1. **MEETING CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**  
Chairperson Williams called meeting to order at 5:26 p.m. Chairperson Williams led the Pledge of Allegiance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn L. Williams</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy S. Link</td>
<td>Trustee</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara J. Miedema</td>
<td>Trustee</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darcy J. Davis</td>
<td>Trustee</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip H. Ward III</td>
<td>Trustee</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanice Guthrie</td>
<td>Student Trustee</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **STUDENT COMMENT**  
Ms. Deborah Cunha, a sophomore pursuing her Associate in Arts degree at the College, shared with the Board her involvement on campus and future academic plans.

3. **APPROVAL OF BOARD MINUTES**  
Approval of Board Minutes from the October 16, 2018 District Board of Trustees Meeting.

RESULT: APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]  
MOVER: Barbara J. Miedema, Trustee  
SECONDER: Wendy S. Link, Trustee  
IN FAVOR: Williams, Miedema, Link, Davis, Ward

4. **APPROVAL OF BOARD AGENDA**  
A. Abstentions by Board Members – None  
B. Public Comments* – None  
C. Motion to approve the Agenda

RESULT: APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]  
MOVER: Wendy S. Link, Trustee  
SECONDER: Philip H. Ward III, Trustee  
IN FAVOR: Williams, Miedema, Link, Davis, Ward

5. **REPORTS**  
A. Chair Report  
   1. Chairperson Williams congratulated the College on the grand opening of the Veterans Success Center.

B. Trustee Committee Reports  
   1. Trustee Miedema, the DBOT representative on the Foundation Board of Directors and Executive Committee, updated the Board on the initial meeting of the Foundation Board Development Committee. During her report, Trustee Miedema noted the following upcoming events being hosted by the Foundation: the annual STEAM Luncheon will be held at the Kravis Center for the Performing Arts on February 20, 2019 and will be highlighted by guest speaker and
renowned author, James Patterson. A VIP reception with Mr. Patterson will be held on the evening of February 19, 2019 at The Breakers.

C. President's Report

1. New faculty for the Boca Raton Campus were introduced by Dr. Tunjarnika L. Coleman-Ferrell, Dean of Academic Affairs. President Parker announced to the Board Dr. Coleman-Ferrell's recent selection as the new Provost for the Palm Beach Gardens Campus effective December 1, 2018.

2. Mrs. Rachael Ondrus Bonlarron shared with the Board the College’s 2019 legislative priorities. Mrs. Ondrus Bonlarron noted that funding the construction of the Dental and Medical Services Technology Building on the Loxahatchee Groves Campus will be the primary focus for the upcoming legislative session. Both, Mrs. Ondrus Bonlarron and President Parker noted that the estimated $16.7 million for the construction of the building might increase due to the rising costs of constructions and the increase in square footage of proposed new design. Additionally, President Parker noted the possibility of a public private partnership for a portion of the site.

A motion for approval of the current legislative priorities, including, but not limited to, the requesting of the funding for the Dental and Medical Services Technology Building on the Loxahatchee Groves Campus was made.

RESULT: APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]  
MOVER: Wendy S. Link, Trustee  
SECONDER: Barbara J. Miedema, Trustee  
IN FAVOR: Williams, Miedema, Link, Davis, Ward

3. Vulnerability Assessment – Jim Bennett, Director of Violence Prevention and Physical Security for Bolante.NET, presented to the Board the comprehensive report prepared based on the College’s violence prevention and crisis response policies and procedures and how the College compares to recognized best practices. A follow-up based on Mr. Bennett’s findings and recommendations will be presented at the January 15, 2019 DBOT Meeting. A copy of the report is attached hereto and made a part hereof.

4. Dr. Bernadette Russell welcomed the Board to the Boca Raton Campus and shared a brief historical overview of the campus. Prior to the commencement of the DBOT Meeting, the Board toured the newly remodeled Chemistry Labs.

6. APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

A. Academic Affairs and Student Services
B. Administration and Business Services
C. Information Technology – None

RESULT: APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]  
MOVER: Darcy J. Davis, Trustee  
SECONDER: Barbara J. Miedema, Trustee  
IN FAVOR: Williams, Miedema, Link, Davis, Ward

7. APPROVAL OF ITEMS REMOVED FROM CONSENT AGENDA - None

8. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS
A. Academic Affairs and Student Services – None

B. Business Administration

1. Human Resources Executive Summary – Mr. Michael Pustizzi presented to the Board the summary of appointments, transfers, promotions, retirements, departures, and temporary assignments for the period of June 1, 2018 through October 31, 2018. Trustee Davis requested for Mr. Pustizzi to analyze future reports for possible trends.

2. Planning and Construction Projects Status Report Dated November 1, 2018 – Mr. Kirk Stetson reported all projects are on schedule.

3. Student Learning Centers (SLC) Update – Mr. Richard Becker shared with the Board the high cost associated with the operation of the SLC and how the College is currently reviewing options to generate funds in order to continue supporting the students’ academic success.

C. Information Technology - None

9. ACTION ITEMS

A. Academic Affairs and Student Services

1. Approval of the 2018-2020 Dual Enrollment Articulation Agreement Between Palm Beach State College and Atlantic Christian Academy, Glades Day School, Grandview Preparatory School, Matlock Academy, and Saint Andrew’s School - Dr. Barbatis presented for Board approval the Dual Enrollment Articulation Agreements between the College and five (5) of the area’s private schools. The agreements are in addition to the Dual Enrollment Articulation Agreements presented for Board approval during the October 18, 2018 Board Meeting. Dr. Barbatis noted that private school dual enrollment students are responsible for standard tuition and cost of books.

