.7%	4	44.4%	80	64.0%
Evacuation of Campus	23	65.7%	50	61.7%	4	44.4%	77	61.6%
Evacuation of Buildings	27	77.1%	59	72.8%	4	44.4%	90	72.0%
Corruption/Loss of Computer Data	21	60.0%	48	59.3%	2	22.2%	71	56.8%
Other	3	8.6%	8	9.9%	0	0.0%	11	8.8%
Criminal								
Homicide	26	74.3%	53	65.4%	2	22.2%	81	64.8%
Assault	24	68.6%	54	66.7%	3	33.3%	81	64.8%
Sexual Assault/Rape	26	74.3%	60	74.1%	5	55.6%	91 *	72.8%
Sexual Harassment	25	71.4%	52	64.2%	5	55.6%	82	65.6%

Table 7 continues

Types	Student Affairs Plan (N = 35)		University Plan Only (N = 81)		No Plan Indicated (N = 9)		Total (N = 125)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Criminal (cont'd)								
Domestic Abuse	19	54.3%	39	48.1%	4	44.4%	62	49.6%
Burglary/Robbery	22	62.9%	46	56.8%	3	33.3%	71	56.8%
Kidnapping/Abduction	12	34.3%	36	44.4%	1	11.1%	49 #	39.2%
Hate Crime	23	65.7%	46	56.8%	3	33.3%	72	57.6%
Terroristic Threat	18	51.4%	47	58.0%	2	22.2%	67	53.6%
Vandalism	22	62.9%	44	54.3%	4	44.4%	70	56.0%
Other	4	11.4%	6	7.4%	0	0.0%	10	8.0%
Human								
Student Death	27	77.1%	59	72.8%	4	44.4%	90	72.0%
Faculty/Staff Death	20	57.1%	50	61.7%	4	44.4%	74	59.2%
Student Injury	26	74.3%	55	67.9%	4	44.4%	85	68.0%
Faculty/Staff Injury	19	54.3%	47	58.0%	4	44.4%	70	56.0%
Suicide	28	80.0%	59	72.8%	5	55.6%	92 *	73.6%
Emotional/Psychological Crisis	27	77.1%	55	67.9%	4	44.4%	86	68.8%
Missing Person	25	71.4%	57	70.4%	3	33.3%	85	68.0%
Alcohol/Drug Overdose	25	71.4%	54	66.7%	3	33.3%	82	65.6%
Infectious Disease	22	62.9%	57	70.4%	4	44.4%	83	66.4%
Racial Incident	21	60.0%	42	51.9%	3	33.3%	66	52.8%
Campus Disturbance/Demonstration	20	57.1%	48	59.3%	3	33.3%	71	56.8%
Other	3	8.6%	9	11.1%	1	11.1%	13	10.4%

* = high frequency

= low frequency

Table 8

Types of Crisis for which Institutions Had Prepared Contingency Plans by Category of Crisis Plan Second Administration of Questionnaire

Types	Student Affairs Plan (N = 43)		University Plan Only (N = 111)		No Plan Indicated (N = 6)		Total (N = 160)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Natural								
Tornado	31	72.1%	74	66.7%	3	50.0%	108	67.5%
Hurricane	20	46.5%	42	37.8%	2	33.3%	64 #	40.0%
Earthquake	23	53.5%	53	47.7%	2	33.3%	78 #	48.8%
Flood	22	51.2%	59	53.2%	3	50.0%	84	52.5%
Severe weather	35	81.4%	83	74.8%	4	66.7%	122 *	76.3%
Other	6	14.0%	11	9.9%	1	16.7%	18	11.3%
Facility								
Fire	35	81.4%	81	73.0%	4	66.7%	120 *	75.0%
Explosion	32	74.4%	70	63.1%	2	33.3%	104	65.0%
Chemical Leak	31	72.1%	74	66.7%	3	50.0%	108	67.5%
Evacuation of Campus	32	74.4%	79	71.2%	3	50.0%	114	71.3%
Evacuation of Buildings	36	83.7%	83	74.8%	4	66.7%	123 *	76.9%
Corruption/Loss of Computer Data	27	62.8%	61	55.0%	4	66.7%	92	57.5%
Other	6	14.0%	6	5.4%	0	0.0%	12	7.5%
Criminal								
Homicide	26	60.5%	69	62.2%	3	50.0%	98	61.3%
Assault	32	74.4%	76	68.5%	3	50.0%	111	69.4%
Sexual Assault/Rape	36	83.7%	84	75.7%	3	50.0%	123 *	76.9%
Sexual Harassment	34	79.1%	83	74.8%	3	50.0%	120 *	75.0%

Table 7 continues

Types	Student Affairs Plan (N = 43)		University Plan Only (N = 111)		No Plan Indicated (N = 6)		Total (N = 160)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Criminal (cont'd)								
Domestic Abuse	26	60.5%	50	45.0%	2	33.3%	78 #	48.8%
Burglary/Robbery	27	62.8%	62	55.9%	3	50.0%	92	57.5%
Kidnapping/Abduction	21	48.8%	45	40.5%	2	33.3%	68 #	42.5%
Hate Crime	31	72.1%	67	60.4%	3	50.0%	101	63.1%
Terroristic Threat	24	55.8%	59	53.2%	3	50.0%	86	53.8%
Vandalism	25	58.1%	61	55.0%	1	16.7%	87	54.4%
Other	6	14.0%	8	7.2%	0	0.0%	14	8.8%
Human								
Student Death	35	81.4%	80	72.1%	2	33.3%	117	73.1%
Faculty/Staff Death	26	60.5%	66	59.5%	2	33.3%	94	58.8%
Student Injury	30	69.8%	77	69.4%	3	50.0%	110	68.8%
Faculty/Staff Injury	27	62.8%	71	64.0%	3	50.0%	101	63.1%
Suicide	36	83.7%	79	71.2%	2	33.3%	117	73.1%
Emotional/Psychological Crisis	32	74.4%	75	67.6%	3	50.0%	110	68.8%
Missing Person	33	76.7%	78	70.3%	3	50.0%	114	71.3%
Alcohol/Drug Overdose	32	74.4%	73	65.8%	2	33.3%	107	66.9%
Infectious Disease	31	72.1%	75	67.6%	2	33.3%	108	67.5%
Racial Incident	29	67.4%	65	58.6%	2	33.3%	96	60.0%
Campus Disturbance/Demonstration	27	62.8%	66	59.5%	3	50.0%	96	60.0%
Other	5	11.6%	3	2.7%	0	0.0%	8	5.0%

* = high frequency

= low frequency

Table 11

Types of Crisis for which Institutions Had Prepared Contingency Plans by Type of Institution First Administration of Questionnaire

Types	Public (N = 28)		Private (N = 97)		Total (N = 125)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Natural						
Tornado	13	46.4%	61	62.9%	74	59.2%
Hurricane	8	28.6%	34	35.1%	42	33.6%
Earthquake	10	35.7%	42	43.3%	52	41.6%
Flood	13	46.4%	44	45.4%	57	45.6%
Severe weather	18 *	64.3%	73	75.3%	91	72.8%
Other	1	3.6%	14	14.4%	15	12.0%
Facility						
Fire	16	57.1%	75 *	77.3%	91	72.8%
Explosion	13	46.4%	66	68.0%	79	63.2%
Chemical Leak	13	46.4%	67	69.1%	80	64.0%
Evacuation of Campus	15	53.6%	62	63.9%	77	61.6%
Evacuation of Buildings	16	57.1%	74 *	76.3%	90	72.0%
Corruption/Loss of Computer Data	14	50.0%	57	58.8%	71	56.8%
Other	1	3.6%	10	10.3%	11	8.8%
Criminal						
Homicide	14	50.0%	67	69.1%	81	64.8%
Assault	15	53.6%	66	68.0%	81	64.8%
Sexual Assault/Rape	17 *	60.7%	74 *	76.3%	91	72.8%
Sexual Harassment	13	46.4%	69	71.1%	82	65.6%
Domestic Abuse	11	39.3%	51	52.6%	62	49.6%

Table 11 continues

Types	Public (N = 28)		Private (N = 97)		Total (N = 125)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Criminal (cont'd)						
Burglary/Robbery	10	35.7%	61	62.9%	71	56.8%
Kidnapping/Abduction	8	28.6%	41	42.3%	49	39.2%
Hate Crime	12	42.9%	60	61.9%	72	57.6%
Terroristic Threat	12	42.9%	55	56.7%	67	53.6%
Vandalism	11	39.3%	59	60.8%	70	56.0%
Other	1	3.6%	9	9.3%	10	8.0%
Human						
Student Death	17 *	60.7%	73	75.3%	90	72.0%
Faculty/Staff Death	14	50.0%	60	61.9%	74	59.2%
Student Injury	14	50.0%	71	73.2%	85	68.0%
Faculty/Staff Injury	14	50.0%	56	57.7%	70	56.0%
Suicide	16	57.1%	76 *	78.4%	92	73.6%
Emotional/Psychological Crisis	16	57.1%	70	72.2%	86	68.8%
Missing Person	15	53.6%	70	72.2%	85	68.0%
Alcohol/Drug Overdose	16	57.1%	66	68.0%	82	65.6%
Infectious Disease	16	57.1%	66	68.0%	82	65.6%
Racial Incident	10	35.7%	56	57.7%	66	52.8%
Campus Disturbance/Demonstration	11	39.3%	60	61.9%	71	56.8%
Other	2	7.1%	11	11.3%	13	10.4%

* = high frequency

Table 12

Types of Crisis for which Institutions Had Prepared Contingency Plans by Type of Institution Second Administration of Questionnaire

Types	Public (N = 34)		Private (N = 126)		Total (N = 160)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Natural						
Tornado	21	61.8%	87	69.0%	108	67.5%
Hurricane	9	26.5%	55	43.7%	64	40.0%
Earthquake	11	32.4%	67	53.2%	78	48.8%
Flood	17	50.0%	67	53.2%	84	52.5%
Severe weather	24 *	70.6%	98 *	77.8%	122	76.3%
Other	4	11.8%	14	11.1%	18	11.3%
Facility						
Fire	20	58.8%	100 *	79.4%	120	75.0%
Explosion	20	58.8%	84	66.7%	104	65.0%
Chemical Leak	22	64.7%	86	68.3%	108	67.5%
Evacuation of Campus	23 *	67.6%	91	72.2%	114	71.3%
Evacuation of Buildings	24 *	70.6%	99 *	78.6%	123	76.9%
Corruption/Loss of Computer Data	18	52.9%	74	58.7%	92	57.5%
Other	1	2.9%	11	8.7%	12	7.5%
Criminal						
Homicide	18	52.9%	80	63.5%	98	61.3%
Assault	18	52.9%	93	73.8%	111	69.4%
Sexual Assault/Rape	23 *	67.6%	100 *	79.4%	123	76.9%
Sexual Harassment	22	64.7%	98 *	77.8%	120	75.0%
Domestic Abuse	14	41.2%	64	50.8%	78	48.8%

