Responding to crises and emergencies is nothing new at colleges and universities, which, like any community, can experience a host of disruptive events that require an institutional response to protect the health and safety of their members. But now, with the encouragement of the U.S. Department of Education’s Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools (OSDFS), campuses across the country are taking a more deliberate approach to plan for any emergency, including natural disasters, violent incidents, and terrorist acts.

“We believe that not only colleges and universities but all schools—elementary and secondary—should develop emergency crisis plans. In the state the country is in today, any place where people congregate—be it schools, churches, community centers, sports venues, or shopping malls—needs to be prepared for emergencies that run along a continuum. Such incidents could be accidents, suicides, assaults, natural disasters, or at the far end of the spectrum, terrorist-related incidents. It’s prudent to have plans that address all of these types of incidents. We call it multi-hazard planning,” said William Modzeleski, OSDFS associate assistant deputy secretary.

But how do issues of emergency preparedness relate to other issues of concern at colleges and universities, such as campus safety and violence prevention?

OSDFS’s Assistant Deputy Secretary Deborah Price said that emergency preparedness is an umbrella that encompasses all of the efforts aimed at protecting the health and safety of students as well as that of faculty and staff. “Violence prevention and campus safety are part and parcel of a comprehensive emergency preparedness plan,” said Price. “In a number of ways, college campuses are cities unto themselves. They provide housing and have power plants and medical facilities, not to mention facilities where researchers can actually split atoms. They need to have a very broad understanding of their vulnerabilities and unique circumstances in order to develop emergency preparedness plans, get them in place, and put them into practice when needed.”

The Department learned some lessons that are relevant to colleges and universities from a grant competition it held for K–12 schools to develop emergency preparedness plans. “We learned that comprehensive crisis planning has four parts: prevention/mitigation, planning, response, and recovery. Most schools do a pretty good job on planning and response. But they are not as strong in the areas of prevention/mitigation or recovery. I don’t think it’s much different in institutions of higher education,” said Modzeleski.

“We haven’t had a lot of experience with recovery issues and we haven’t tied together everything we can in the area of prevention or mitigation. We need to tie all of the elements together to ensure that schools have the capacity for prevention and mitigation on the front end of planning as well as recovery at the far end of planning. “The second lesson is that all schools, colleges, and universities have different needs. They’re located in communities that are different. They are different in size, (Continued on page 2)
Four Elements of a Comprehensive Plan

The Department of Education has developed the following framework to assist schools and communities in developing their emergency preparedness plans. This information is available at www.ed.gov/news/pressreleases/2003/03/03072003.html:

Prevention/Mitigation

- Conduct an assessment of each campus building. Identify those factors that put the building, students, and staff at risk, such as proximity to rail tracks that regularly transport hazardous materials or facilities that produce highly toxic material or propane-gas tanks, and develop a plan for reducing the risk.
- Work with businesses and factories in close proximity to the campus to ensure that the institution’s crisis plan is coordinated with their crisis plans.
- Ensure a process is in place for controlling access and egress to the campus. Require all persons who do not have authority to be in the buildings to sign in.
- Review traffic patterns, and where possible, keep cars, buses, and trucks away from campus buildings.
- Review landscaping, and ensure buildings are not obscured by an overgrowth of bushes or shrubs where contraband can be placed or persons can hide.

Preparedness

- Have site plans for each campus facility readily available and ensure that they are shared with first responders and the agencies responsible for emergency preparedness.
- Ensure that there are multiple evacuation routes and rallying points. The first or second evacuation site options may be blocked or unavailable at the time of the crisis.
- Practice responding to a crisis on a regular basis.
- Establish a process for communicating during a crisis.
- Inspect equipment to ensure it operates during crisis situations.
- Have a plan for discharging students. Make sure every student has a secondary contact person and contact information readily available.
- Have a plan for communicating information to parents and for quelling rumors. Cultivate relationships with the media ahead of time, and identify a public information officer to communicate with the media and the community during a crisis.
- Work with law enforcement officials and emergency preparedness agencies on a strategy for sharing key parts of the institution’s crisis plans.

Response

- Develop a command structure for responding to a crisis. Establish the roles and responsibilities—as well as a process for reviewing and approving them—for educators, law enforcement, fire officials, and other first responders in response to different types of crises.

