

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 468 176

HE 035 168

AUTHOR van der Kaay, Christopher D.
TITLE Student Privacy versus Campus Safety: Has Recent Legislation Compromised Privacy Rights?
PUB DATE 2001-00-00
NOTE 8p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Students; Court Litigation; *Crime; *Federal Legislation; *Higher Education; *Privacy; *School Safety

ABSTRACT

This study highlights major legislation addressing campus safety and crime reporting and discusses its impact on a student's right to privacy. The 1974 Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, commonly referred to as the "Buckley Amendment," was among the first pieces of legislation to address the notion of student privacy and confidentiality. This amendment requires that educational institutions not release identifiable student information without student consent or it will risk losing federal funds. If an institution hides crime statistics under the provisions of the Buckley Amendment, it may not meet the requirements of the Campus Awareness and Campus Security Act of 1990, in which institutions of higher education are required to provide campus crime statistics and describe security procedures. Other federal legislation relates to the disclosure of information about campus crime, and there is proposed legislation that would extend requirements for disclosure of information about campus crime. These provisions receive criticism from privacy advocates, but, in light of the September 11 terrorist attacks, student information has become more accessible under the U.S.A. Patriot Act. Public concern over the balance between privacy and safety will continue to shift, as has been demonstrated by the consequences of September 11. (SLD)

HE

Running head: STUDENT PRIVACY

ED 468 176

STUDENT PRIVACY VERSUS CAMPUS SAFETY: HAS RECENT LEGISLATION
COMPROMISED PRIVACY RIGHTS?

Christopher D. van der Kaay

Higher Education Administration Program

Department of Leadership Development

University of South Florida

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS
BEEN GRANTED BY

C. Vander Kaay

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

STUDENT PRIVACY AND CAMPUS SAFETY: HAS RECENT LEGISLATION
COMPROMISED PRIVACY RIGHTS?

Introduction

Does the need for security necessitate the sacrifice of individual rights? Is it possible to achieve a balance between privacy and safety? With an increasing number of crimes committed on college campuses, a greater concern has developed for safety among students, parents, faculty, and staff. Advocates for college campus safety and security, as well as the media, have supported and proved instrumental in successfully passing legislation to establish and expand an institution's responsibility for releasing crime reports - bringing to the forefront of legal debate the notion of a student's right to privacy and confidentiality versus student safety. The purpose of this brief paper is to highlight major legislation addressing campus safety and crime reporting, and to discuss its impact on a student's right to privacy.

Student Privacy and Campus Security

Major Legislation

The 1974 Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), commonly referred to as the "Buckley Amendment", was among the first piece of legislation to address the notion of student privacy and confidentiality. In short, the Buckley Amendment requires that educational institutions not release identifiable student information without student consent or risk losing federal funds (Childs, 1998; Overbeck, 1990). However, critics argue that the Buckley Amendment provided colleges and

universities with the means by which they could conceal crime statistics and reports. According to Brienza (1998), "schools across the country may be hiding... their crime statistics to project and image of safety and tranquility at their institutions." Obtaining crime reports generally proved difficult since many institutions considered such information as educational records. This interpretation of the Buckley Amendment would challenge the Crime Awareness and Campus Security Act of 1990, in which institutions of higher education were required to provide campus crime statistics and security procedures (Security on Campus, 2002). The resultant 1992 Buckley Amendment Clarification would specify that campus police and security records are not considered educational records (Security on Campus, 2002). A later act, the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act of 1998 would clarify and expand the 1990 Campus Security Act by addressing ambiguities and providing further requirements for reporting crime (Security on Campus, 2002).

Additional federal laws would extend requirements for institutions to disclose information concerning campus crime. For example, the 1998 Foley Amendment, which amends the Buckley Amendment, stipulates that a student who has committed a violent act, including non-forcible sex, is no longer afforded federal student privacy protection (Security on Campus, 2002). Consequently, the names of such students are accessible by the public. A similar law addressing sex related crimes, the Campus Sex Crimes Prevention Act of 2000, provides for the collection

and publication of information concerning convicted sexual offenders that are employees or students at an educational institution.