RESULT: APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: Barbara J. Miedema, Trustee
SECONDER: Philip H. Ward III, Trustee
IN FAVOR: Williams, Miedema, Link, Davis, Ward

B. Administration and Business Services

C. Information Technology

10. OTHER BUSINESS

11. BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

12. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Board Policy 6Hx-18-10.2 authorizes the President to approve routine business items and administrative appointments that would have appeared on the December Board Meeting Agenda. These items will be submitted for confirmation at the January 15, 2019 Board Meeting.

B. The College will be closed in observance of the Thanksgiving Holiday November 22-23, 2018. There are no classes scheduled to begin at 5:00 p.m. or later on the Wednesday prior to Thanksgiving Day. However, any class already in progress at 5:00 p.m. on that Wednesday should be completed. There are no classes scheduled for the Saturday and Sunday immediately following the Thanksgiving break.

C. Fall Commencement Ceremonies will be held on Wednesday, December 19, 2018 at the South Florida Fair and Expo Center, located at 9067 Southern Boulevard, West Palm Beach, FL 33411. The ceremony for the Bachelor’s, Associate in Science Degrees and
Certificate Programs will be held at 9:30 a.m. The ceremony for the Associate in Arts Degree Program will be held at 2:00 p.m.

D. The College will be closed for Winter Break from December 20, 2018 through January 1, 2019. The College will reopen on January 2, 2019. To accommodate student registration during the Winter Break, the Student Services Offices on the Lake Worth Campus will be open from 9:00 a.m. – 6:00 p.m. on Thursdays, December 20, 2018 and December 27, 2018 and from 9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m. on Fridays, December 21, 2018 and December 28, 2018.

E. The next, regular District Board of Trustees meeting will be held on Tuesday, January 15, 2019 at 5:00 p.m. in the Multi-Media Board Room (CE-129) at the Lake Worth Campus of Palm Beach State College.

13. ADJOURNMENT

A. The meeting was adjourned at 7:02 p.m.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULT:</th>
<th>APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOVER:</td>
<td>Philip H. Ward III, Trustee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDER:</td>
<td>Darcy J. Davis, Trustee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN FAVOR:</td>
<td>Williams, Miedema, Link, Davis, Ward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ATTEST: Carolyn L. Williams, Chairperson

Ava L. Parker, J.D., President
VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENT
Violence Prevention and Crisis Response

Palm Beach State College
October 2018

Bolante.NET
285 Court St. NE - Salem, OR 97301

A network of experts providing training in the areas of threat assessment and disaster response.
October 2018,

Bolante.NET is pleased to present this vulnerability assessment to the leadership of Palm Beach State College. The purpose of the review was to provide a comprehensive review of the institution’s violence prevention and crisis response policies and procedures, and to compare them to recognized best practices.

The report, as detailed on the following pages, was initiated through a contract agreement between Bolante.NET and the College. The scope and methodology, as well as recommendations and suggestions, are detailed on the following pages.

Palm Beach State College is to be commended for the efforts the Security Department and the institution have taken to protect their campus community from active violence. From physical security and preparedness measures to procedural and policy driven initiatives, there is little room for doubt that Palm Beach State College views safety of the campus community as an important component of delivering quality education.

The working relationship between Bolante.NET, the Palm Beach State College Security Department and individuals from throughout the District has been ideal and instrumental in preparation of this document.

As Managing Director and Director of Violence Prevention and Physical Security, we would like to extend our most sincere appreciation for allowing us to assist you on this important and necessary path. It has been our pleasure to work with you and we look forward to any future assistance we can provide your outstanding institution.

Rebecca Bolante  
Managing Director

Jim Bennett  
Director of Violence Prevention and Physical Security
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Executive Summary

The following report is a vulnerability assessment conducted by the review team of Bolante.NET, a consulting and training firm with expertise in behavioral threat assessment and post disaster behavioral health. The process included a comprehensive review of the Palm Beach State College (PBSC) assessment, prevention, preparedness and response to violence or threats of violence.

The assessment included a multi-phase data collection process with on-site interviews, tours and discussions. In addition, reports, documents, procedures and policies were provided by the College and reviewed by the review team. Recommendations were developed based on the professional expertise and experience of the Bolante.NET team, supported by numerous national best practice models.

The review found that the institution and its individual departments demonstrated a strong commitment and action to promoting and providing an environment conducive to safe educational pursuits. Although the review team found some areas for additional consideration by the institution, there were no immediate issues of extreme concern.

Internal assessment of threats are conducted through a Students of Concern Team. The Bolante.NET review team recognizes the outstanding work of these teams and encourages the development of a separate behavioral threat assessment team to more effectively and exclusively address threats of violence. Team structure, procedures, training, meeting frequency and processes is critical to demonstrate and fulfill the need of identifying potential threats early on.

Prevention efforts remain strong with various classes, presentations, and marketing activities throughout the campus community. Not uncommon in the higher education environment is some disconnect in student reception of prevention materials and awareness of reporting pathways. Clear and known routes of reporting are crucial in threat prevention to make sure that information is not overlooked or failed to reach assessors and responders.