Recovery

- Return to the business of teaching and learning as soon as possible.
- Identify and approve a team of credentialed mental health workers to provide mental health services to faculty and students after a crisis. Understand that recovery takes place over time and that the services of this team may be needed over an extended time period.
- Ensure that the team is adequately trained.
Planning for a Crisis
It’s Not an Oxymoron

When it comes to emergency preparedness at colleges and universities, the U.S. Department of Education, the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) all say that good planning can help save lives, prevent injuries, and minimize property damage in the event of a disaster.

“Emergencies can be prevented, interrupted, or mitigated. However, to do that, the university must first recognize that they can occur. Many universities do not want to recognize that fact and believe they are safe environments,” said John Nicoletti, Ph.D., co-author of Violence Goes to College: The Authoritative Guide to Prevention and Intervention (Charles C Thomas, Publisher, 2001).

Linda Langford, Sc.D., associate director for violence prevention initiatives at the U.S. Department of Education’s Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse and Violence Prevention, said that when campuses systematically assess their vulnerability to attacks, accidents, or other incidents that threaten the health and safety of students, staff, and faculty, rather than wait for an emergency to occur, it raises the profile of emergency preparedness.

“Many campuses have plans in place to respond to crises. But risk assessments lead to prevention-focused plans that are comprehensive; address multiple types of violence, emergencies, and disasters; involve all campus constituents; and take into account both on- and off-campus settings,” said Langford.

Chief Larry Barnett, assistant vice president for public safety at the University of San Diego, agreed. He said, “Prevention is always the best response. A thorough campuswide risk assessment is perhaps one of the best methods of determining what types of situations can be prevented. The emergency plan should identify areas of concern for prevention efforts and provide guidelines for an ongoing assessment of both current and future prevention opportunities.”

According to Langford, campus safety and violence prevention go hand-in-hand with emergency preparedness. They both include

- preparing for multiple types of problems and events
- planning in advance of an incident
- engaging in an ongoing assessment, planning, and evaluation process
- adapting to local conditions—one size does not fit all
- employing multiple strategies
- building collaborations and infrastructure at each phase
- using best practices for each element of the plan
- striving for coordination and synergy

Chief Barnett agreed. “In both instances, management systems must be developed in advance that provide a comprehensive assessment of the types of emergencies or campus safety issues that can be anticipated to occur. It’s important to identify clearly who needs to respond, assign specific responsibilities for the management of the incident, and determine what resources are necessary for an appropriate response. In addition, campuses and communities need to identify guidelines for how emergencies will be managed to identify the steps necessary to return to normal business operations, once the initial incident has been resolved.”

Langford pointed out that emergency preparedness in campuses and communities is inextricably linked. “A crisis in either a community or campus needs to engage multiple partners in both, including the personnel, expertise, and equipment of all emergency responders (police, fire, health care, public health, and others), top leadership, the media, citizens/students, and others,” said Langford.

“Campus and community officials and law enforcement officers need to work together generally, but effective emergency preparedness requires a very

(Continued on page 4)
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detailed level of information sharing, operational planning, and cooperation that may be new to some campuses.”

For example, campus and community officials should be aware of and plan for all of the potential hazards or targets both on campus and in the community. That means covering the full range of potential threats—from a high potential for a hurricane or flood or the presence of a high security biolab to the child of a controversial or well-known individual attending the institution. They need to know what equipment, expertise, personnel, and communications systems each other has or needs and decide how they will be obtained and deployed in the event of an emergency.

“They also need to decide on a chain of command for emergencies—what sorts of emergency situations are led by campus officials versus community officials? It’s not just the surrounding community, but the region that should be taken into account. Most Homeland Security funding is allocated through state channels, so campus and community officials need to make state officials aware of their needs regarding these issues as well as be aware of state-level requirements and protocols,” said Langford.

The Department of Homeland Security agrees. Its recommendations call for collaboration among agencies, organizations, and jurisdictions to develop a framework for prevention. Describing tasks as specific to law enforcement, fire, emergency management agency, public health, and so forth is often an impediment to collaboration by maintaining “stovepipes” or “silos.” The department also recommends that emergency preparedness planning tasks and activities be considered by jurisdictions, rather than by disciplines, and that the responsibilities for action and implementation be determined collaboratively within those jurisdictions, based on resources, agencies, and personnel. That way a “framework for prevention” unique to the jurisdiction’s capabilities, threats, vulnerabilities, and risks,

What Can Students Contribute in an Emergency?