Table 12 continues

Types	Public (N = 34)		Private (N = 126)		Total (N = 160)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Criminal (cont'd)						
Burglary/Robbery	17	50.0%	76	60.3%	93	58.1%
Kidnapping/Abduction	14	41.2%	54	42.9%	68	42.5%
Hate Crime	18	52.9%	83	65.9%	101	63.1%
Terroristic Threat	15	44.1%	71	56.3%	86	53.8%
Vandalism	16	47.1%	71	56.3%	87	54.4%
Other	2	5.9%	12	9.5%	14	8.8%
Human						
Student Death	22	64.7%	95	75.4%	117	73.1%
Faculty/Staff Death	17	50.0%	77	61.1%	94	58.8%
Student Injury	19	55.9%	91	72.2%	110	68.8%
Faculty/Staff Injury	18	52.9%	83	65.9%	101	63.1%
Suicide	22	64.7%	95	75.4%	117	73.1%
Emotional/Psychological Crisis	19	55.9%	91	72.2%	110	68.8%
Missing Person	21	61.8%	93	73.8%	114	71.3%
Alcohol/Drug Overdose	19	55.9%	88	69.8%	107	66.9%
Infectious Disease	19	55.9%	89	70.6%	108	67.5%
Racial Incident	16	47.1%	80	63.5%	96	60.0%
Campus Disturbance/Demonstration	17	50.0%	79	62.7%	96	60.0%
Other	1	2.9%	7	5.6%	8	5.0%

* = high frequency

Table 19

Phases of Crisis Addressed in Contingency Plans by Type of Written Crisis Management Plan First Administration of Questionnaire

Types	Student Affairs Plan (N = 35)		University Plan Only (N = 81)		No Plan Indicated (N = 9)		Total (N = 125)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Natural								
Tornado								
Pre-Crisis	14	40.0%	42	51.9%	1	11.1%	57	45.6%
Crisis	18	51.4%	51	63.0%	1	11.1%	70	56.0%
Post-Crisis	16	45.7%	43	53.1%	1	11.1%	60	48.0%
All Phases	12	34.3%	36	44.4%	1	11.1%	49	39.2%
Hurricane								
Pre-Crisis	7	20.0%	20	24.7%	2	22.2%	29 #	23.2%
Crisis	12	34.3%	25	30.9%	2	22.2%	39 #	31.2%
Post-Crisis	9	25.7%	21	25.9%	2	22.2%	32 #	25.6%
All Phases	6	17.1%	16	19.8%	2	22.2%	24 #	19.2%
Earthquake								
Pre-Crisis	10	28.6%	25	30.9%	0	0.0%	35 #	28.0%
Crisis	15	42.9%	35	43.2%	1	11.1%	51 #	40.8%
Post-Crisis	13	37.1%	27	33.3%	1	11.1%	41 #	32.8%
All Phases	9	25.7%	22	27.2%	0	0.0%	31 #	24.8%
Flood								
Pre-Crisis	13	37.1%	25	30.9%	2	22.2%	40 #	32.0%
Crisis	18	51.4%	35	43.2%	2	22.2%	55 #	44.0%
Post-Crisis	16	45.7%	28	34.6%	2	22.2%	46	36.8%
All Phases	12	34.3%	22	27.2%	2	22.2%	36	28.8%

Table 19 continues

Types	Student Affairs Plan (N = 35)		University Plan Only (N = 81)		No Plan Indicated (N = 9)		Total (N = 125)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Severe weather								
Pre-Crisis	22	62.9%	50	61.7%	4	44.4%	76 *	60.8%
Crisis	25	71.4%	59	72.8%	3	33.3%	87 *	69.6%
Post-Crisis	23	65.7%	51	63.0%	3	33.3%	77 *	61.6%
All Phases	20	57.1%	45	55.6%	3	33.3%	68 *	54.4%
Other								
Pre-Crisis	3	8.6%	8	9.9%	0	0.0%	11	8.8%
Crisis	3	8.6%	11	13.6%	0	0.0%	14	11.2%
Post-Crisis	3	8.6%	10	12.3%	0	0.0%	13	10.4%
All Phases	2	5.7%	8	9.9%	0	0.0%	10	8.0%
Facility								
Fire								
Pre-Crisis	23	65.7%	50	61.7%	3	33.3%	76 *	60.8%
Crisis	27	77.1%	58	71.6%	2	22.2%	87 *	69.6%
Post-Crisis	23	65.7%	51	63.0%	2	22.2%	76 *	60.8%
All Phases	21	60.0%	45	55.6%	2	22.2%	68 *	54.4%
Explosion								
Pre-Crisis	16	45.7%	36	44.4%	3	33.3%	55	44.0%
Crisis	19	54.3%	54	66.7%	2	22.2%	75	60.0%
Post-Crisis	14	40.0%	44	54.3%	2	22.2%	60	48.0%
All Phases	11	31.4%	32	39.5%	2	22.2%	45	36.0%
Chemical Leak								
Pre-Crisis	18	51.4%	38	46.9%	3	33.3%	59	47.2%
Crisis	21	60.0%	53	65.4%	2	22.2%	76	60.8%

Table 19 continues

Types	Student Affairs Plan (N = 35)		University Plan Only (N = 81)		No Plan Indicated (N = 9)		Total (N = 125)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Chemical Leak (cont'd)								
Post-Crisis	17	48.6%	43	53.1%	2	22.2%	62	49.6%
All Phases	14	40.0%	34	42.0%	2	22.2%	50	40.0%
Evacuation of Campus								
Pre-Crisis	18	51.4%	38	46.9%	3	33.3%	59	47.2%
Crisis	23	65.7%	48	59.3%	2	22.2%	73	58.4%
Post-Crisis	20	57.1%	42	51.9%	2	22.2%	64	51.2%
All Phases	17	48.6%	33	40.7%	2	22.2%	52	41.6%
Evacuation of Buildings								
Pre-Crisis	21	60.0%	47	58.0%	3	33.3%	71 *	56.8%
Crisis	26	74.3%	57	70.4%	2	22.2%	85	68.0%
Post-Crisis	22	62.9%	48	59.3%	2	22.2%	72	57.6%
All Phases	19	54.3%	40	49.4%	2	22.2%	61	48.8%
Corruption/Loss of Computer Data								
Pre-Crisis	17	48.6%	38	46.9%	2	22.2%	57	45.6%
Crisis	18	51.4%	46	56.8%	2	22.2%	66	52.8%
Post-Crisis	15	42.9%	37	45.7%	2	22.2%	54	43.2%
All Phases	13	37.1%	33	40.7%	2	22.2%	48	38.4%
Other								
Pre-Crisis	1	2.9%	6	7.4%	0	0.0%	7	5.6%
Crisis	2	5.7%	8	9.9%	0	0.0%	10	8.0%
Post-Crisis	2	5.7%	7	8.6%	0	0.0%	9	7.2%
All Phases	0	0.0%	6	7.4%	0	0.0%	6	4.8%

Table 19 continues

Types	Student Affairs Plan (N = 35)		University Plan Only (N = 81)		No Plan Indicated (N = 9)		Total (N = 125)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Criminal								
Homicide								
Pre-Crisis	13	37.1%	29	35.8%	2	22.2%	44	35.2%
Crisis	25	71.4%	52	64.2%	2	22.2%	79	63.2%
Post-Crisis	22	62.9%	40	49.4%	2	22.2%	64	51.2%
All Phases	12	34.3%	27	33.3%	2	22.2%	41	32.8%
Assault								
Pre-Crisis	15	42.9%	36	44.4%	3	33.3%	54	43.2%
Crisis	23	65.7%	52	64.2%	2	22.2%	77	61.6%
Post-Crisis	19	54.3%	43	53.1%	2	22.2%	64	51.2%
All Phases	14	40.0%	33	40.7%	2	22.2%	49	39.2%
Sexual Assault/Rape								
Pre-Crisis	20	57.1%	49	60.5%	4	44.4%	73 *	58.4%
Crisis	25	71.4%	58	71.6%	2	22.2%	85 *	68.0%
Post-Crisis	23	65.7%	52	64.2%	2	22.2%	77 *	61.6%
All Phases	19	54.3%	45	55.6%	2	22.2%	66	52.8%
Sexual Harassment								
Pre-Crisis	20	57.1%	44	54.3%	4	44.4%	68	54.4%
Crisis	24	68.6%	50	61.7%	2	22.2%	76	60.8%
Post-Crisis	23	65.7%	42	51.9%	2	22.2%	67	53.6%
All Phases	19	54.3%	39	48.1%	2	22.2%	60	48.0%
Domestic Abuse								
Pre-Crisis	14	40.0%	26	32.1%	4	44.4%	44	35.2%
Crisis	18	51.4%	37	45.7%	2	22.2%	57	45.6%

Table 19 continues

Types	Student Affairs Plan (N = 35)		University Plan Only (N = 81)		No Plan Indicated (N = 9)		Total (N = 125)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Domestic Abuse (cont'd)								
Post-Crisis	15	42.9%	28	34.6%	2	22.2%	45 #	36.0%
All Phases	11	31.4%	21	25.9%	2	22.2%	34 #	27.2%
Burglary/Robbery								
Pre-Crisis	13	37.1%	33	40.7%	3	33.3%	49	39.2%
Crisis	21	60.0%	43	53.1%	1	11.1%	65	52.0%
Post-Crisis	19	54.3%	32	39.5%	1	11.1%	52	41.6%
All Phases	12	34.3%	27	33.3%	1	11.1%	40	32.0%
Kidnapping/Abduction								
Pre-Crisis	5	14.3%	22	27.2%	1	11.1%	28 #	22.4%
Crisis	12	34.3%	35	43.2%	0	0.0%	47 #	37.6%
Post-Crisis	10	28.6%	30	37.0%	0	0.0%	40 #	32.0%
All Phases	5	14.3%	21	25.9%	0	0.0%	26 #	20.8%
Hate Crime								
Pre-Crisis	16	45.7%	32	39.5%	3	33.3%	51	40.8%
Crisis	22	62.9%	44	54.3%	1	11.1%	67	53.6%
Post-Crisis	21	60.0%	35	43.2%	1	11.1%	57	45.6%
All Phases	15	42.9%	29	35.8%	1	11.1%	45	36.0%
Terroristic Threat								
Pre-Crisis	9	25.7%	29	35.8%	2	22.2%	40 #	32.0%
Crisis	18	51.4%	46	56.8%	0	0.0%	64	51.2%
Post-Crisis	14	40.0%	37	45.7%	0	0.0%	51	40.8%
All Phases	8	22.9%	27	33.3%	0	0.0%	35	28.0%

Table 19 continues

Types	Student Affairs Plan (N = 35)		University Plan Only (N = 81)		No Plan Indicated (N = 9)		Total (N = 125)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Vandalism								
Pre-Crisis	12	34.3%	29	35.8%	4	44.4%	45	36.0%
Crisis	20	57.1%	41	50.6%	2	22.2%	63	50.4%
Post-Crisis	16	45.7%	35	43.2%	1	11.1%	52	41.6%
All Phases	7	20.0%	27	33.3%	1	11.1%	35	28.0%
Other								
Pre-Crisis	1	2.9%	5	6.2%	0	0.0%	6	4.8%
Crisis	4	11.4%	6	7.4%	0	0.0%	10	8.0%
Post-Crisis	3	8.6%	5	6.2%	0	0.0%	8	6.4%
All Phases	1	2.9%	5	6.2%	0	0.0%	6	4.8%
Human								
Student Death								
Pre-Crisis	17	48.6%	39	48.1%	4	44.4%	60	48.0%
Crisis	26	74.3%	57	70.4%	4	44.4%	87	69.6%
Post-Crisis	24	68.6%	52	64.2%	4	44.4%	80 *	64.0%
All Phases	16	45.7%	36	44.4%	4	44.4%	56	44.8%
Faculty/Staff Death								
Pre-Crisis	12	34.3%	29	35.8%	4	44.4%	45	36.0%
Crisis	19	54.3%	49	60.5%	3	33.3%	71	56.8%
Post-Crisis	18	51.4%	43	53.1%	3	33.3%	64	51.2%
All Phases	11	31.4%	28	34.6%	3	33.3%	42	33.6%
Student Injury								
Pre-Crisis	15	42.9%	35	43.2%	4	44.4%	54	43.2%
Crisis	25	71.4%	54	66.7%	2	22.2%	81	64.8%