The College’s preparedness efforts through emergency operation planning as well as campus-wide drill frequency and variety is among the best. Expanded drills in the form of table-top and scenario-based training for internal responders is highly recommended as well as full-scale drill events to test the response system of all providers, internal and external. Interoperability of radio communications within the college as well as with external emergency service providers is crucial and needs further organizational review.
Likewise, reviewing lockdown procedures and the ability to instantaneously lock doors through electronic access control is also a critical component of preparation and response to active violence.

**Response** to active violence has procedurally been accomplished and is supported heavily by an anticipated response, and response time of outside law enforcement providers. While some campuses have expeditious response times, others may be impacted by extended response times form armed law enforcement services. Options of arming current security forces or contracting with other providers may want to be considered for some or all campuses. However, as detailed in this report there are substantial challenges to moving an organization to an armed presence on campus. The report details many of the elements necessary to deploy armed personnel. Consideration must be given to numerous factors, most notably; determining the true need for armed officers, transitional obstacles, costs, community acceptance or desire for armed presence and an equitable deployment of armed personnel to adequately protect all campus community members.
The following recommendations and suggestions are listed for ease of review and their placement does not indicate hierarchy of importance or priority. These have been extracted from the preceding pages under “Review Team Comments” and included below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation or Consideration</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radio Interoperability – Law Enforcement</td>
<td>Ability for campus security to talk directly with local law enforcement, at a minimum, during critical incidents, with appropriate procedures and training.</td>
<td>39-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio Interoperability – Internal</td>
<td>During a critical incident clear and direct communication is critical, but relayed information wastes time and has the potential of altering the message. Allow all officers to have direct radio access to all campus radio frequencies (maintenance, emergency coordinators, building coordinators, etc.).</td>
<td>39-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional languages in emergency materials</td>
<td>Expanding the reach to each family member whose first language is not English and may struggle with reading important emergency procedure documents. Consider identifying key languages and translating emergency response and procedures into those identified and most common languages.</td>
<td>28-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased sharing of security internal logs</td>
<td>Encourage officers who have been on leave to review past logs; all campus security departments regularly review and share logs from other campuses to insure there is no “silo” effect of information that may, unexpectedly impact another campus.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency notification system test</td>
<td>Regular, system-wide stress tests of Blackboard Connect.</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post incident disaster behavioral health</td>
<td>Develop plans and processes for immediate behavioral health needs following a critical incident. Consider inclusion of Disaster Behavioral Health Teams for emotional support, planning for support rooms, reunification and longer-term mental health care for the campus community.</td>
<td>50-51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Recommendation or Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation or Consideration</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lockout Key</strong></td>
<td>Consider re-assessing the “lock-out” key process to ensure that all members of the campus community have the opportunity to find secure shelter during a violent act.</td>
<td>36-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access Control</strong></td>
<td>Assess the feasibility of providing access control with immediate electronic lockdown capability to all exterior doors instead of current manual process at four campuses.</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students of Concern Team</strong></td>
<td>- Consider the current charge of the team; best practices indicate the benefits of a separate Threat Assessment Team with the right members.</td>
<td>17-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Appropriate threat assessment training for members conducting threat assessments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Consider combing all threat assessment (students, staff, faculty, non-students) into the charge of the threat assessment team.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Consider title of a separate threat assessment team that clearly demonstrates to the campus community the purpose of the team (i.e. “Threat Assessment Team”).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Create regular meeting times for each team; meet even if there are no new cases to assess.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Confirm cyber security of Maxient files for the SOC/Threat Assessment Team. ONLY team members should have access to these files.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Confirm each team has a focus and awareness of team member trigger points; be aware of effects from case work, supporting recusal from a case is necessary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Consider inclusion of part-time law enforcement participation in threat assessment teams. While law enforcement may attend infrequently they should receive advance training on team dynamics, threat assessment process and college operations as they relate to threats of violence response.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Recommendations and Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation or Consideration</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct Training</td>
<td>Consider ways to increase training for adjunct staff; ensure all staff receive the same emergency response, reporting and evacuations training.</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC (Threat Assessment Team) marketing</td>
<td>Continue work in branding and marketing of the SOC (Threat Assessment Team) throughout the organization (staff and students).</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidentiality</td>
<td>Suggest use of confidentiality and team agreement form for all team members. Confidentiality form for all visitors (internal and external) – see sample Appendix B</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement memorandum of understanding (MOU) for sharing of information</td>
<td>Consider an MOU to outline sharing of information and investigation of protocols between PBSC security and law enforcement.</td>
<td>19, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider being a leader in creating a community-based threat assessment team</td>
<td>The highly effective community-based threat assessment teams greatly increase information sharing and are strong examples of a multi-disciplinary approach to assessment. Consideration should be given to initiating a community-based team.</td>
<td>19, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No weapons signage</td>
<td>To campus community members and especially visitors, there does not appear to be signage indicating the weapon policy of the College. Consider signage at each building and within parking lots providing specific direction on weapon prohibitions.</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incident Response – Mass Injuries</td>
<td>Training for key staff on “stop the bleed” response to significant injuries and deployment of response materials throughout campus facilities.</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUN-HIDE-FIGHT (Classroom)</td>
<td>Consider offering classroom/scenario-based training with instruction. This does somewhat occur with the lockdown drills but more in-depth training of how to personally respond could be beneficial.</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider tighter mandate on staff training</td>
<td>It is imperative that all staff understand the College’s reporting system, to whom they are to report, the purpose of the SOC (Threat Assessment) team, violence response protocols, etc. Routine refresher training that administration may want to require is also suggested.</td>
<td>21, 26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation or Consideration</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security phones answered 24/7</td>
<td>Students and staff may not fully understand on site security phone numbers are not answered at all hours (exception Lake Worth and Palm Beach Gardens). Consider having all phone transfer to a 24/7 monitored security line.</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary security telephone number</td>
<td>If a student or staff travels between campuses it could be confusing to know what number to call during an incident, or where to direct assistance. Consider providing a master security number or alternative where all security lines are answered 24/7.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reassess drill protocols with advance notice</td>
<td>Consideration to the multiple day prior notice for drills.</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve student reporting</td>
<td>Continue to provide outreach and marketing to encourage reporting; ensure students know to whom to report incidents.</td>
<td>30-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table-Top Drill Exercises</td>
<td>Consider conducting, at a minimum, a yearly table top drill for emergency response team, executive staff, etc. These drills help to strengthen the organization’s response and command capabilities.</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full scale drill</td>
<td>Consider conducting a full-scale drill to assess the response capabilities and coordination of response between outside emergency services and responders from throughout the organization.</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bolante.NET was contracted to provide an assessment of Palm Beach State College’s (PBSC) violence prevention and crisis response policies and procedures and to compare them to recognized best practices. To facilitate this process the assessment was divided into four key areas for ease of understanding and organization: assessment, prevention, preparedness and response to threats or acts of violence.