As members of the campus community, students have an important role in ensuring the safety of that environment and can assist in emergency preparedness.

“Students should be aware of the vulnerabilities of the facilities they use and cooperate with efforts to secure them; for example, they can help by not propping open the doors of laboratories where there are hazardous chemicals. They should be knowledgeable about their campus crisis and evacuation plans and the importance of following any instructions they are given by campus or local personnel in the event of an emergency,” said Linda Langford, Sc.D., of the U.S. Department of Education’s Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse and Violence Prevention. “For example, they may need to stay where they are if instructed that leaving is unsafe or evacuate if informed that their current location is unsafe. If they see unusual behaviors or suspicious persons, they should report them to a campus official.”

With assistance from campus administrators and by taking on some initiative themselves, here are some other ways that students can support campus emergency preparedness:

• Participate in a crisis audit.
• Participate in crafting crisis plans.
• Provide feedback to authorities when plans or communications are unclear.
• Volunteer to participate in drills or mock emergencies.
• Volunteer to receive training to become emergency responders or emergency medical technicians. Offer training on these subjects if they hold expertise.
• Help distribute information about the crisis plan in the residence halls.
• Comply with the code of conduct.
• Abstain from engaging in practical jokes that might create a false alarm.

(Continued on page 11)
Emergency Preparedness Resources

The following resources are available on the Higher Education Center’s Web site at www.higheredcenter.org/violence/emergency-preparedness.html, or by clicking on the links below:

Building a Disaster-Resistant University
This publication from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) is both a how-to guide and a distillation of the experiences of six universities and colleges across the country to become more disaster-resistant.

Developing the Mitigation Plan
This guide from FEMA explains the steps in developing a mitigation plan and the ways in which to document the planning process.

Early Warning, Timely Response: A Guide to Safe Schools
This guide from the U.S. Department of Education (ED) offers research-based practices designed to assist primary and secondary schools and communities in identifying warning signs in unstable and potentially violent students and develop prevention, intervention, and crisis response plans.

Emergency Planning for America’s Schools
This two-page document from ED highlights selected elements from Practical Information on Crisis Planning: A Guide for Schools and Communities, created in 2003.

Getting Started: Building Support for Mitigation Planning
This guide from FEMA explains the process of determining how to reduce or eliminate the loss of life and property damage resulting from hazards.

NASPA NetResults: Responding to the Threat of Campus Terrorism
This National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) NetResults article summarizes prevention measures taken by campuses to prevent possible terrorist attacks.

NASULGC Newsline: Prevention Strategies Highlighted at Campus Security Summit
This two-page article from the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC) summarizes the issues raised at the 2003 Higher Education Summit on Homeland Security.

The Office for Domestic Preparedness Guidelines for Homeland Security

Practical Information on Crisis Planning: A Guide for Schools and Communities
This comprehensive guide from ED’s Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools is designed for schools and communities aiming to prevent and prepare for emergencies.

Preventing Violence and Promoting Safety in Higher Education Settings: Overview of a Comprehensive Approach
This publication from ED’s Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse and Violence Prevention reviews the scope of campus violence problems and lists specific recommendations to strengthen their programs and services.

Public Health Emergency Response Guide for State, Local, and Tribal Public Health Directors
This guide from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) is a reference tool for health professionals responsible for initiating the public health response during the first 24 hours (i.e., the acute phase) of any type of emergency or disaster.

Threat Assessment in Schools: A Guide to Managing Threatening Situations and to Creating Safe School Climates
This 99-page document details key findings from ED’s and the U.S. Secret Service’s Safe School Initiative’s Study of Targeted School Violence.

Resources From Selected Campuses

Critical Incident Protocol—A Public and Private Partnership
This publication from Michigan State University discusses the need for the public and private sectors to work together to plan for emergencies.

George Washington University’s Center for Health and Health Care in Schools: Emergency Preparedness: A Quick Guide for School Staff
This brief introduction is a list of resources for those responsible for developing an emergency preparedness plan.