Table 19 continues

Types	Student Affairs Plan (N = 35)		University Plan Only (N = 81)		No Plan Indicated (N = 9)		Total (N = 125)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Student Injury (cont'd)								
Post-Crisis	23	65.7%	45	55.6%	3	33.3%	71	56.8%
All Phases	14	40.0%	31	38.3%	2	22.2%	47	37.6%
Faculty/Staff Injury								
Pre-Crisis	11	31.4%	28	34.6%	4	44.4%	43	34.4%
Crisis	19	54.3%	47	58.0%	3	33.3%	69	55.2%
Post-Crisis	17	48.6%	36	44.4%	3	33.3%	56	44.8%
All Phases	11	31.4%	25	30.9%	3	33.3%	39	31.2%
Suicide								
Pre-Crisis	20	57.1%	43	53.1%	5	55.6%	68	54.4%
Crisis	27	77.1%	57	70.4%	4	44.4%	88 *	70.4%
Post-Crisis	25	71.4%	53	65.4%	4	44.4%	82 *	65.6%
All Phases	19	54.3%	41	50.6%	4	44.4%	64 *	51.2%
Emotional/Psychological Crisis								
Pre-Crisis	21	60.0%	38	46.9%	4	44.4%	63	50.4%
Crisis	26	74.3%	53	65.4%	3	33.3%	82	65.6%
Post-Crisis	22	62.9%	47	58.0%	3	33.3%	72	57.6%
All Phases	18	51.4%	36	44.4%	3	33.3%	57	45.6%
Missing Person								
Pre-Crisis	15	42.9%	42	51.9%	3	33.3%	60	48.0%
Crisis	24	68.6%	55	67.9%	2	22.2%	81	64.8%
Post-Crisis	17	48.6%	46	56.8%	2	22.2%	65	52.0%
All Phases	11	31.4%	35	43.2%	2	22.2%	48	38.4%

Table 19 continues

Types	Student Affairs Plan (N = 35)		University Plan Only (N = 81)		No Plan Indicated (N = 9)		Total (N = 125)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Alcohol/Drug Overdose								
Pre-Crisis	19	54.3%	40	49.4%	3	33.3%	62	49.6%
Crisis	24	68.6%	53	65.4%	2	22.2%	79	63.2%
Post-Crisis	21	60.0%	47	58.0%	2	22.2%	70	56.0%
All Phases	16	45.7%	38	46.9%	2	22.2%	56	44.8%
Infectious Disease								
Pre-Crisis	16	45.7%	41	50.6%	4	44.4%	61	48.8%
Crisis	22	62.9%	56	69.1%	3	33.3%	81	64.8%
Post-Crisis	21	60.0%	50	61.7%	3	33.3%	74	59.2%
All Phases	16	45.7%	39	48.1%	3	33.3%	58	46.4%
Racial Incident								
Pre-Crisis	16	45.7%	24	29.6%	3	33.3%	43	34.4%
Crisis	21	60.0%	40	49.4%	2	22.2%	63	50.4%
Post-Crisis	20	57.1%	34	42.0%	2	22.2%	56	44.8%
All Phases	16	45.7%	22	27.2%	2	22.2%	40	32.0%
Campus Disturbance/ Demonstration								
Pre-Crisis	11	31.4%	31	38.3%	3	33.3%	45	36.0%
Crisis	18	51.4%	46	56.8%	2	22.2%	66	52.8%
Post-Crisis	15	42.9%	37	45.7%	2	22.2%	54	43.2%
All Phases	9	25.7%	27	33.3%	2	22.2%	38	30.4%
Other								
Pre-Crisis	1	2.9%	6	7.4%	0	0.0%	7	5.6%
Crisis	3	8.6%	8	9.9%	1	11.1%	12	9.6%
Post-Crisis	2	5.7%	7	8.6%	1	11.1%	10	8.0%
All Phases	1	2.9%	6	7.4%	0	0.0%	7	5.6%

* = high frequency

= low frequency

Table 20

Phases of Crisis Addressed in Contingency Plans by Type of Written Crisis Management Plan Second Administration of Questionnaire

Types	Student Affairs Plan (N = 43)		University Plan Only (N = 111)		No Plan Indicated (N = 6)		Total (N = 160)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Natural								
Tornado								
Pre-Crisis	26	60.5%	56	50.5%	2	33.3%	84	52.5%
Crisis	29	67.4%	54	48.6%	3	50.0%	86	53.8%
Post-Crisis	24	55.8%	44	39.6%	1	16.7%	69	43.1%
All Phases	21	48.8%	44	39.6%	1	16.7%	66	41.3%
Hurricane								
Pre-Crisis	17	39.5%	26	23.4%	2	33.3%	45 #	28.1%
Crisis	19	44.2%	40	36.0%	2	33.3%	61 #	38.1%
Post-Crisis	18	41.9%	26	23.4%	1	16.7%	45 #	28.1%
All Phases	16	37.2%	23	20.7%	1	16.7%	40 #	25.0%
Earthquake								
Pre-Crisis	17	39.5%	29	26.1%	1	16.7%	47 #	29.4%
Crisis	22	51.2%	50	45.0%	2	33.3%	74 #	46.3%
Post-Crisis	20	46.5%	30	27.0%	1	16.7%	51 #	31.9%
All Phases	15	34.9%	23	20.7%	1	16.7%	39 #	24.4%
Flood								
Pre-Crisis	18	41.9%	41	36.9%	2	33.3%	61	38.1%
Crisis	22	51.2%	54	48.6%	3	50.0%	79	49.4%
Post-Crisis	19	44.2%	42	37.8%	1	16.7%	62	38.8%
All Phases	15	34.9%	33	29.7%	1	16.7%	49	30.6%

Table 20 continues

Types	Student Affairs Plan (N = 43)		University Plan Only (N = 111)		No Plan Indicated (N = 6)		Total (N = 160)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Severe weather								
Pre-Crisis	31	72.1%	66	59.5%	2	33.3%	99 *	61.9%
Crisis	33	76.7%	79	71.2%	4	66.7%	116 *	72.5%
Post-Crisis	29	67.4%	59	53.2%	1	16.7%	89	55.6%
All Phases	26	60.5%	51	45.9%	1	16.7%	78 *	48.8%
Other								
Pre-Crisis	3	7.0%	4	3.6%	1	16.7%	8	5.0%
Crisis	6	14.0%	10	9.0%	0	0.0%	16	10.0%
Post-Crisis	5	11.6%	7	6.3%	0	0.0%	12	7.5%
All Phases	3	7.0%	4	3.6%	0	0.0%	7	4.4%
Facility								
Fire								
Pre-Crisis	28	65.1%	60	54.1%	3	50.0%	91	56.9%
Crisis	35	81.4%	77	69.4%	3	50.0%	115	71.9%
Post-Crisis	29	67.4%	59	53.2%	1	16.7%	89	55.6%
All Phases	25	58.1%	49	44.1%	1	16.7%	75	46.9%
Explosion								
Pre-Crisis	23	53.5%	46	41.4%	1	16.7%	70	43.8%
Crisis	31	72.1%	64	57.7%	2	33.3%	97	60.6%
Post-Crisis	24	55.8%	46	41.4%	1	16.7%	71	44.4%
All Phases	18	41.9%	36	32.4%	1	16.7%	55	34.4%
Chemical Leak								
Pre-Crisis	23	53.5%	51	45.9%	2	33.3%	76	47.5%
Crisis	30	69.8%	68	61.3%	3	50.0%	101	63.1%

Table 20 continues

Types	Student Affairs Plan (N = 43)		University Plan Only (N = 111)		No Plan Indicated (N = 6)		Total (N = 160)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Chemical Leak (cont'd)								
Post-Crisis	26	60.5%	51	45.9%	1	16.7%	78	48.8%
All Phases	20	46.5%	41	36.9%	1	16.7%	62	38.8%
Evacuation of Campus								
Pre-Crisis	25	58.1%	60	54.1%	1	16.7%	86	53.8%
Crisis	31	72.1%	75	67.6%	3	50.0%	109	68.1%
Post-Crisis	24	55.8%	53	47.7%	1	16.7%	78	48.8%
All Phases	20	46.5%	48	43.2%	1	16.7%	69	43.1%
Evacuation of Buildings								
Pre-Crisis	31	72.1%	61	55.0%	2	33.3%	94	58.8%
Crisis	36	83.7%	77	69.4%	4	66.7%	117 *	73.1%
Post-Crisis	27	62.8%	55	49.5%	1	16.7%	83	51.9%
All Phases	24	55.8%	47	42.3%	1	16.7%	72	45.0%
Corruption/Loss of Computer Data								
Pre-Crisis	21	48.8%	43	38.7%	2	33.3%	66	41.3%
Crisis	26	60.5%	52	46.8%	3	50.0%	81	50.6%
Post-Crisis	23	53.5%	39	35.1%	0	0.0%	62	38.8%
All Phases	19	44.2%	33	29.7%	0	0.0%	52	32.5%
Other								
Pre-Crisis	3	7.0%	1	0.9%	0	0.0%	4	2.5%
Crisis	6	14.0%	5	4.5%	0	0.0%	11	6.9%
Post-Crisis	5	11.6%	3	2.7%	0	0.0%	8	5.0%
All Phases	3	7.0%	1	0.9%	0	0.0%	4	2.5%

Table 20 continues

Types	Student Affairs Plan (N = 43)		University Plan Only (N = 111)		No Plan Indicated (N = 6)		Total (N = 160)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Criminal								
Homicide								
Pre-Crisis	21	48.8%	39	35.1%	2	33.3%	62	38.8%
Crisis	23	53.5%	67	60.4%	3	50.0%	93	58.1%
Post-Crisis	22	51.2%	48	43.2%	2	33.3%	72	45.0%
All Phases	17	39.5%	34	30.6%	1	16.7%	52	32.5%
Assault								
Pre-Crisis	28	65.1%	51	45.9%	3	50.0%	82	51.3%
Crisis	32	74.4%	71	64.0%	3	50.0%	106	66.3%
Post-Crisis	31	72.1%	55	49.5%	2	33.3%	88	55.0%
All Phases	28	65.1%	42	37.8%	2	33.3%	72	45.0%
Sexual Assault/Rape								
Pre-Crisis	32	74.4%	66	59.5%	3	50.0%	101 *	63.1%
Crisis	35	81.4%	80	72.1%	3	50.0%	118 *	73.8%
Post-Crisis	33	76.7%	69	62.2%	2	33.3%	104 *	65.0%
All Phases	30	69.8%	59	53.2%	2	33.3%	91 *	56.9%
Sexual Harassment								
Pre-Crisis	30	69.8%	67	60.4%	3	50.0%	100 *	62.5%
Crisis	34	79.1%	79	71.2%	3	50.0%	116 *	72.5%
Post-Crisis	31	72.1%	65	58.6%	2	33.3%	98 *	61.3%
All Phases	29	67.4%	58	52.3%	2	33.3%	89 *	55.6%
Domestic Abuse								
Pre-Crisis	18	41.9%	33	29.7%	1	16.7%	52 #	32.5%
Crisis	25	58.1%	45	40.5%	2	33.3%	72 #	45.0%