The assessment is limited in scope and does not include a review of the competency of staff, budgeting, organizational structure, operational procedures, workloads, efficiencies, or effectiveness other than those areas that applied directly or indirectly to assessment, prevention, preparedness and response to threats or acts of violence.

The report is prepared as a document of recommendations and suggestions, as well as a sharing of best practices. The assessor and staff of Bolante.NET are not legal counsel and do not possess an expertise in Florida State Law. It is recommended that the institution’s legal counsel be consulted in any areas that may increase or decrease exposure to liability. Bolante.NET has an obligation to report to our client any urgent issues or concerns where there may be a known or potential violation of law or practices that may put members of the campus community in significant danger.

*The September 2018 review revealed there were NO known areas requiring immediate action to be compliant with law or other immediate, critical safety measures.*

**CONTRACT ASSESSMENT DELIVERABLES**

- Practices and procedures comparative to national standards and best practices in regard to prevention, preparedness and response to threats and acts of violence.
- Physical security measures (comparative to typical/average configurations with recommendations for enhancement beyond typical/average configurations) at all five campuses/centers.
- Structure in relationship to the readiness to respond to acts of violence (public safety, administration, etc.).
- Review the college’s current status and options for armed response (i.e. arming current staff, establishment of sworn law enforcement, or contracting with an outside provider).
- Community engagement programming to facilitate violence prevention
- Staff prevention and readiness
- Behavioral threat assessment process and procedures
The review was conducted through a mixed data collection process that included the following points of collection:

- On-site assessor visits to each of the five campuses within the College
- On-site or electronic interviews or discussions with key personnel including the President, Vice President of Administration and Business Services, Provosts, Deans, Faculty, Staff, Emergency Coordinators, Building Coordinators, Students of Concern Team members and Security Department Personnel
- On-site student discussion (focus) group Note: discussion group was limited in scope and participation and was not a scientific survey with pre-determined response choices – the College may wish to consider an in-depth, formal, structured survey to better assess the opinions and concerns of students.
- Data derived from the PBSC website
- On-site observation of an evacuation drill and debrief
- Electronic or phone communications with various district staff members
- General data collection on security department protocols, threat assessment, prevention, preparedness and response policies, procedures and practices
- Electronic or phone communications with select community law enforcement partners
- Discussion with other comparable institutions in the state of Florida
- Documents including the Annual Security Reports, Shift Logs, Emergency Operations Plan, Security Plan and more

The data and interviews were conducted, reviewed and assessed by the primary assessor (Jim Bennett, Director of Violence Prevention and Physical Security) and evaluated based on professional experience, training, recognized best practices and Bolante.NET recommended practices and procedures.

The draft report was then reviewed by Dr. Rebecca Bolante, Certified Threat Manager and Managing Director of Bolante.NET as well as the internal Bolante.NET review team. The team provides the following credentials as the basis for expertise: PHD, Master’s Degree, Former Higher Education Chiefs and Directors of Public Safety, Emergency Management, Public Information, Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design, Certified Threat Manager, Psychological First Aid Trainers, Recognized Behavioral Threat Assessment Trainers, Municipal Law Enforcement, Management of Crime Analysis and Prevention Units, Advanced Crime Prevention, Governor appointments to higher education safety work groups, Executive Director of State-wide Higher Education
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Administrator’s Association and past president and vice presidents of higher education public safety associations and crime prevention organizations.

The four focus areas of assessment are defined further below. Throughout the assessment and as noted in the report, these areas, when addressed appropriately and fully, represent an organization’s effective approach to violence prevention and response.

**FOUR KEY AREAS OF ASSESSMENT**

1. **Assessment**
   Does the institution conduct appropriate, lawful, assessments based on best practices and is the process in line with current recognized strategies for behavioral threat assessment?

2. **Prevention**
   Does the institution provide prevention services designed for all members of the campus community that are effective, communicated well and prevent violence?

3. **Preparedness**
   Has the institution put systems and procedures in place to best prepare for an act of violence, including communication systems, emergency notifications and post incident protocols? Does the institution test these systems regularly and effectively?