University of Arizona: Campus Emergency Response Team Report
This three-page article describes the work of the University of Arizona Campus Emergency Response Team.
Q: You were in the path of last year’s hurricanes. How did you respond to those natural disasters?

A: Four hurricanes hit Florida this past fall. Two of them directly affected the Gainesville area and the University of Florida community. There are three phases of crisis—pre-crisis, crisis, and post-crisis. From my research, campuses and communities are pretty good at the crisis phase. In the aftermath, or post-crisis phase, we do pretty well in following up with people. But the pre-crisis phase—what we can do to prevent the situation from occurring and to reduce the impact of a crisis—needs more attention. With a hurricane, where we have advance warning, how do we best get information to people and coordinate response efforts on the campus and in the community? For us it was a matter of getting information to students both on and off campus about what safety precautions they needed to take to prepare for a hurricane. For example, we advised students to set up an emergency communications plan in order to diffuse the situation by sharing the information we have, as well as providing resources and a contact so that we can get more information to them? It’s also a matter of contacting faculty members to let them know that the student will not be in class. As a follow-up, we consider how the accident might affect the student’s academics and other situations, and whether we need to work with family members.

Q: From your perspective as a dean of students, what role can students play in emergency preparedness?

A: Students are important ties to other individuals in a crisis situation. When a crisis occurs or something bad happens, people often think mainly about those who are immediately involved—what we might term the primary victims, such as the student involved in the car crash. I see the campus community like a clear pool of water. When a crisis occurs, it’s like taking a pebble and dropping it in that pool. First, there’s the big splash that captures everybody’s attention. Then there are the ripples, which represent the different people throughout the campus community who are also affected by that crisis—the secondary and tertiary victims. It’s important for a campus not to respond just to the immediate victims, but to reach out to everyone who is affected. For example, if a student is involved in a car accident off campus and has been hospitalized with a serious injury, the first thing we want to do is identify the student. Does the student live on campus? Off campus? Who are the appropriate people to notify—our off-campus coordinator or housing staff? Does the student have a roommate or significant other who may be affected? Students who show up at the hospital to help may in fact be problematic for emergency personnel who cannot release information to them. Do we need to send a staff member to the emergency room to work with students who might be upset in order to help diffuse the situation by sharing the information we have? Also, do we need to work with family members? As a follow-up, we consider how the accident might affect the student’s academics and other situations, and whether we need to work with family members.
Q&A With Eugene Zdziarski

with family members so that in the event something did happen they would know how to contact each other. That might mean identifying someone outside the hurricane’s path as a contact point, anticipating that phones might be down.

A lot of people asked whether the university would close. However, while we had advanced warning, we really didn’t know where the hurricane would hit. We had parents in South Florida who wanted us to close the university so that their children could go home and be with family. But to do that we would have had to make the call very early. And because the storm was coming up from the south and might hit Miami, we could be sending students into harm’s way. And, of course, it might hit Miami but never hit Gainesville. The challenge was to look at what a reasonable time frame was and how accurate our information was about when it was likely to hit the university.

Q: The hurricanes gave the university a real-life test for its plan. How did things go for you during the hurricanes?

A: Overall, I think it went very well. We were able to maintain communications with students, faculty, and staff. But the Gainesville community got hit a lot harder than the campus community. In the storm’s aftermath, faculty, staff, and students were faced with repairing their homes while the university itself was able to return to normal business operations fairly quickly. We had to recognize that a situation like this goes beyond just the campus community.

I would suggest that there are three different levels of emergencies: critical incidents, crises, and disasters. A critical incident is something that affects a subset or subgroup of that organization and may affect their normal operations, but it doesn’t stop the entire operations of the organization. A crisis is generally defined as something that affects an organization in its entirety. It stops the normal operations of that unit or organization. A disaster is something that not only affects the organization or the unit itself but also the surrounding community. Clearly a hurricane falls into that category. A disaster creates significant issues to address in all three phases—pre-crisis, post-crisis, and crisis. In dealing with a crisis, a campus may rely on off-campus resources and services that in a disaster are needed elsewhere. In the aftermath of the hurricane, the university was able to get back to normal operations pretty quickly while the people in the community were not. But our ability to get back to normal operations as quickly as we could was affected because we had faculty, staff, and students who were picking up in the hurricane’s aftermath.