Table 20 continues

Types	Student Affairs Plan (N = 43)		University Plan Only (N = 111)		No Plan Indicated (N = 6)		Total (N = 160)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Domestic Abuse (cont'd)								
Post-Crisis	22	51.2%	32	28.8%	1	16.7%	55 #	34.4%
All Phases	16	37.2%	25	22.5%	1	16.7%	42 #	26.3%
Burglary/Robbery								
Pre-Crisis	20	46.5%	37	33.3%	2	33.3%	59	36.9%
Crisis	27	62.8%	60	54.1%	3	50.0%	90	56.3%
Post-Crisis	23	53.5%	40	36.0%	1	16.7%	64	40.0%
All Phases	19	44.2%	31	27.9%	1	16.7%	51	31.9%
Kidnapping/Abduction								
Pre-Crisis	12	27.9%	25	22.5%	1	16.7%	38 #	23.8%
Crisis	21	48.8%	43	38.7%	2	33.3%	66 #	41.3%
Post-Crisis	19	44.2%	29	26.1%	1	16.7%	49 #	30.6%
All Phases	12	27.9%	18	16.2%	1	16.7%	31 #	19.4%
Hate Crime								
Pre-Crisis	25	58.1%	49	44.1%	3	50.0%	77	48.1%
Crisis	31	72.1%	63	56.8%	3	50.0%	97	60.6%
Post-Crisis	26	60.5%	44	39.6%	2	33.3%	72	45.0%
All Phases	23	53.5%	39	35.1%	2	33.3%	64	40.0%
Terroristic Threat								
Pre-Crisis	15	34.9%	37	33.3%	2	33.3%	54	33.8%
Crisis	24	55.8%	56	50.5%	3	50.0%	83	51.9%
Post-Crisis	17	39.5%	38	34.2%	1	16.7%	56	35.0%
All Phases	13	30.2%	29	26.1%	1	16.7%	43	26.9%
Vandalism								
Pre-Crisis	21	48.8%	42	37.8%	0	0.0%	63	39.4%

Table 20 continues

Types	Student Affairs Plan (N = 43)		University Plan Only (N = 111)		No Plan Indicated (N = 6)		Total (N = 160)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Vandalism (cont'd)								
Crisis	22	51.2%	55	49.5%	1	16.7%	78	48.8%
Post-Crisis	19	44.2%	43	38.7%	0	0.0%	62	38.8%
All Phases	17	39.5%	32	28.8%	0	0.0%	49	30.6%
Other								
Pre-Crisis	2	4.7%	3	2.7%	0	0.0%	5	3.1%
Crisis	5	11.6%	5	4.5%	0	0.0%	10	6.3%
Post-Crisis	4	9.3%	4	3.6%	0	0.0%	8	5.0%
All Phases	2	4.7%	2	1.8%	0	0.0%	4	2.5%
Human								
Student Death								
Pre-Crisis	23	53.5%	51	45.9%	2	33.3%	76	47.5%
Crisis	34	79.1%	75	67.6%	2	33.3%	111	69.4%
Post-Crisis	33	76.7%	60	54.1%	2	33.3%	95 *	59.4%
All Phases	23	53.5%	43	38.7%	2	33.3%	68	42.5%
Faculty/Staff Death								
Pre-Crisis	19	44.2%	40	36.0%	2	33.3%	61	38.1%
Crisis	26	60.5%	62	55.9%	1	16.7%	89	55.6%
Post-Crisis	22	51.2%	45	40.5%	1	16.7%	68	42.5%
All Phases	18	41.9%	33	29.7%	1	16.7%	52	32.5%
Student Injury								
Pre-Crisis	23	53.5%	48	43.2%	2	33.3%	73	45.6%
Crisis	30	69.8%	72	64.9%	3	50.0%	105	65.6%
Post-Crisis	26	60.5%	55	49.5%	1	16.7%	82	51.3%
All Phases	21	48.8%	39	35.1%	1	16.7%	61	38.1%

Table 20 continues

Types	Student Affairs Plan (N = 43)		University Plan Only (N = 111)		No Plan Indicated (N = 6)		Total (N = 160)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Faculty/Staff Injury								
Pre-Crisis	19	44.2%	39	35.1%	2	33.3%	60	37.5%
Crisis	27	62.8%	66	59.5%	2	33.3%	95	59.4%
Post-Crisis	25	58.1%	45	40.5%	0	0.0%	70	43.8%
All Phases	19	44.2%	29	26.1%	0	0.0%	48	30.0%
Suicide								
Pre-Crisis	32	74.4%	61	55.0%	2	33.3%	95 *	59.4%
Crisis	35	81.4%	74	66.7%	2	33.3%	111	69.4%
Post-Crisis	34	79.1%	64	57.7%	2	33.3%	100 *	62.5%
All Phases	31	72.1%	54	48.6%	2	33.3%	87 *	54.4%
Emotional/Psychological Crisis								
Pre-Crisis	30	69.8%	57	51.4%	2	33.3%	89	55.6%
Crisis	32	74.4%	69	62.2%	3	50.0%	104	65.0%
Post-Crisis	29	67.4%	54	48.6%	1	16.7%	84	52.5%
All Phases	29	67.4%	46	41.4%	1	16.7%	76	47.5%
Missing Person								
Pre-Crisis	24	55.8%	53	47.7%	2	33.3%	79	49.4%
Crisis	32	74.4%	73	65.8%	3	50.0%	108	67.5%
Post-Crisis	29	67.4%	54	48.6%	1	16.7%	84	52.5%
All Phases	23	53.5%	44	39.6%	1	16.7%	68	42.5%
Alcohol/Drug Overdose								
Pre-Crisis	29	67.4%	55	49.5%	2	33.3%	86	53.8%
Crisis	31	72.1%	68	61.3%	2	33.3%	101	63.1%

Table 20 continues

Types	Student Affairs Plan (N = 43)		University Plan Only (N = 111)		No Plan Indicated (N = 6)		Total (N = 160)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Alcohol/Drug Overdose (cont'd)								
Post-Crisis	29	67.4%	56	50.5%	1	16.7%	86	53.8%
All Phases	27	62.8%	46	41.4%	1	16.7%	74	46.3%
Infectious Disease								
Pre-Crisis	25	58.1%	52	46.8%	2	33.3%	79	49.4%
Crisis	31	72.1%	72	64.9%	2	33.3%	105	65.6%
Post-Crisis	28	65.1%	55	49.5%	1	16.7%	84	52.5%
All Phases	25	58.1%	44	39.6%	1	16.7%	70	43.8%
Racial Incident								
Pre-Crisis	26	60.5%	46	41.4%	2	33.3%	74	46.3%
Crisis	28	65.1%	59	53.2%	2	33.3%	89	55.6%
Post-Crisis	27	62.8%	48	43.2%	1	16.7%	76	47.5%
All Phases	25	58.1%	37	33.3%	1	16.7%	63	39.4%
Campus Disturbance/ Demonstration								
Pre-Crisis	23	53.5%	37	33.3%	3	50.0%	63	39.4%
Crisis	26	60.5%	59	53.2%	3	50.0%	88	55.0%
Post-Crisis	22	51.2%	43	38.7%	1	16.7%	66	41.3%
All Phases	20	46.5%	25	22.5%	1	16.7%	46	28.8%
Other								
Pre-Crisis	1	2.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.6%
Crisis	5	11.6%	2	1.8%	0	0.0%	7	4.4%
Post-Crisis	3	7.0%	2	1.8%	0	0.0%	5	3.1%
All Phases	1	2.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.6%

* = high frequency

= low frequency

Table 25

Crisis Response Coordinators by Type of Plan First Administration of Questionnaire

Position	University Plan Only (N = 81)		Student Affairs Plan (N = 35)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
President	6	7.4%	NA	NA
VP Academic Affairs/Provost	1	1.2%	NA	NA
VP Administration/Business Affairs	10 *	12.3%	NA	NA
VP Student Affairs	23 *	28.4%	18 *	51.4%
Chief/Director University Police	13 *	16.0%	2 *	5.7%
Director Public Information/Relations	1	1.2%	NA	NA
Director of Health & Safety	6	7.4%	NA	NA
Dean of Students	3	3.7%	9 *	25.7%
Director of Student Counseling	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Director of Student Health Services	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Director of Residence Life	0	0.0%	1	2.9%
Director of Student Activities	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Other	18 *	22.2%	4 *	11.4%

* = high frequency

Table 26

Crisis Response Coordinators by Type of Plan Second Administration of Questionnaire

Position	University Plan Only (N = 111)		Student Affairs Plan (N = 43)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
President	11	9.9%	NA	NA
VP Academic Affairs/Provost	1	0.9%	NA	NA
VP Administration/Business Affairs	13 *	11.7%	NA	NA
VP Student Affairs	25 *	22.5%	24 *	55.8%
Chief/Director University Police	23 *	20.7%	2 *	4.7%
Director Public Information/Relations	2	1.8%	NA	NA
Director of Health & Safety	3	2.7%	NA	NA
Dean of Students	5	4.5%	10 *	23.3%
Director of Student Counseling	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Director of Student Health Services	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Director of Residence Life	1	0.9%	1	2.3%
Director of Student Activities	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Other	27 *	24.3%	9 *	20.9%

* = high frequency

Table 31

How Crisis Management Plans are Communicated by Type of Plan First Administration of Questionnaire

Response	Student Affairs Plan (N = 35)		University Plan Only (N = 81)		Total (N = 116)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Not communicated	3	8.6%	4	4.9%	7	6.0%
Copy of plan available upon request	20 *	57.1%	29 *	35.8%	49	42.2%
Plan accessible on the web	14 *	40.0%	39 *	48.1%	53	45.7%
Annual notification	9	25.7%	18	22.2%	27	23.3%
New employee orientation	11 *	31.4%	23 *	28.4%	34	29.3%
New student orientation	7	20.0%	19	23.5%	26	22.4%
Optional CM training sessions	8	22.9%	16	19.8%	24	20.7%
Required CM training sessions	8	22.9%	20	24.7%	28	24.1%
Drills and exercises	26 *	74.3%	46 *	56.8%	72	62.1%
Other	4	11.4%	10	12.3%	14	12.1%

* = high frequency

Table 32

*How Crisis Management Plans are Communicated by Type of Plan Second**Administration of Questionnaire*

Response	Student Affairs Plan (N = 43)		University Plan Only (N = 111)		Total (N = 154)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Not communicated	5	11.6%	4	3.6%	9	5.8%
Copy of plan available upon request	25 *	58.1%	50 *	45.0%	75	48.7%
Plan accessible on the web	15 *	34.9%	66 *	59.5%	81	52.6%
Annual notification	15 *	34.9%	34	30.6%	49	31.8%
New employee orientation	10	23.3%	42 *	37.8%	52	33.8%
New student orientation	9	20.9%	32	28.8%	41	26.6%
Optional CM training sessions	12	27.9%	19	17.1%	31	20.1%
Required CM training sessions	15 *	34.9%	26	23.4%	41	26.6%
Drills and exercises	32 *	74.4%	66 *	59.5%	98	63.6%
Other	9	20.9%	12	10.8%	21	13.6%

* = high frequency

Table 43

*Training Provided to Crisis Management Teams by Type of Crisis Management Plan**First Administration of Questionnaire*