4. **Response**
   Does the institution have response plans, procedures, partnerships, policies and appropriate staffing and equipment to effectively respond to incidents of violence on campus?

**Background Information – Palm Beach State College**

The Palm Beach State College encompasses five separate campuses with a combined student headcount of more than 48,000. The College provides certification programs, associate degrees, bachelor’s degrees as well as continuing education classes for community members. The College employs more than 3,330 full and part-time faculty, staff, administrators and student workers.

The College is overseen by a Board of Trustees appointed by the Governor. The chief executive of the College is the President, appointed by the Board of Trustees. Each campus is managed by a Provost, who is supported by other administrative staff assigned specifically to each of the five campuses.
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Background Information – Palm Beach State College (continued)

The Lake Worth campus is the largest campus serving a population of approximately 24,000 students (based on headcount) as well as supporting many of the College’s administrative and service functions. The Palm Beach Gardens and Boca Raton campuses each serve student populations of more than 10,000 students (based on headcount). The Belle Glade campus, containing three primary educational buildings, serves approximately 1,400 students (based on headcount) and the newest campus, Loxahatchee, has one large facility; its student population has already grown to over 2,400 students (based on headcount).

The five campuses operate somewhat autonomously insomuch as they each have many of their own support services, such as counseling, registration, financial aid, security team, administrative offices and more.

Background Information – PBSC Security Department

The security department provides non-sworn, unarmed, security services to all five campuses in the district. The primary security administration office is at the Lake Worth campus; however, each campus has its own security office, assigned officers, dispatchers and supervisors. Officers are exempt from state licensure based on Florida State Statute 493.6102.

The department does not keep records or statistics on all calls for service but representative numbers of activity, in the form of reports taken including accidents, crimes, incidents and other occurrences. There were 1,344 district-wide reports in 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018 (to 8/29/18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lake Worth</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach Gardens</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boca Raton</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belle Glade</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loxahatchee</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The department is managed by the Director (Chief) of Security. Day-to-day operational management is provided by the Lieutenant and her team of supervisors (sergeants). The Security Department provides services 24/7 at the Lake Worth and Palm Beach Gardens campus, while the other campuses generally have security services during hours in which the campus is open (generally until about 10pm).

A network of experts providing training in the areas of threat assessment and disaster response
The following are specifics of the security department and their operations as they relate to this report:

**SUPERVISION EXERCISED**
- Director is involved routinely in cases, reviewing and providing direction to staff.
- Sergeants have operational responsibility for all campuses and report to the Lieutenant.

**REPORTING**
- Typed reports are taken on most incidents as stated in PBSC Security Department General Order 3-100.
- The department does not have a computer aided dispatch (CAD) system that would track each call for service and the corresponding data.
- Each shift supervisor provides a shift activity log, as well as a log from each officer. The log captures the significant activities that occurred during the shift. The log is kept on a shared drive and each day the shift supervisors review with their teams the previous shift’s logs. Although officers have access to these logs, they are not currently required to review previous logs when they return from leave.

**INVESTIGATIONS**
- Officers are authorized by Board resolution to conduct investigations.
- There is no specific crime analysis software being used at this time.

**TRAINING**
- Officers receive approximately 40 hours of in-house professional training before they are assigned “solo” patrol responsibilities.
- There are daily, short, additional training opportunities provided by supervisors to officers.
- Officers receive de-escalation training (Nonviolent Crisis Intervention) of 6.5 hours per year and 8 hours of mental health first aid training. Nonviolent Crisis Intervention is a recognized training program in management and prevention of difficult behavior developed by the Crisis Prevention Institute (www.crisisprevention.com/What-We-Do/Nonviolent-Crisis-Intervention). The Security Department has trained instructor staff who provide the initial and refresher training to all field staff.

A network of experts providing training in the areas of threat assessment and disaster response
The school counselor soon will be providing additional mental health training for officers.

**OFFICERS**

- Officer and department staff hiring process background investigations consist of interviews, electronic criminal history checks and contact with three references. Backgrounds do not include contact with other individuals beyond references. Nor do they include psychological examinations or polygraph testing.
- Officers do not carry any defensive weapons.
- Officers do not make any arrests.

**COMMUNICATIONS**

- The department has its own repeater-based VHF radio system. There is no radio connectivity between the campuses, although all department radios have the same bank of channels so that any officer when going to a different campus can communicate with campus officers.
- Each campus provides its own dispatching services.

To facilitate the assessment, the assessor received a tour of each of the campuses and the security operation facilities, led by Lt. Gwen Johnson. Discussions or interviews were conducted with security staff throughout the district and specific operational and procedural questions were addressed by Director Smith and Lt. Johnson.

---

**Background Information – Law Enforcement Service**

The institution and security department maintain what appears by all accounts to be a positive, respectful and productive working relationship with their law enforcement service providers. The Palm Beach Sheriff’s Office provides services to the Lake Worth, Belle Glade and Loxahatchee campuses while the Palm Beach Gardens Police Department provides services to the Palm Beach Gardens campus. The Boca Raton campus, which sits adjacent to Florida Atlantic University (FAU), is serviced for law enforcement matters, under contract, by the FAU Police Department who are in-turn supported by the Boca Raton Police Department.

Security administration states that the relationship between their line officers and officers of the represented law enforcement agencies is good, and outside agencies have a good understanding of the layout and operations of the campuses to which they provide services.