Q: That raises a very interesting question. What role do communities play in responding to emergencies at colleges and universities and how should they be involved in developing the plan?

A: Clearly there needs to be collaboration and cooperation between the community and the campus community. Larger institutions may be able to bring resources to bear that smaller institutions can’t. In any event there must be cooperation and collaboration. A campus has to work with local law enforcement, fire departments, and other emergency services so that there is a coordinated effort in responding to incidents and emergencies. For example, during the hurricanes, the university operated two shelters for community members as part of the county network of shelters that were staffed in part by university personnel in addition to the American Red Cross personnel.

(Continued on page 11)
Highlights From the U.S. Department of Education’s 18th Annual National Meeting on Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse and Violence Prevention in Higher Education

More than 520 people from across the country came to Arlington, Va., last October to attend the 2004 National Meeting on Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse and Violence Prevention in Higher Education. The theme of this 18th Annual National Meeting was *Shaping Our Future: Uniting for Comprehensive Prevention.*

In cooperation with the Network: Addressing Collegiate Alcohol and Other Drug Issues, the Department sponsored the one-day National Forum for Senior Administrators during the National Meeting, which attracted 75 presidents, chancellors, trustees, vice presidents, deans, and major unit directors for a collegial meeting with peers to consider leadership strategies for promoting safe and healthy learning and living environments.

A highlight was an award ceremony recognizing the recipients of the Department’s Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention Models on College Campuses Grant Competition. It recognized colleges and universities for effective alcohol or other drug prevention programs on their campuses. The 2004 awards, presented by Assistant Deputy Secretary of Education Deborah Price, went to:

- Grand Valley State University, for its ALERT Labs AOD Prevention Model. The model uses an environmental management approach to target first-year students that includes a media campaign to change student misperceptions about campus drinking norms and promote a social mentoring program, alcohol-free housing, a theater troupe that addresses alcohol-related problems, and counseling for recovering students.

- Massachusetts Institute of Technology, for its MIT Screening and Brief Intervention Model, which is based on the Brief Alcohol Screening and Intervention for College Students (BASICS) program that serves first-year students at MIT through an online screening survey that is followed by counseling interventions for students identified as high-risk drinkers.

- The University of Chicago, for its *Noctis Sero* (Late Night) Program, which will expand the university's current program to include increased outreach efforts, additional drug-free campus activities, and educational materials on marijuana prevention and stress management.

In addition, the National Meeting featured the presentation of the Presidents Leadership Group (PLG) award. With support from The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, the PLG was formed in 1997 to bring national attention to campus AOD issues, highlighting concrete ways presidents can serve as effective catalysts for change. The 2004 awardee was Karen Holbrook, Ph.D., president of The Ohio State University, for her leadership in addressing unruly sports fan behavior and student rioting at OSU. Dr. Holbrook and her colleague William Hall, vice president for student affairs, also spoke at the Senior Administrators Forum.

The National Meeting also featured the presentation of the Network’s Outstanding Contribution to the Field award. The 2004 awardee was Cheryl Presley, Ph.D., the executive director of the Core Institute since 1989.
Publishing as a Way to Make Prevention a Campuswide Imperative

by Mary Stuart Hunter

Research and descriptions of best practices in alcohol, other drugs, and violence prevention are valuable resources for helping new and veteran alcohol and other drug educators improve effectiveness. The Network member institutions strive to increase awareness and implementation of prevention initiatives. If this important work is to realize its deserved value and status on our campuses and in our communities, however, we must find ways to spread information on these critical issues beyond the existing alcohol and other drug community to faculty, administrators, institutional leaders, community stakeholders, and policy-makers.

In the academy, prerequisites to institutionalization of new initiatives include broad acknowledgment of the issue and empirical evidence transmitted through a solid literature base. Therefore, I offer for consideration two strategies for elevating the status of prevention education on our campuses and in the greater higher education community.

The first is to raise awareness of alcohol and other drug issues by circulating existing publications in the field such as Catalyst to faculty colleagues and administrators across the campuses and into the communities. Discussing these issues with colleagues outside our natural work circles will result in dialogues that will benefit all concerned and have the potential to set in motion significant changes.

The second strategy is to encourage fellow prevention educators to publish their research and other writings in journals, magazines, and newsletters whose readership is beyond our own professional community. Below is information on nationally disseminated periodicals that reach outside our already-established collegiate networks. The Web sites cited include manuscript submission guidelines.