Campus Security Verse Student Privacy and Confidentiality

The passage of the before mentioned federal acts and amendments have received widespread criticism from privacy advocates. It has been argued that in such legislation lays the foundation for laws that will lead to greater intrusion on individual privacy - essentially creating a "slippery slope" by which additional legislation, such as new amendments to FERPA, will increase the ease for accessing student records by individuals or entities outside the institution, namely law enforcement and the media. For instance, an exception to the student privacy protection afforded by FERPA includes an educational institution's requirement to provide directory information (i.e., contact information, name, date and location of birth, previously attended institutions etc.) (American Civil Liberties Union, 2002). Furthermore, colleges or universities may reveal a student's personal information and academic records under emergency situations without judicial order or a subpoena when such information is necessary for the protection of others (American Civil Liberties Union, 2002). Privacy advocates suggest that such stipulations for releasing student records are vague and open for interpretation - thus being an open door for potential abuses, namely from law enforcement. In contrast, safety and security advocates indicate that both the institution and law enforcement must be given additional authority to

protect students, faculty, and staff. Accessing student records are governed by policies and procedures in place for the purpose of accountability (e.g., judicial review and court orders) and to protect personal information.

Nonetheless, in light of the September 11th terrorist attacks, student information has become more accessible under the USA Patriot Act (H.R. 3162). The USA Patriot Act amends FERPA and allows law enforcement officials, under section 507 and 508, to more easily obtain student information. Under authorization from the Attorney General or Secretary of Education, Section 507 allows the release of personal student information to aid in both the prevention and/or investigation of domestic or international terrorism offenses (House Judiciary Democratic Staff, 2001). Section 508 permits law enforcement officials to obtain student statistical data from the U.S. Education Department (House Judiciary Democratic Staff, 2001). However, since FERPA already permits the disclosure of student information under specific conditions (directory information, legally obtained subpoenas, or emergencies), critics indicate that section 507 and 508 has allowed federal investigators and law enforcement officials to obtain personal information under mere suspicion, and without evidence or probable cause.

Conclusion

Legislation that has addressed campus security and student privacy has been shaped and influenced by a variety of factors. Law does not exist in a vacuum and is continually affected by ever-changing political, cultural, economic and social issues.

Public concern over the balance between privacy and safety will continue to shift - as has been demonstrated by the consequences of September 11th. Although a perfect balance is likely an unattainable goal, the ongoing debate between safety and privacy advocates will serve to inform and assist individuals in shaping their own perspectives on this controversial and seemingly ubiquitous issue.

References

American Civil Liberties Union (October, 2001). How the USA Patriot Act puts students at risk. Retrieved March 12, 2002 from the World Wide Web:

<http://www.aclu.org/congress/l102301c.html>

Brienza, J. (1998). University must release campus records. Trial, 34(2), 84-85.

Childs, K. (1998). U.S. sues to protect college records. Editor & Publisher, 131(8), 27-28.

House Judiciary Democratic Staff (2001). H.R. 3162 - USA Patriot Act of 2001: Section by section analysis. Retrieved March 12, 2002 from the World Wide Web:

http://www.house.gov/judiciary_democrats/usapatriotsecbysec102301.pdf

Overbeck, W. (1990). The Buckley Amendment and the campus press. Retrieved March 10, 2002 from the World Wide Web:

<http://commfaculty.fullerton.edu/woverbeck/1990.htm>

Security on Campus (2002). About security on campus. Retrieved March 10, 2002 from the World Wide Web:

<http://www.campussafety.org/aboutsoc/>

HE 035168



U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)



REPRODUCTION RELEASE
(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Form with fields for Title, Author(s), Corporate Source, and Publication Date.

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, Resources in Education (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS).

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

Level 1 permission sticker sample

Level 2A permission sticker sample

Level 2B permission sticker sample

Level 1

Checked box for Level 1

Level 2A

Unchecked box for Level 2A

Level 2B

Unchecked box for Level 2B

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Signature and contact information fields for Christopher D. van der Kaay, Graduate Student.

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4493-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: info@ericfac.piccard.csc.com
WWW: <http://ericfacility.org>

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2003)