*A network of experts providing training in the areas of threat assessment and disaster response*
provide service. Law enforcement agencies have toured the campuses, routinely respond to the campuses and are equipped with electronic mapping of all facilities. In addition, tours have been provided to law enforcement tactical teams to better inform them of the campus layout.

Communication and the sharing of information is critical in the support of violence prevention. According to Security administration, the law enforcement agencies share, at times, information with the security department relevant to potential threats or persons who may pose a safety threat. However, administrative staff believes there is room for growth in the sharing of information.

The assessor sent an electronic questionnaire to the three law enforcement agencies that provide services to the PBSC District (Palm Beach Sheriff’s Office, Florida Atlantic University Police and the Palm Beach Gardens Police Department).

Assistant Chief Dominic Pape and Major Bob Wilson of the Palm Beach Gardens Police Department responded to the request and provided the following information:

- The department believes that there is a positive, productive and effective flow of information between them and PBSC. Examples were cited of information sharing that support a positive information sharing environment.
- Chief Pape indicated that his department would be open to having an officer participate, as time is available, in PBSC threat assessments, when appropriate for a law enforcement perspective. In addition, he would be willing to have members of his department attend a PBSC sponsored training on threat assessment and how it relates to the state college environment.
- There does not exist a community based (multi-disciplinary) threat assessment team, however there is a law enforcement investigator’s intelligence meeting held regularly that members of his department attend. Information obtained that is relevant and appropriate, is shared with the College’s Security Department.
- The department would be open to considering conducting a full-scale active violence drill for first responders at the campus, if a request is made from the college. They have conducted many of these drills at different educational facilities within the city.
- Between January 1 and September 28, 2018 there were 335 “incidents” at the Palm Beach Gardens campus that showed in the police departments dispatch system. 267 of those “incidents” were proactive policing activities where officers were on campus, conducting routine patrol and interaction with community members. The remaining 68 “incidents” were calls for service, with none of them registering as a “priority 1” event (which denotes a high priority call or emergency
call). The average response time from dispatch to officer arrival for non-priority calls was less than 11 minutes.

- Since there were no priority calls during the period there was no assessment of emergency response time. However, the Chief and Major stated that the shopping mall located across the street from the campus has an assigned police officer at all hours the mall is open for business, which is similar to the hours of the college campus.

- The department provides extensive community-wide training on RUN-HIDE-FIGHT active violence response and is happy to provide training, as requested, to staff or other campus community members.

- The Security Department also works closely with the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), receiving reports and information regularly. Likewise, the department is connected to the state’s Fusion Center, which is an important clearinghouse of public safety information from throughout the state and nation.
A.) ASSESSMENT - Threat Assessment Teams

FINDINGS

PBSC does not have a traditional Behavioral Threat Assessment Team but rather a Students of Concern (SOC) team that is, in part, a Behavioral Intervention Team (BIT). The “District” SOC team is part of the Lake Worth campus and the members include the Director of Security, Title IX Coordinator, Student Life Director and the Director of Counseling Services. The “District” team can and does participate at times in any or all of the various campus teams. The Director of Security and the Director of Counseling Services typically participate in team meetings at each campus.

All campuses, other than Lake Worth, have somewhat similar team structures and as mentioned previously, also include the Director of Security and The Director of Counseling Services. The teams will routinely invite other faculty or staff to participate as the need for a more diverse, or topic/incident specific expertise is needed.

The teams are specific to student related issues and do not conduct assessments or reviews for non-student issues (such as staff, visitors or contractors). All teams conduct reviews or assessments of needs that include student safety concerns, students in crisis and potential or actual threats of violence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOC Team Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campus</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Worth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boca Raton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belle Glade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loxahatchee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Student of Concern (SOC) TEAM SCOPE

Incidents or concerns involving staff are usually assessed by members of the Human Resources Department and will include the Director of Security depending on the nature of the concern. Other incidents involving persons who are not members of the campus community are generally assessed within the Security Department, with the assistance of other campus departments, as deemed appropriate.

FREQUENCY AND CASE LOAD

The Lake Worth team meets regularly. The other teams do not have a set meeting schedule and meet as incidents or concerns arise. However, all teams are under the agreement that urgent matters may require meetings with little to no notice.

Staff estimates that the Lake Worth team reviews or assesses approximately 50 cases per year, with all other campuses 6-7 cases, except for Loxahatchee which may have 1-2 per year.

DOCUMENTATION

The teams use Maxient (primarily a student affairs adjudication database/tool) to document their information, actions and recommendations. This popular documentation software helps to insure tracking and historical data recovery. The system and data are accessible by all members of the SOC teams.

The team does not use a confidentiality agreement or visitor confidentiality agreement. The team does use an electronic threat assessment tool to support their risk assessments and recommendations.

TRAINING

Staff reports that most team members have been through at least one class, with most having received at least 32 hours of BIT training. There was no indication of specific Behavioral Threat Assessment Team training. Several team members indicated that they had training beyond 32 hours of BIT that was specifically relevant to their SOC team responsibilities. There is no regularly scheduled internal BIT team training.

TEAM VISIBILITY

Campus community awareness of the team(s) is most likely minimal. Most cases reviewed or assessed by the teams come from a team member or from Student Affairs/Services or the Security Department.
COMMUNITY BASED TEAMS

There are no known community-based threat assessment teams, although there may be circumstances where community partners (specifically law enforcement) meet with institution officials or others to discuss or provide an informal assessment.