Refereed Journals

Journal of College and University Student Housing. This journal features articles on current research and trends in the housing profession, book reviews, and other in-depth discussions of interest to Association of College and University Housing Officers—International members.

http://publications.naspa.org/naspajournal

Journal of College Orientation and Transition. Published by the National Orientation Directors Association, this journal focuses on the trends, practices, research, and development of programs, policies, and activities related to the matriculation, orientation, transition, and retention of college students. Also published are literature reviews, “how-to” articles, innovative initiatives, successful practices, and new ideas.

http://www.nodaweb.org/publications/journal.htm

Journal of College Student Development. Published by the American College Personnel Association, the journal welcomes manuscripts concerning student development, professional development, professional issues, administrative concerns, and creative programs to improve student services. Authors may focus on recent original research, replication of research, reviews of research, graduate education in student affairs, or essays on theoretical, organizational, and professional issues. Both quantitative and qualitative research manuscripts are considered.


Journal of The First-Year Experience and Students in Transition. This journal disseminates research findings on retention of first-year students, applied first-year programs, methodologies and results of first-year program assessments, and institutional policies and programs that affect first-year students.

http://www.sc.edu/fye/publications/submissions.html

NASPA Journal. The National Association of Student Personnel Administrators journal, a quarterly publication, provides in-depth articles covering issues pertinent to student affairs administration. The journal’s primary audience is the student affairs generalist who has broad responsibility for educational leadership, policy, staff development, and management. Common article topics include cultural diversity, legal and judicial issues, student development, assessment, and administration.

http://publications.naspa.org/naspajournal

NetResults is NASPA’s online “zine” for student affairs professionals.

Magazines

About Campus. Sponsored by the American College Personnel Association (ACPA), About Campus is dedicated to the idea that student learning is the responsibility of all educators on campus. Six times a year, About Campus offers an exciting and eclectic mix of articles and features—all designed to illuminate the critical issues faced by both student affairs and academic affairs staff as they work on the shared goal of helping students learn.

http://www.acpaphiladelphia.org/aboutcampus/

Change. This magazine covers contemporary issues in higher learning. It is intended to stimulate and inform reflective practitioners in colleges, universities, corporations, government, and elsewhere. Change spotlights trends, provides new insights and ideas, and analyzes the implications of educational programs, policies, and practices.

http://www.heldref.org/changemanu.php

Newsletters

E-Source for College Transitions. This electronic newsletter, published six times a year, offers innovative and practical ideas for improving programs for first-year students, transfers, and seniors. Practical, diverse, and current examples demonstrate how effective programming can help to improve a student’s academic career.

http://www.sc.edu/fye/publications/submissions.html

Magna Publications, Inc. This organization publishes eight subscription newsletters in the field of higher education, including Academic Leader,
Keeping Up Standards

Members of the Network: Addressing Collegiate Alcohol and Other Drug Issues work to advance local, state, regional, and national prevention initiatives through a commitment to a set of standards for policy development, educational strategies, enforcement, evaluation, and community collaboration. In fact, since 1987 more than 1,500 colleges and universities have attested to those standards as a condition of Network membership.

The Network standards have been reviewed and updated over time to ensure that they reflect current research on effective prevention approaches that include individual, educational, and environmental strategies. Many of the recommendations in the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism’s report A Call to Action: Changing the Culture of Drinking at U.S. Colleges (www.higheredcenter.org/niaaa/report.html) echo the Network’s standards, especially in the area of community collaboration.

The standards provide a framework for institutional activities and task force initiatives, models for federal and state legislation, and a focal point for action on reducing alcohol, other drug, and related violence (AODV) problems among students and promoting healthy campus environments.

In 1998, as part of a review of its own standards, the Network started collaborating with the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (www.cas.edu) to bring more congruence between the standards of the CAS and the Network. The CAS had developed standards and guidelines aimed at helping practitioners access comprehensive criteria on which they can rely as they judge how well they are fulfilling their responsibilities. They include alcohol and other drug program standards.