Training	Student Affairs Plan (N = 35)		University Plan Only (N = 81)		No Plan Indicated (N = 9)		Total (N = 125)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
No training provided	1	2.9%	1	1.2%	1	11.1%	3	2.4%
Crisis Management (campus procedures)	28 *	80.0%	64 *	79.0%	4	44.4%	96	76.8%
Crisis Management (general)	25 *	71.4%	41	50.6%	4	44.4%	70	56.0%
Legal Issues/Risk Management	13	37.1%	26	32.1%	2	22.2%	41	32.8%
Working with Law Enforcement & Emergency Personnel	21 *	60.0%	43 *	53.1%	2	22.2%	66	52.8%
Responding to Civil Disturbance or Demonstration	3 #	8.6%	6 #	7.4%	1	11.1%	10	8.0%
Suicide Intervention	20	57.1%	28	34.6%	3	33.3%	51	40.8%
Media Relations	18	51.4%	32	39.5%	2	22.2%	52	41.6%
Campus Violence Issues	14	40.0%	26	32.1%	3	33.3%	43	34.4%
Substance Abuse	11 #	31.4%	19 #	23.5%	2	22.2%	32	25.6%
Grieving Process	12 #	34.3%	11 #	13.6%	0	0.0%	23	18.4%
Orientation to Community & County Agency Assistance	9 #	25.7%	21 #	25.9%	2	22.2%	32	25.6%
Critical Incident Stress Management/Debriefing	18	51.4%	25	30.9%	2	22.2%	45	36.0%
Table-top exercises	23 *	65.7%	45 *	55.6%	4	44.4%	72	57.6%
Crisis simulations or drills	19	54.3%	42 *	51.9%	2	22.2%	63	50.4%
Other	2	5.7%	4	4.9%	0	0.0%	6	4.8%

* = high frequency

= low frequency

Table 44

*Training Provided to Crisis Management Teams by Type of Crisis Management Plan**Second Administration of Questionnaire*

Training	Student Affairs Plan (N = 43)		University Plan Only (N = 111)		No Plan Indicated (N = 6)		Total (N = 160)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
No training provided	1	2.3%	6	5.4%	0	0.0%	7	4.4%
Crisis Management (campus procedures)	34 *	79.1%	83 *	74.8%	3	50.0%	120	75.0%
Crisis Management (general)	27 *	62.8%	62 *	55.9%	4	66.7%	93	58.1%
Legal Issues/Risk Management	20	46.5%	28	25.2%	2	33.3%	50	31.3%
Working with Law Enforcement & Emergency Personnel	24 *	55.8%	54 *	48.6%	4	66.7%	82	51.3%
Responding to Civil Disturbance or Demonstration	3 #	7.0%	7 #	6.3%	1	16.7%	11	6.9%
Suicide Intervention	23	53.5%	39	35.1%	3	50.0%	65	40.6%
Media Relations	22	51.2%	37	33.3%	3	50.0%	62	38.8%
Campus Violence Issues	19	44.2%	37	33.3%	1	16.7%	57	35.6%
Substance Abuse	15	34.9%	21 #	18.9%	2	33.3%	38	23.8%
Grieving Process	11 #	25.6%	15 #	13.5%	1	16.7%	27	16.9%
Orientation to Community & County Agency Assistance	7 #	16.3%	26	23.4%	1	16.7%	34	21.3%
Critical Incident Stress Management/Debriefing	14 #	32.6%	24 #	21.6%	2	33.3%	40	25.0%
Table-top exercises	29 *	67.4%	68 *	61.3%	2	33.3%	99	61.9%
Crisis simulations or drills	22	51.2%	53	47.7%	3	50.0%	78	48.8%
Other	3	7.0%	11	9.9%	0	0.0%	14	8.8%

* = high frequency

= low frequency

Table 45

Level of Involvement of Stakeholders by Type of Crisis Management Plan First Administration of Questionnaire

Stakeholders	Student Affairs Plan			University Plan Only			No Plan Indicated			Total		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Internal												
President	30	1.43 *	0.68	67	1.70 *	0.72	5	2.40	1.14	102	1.66	0.75
VP Academic Affairs	30	1.50	0.73	67	1.75	0.88	5	2.40	1.14	102	1.71	0.86
VP Administrative Affairs	28	1.86	1.33	66	2.09	1.53	5	2.60	1.52	99	2.05	1.47
VP Student Affairs	30	1.43 *	1.22	68	1.76	1.40	5	2.60	1.52	103	1.71	1.37
General Counsel	28	2.89	1.50	63	3.44	1.45	4	3.00	1.41	95	3.26	1.47
University Police	30	1.37 *	1.03	67	1.82	1.54	6	2.00	1.67	103	1.70	1.42
University Relations/PIO	30	1.27 *	0.78	66	1.42 *	0.93	5	1.60	0.89	101	1.39	0.88
Physical Plant	29	1.62	0.94	68	1.47 *	0.85	6	1.50	0.84	103	1.51	0.87
Environmental Health	28	2.96	1.77	64	3.16	1.75	5	2.60	2.19	97	3.07	1.76
Dean of Students	29	2.28	1.75	66	2.12	1.69	6	2.00	1.67	101	2.16	1.69
Dean of Faculties	27	3.70	1.71	66	3.52	1.59	5	2.80	2.05	98	3.53	1.64
Human Resources	29	1.86	1.06	64	1.91	1.00	4	1.75	0.96	97	1.89	1.01
Student Health Services	29	1.90	1.11	65	1.98	1.28	5	2.00	1.00	99	1.96	1.21

Table 45 continues

Stakeholders	Student Affairs Plan			University Plan Only			No Plan Indicated			Total		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Internal (cont'd)												
Student Counseling Services	29	1.72	0.96	67	1.84	0.99	5	1.60	0.89	101	1.79	0.97
Employee Assistance	26	3.46	1.42	62	3.56	1.44	4	1.75	0.96	92	3.46	1.46
Residence Life	28	1.50	0.58	66	1.56 *	0.95	6	2.33	1.63	100	1.59	0.92
Student Activities	28	2.57	0.88	65	2.63	0.99	4	3.00	1.15	97	2.63	0.96
Athletics	29	2.62	0.98	66	2.73	1.31	5	3.60	1.52	100	2.74	1.24
International Student Services	28	2.54	0.84	65	2.92	1.16	5	2.60	1.52	98	2.80	1.10
Campus Ministers	28	2.86	1.58	65	3.06	1.43	6	3.67	1.63	99	3.04	1.48
Students	28	2.64	0.99	66	2.76	0.80	4	3.00	1.63	98	2.73	0.89
Faculty	29	2.41	1.12	66	2.58	0.88	5	2.40	0.89	100	2.52	0.95
Other	14	3.50	1.83	27	3.59	1.55	1	3.00	NA	42	3.55	1.61
External												
FBI	29	3.90	1.01	64	3.53	1.05	4	3.00	1.15	97	3.62	1.06
Local Police/Sheriff	30	2.23 *	0.43	66	2.30 *	0.68	5	2.80	0.84	101	2.31	0.63
State Police	30	2.97	1.03	65	3.00	0.92	5	2.60	0.55	100	2.97	0.94

Table 45 continues

Stakeholders	Student Affairs Plan			University Plan Only			No Plan Indicated			Total		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
External (cont'd)												
Local Fire Department	30	2.20 *	0.41	67	2.22 *	0.67	4	2.75	0.50	101	2.24	0.60
State Fire Marshal	30	3.27	1.05	66	3.11	0.96	5	2.60	0.55	101	3.13	0.98
Local Hospitals	30	2.53 *	0.68	67	2.70	0.84	4	2.50	0.58	101	2.64	0.78
Local Health Department	30	2.60	0.89	67	2.69 *	0.99	5	2.40	0.55	102	2.65	0.94
State Health Department	30	2.93	0.83	67	3.06	0.90	5	2.60	0.55	102	3.00	0.87
Local Mental Health	30	2.77	0.82	67	2.85	0.94	4	2.50	0.58	101	2.81	0.89
State Mental Health	30	3.07	0.98	66	3.33	0.90	3	2.33	0.58	99	3.22	0.93
Local Emergency Mgmt.	30	2.37 *	0.61	66	2.38 *	0.87	5	2.40	0.55	101	2.38	0.79
Campus Ministers	30	2.90	1.52	67	3.21	1.33	5	3.20	1.79	102	3.12	1.40
Red Cross	30	2.87	0.97	67	3.09	1.00	4	3.50	1.29	101	3.04	1.00
Victims Assistance Program	30	3.27	1.01	67	3.28	1.03	4	3.50	1.29	101	3.29	1.02
Local Gov. Officials	30	2.90	0.92	67	3.04	0.91	4	2.75	0.50	101	2.99	0.90
State Gov. Officials	30	3.20	0.96	67	3.36	0.93	4	3.00	0.82	101	3.30	0.93
Alumni Association	30	3.23	0.86	67	3.51	0.88	4	4.25	0.50	101	3.46	0.88
Hometown Alumni Clubs	30	3.83	0.91	67	3.88	0.93	4	4.25	0.50	101	3.88	0.91

Table 45 continues

Stakeholders	Student Affairs Plan			University Plan Only			No Plan Indicated			Total		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
External (cont'd)												
Parents	30	3.03	0.81	66	3.08	0.73	4	2.75	0.50	100	3.05	0.74
Local Community Members	30	3.23	0.77	66	3.14	0.84	4	3.25	1.26	100	3.17	0.83
Other	12	4.17	1.11	26	4.27	1.04	1	2.00	NA	39	4.18	1.10

* = high involvement

Table 46

Level of Involvement of Stakeholders by Type of Crisis Management Plan Second Administration of Questionnaire

Stakeholders	Student Affairs Plan			University Plan Only			No Plan Indicated			Total		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Internal												
President	41	1.73	0.87	99	1.65 *	0.80	6	1.83	1.17	146	1.68	0.83
VP Academic Affairs	41	1.71	0.98	98	1.72	0.89	6	1.50	0.55	145	1.71	0.90
VP Administrative Affairs	39	2.44	1.73	93	2.15	1.57	6	2.00	1.55	138	2.22	1.61
VP Student Affairs	41	1.56	1.21	96	1.69	1.38	6	1.83	1.60	143	1.66	1.33
General Counsel	38	2.66	1.44	92	3.27	1.56	6	2.83	1.72	136	3.08	1.55
University Police	41	1.41 *	1.09	96	1.56 *	1.29	6	1.83	1.60	143	1.53	1.24
University Relations/PIO	39	1.18 *	0.56	95	1.46 *	1.01	6	1.83	1.17	140	1.40	0.92
Physical Plant	40	1.40 *	0.59	97	1.29 *	0.58	6	1.67	0.52	143	1.34	0.58
Environmental Health	36	2.69	1.77	92	3.37	1.81	6	3.50	1.76	134	3.19	1.81
Dean of Students	40	1.65	1.25	98	1.93	1.56	6	3.00	2.19	144	1.90	1.52
Dean of Faculties	37	3.03	1.77	90	3.28	1.69	4	4.25	1.50	131	3.24	1.71
Human Resources	38	2.13	1.12	96	2.00	1.09	6	1.67	1.21	140	2.02	1.10
Student Health Services	41	2.02	1.11	94	2.33	1.35	5	2.60	1.82	140	2.25	1.30

Table 46 continues

Stakeholders	Student Affairs Plan			University Plan Only			No Plan Indicated			Total		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Internal (cont'd)												
Student Counseling Services	41	1.73	0.71	94	1.80	0.97	6	2.67	1.51	141	1.82	0.94
Employee Assistance	38	3.42	1.22	92	3.49	1.52	5	4.40	1.34	135	3.50	1.43
Residence Life	41	1.44 *	0.59	96	1.69	1.15	6	2.17	1.60	143	1.64	1.05
Student Activities	40	2.43	0.96	91	2.49	1.02	5	3.80	1.30	136	2.52	1.03
Athletics	41	2.66	1.02	92	2.83	1.14	6	3.50	1.22	139	2.81	1.12
International Student Services	40	2.65	0.92	92	2.99	1.21	6	3.17	0.75	138	2.90	1.12
Campus Ministers	41	2.68	1.19	93	3.03	1.38	6	3.33	1.37	140	2.94	1.33
Students	40	2.90	0.93	92	3.02	0.93	6	3.00	0.00	138	2.99	0.90
Faculty	41	2.71	0.96	92	2.71	0.92	5	3.00	0.00	138	2.72	0.91
Other	15	2.87	1.51	45	4.07	1.42	3	3.67	1.15	63	3.76	1.50
External												
FBI	40	3.80	1.07	92	3.66	1.06	5	3.40	1.34	137	3.69	1.07
Local Police/Sheriff	39	2.41 *	0.91	98	2.24 *	0.73	5	1.80	0.84	142	2.27	0.79
State Police	40	3.05	1.15	96	3.00	0.96	5	3.40	1.34	141	3.03	1.03