DISCUSSIONS WITH Student of Concern (SOC) Team

The assessor provided members of the SOC Team with questions to better understand their role, experience, expectations and structure. The following is a synopsis of the information received. This was not a scientific sampling or survey.

➢ As stated previously, most team members had 30 or more hours of training, with one respondent stating they had none, although training was primarily BIT training.
➢ Many indicated that they needed additional training to better conduct threat assessments.
➢ Most respondents indicated that they felt community awareness of the team was limited; however, key departments or staff are aware of the team and the team’s charge.
➢ When asked about the overall culture of communication and willingness for community members to share concerns, most indicated it was satisfactory, but an area that can continually benefit from marketing efforts to break down the barriers of communication. Team members did indicate that there is ongoing discussion to create branding for the teams and identify better ways to encourage communication.
➢ For additional team members, there was discussion that a “case manager” was being hired to better support the process and that there is a need to have Human Resources be part of the team.
➢ Challenges noted: A lack of Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with local law enforcement for sharing of information and a lack of state direction in sharing of student information between educational institutions.
➢ Comments included the need for stronger leadership roles and consistent process between all campuses, as well as more clearly defined responsibilities and team structure.

ASSESSOR TEAM COMMENTS

The College has put significant effort into addressing threats through an assessment process. The teams are well trained in Behavioral Intervention which has many crossovers to behavioral threat assessment. The teams have put processes in place that include documentation management and storage, as well as assessment software.
STUDENT OF CONCERN TEAM CHARGE

- There is a need for a specific Threat Assessment Team handling student and non-student threats of violence.
- While combined teams of Behavioral Intervention, Students of Concern and Threat Assessment can be effective, it is recommended that threat assessment stand alone and be dedicated only for assessing threats of violence. This is to retain the purity and demonstrative importance of assessing threats as well as to clearly and specifically define training opportunities associated with threat assessment.
- The current threat assessment best practice advises the threat assessment team to be comprised of a multidisciplinary group of school and community officials, including law enforcement, mental health professionals, and appointed school employees (Bolante & Dykeman 2015, Meloy, Hoffmann, Guldimann, & James, 2012; O’Toole, 2000). The team approach to threat management in colleges has proven the most effective.
- The PBSC system of assessment separates non-student issues (i.e. staff, faculty, visitors, outside threats) from student concerns, and places those incidents on a different assessment track. Based upon the recommendations from researchers and practitioners in the field of threat assessment, we recommend having a threat assessment team focused on any situation of potential targeted violence towards the campus community (vendors, employees, students, etc.). Bolante.NET recommends threat assessment strategies that encompass all potential threats.

TEAM NAME

Name the team “Threat Assessment Team”; embrace the team name and educate the campus community on the team’s supportive functions and how/who to report situations of concern.

Lately there have been national discussions involving ways to title a team. Some prefer a softer approach by creating titles such as “care teams”. However, the belief by many experts in the field of threat assessment, including Bolante.NET, is to give the team an accurate title such as “Threat Assessment Team”. Today’s students and staff understand the reality of threats and violence from what they see every day in the news. By clearly stating the presence of a campus multi-disciplinary team that focuses specifically on threats, the college’s students, staff and parents will be assured that the issue of safety on campus is taken seriously and is not lost amongst the myriad of other student concerns and issues that have nothing to do with threats of violence.
TRAINING AND CONSISTENCY

Specific behavior threat assessment team training is essential for all members of the team. Training must focus on team dynamics, an understanding of the Pathway to Violence as developed by Calhoun and Weston (see Appendix D), assessment processes, team make-up and how to respond to threats.

Team consistency is crucial. Consistency allows for trust to be built among team members, providing the means for members to better understand the expertise each one brings to the team. While it can be difficult for an institution with multiple campuses, separated by a large geographic footprint, with some varying populations (and varying frequency of threats) to maintain a team, the consistency in team participants is necessary to more effectively manage threats of violence.

The PBSC system uses a core team, as detailed previously, who travel to each campus and supplement the team in place. This is one option, the other being a district wide team that meets and has representatives from each campus within the appropriate disciplines.

The value of engaging a district-wide team (rather than a core team) is that district-wide teams have stronger team dynamics as they tend to meet on a regular basis, whereas smaller campuses with fewer campus incidents to report tend to meet less frequently. Experience has shown that regular meeting schedules stimulate conversation, facilitate better tracking and management of open cases, and demonstrate to the campus community the value placed by the institution in preventing active violence.

The American National Standards Institute supports the creation of trained multidisciplinary teams who can identify, assess and prevent/mitigate situations potentially leading to targeted violence (ASIS International; ASME Innovative Technologies Institute; Society of Human Resource Management). Effective multidisciplinary teams also establish and utilize community relationships with both law enforcement and mental health agencies. Staying current through continuing education is necessary for all involved in threat assessment.

DOCUMENTATION

Maxient, the tool used to document the data and materials from the team, is generally hosted off site which reduces the possibility of access by unauthorized persons. However, this report does not examine data and material from a cyber safety perspective. It is recommended that only members of the SOC team have access to these files and that appropriate high-security measures are put into place.
TEAM HEALTH

Frequently assessing threats can take a toll on team members. It can be emotionally draining to continually hear of potential or actual violence. At any time, a certain topic or incident could strike a trigger point of emotions within any member of the team. For this reason, the teams are reminded to always take the time to engage in self-assessment as well as debrief critical incidents. Team members should be encouraged to recuse themselves from any topic of discussion they know will negatively impact them.