While the CAS’s standards are used primarily by campuses to do an internal assessment of how their student affairs programs are working, the Network’s standards are more of a set of guidelines for establishing and maintaining a campus alcohol and other drug program. As such, the Network’s standards provide a good sounding board for campuses as they conduct their 2006 Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act (DFSCA) Part 86–mandated biennial review on the effectiveness of their alcohol and other drug program and the consistency of policy enforcement (www.higheredcenter.org/dfsca).

The standards are organized within the five areas that make up a comprehensive campus alcohol and other drug prevention program. They are policy, education and student assistance, enforcement, assessment, and campus community collaboration (www.thenetwork.ws/standards.htm).

While Part 86 outlines minimum requirements that campuses must do to be in compliance with federal law, incorporating the Network’s standards into their plans can help campuses comply with the spirit and not just with the letter of the law and gain significant benefits for the entire institution and its students.

(Continued from page 9)

Publishing . . .

Administrator, The National On-Campus Report, Perspective, and Recruitment and Retention in Higher Education. For submission guidelines, contact Magna Publications, Inc., 2718 Dryden Drive, Madison, WI 53704; (608) 246-3590; fax (608) 246-3597. www.magnapubs.com

The journals, magazines, and newsletters cited here represent only a small sampling of those where articles on alcohol and other drug issues would be appropriate. I encourage you to extend your important work to the rest of the higher education community by pursuing writing and research on the critical issues that we work so hard to address day after day.

Mary Stuart Hunter is the director of the National Resource Center for The First-Year Experience and Students in Transition and is a member of the Council of Advisors of the Network: Addressing Collegiate Alcohol and Other Drug Issues.

Join the Network!

Welcome New Network Members

• Bainbridge College, Ga.
• Berklee College of Music, Mass.
• Big Sandy Community and Technical College, Ky.
• Bluegrass Community and Technical College District, Ky.
• Bridgewater College, Va.
• Cheyney University, Pa.
• Davis & Elkins College, W.Va.
• Electronic Data Processing College of Puerto Rico, Inc., Puerto Rico
• Fitchburg State College, Mass.
• Florida Memorial College, Fla.
• ICPR Junior College, Puerto Rico
• Instituto Tecnologico de Puerto Rico, Puerto Rico
• Inter American University of Puerto Rico, Puerto Rico
• Iowa Western Community College, Iowa
• Lexington College, Ill.
• Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts, Mass.
• MBTI Business Training Institute, Puerto Rico
• Moravian College, Pa.
• Penn State, Abington, Pa.
• Penn State, Hazleton, Pa.
• Penn State, McKeesport, Pa.
• Penn State, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.
• Regis College, Mass.
• Rhodes College, Tenn.
• Rowan University, Glassboro, N.J.
• St. Francis University, Pa.
• Southeast Technical Institute, S.D.
• Universidad Interamericano de Puerto Rico, Puerto Rico
• University of Maine System, Maine
• University of Minnesota, Crookston, Minn.
• University of Sioux Falls, S.D.
• University of Wisconsin, Stevens Point, Wis.
• University of Wisconsin, Superior, Wis.
• Western Dakota Technical Institute, S.D.
• Winona State University, Minn.

As of April 30, 2005, Network membership stood at 1,532 postsecondary institutions.
Planning for a Crisis—It’s Not an Oxymoron

as well as the available resources can be developed (www.ojp.usdoj.gov/odp/docs/ODPPrev1.pdf).

For example, emergency plans for campuses and surrounding communities may include using each other as a shelter. Community members may be evacuated to a campus facility or vice versa. This expectation must be identified, communicated, and planned for clearly. If the community plan says that the campus will shelter citizens in an emergency, campus officials must be prepared to accommodate them with food, water, sanitary facilities, security, communications, and so on.

According to Chief Barnett, the type of emergency and the level of emergency response resources available on the campus will dictate the role that communities play in responding to university emergencies.

For example, when developing an emergency plan, depending on the type of emergency and its impact on the surrounding community, for some situations the community’s emergency response resources may not be available to the campus. Campuses must determine in advance how to respond to situations in which outside community resources are either not available or the response time for those services will be significantly delayed.

Chief Barnett pointed out that while the campus police or public safety department plays a very important role in promoting emergency preparedness on campus, they cannot do it alone.