Table 46 continues

Stakeholders	Student Affairs Plan			University Plan Only			No Plan Indicated			Total		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
External (cont'd)												
Local Fire Department	41	2.32 *	0.96	97	2.31 *	0.70	5	2.00	0.71	143	2.30	0.78
State Fire Marshal	39	3.13	1.10	93	3.05	0.95	5	3.20	0.84	137	3.08	0.99
Local Hospitals	39	2.85 *	0.93	94	2.68 *	0.81	5	3.40	1.14	138	2.75	0.86
Local Health Department	39	2.95	0.92	95	2.81	0.93	5	3.40	1.14	139	2.87	0.93
State Health Department	38	3.21	0.96	94	3.21	0.95	5	4.00	0.71	137	3.24	0.95
Local Mental Health	40	2.95	1.01	94	2.79	0.85	5	3.00	1.58	139	2.84	0.93
State Mental Health	39	3.44	1.02	92	3.42	0.88	5	4.20	0.45	136	3.46	0.92
Local Emergency Mgmt.	40	2.48 *	0.96	95	2.52 *	0.85	5	2.00	0.71	140	2.49	0.88
Campus Ministers	41	2.95	1.38	94	3.13	1.29	5	3.00	1.58	140	3.07	1.32
Red Cross	40	3.35	1.03	93	3.09	0.87	5	3.20	1.30	138	3.17	0.93
Victims Assistance Program	40	3.53	1.11	92	3.35	1.01	5	3.00	1.00	137	3.39	1.04
Local Gov. Officials	38	3.24	1.02	93	3.06	0.88	5	3.40	1.14	136	3.13	0.93
State Gov. Officials	39	3.62	0.91	93	3.40	0.86	5	4.00	0.71	137	3.48	0.88
Alumni Association	41	3.51	0.98	93	3.57	0.83	5	4.00	0.71	139	3.57	0.87
Hometown Alumni Clubs	39	3.95	0.76	91	3.95	0.86	5	4.20	0.45	135	3.96	0.82

Table 46 continues

Stakeholders	Student Affairs Plan			University Plan Only			No Plan Indicated			Total		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
External (cont'd)												
Parents	40	3.08	0.89	94	3.07	0.77	5	3.20	1.10	139	3.08	0.81
Local Community Members	37	3.38	0.92	91	3.20	0.82	5	3.40	0.89	133	3.26	0.85
Other	14	4.14	1.03	40	4.18	1.24	1	5.00	NA	55	4.18	1.17

* = high involvement

Table 47
*Level of Involvement of Stakeholders by Type of Institution First Administration of
 Questionnaire*

Stakeholders	Public			Private			Total		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Internal									
President	20	1.65	0.67	82	1.66	0.77	102	1.66	0.75
VP Academic Affairs	20	1.65	0.99	82	1.72	0.84	102	1.71	0.86
VP Administrative Affairs	20	2.20	1.54	79	2.01	1.45	99	2.05	1.47
VP Student Affairs	20	1.95	1.61	83	1.65	1.31	103	1.71	1.37
General Counsel	19	3.16	1.42	76	3.29	1.49	95	3.26	1.47
University Police	20	1.45 *	1.23	83	1.76 *	1.46	103	1.70	1.42
University Relations/PIO	20	1.20	0.41	81	1.43	0.96	101	1.39	0.88
Physical Plant	20	1.55	0.69	83	1.51	0.92	103	1.51	0.87
Environmental Health	19	2.74 *	1.69	78	3.15 *	1.78	97	3.07	1.76
Dean of Students	20	2.25	1.68	81	2.14	1.70	101	2.16	1.69
Dean of Faculties	20	3.60	1.50	78	3.51	1.68	98	3.53	1.64
Human Resources	20	1.80	0.83	77	1.91	1.05	97	1.89	1.01
Student Health Services	19	1.74	0.99	80	2.01	1.26	99	1.96	1.21
Student Counseling Services	20	1.85	0.81	81	1.78	1.01	101	1.79	0.97
Employee Assistance	20	3.30	1.42	72	3.50	1.47	92	3.46	1.46
Residence Life	19	1.63	1.26	81	1.58	0.83	100	1.59	0.92
Student Activities	20	2.70	1.13	77	2.61	0.92	97	2.63	0.96
Athletics	20	2.75	1.25	80	2.74	1.24	100	2.74	1.24
International Student Services	20	2.90	1.07	78	2.77	1.12	98	2.80	1.10
Campus Ministers	20	3.80 *	1.32	79	2.85 *	1.47	99	3.04	1.48
Students	20	2.80	0.89	78	2.72	0.90	98	2.73	0.89

Table 47 continues

Stakeholders	Public			Private			Total		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Internal (cont'd)									
Faculty	20	2.65	0.88	80	2.49	0.97	100	2.52	0.95
Other	7	4.00 *	1.29	35	3.46 *	1.67	42	3.55	1.61
External									
FBI	19	4.11 *	0.88	78	3.50 *	1.07	97	3.62	1.06
Local Police/Sheriff	20	2.40	0.60	81	2.28	0.64	101	2.31	0.63
State Police	20	2.80	0.95	80	3.01	0.93	100	2.97	0.94
Local Fire Department	20	2.40	0.60	81	2.20	0.60	101	2.24	0.60
State Fire Marshal	20	3.15	0.88	81	3.12	1.00	101	3.13	0.98
Local Hospitals	20	2.55	0.69	81	2.67	0.81	101	2.64	0.78
Local Health Department	20	2.65	0.93	82	2.65	0.95	102	2.65	0.94
State Health Department	20	2.90	0.72	82	3.02	0.90	102	3.00	0.87
Local Mental Health	20	2.65	0.75	81	2.85	0.92	101	2.81	0.89
State Mental Health	20	3.50 *	0.89	79	3.15 *	0.93	99	3.22	0.93
Local Emergency Mgmt.	19	2.26	0.56	82	2.40	0.83	101	2.38	0.79
Campus Ministers	20	3.65 *	1.39	82	2.99 *	1.38	102	3.12	1.40
Red Cross	20	2.85 *	0.75	81	3.09 *	1.05	101	3.04	1.00
Victims Assistance Program	20	3.25	0.85	81	3.30	1.07	101	3.29	1.02
Local Gov. Officials	20	2.95	0.76	81	3.00	0.94	101	2.99	0.90
State Gov. Officials	20	3.20	0.83	81	3.32	0.96	101	3.30	0.93
Alumni Association	20	3.50	0.89	81	3.44	0.88	101	3.46	0.88
Hometown Alumni Clubs	20	3.90	0.91	81	3.88	0.91	101	3.88	0.91
Parents	20	3.20	0.62	80	3.01	0.77	100	3.05	0.74
Local Community Members	20	3.25	0.72	80	3.15	0.86	100	3.17	0.83
Other	7	4.00	1.15	32	4.22	1.10	39	4.18	1.10

* = high difference in involvement

Table 48

Level of Involvement of Stakeholders by Type of Institution Second Administration of Questionnaire

Stakeholders	Public			Private			Total		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Internal									
President	28	1.57	0.69	118	1.70	0.86	146	1.68	0.83
VP Academic Affairs	28	1.57	0.74	117	1.74	0.94	145	1.71	0.90
VP Administrative Affairs	27	1.78	1.25	111	2.33	1.68	138	2.22	1.61
VP Student Affairs	28	1.61	1.29	115	1.67	1.35	143	1.66	1.33
General Counsel	28	2.86	1.56	108	3.14	1.55	136	3.08	1.55
University Police	28	1.71	1.30	115	1.49	1.23	143	1.53	1.24
University Relations/PIO	28	1.21	0.42	112	1.45	1.00	140	1.40	0.92
Physical Plant	28	1.50	0.75	115	1.30	0.53	143	1.34	0.58
Environmental Health	27	2.70 *	1.75	107	3.32 *	1.82	134	3.19	1.81
Dean of Students	28	1.96	1.53	116	1.88	1.53	144	1.90	1.52
Dean of Faculties	26	3.69 *	1.54	105	3.12 *	1.74	131	3.24	1.71
Human Resources	28	2.21	1.29	112	1.97	1.04	140	2.02	1.10
Student Health Services	28	2.25	1.35	112	2.25	1.29	140	2.25	1.30
Student Counseling Services	28	1.75	0.84	113	1.83	0.96	141	1.82	0.94
Employee Assistance	28	3.14	1.33	107	3.60	1.45	135	3.50	1.43
Residence Life	28	2.07	1.41	115	1.53	0.92	143	1.64	1.05
Student Activities	27	2.63	1.08	109	2.50	1.02	136	2.52	1.03
Athletics	28	3.04	1.23	111	2.75	1.08	139	2.81	1.12
International Student Services	28	2.96	1.10	110	2.88	1.13	138	2.90	1.12
Campus Ministers	28	3.79 *	1.47	112	2.73 *	1.21	140	2.94	1.33
Students	28	2.93	0.81	110	3.00	0.93	138	2.99	0.90

Table 48 continues

Stakeholders	Public			Private			Total		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Internal (cont'd)									
Faculty	28	2.82	0.67	110	2.69	0.96	138	2.72	0.91
Other	9	4.56 *	1.01	54	3.63 *	1.53	63	3.76	1.50
External									
FBI	26	3.42 *	0.95	111	3.76 *	1.09	137	3.69	1.07
Local Police/Sheriff	28	2.14	0.65	114	2.31	0.82	142	2.27	0.79
State Police	28	3.00	0.94	113	3.04	1.05	141	3.03	1.03
Local Fire Department	28	2.43	0.57	115	2.27	0.82	143	2.30	0.78
State Fire Marshal	27	2.96	0.85	110	3.11	1.02	137	3.08	0.99
Local Hospitals	28	2.64	0.73	110	2.78	0.89	138	2.75	0.86
Local Health Department	28	2.71	0.94	111	2.91	0.93	139	2.87	0.93
State Health Department	28	2.89 *	0.88	109	3.33 *	0.95	137	3.24	0.95
Local Mental Health	28	2.57 *	0.74	111	2.91 *	0.96	139	2.84	0.93
State Mental Health	28	3.14 *	0.80	108	3.54 *	0.93	136	3.46	0.92
Local Emergency Mgmt.	28	2.54	0.74	112	2.47	0.91	140	2.49	0.88
Campus Ministers	28	4.04 *	1.26	112	2.83 *	1.22	140	3.07	1.32
Red Cross	28	3.00	0.77	110	3.21	0.97	138	3.17	0.93
Victims Assistance Program	28	3.39	1.03	109	3.39	1.04	137	3.39	1.04
Local Gov. Officials	28	2.96	0.79	108	3.17	0.96	136	3.13	0.93
State Gov. Officials	28	3.29	0.76	109	3.53	0.90	137	3.48	0.88
Alumni Association	28	3.68	0.86	111	3.54	0.87	139	3.57	0.87
Hometown Alumni Clubs	27	4.07	0.78	108	3.93	0.83	135	3.96	0.82
Parents	28	3.11	0.79	111	3.07	0.82	139	3.08	0.81
Local Community Members	27	3.33	0.78	106	3.24	0.87	133	3.26	0.85
Other	9	4.33	1.12	46	4.15	1.19	55	4.18	1.17