“Typically, the campus police will be the primary first responders to all campus emergencies. As such, they must ensure that there is a clear understanding, in advance of an incident occurring, of their specific role and limitations in managing the various types of emergencies that can occur on a campus,” said Chief Barnett. “However, the responsibility for

If the community plan says that the campus will shelter citizens in an emergency, campus officials must be prepared to accommodate them with food, water, sanitary facilities, security, communications, and so on.

emergency preparedness does not rest solely with the campus police—it is a responsibility that must be shared with the entire campus community.”

The key to preparedness is for colleges, universities, and their surrounding communities to take the necessary steps in advance to develop a comprehensive emergency response plan.

“One the plan is developed, it must be tested, critiqued, and modified as necessary. Clearly, university presidents have the difficult task of managing the many competing needs for limited resources throughout our campuses. However, this is an area of responsibility that the president must ensure receives the appropriate commitment toward providing adequate resources and staff time,” said Chief Barnett.

Q&A with Eugene Zdziarski

Q: Why do people point to the University of Florida as one with a good emergency preparedness plan?

A: In the early 1990s, a serial murderer in the Gainesville community created a lot of campus concern. Students and their families were very worried about their safety. Through its plan, the university responded in a way that students, faculty, staff, and the surrounding community all felt was appropriate and positive. The plan has expanded and become more formalized since that time. It has become a model that many campuses across the country have used in developing their own plans.

Prior to coming to the University of Florida, I worked at Texas A&M University. We looked at the University of Florida plan and developed the Critical Incident Response Team. When the bonfire at Texas A&M collapsed in 1999, I was responsible for the coordination and deployment of the Critical Incident Response Team. Our plan was a big part of the division of student affairs and the university’s response to that tragic crisis that involved the entire campus community. Having a plan really helps an institution prepare for and respond to such emergencies—and people have seen that bear out.

Q: What advice would you offer to college presidents as they begin to address threats of terrorism, natural disasters, and other emergencies, including student riots and accidents such as fires or other disruptions of facilities?

A: People recognize that crisis management is important. But in the day-to-day hustle of setting priorities—for time, resources, and personnel—it never quite seems to make the top of the list. Unfortunately, too many campuses find out the hard way how important a plan is by experiencing a disaster or crisis. It really does take some advance planning. When I ask other campuses whether they have a plan, whether it is written down, and whether people know where to find it, the response is often: “Well, no, it’s not really written down. We just kind of know what to do.” I respond that research shows that campuses with a written plan that is communicated to people, trained in, and practiced are much more effective in responding to emergencies than those campuses that don’t have that resource. Putting time and energy into a plan on the front end pays off when it comes to responding to an emergency.

For more information on the University of Florida’s emergency preparedness plan, please email Dean Zdziarski at genez@ufl.edu.
Recent Responses to Crises at Campuses

Gaining Control Through Regulations in Boulder

A city-sanctioned block party in Boulder, Colo., home to the University of Colorado, that resulted in a riot where the crowd started a bonfire, overturned cars, and hurled rocks at police—who responded by firing tear gas canisters at the rioters—has led to new city rules governing such parties. Residents who want to host a community block party will now need permission from five city departments and must follow stringent new guidelines, according to new municipal procedures. “There wasn’t much in the way of limitations prior to this,” City Clerk Alisa Lewis told The Daily Times-Call. “We’ve created a tighter review process from our end.”

Under the new rules, applications must be approved by the city’s police, fire, transportation, and environmental enforcement departments. Officials also added a few new rules that will prevent large, rowdy gatherings. Alcohol is prohibited on public property, parties must end by 10 p.m., and special permission will be required for parties of more than 100 people. In addition, all applications must be submitted at least 30 days before a planned event.

Alcohol Ban at Cal

More than two years after the University of California, Berkeley, lifted a ban on alcohol in the campus Greek system, alcohol is now indefinitely banned from campus fraternities and sororities and all events they sponsor, whether on or off campus. The new policy is in response to recent arrests of fraternity members and suspension of another fraternity following a fight-filled boat party in San Francisco Bay and the suspension of yet another fraternity when a pledge was shot 30 times with pellets during a hazing.

While campus officials will not actively check for possible violations, the university warned students to take the ban seriously. If a fraternity or sorority violates the order, the university’s Student Judicial Affairs office “will move to revoke its recognition by the campus,” officials told the San Francisco Chronicle.