* = high difference in involvement

Table 49

Level of Involvement of Stakeholders by Size of Institutional Enrollment First Administration of Questionnaire

Stakeholder	1-1500			1501-3000			3001-5000			Total		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Internal												
President	38	1.68	0.87	41	1.61	0.74	23	1.70	0.56	102	1.66	0.75
VP Academic Affairs	38	1.87	1.07	41	1.68	0.76	23	1.48	0.59	102	1.71	0.86
VP Administrative Affairs	37	2.27	1.68	39	2.00	1.41	23	1.78	1.17	99	2.05	1.47
VP Student Affairs	39	1.85	1.51	41	1.80	1.44	23	1.30	0.88	103	1.71	1.37
General Counsel	35	3.26	1.52	37	3.11	1.43	23	3.52	1.47	95	3.26	1.47
University Police	39	2.38 *	1.82	41	1.29	0.93	23	1.26 *	0.86	103	1.70	1.42
University Relations/PIO	38	1.53	1.13	41	1.37	0.80	22	1.18	0.39	101	1.39	0.88
Physical Plant	40	1.65	1.14	40	1.43	0.68	23	1.43	0.59	103	1.51	0.87
Environmental Health	35	3.80 *	1.64	40	2.70	1.74	22	2.59 *	1.68	97	3.07	1.76
Dean of Students	37	2.62	1.85	41	1.80	1.50	23	2.04	1.64	101	2.16	1.69
Dean of Faculties	37	3.89	1.56	40	3.10	1.72	21	3.71	1.49	98	3.53	1.64
Human Resources	35	2.37	1.21	40	1.68	0.80	22	1.50	0.67	97	1.89	1.01

Table 49 continues

Stakeholder	1-1500			1501-3000			3001-5000			Total		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Internal (cont'd)												
Student Health Services	37	2.49	1.56	40	1.63	0.81	22	1.68	0.84	99	1.96	1.21
Student Counseling Services	38	2.05	1.21	40	1.58	0.81	23	1.74	0.69	101	1.79	0.97
Employee Assistance	33	4.15 *	1.18	37	3.08	1.48	22	3.05 *	1.46	92	3.46	1.46
Residence Life	38	1.84	1.24	41	1.41	0.63	21	1.48	0.60	100	1.59	0.92
Student Activities	36	2.72	1.00	38	2.58	0.83	23	2.57	1.12	97	2.63	0.96
Athletics	38	3.26	1.39	39	2.41	0.99	23	2.43	1.08	100	2.74	1.24
International Student Services	36	3.25	1.20	39	2.44	0.97	23	2.70	0.93	98	2.80	1.10
Campus Ministers	38	3.50 *	1.47	39	2.54 *	1.41	22	3.14	1.42	99	3.04	1.48
Students	36	2.83	0.65	39	2.59	1.04	23	2.83	0.94	98	2.73	0.89
Faculty	38	2.68	0.81	39	2.33	0.96	23	2.57	1.12	100	2.52	0.95
Other	14	3.79	1.48	17	3.12	1.73	11	3.91	1.58	42	3.55	1.61
External												
FBI	37	3.59	1.07	37	3.65	1.09	23	3.61	1.03	97	3.62	1.06
Local Police/Sheriff	38	2.39	0.75	40	2.35	0.53	23	2.09	0.51	101	2.31	0.63

Table 49 continues

Stakeholder	1-1500			1501-3000			3001-5000			Total		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
External (cont'd)												
State Police	37	3.03	0.93	40	3.10	0.98	23	2.65	0.83	100	2.97	0.94
Local Fire Department	37	2.30	0.74	41	2.29	0.51	23	2.04	0.47	101	2.24	0.60
State Fire Marshal	38	3.18	1.04	41	3.12	0.98	22	3.05	0.90	101	3.13	0.98
Local Hospitals	37	2.65	0.89	41	2.66	0.76	23	2.61	0.66	101	2.64	0.78
Local Health Department	38	2.89 *	1.06	41	2.61	0.92	23	2.30 *	0.63	102	2.65	0.94
State Health Department	38	3.13	0.96	41	3.02	0.88	23	2.74	0.62	102	3.00	0.87
Local Mental Health	37	2.89	1.02	41	2.83	0.83	23	2.65	0.78	101	2.81	0.89
State Mental Health	37	3.30	1.00	40	3.20	0.91	22	3.14	0.89	99	3.22	0.93
Local Emergency Mgmt.	38	2.45	0.92	41	2.41	0.77	22	2.18	0.50	101	2.38	0.79
Campus Ministers	38	3.61 *	1.39	41	2.59 *	1.28	23	3.26	1.36	102	3.12	1.40
Red Cross	37	3.05	1.03	41	3.27 *	1.03	23	2.61 *	0.78	101	3.04	1.00
Victims Assistance Program	37	3.46	1.10	41	3.27	1.03	23	3.04	0.88	101	3.29	1.02
Local Gov. Officials	37	2.97	0.90	41	3.10	0.94	23	2.83	0.83	101	2.99	0.90

Table 49 continues

Stakeholder	1-1500			1501-3000			3001-5000			Total		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
External (cont'd)												
State Gov. Officials	37	3.41	0.96	41	3.34	0.99	23	3.04	0.77	101	3.30	0.93
Alumni Association	37	3.51	0.84	41	3.41	0.92	23	3.43	0.90	101	3.46	0.88
Hometown Alumni Clubs	37	4.19 *	0.84	41	3.76	0.92	23	3.61 *	0.89	101	3.88	0.91
Parents	37	3.11	0.74	40	2.98	0.80	23	3.09	0.67	100	3.05	0.74
Local Community Members	36	3.14	0.87	41	3.17	0.83	23	3.22	0.80	100	3.17	0.83
Other	13	4.38	0.96	16	4.06	1.18	10	4.10	1.20	39	4.18	1.10

* = high difference in involvement

Table 50

Level of Involvement of Stakeholders by Size of Institutional Enrollment Second Administration of Questionnaire

Stakeholder	1-1500			1501-3000			3001-5000			Total		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Internal												
President	49	1.63	0.70	62	1.79	0.96	35	1.54	0.74	146	1.68	0.83
VP Academic Affairs	49	1.86	1.10	61	1.70	0.84	35	1.51	0.66	145	1.71	0.90
VP Administrative Affairs	46	2.70 *	1.81	60	1.97 *	1.43	32	2.03	1.53	138	2.22	1.61
VP Student Affairs	48	1.98	1.60	60	1.40	1.03	35	1.66	1.33	143	1.66	1.33
General Counsel	45	3.24	1.57	57	3.25	1.49	34	2.59	1.56	136	3.08	1.55
University Police	46	1.96 *	1.65	62	1.42	1.12	35	1.17 *	0.45	143	1.53	1.24
University Relations/PIO	45	1.69	1.31	61	1.33	0.72	34	1.15	0.36	140	1.40	0.92
Physical Plant	47	1.40	0.68	61	1.26	0.48	35	1.37	0.60	143	1.34	0.58
Environmental Health	43	3.88 *	1.65	58	2.81 *	1.80	33	2.97	1.83	134	3.19	1.81
Dean of Students	47	1.64	1.34	62	2.03	1.61	35	2.00	1.59	144	1.90	1.52
Dean of Faculties	44	3.64	1.75	55	3.04	1.66	32	3.03	1.69	131	3.24	1.71
Human Resources	47	2.26	1.11	59	1.88	1.02	34	1.94	1.18	140	2.02	1.10

Table 50 continues

Stakeholder	1-1500			1501-3000			3001-5000			Total		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Internal (cont'd)												
Student Health Services	46	2.57	1.47	60	2.20	1.19	34	1.91	1.16	140	2.25	1.30
Student Counseling Services	46	1.85	0.97	61	1.84	0.95	34	1.74	0.90	141	1.82	0.94
Employee Assistance	42	3.76 *	1.43	60	3.58	1.32	33	3.03 *	1.57	135	3.50	1.43
Residence Life	48	1.71	1.29	61	1.62	1.00	34	1.56	0.75	143	1.64	1.05
Student Activities	44	2.55	1.17	58	2.55	1.03	34	2.44	0.86	136	2.52	1.03
Athletics	45	3.11	1.19	60	2.72	1.06	34	2.56	1.05	139	2.81	1.12
International Student Services	46	2.96	1.28	59	2.85	1.01	33	2.91	1.10	138	2.90	1.12
Campus Ministers	45	3.09	1.50	60	2.92	1.24	35	2.80	1.26	140	2.94	1.33
Students	45	2.98	1.03	60	3.03	0.88	33	2.91	0.77	138	2.99	0.90
Faculty	44	2.57	0.95	60	2.87	0.91	34	2.65	0.85	138	2.72	0.91
Other	18	3.94	1.59	32	3.66	1.49	13	3.77	1.48	63	3.76	1.50
External												
FBI	46	3.80	1.02	57	3.68	1.07	34	3.56	1.13	137	3.69	1.07
Local Police/Sheriff	46	2.28	0.78	60	2.38	0.90	36	2.08	0.55	142	2.27	0.79

Table 50 continues

Stakeholder	1-1500			1501-3000			3001-5000			Total		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
External (cont'd)												
State Police	48	3.04	1.07	58	3.26 *	0.98	35	2.63 *	0.94	141	3.03	1.03
Local Fire Department	48	2.42	0.87	60	2.35	0.80	35	2.06	0.54	143	2.30	0.78
State Fire Marshal	45	3.20 *	1.04	58	3.16	0.91	34	2.79 *	1.01	137	3.08	0.99
Local Hospitals	45	2.84	0.93	58	2.86	0.87	35	2.46	0.70	138	2.75	0.86
Local Health Department	45	2.93	0.94	58	2.97	0.99	36	2.64	0.80	139	2.87	0.93
State Health Department	45	3.22	0.95	58	3.38	0.91	34	3.03	1.00	137	3.24	0.95
Local Mental Health	45	2.87	0.99	59	3.00 *	0.96	35	2.54 *	0.70	139	2.84	0.93
State Mental Health	44	3.39	0.95	59	3.61	0.83	33	3.27	1.01	136	3.46	0.92
Local Emergency Mgmt.	45	2.56	0.84	60	2.50	0.95	35	2.37	0.81	140	2.49	0.88
Campus Ministers	46	3.22 *	1.40	59	3.15	1.31	35	2.74 *	1.20	140	3.07	1.32
Red Cross	45	3.27	0.99	59	3.25	0.88	34	2.88	0.91	138	3.17	0.93
Victims Assistance Program	44	3.43	1.07	59	3.39	0.97	34	3.32	1.15	137	3.39	1.04
Local Gov. Officials	45	3.31	0.97	57	3.09	0.97	34	2.94	0.78	136	3.13	0.93
State Gov. Officials	45	3.56	0.89	59	3.56	0.84	33	3.24	0.90	137	3.48	0.88

Table 50 continues

Stakeholder	1-1500			1501-3000			3001-5000			Total		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
External (cont'd)												
Alumni Association	46	3.52	0.91	59	3.69	0.79	34	3.41	0.92	139	3.57	0.87
Hometown Alumni Clubs	45	3.87	0.81	58	4.07	0.79	32	3.88	0.87	135	3.96	0.82
Parents	44	3.07	0.82	60	3.13	0.85	35	3.00	0.73	139	3.08	0.81
Local Community Members	42	3.26	0.89	58	3.34	0.87	33	3.09	0.77	133	3.26	0.85
Other	17	4.18	1.19	26	4.19	1.17	12	4.17	1.27	55	4.18	1.17

* = high difference in involvement

Appendix F

Quantitative Data Codebook

CAMPUS CRISIS MANAGEMENT SURVEY CODEBOOK

PART 1

Please respond to each question by checking the appropriate box(es).

1. On a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 is unprepared and 10 is well-prepared, please indicate how prepared your student affairs division is to respond to campus crises.
Unprepared 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Well-prepared (each number scored as same value)

2. Does your university have a written crisis management plan addressing campus crises?
Yes (1) No (2)

3. Who coordinates your university's response to campus crises? (*Check only one.*)

President (1)	Dean of Students (8)
VP Academic Affairs/Provost (2)	Director of Student Counseling (9)
VP Administration/Business Affairs (3)	Director of Student Health Services (10)
VP Student Affairs (4)	Director of Residence Life (11)
Chief/Director University Police (5)	Director of Student Activities (12)
Director Public Information/Relations(6)	Other _____ (13)
Director of Health & Safety (7)	

4. Does your student affairs division have a separate, written crisis management plan addressing campus crises?
Yes (1) No (2)
If yes, please indicate who coordinates the student affairs response to campus crises. (*Check only one.*)

VP Student Affairs (1)	Director of Student Health Services (5)
Chief/Director University Police (2)	Director of Residence Life (6)
Dean of Students (3)	Director of Student Activities (7)
Director of Student Counseling (4)	Other _____ (8)

5. How long has this crisis management plan existed?

1 year or less (1)	5 to 10 years (3)
1 to 5 years (2)	More than 10 years (4)

6. How often is the crisis management plan reviewed?

Annually (1)	Every 5 years (3)
Every 3 years (2)	Other _____ (4)

7. A crisis audit refers to the process of assessing the internal and external environment to identify potential crises, and determine the impact and probability of various crises occurring. Has a crisis audit been conducted on your campus? (*Check all that apply.*)

- | | |
|--|------------------------------|
| No (1) | Annually (4) |
| When the plan was originally created (2) | Whenever a crisis occurs (5) |
| Each time the plan is reviewed (3) | Other _____ (6) |

8. Please indicate whether the procedures in your crisis management plan address one or more of the following phases of crisis. (*Check all that apply.*)
- Pre-crisis: Actions to take prior to the onset of a crisis. These actions may include such things as preventative measures, preparation activities, and ways to detect potential crisis. (1)
- Crisis: Actions to take during a crisis event. These actions may include such things as activation of response procedures, means of containing a crisis, and steps to resume normal operations. (2)
- Post-crisis: Actions to take after a crisis. These actions may include such things as methods for verifying that a crisis has past, follow-up communications with stakeholders, and mechanisms to revise or improve procedures for the next crisis. (3)
9. How is the crisis management plan communicated to members of the campus community? (*Check all that apply.*)
- | | |
|---|--|
| Not communicated (1) | Optional crisis management training sessions (7) |
| Copy of plan available upon request (2) | Required crisis management training sessions (8) |
| Plan accessible on the web (3) | Drills and exercises (9) |
| Annual notification (4) | Other _____ (10) |
| New employee orientation (5) | |
| New student orientation (6) | |
10. Does your crisis management plan address the mental/emotional health of university caregivers that respond to campus crisis by providing Critical Incident Stress debriefings?
Yes (1) No (2)
11. An “On-Call” or “Duty” system is a system in which a particular individual is identified as the initial or primary contact to be notified. In such a system, the responsibility of serving as the initial or primary contact rotates to another individual at specified time intervals (e.g. weekly, monthly, etc.). Is there an “On-Call” or “Duty” system in place to respond to campus crises?
Yes (1) No (2)
12. Is there an established committee or team of individuals identified to respond to campus crises?
Yes (1) No (2) (*Skip to Part 2*)

13. How are individuals assigned to the crisis management committee or team? (*Check only one.*)

Self-appointed (1)

Volunteer (2)

Appointed by Superior (3)

Specified in Job Description (4)

Recruited (5)

Other _____ (6)

14. What type of training is provided to crisis management team members or individuals involved in responding to campus crises? (*Check all that apply.*)

No training provided (1)

Crisis Management (campus procedures)
(2)

Crisis Management (general) (3)

Legal Issues/Risk Management (4)

Working with Law Enforcement &
Emergency Personnel (5)

Responding to Civil Disturbance or
Demonstration (6)

Suicide Intervention (7)

Media Relations (8)

Campus Violence Issues (9)

Substance Abuse (10)

Grieving Process (11)

Orientation to Community & County
Agency Assistance (12)

Critical Incident Stress
Management/Debriefing (13)

Table-top exercises (14)

Crisis simulations or drills (15)

Other _____ (16)

PART 2

Internal Stakeholders	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
	Represented on Crisis Management Committee or Team	Involved in Planning/Response as Needed	Impact/Consequences of Crisis on this Stakeholder is Routinely Considered	Not Significant to Crisis Planning/Response	Does Not Exist
President	1	2	3	4	5
VP Academic Affairs	1	2	3	4	5
VP Administrative Affairs	1	2	3	4	5
VP Student Affairs	1	2	3	4	5
General Counsel	1	2	3	4	5
University Police	1	2	3	4	5
University Relations/PIO	1	2	3	4	5
Physical Plant	1	2	3	4	5
Environmental Health	1	2	3	4	5
Dean of Students	1	2	3	4	5
Dean of Faculties	1	2	3	4	5
Human Resources	1	2	3	4	5
Student Health Services	1	2	3	4	5
Student Counseling Services	1	2	3	4	5
Employee Assistance	1	2	3	4	5
Residence Life	1	2	3	4	5
Student Activities	1	2	3	4	5
Athletics	1	2	3	4	5
International Student Services	1	2	3	4	5
Campus Ministers	1	2	3	4	5
Students	1	2	3	4	5
Faculty	1	2	3	4	5
Other:	1	2	3	4	5

External Stakeholders	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
	Represented on Crisis Management Committee or Team	Involved in Planning/Response as Needed	Impact/Consequences of Crisis on this Stakeholder is Routinely Considered	Not Significant to Crisis Planning/Response	Does Not Exist
FBI	1	2	3	4	5
Local Police/Sheriff	1	2	3	4	5
State Police	1	2	3	4	5
Local Fire Department	1	2	3	4	5
State Fire Marshal	1	2	3	4	5
Local Hospitals	1	2	3	4	5
Local Health Department	1	2	3	4	5
State Health Department	1	2	3	4	5
Local Mental Health	1	2	3	4	5
State Mental Health	1	2	3	4	5
Local Emergency Mgmt.	1	2	3	4	5
Campus Ministers	1	2	3	4	5
Red Cross	1	2	3	4	5
Victims Assistance Program	1	2	3	4	5
Local Gov. Officials	1	2	3	4	5
State Gov. Officials	1	2	3	4	5
Alumni Association	1	2	3	4	5
Hometown Alumni Clubs	1	2	3	4	5
Parents	1	2	3	4	5
Local Community Members	1	2	3	4	5
Other:	1	2	3	4	5

PART 3

Type of Crisis (Check all that apply)	Phase of Crisis Addressed		
	Pre-Crisis	Crisis	Post-Crisis
Natural			
Tornado	1	2	3
Hurricane	1	2	3
Earthquake	1	2	3
Flood	1	2	3
Severe weather	1	2	3
Other	1	2	3
Facility			
Fire	1	2	3
Explosion	1	2	3
Chemical Leak	1	2	3
Evacuation of Campus	1	2	3
Evacuation of Buildings	1	2	3
Corruption/Loss of Computer Data	1	2	3
Other	1	2	3
Criminal			
Homicide	1	2	3
Assault	1	2	3
Sexual Assault/Rape	1	2	3
Sexual Harassment	1	2	3
Domestic Abuse	1	2	3
Burglary/Robbery	1	2	3
Kidnapping/Abduction	1	2	3
Hate Crime	1	2	3
Terroristic Threat	1	2	3
Vandalism	1	2	3
Other	1	2	3
Human			
Student Death	1	2	3
Faculty/Staff Death	1	2	3
Student Injury	1	2	3
Faculty/Staff Injury	1	2	3
Suicide	1	2	3
Emotional/Psychological Crisis	1	2	3
Missing Person	1	2	3
Alcohol/Drug Overdose	1	2	3
Infectious Disease	1	2	3
Racial Incident	1	2	3
Campus Disturbance/Demonstration	1	2	3
Other	1	2	3

Appendix G

Qualitative Data CODING Table

	SSAO1	SSAO2	SSAO3	SSAO4	SSAO5
Region	II	IV-West	I	IV-East	VI
Were you involved?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No, original plan predates his arrival	Yes
How were participants selected?	Consultant recommendation	Based on position	Based on expertise	original plan outsourced, reviews have been based on both position and expertise	Based mostly on position
Who made the selections?	Cabinet/Consultant	Director of Safety/Cabinet	Cabinet	President's cabinet	Cabinet
Is there an individual or group most involved in maintenance of plan?	No consistent leadership, but there's a new person	Director of Safety	VP for Finance & Administrative Services	VP of Student Life	no true leader
Is crisis management in this leader's job description?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA
Are there depts or individuals who should be involved but aren't?	No, but need more intentionality	No	No	No	the President
How much time is committed by this person?	unknown	15 - 20% now, but moving to 40%	5%	not much	very little
What do you think of plan's overall quality?	Needs more focused effort	adequate, needs updated	comfortable, especially with the people at the table	far more extensive and thought through plan in place than many institutions their size	narrowly focused, but there is a separate Student Affairs plan with more detail
Are there things you'd do differently?	No, using the consultant was a key	Yes, leader now reports directly to President. And need depth at each position to cover absence/vacancy	No	Probably not, except better dissemination of the plan and communication with constituents	Would have been much more assertive to make sure the plan was broad.
Other items:	Not enough conversation about the mental health impact of crises; Liability issues		Liability issues		

Appendix H

Example of Coding

Text of Transcript	Coding
Interviewer: Okay. And actually the last of my official questions here is if you had the opportunity to start over with your crisis management plan, are there things that you would do differently, whether that's in the development process or maybe the things that were included in that plan?	
Interviewee: One of the things that we are doing now as I mentioned we've kind of been reenergized in this area is that the emergency management has factored aspect of that individual's job, he's actually going to start reporting directly to the president for that.	Direct Presidential Involvement
Interviewer: Okay.	
Interviewee: And it that was – it was not that way initially, it was kind of through me, kind of through some other areas and I think in the future I think that is definitely the way that it will be that maybe had we done that initially that might have taken on a little bit more purpose and priority and as you said it's one of those easy things that you can slide off because if there is no one demanding that things are being done you've got 20 other things that people are demanding that.	Report to President means purpose and priority
Interviewer: Absolutely.	
Interviewee: And we also had a circumstance where the individual that is in that role was deployed and actually off our campus for almost two years. So, during that time we did some things and we moved along a little bit but we didn't make the progress we would have made obviously had he been here because we were working again with somebody in temporary role.	Deployment of leader exposed weakness in plan
Interviewer: Yes. You know that just adds to the challenge but always the reminder that anytime you're only depending on one individual . . .	
Interviewee: Exactly.	
Interviewer: . . . you're in a world of hurt.	
Interviewee: We are, we are and that was actually one of the things we talked about in our meeting last week was we need to have someone who is the second there.	Greater depth needed
Interviewer: Right.	
Interviewee: Who knows about as much as he does to be able to get us through that.	