TEAM AWARENESS

Educate the campus community about threat assessment

A team that works “in the shadows” and is viewed as something of a “secret society” will continually be challenged by accusatory individuals who do not fully understand the team’s stated goal of maintaining a multi-disciplinary, impartial approach to threat assessment. Therefore, it is critical to the team’s success that all campus community members are aware of the team’s presence and purpose. The campus community needs to know who the threat assessment team is and the extent to which it takes their issues seriously.

Campus communities who are aware of the purposes of the threat assessment team may also be more inclined to report incidents of concern. In other words, the threat assessment team should be the leaders in identifying ways to promote the reporting of incidents and concerns throughout the district. Threat assessment teams whose faculty are fully informed of the team’s charge, process and structure, will feel more comfortable referring (either directly or through the appropriate channels) information to the team. Visible teams are inclined toward success.

LAW ENFORCEMENT PARTNERSHIPS

While it is not practical or appropriate for law enforcement to attend every team meeting, consideration should be given to incorporating this partnership into the threat assessment process whenever needed. Setting up their involvement, possibly through an MOU process, ahead of time and inviting them to participate in basic team training will position the law enforcement partners as worthwhile contributors to the team. Additionally, law enforcement will expand their understanding of College operations while learning how the college internally manages the concerns of students and staff.
CONFIDENTIALITY

Confidentiality is the cornerstone of a successful threat assessment team. When there is a breach of confidentiality it can instantly destroy public trust as well create organizational liability. It is common practice for teams to have all members sign an agreement of confidentiality. In addition, it is extremely important for visitors invited to the team meeting to also complete an agreement of confidentiality (see Appendix C for sample confidentiality form).

TEAM MEMBERS

The following is a list of recommended team members, although consideration may be given to other team members as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Director</th>
<th>Public Safety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director of Legal Resources</td>
<td>Legal Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director/Counselor</td>
<td>Counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Student Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Dean of Students</td>
<td>Student Development and Learning Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>Disability Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Assistant</td>
<td>Student Development and Learning Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Student Financial Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Student Retention and College Life</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SITE SPECIFIC TEAMS / COMMUNITY BASED TEAMS

Behavioral Threat Assessment Teams are generally categorized as either an onsite/site specific team or a community-based team. The SOC team is similar to a site-based team, and while multi-disciplinary, is somewhat limited to the resources found within the educational institution, at times possibly lacking information from outside agencies.

Consideration should be given to partnerships with outside law enforcement agencies, other regional educational organizations and other entities to develop a community-based threat assessment team to complement the internal based teams. Some teams have strict confidentiality codes and share information based on a community perspective; they use the input from different entities to reduce the risk of missing key information.

Continued strengthening of the bond between law enforcement, community mental health, and the campus is always recommended, especially when assessing and communicating threats. A strong Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the law enforcement providers, community mental health, and the institution addressing threat assessment and communication/sharing of information will also prevent the inadvertent overlooking of information relative to threats.
B-1) PREVENTION - Programming and Presentations

FINDINGS

The Security Department has a substantial selection of prevention and outreach activities and efforts that relate directly to violence prevention, preparedness and response. The department deploys and rotates posters throughout the campus communities that promote safety, advertise security contact numbers and reminds community members of the importance of saying something if they see something. The assessor found these posters very visible and heard from many community members that they had seen them and could recall some of the messaging.

Violence can come in many forms, and sadly, sexual violence does occur on college campuses. Empowering persons to identify and fight back against an assault is an important step in stopping these attacks. PBSC provides RAD (Rape Aggression Defense) training for women from throughout the campus community. This is a well-regarded assault prevention and response program.

Prevention programming (training) offerings are important to encourage reporting and response to violence or threat of violence.

The Security Department provides a variety of training:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent Orientation</td>
<td>Informing parents of prevention tactics and reporting procedures</td>
<td>Offered at beginning of school year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Student Orientation</td>
<td>Messaging provided by Security Department and presented by other departments</td>
<td>Each semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Adjunct Presentation</td>
<td>Information on active violence response, drills, evacuations and reporting</td>
<td>Presented periodically and at a minimum each year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome back faculty presentation</td>
<td>Overview of security services and response to incidents</td>
<td>Beginning of school year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New employee orientation</td>
<td>Security department overview, services, response to violence, evacuations and reporting</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety Fairs</td>
<td>Participation in these events to promote safety initiatives</td>
<td>As requested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Coordinator Training</td>
<td>Training on the role of building coordinators including evacuations, lockdown and shelter in place</td>
<td>As needed (new coordinators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonviolent Crisis Intervention</td>
<td>Nationally recognized program in the management and prevention of difficult behavior from the Crisis Prevention Institute (<a href="http://www.crisisprevention.com">www.crisisprevention.com</a>), designed to de-escalate situations without physical confrontation</td>
<td>Offered twice per year to students, faculty and staff (optional attendance)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ASSESSOR TEAM COMMENTS**

It seems there is never enough training and outreach opportunities offered by any organization to fully support the prevention, reporting and response to potential threats of violence. The Bolante.NET team commends PBSC for the presentations and trainings it offers to its employees.

- Most institutions agree that adjunct faculty do not always receive the full breadth of prevention, reporting and response training that full-time faculty members receive simply because adjuncts work fewer hours and are not always on campus when trainings are offered. Many adjunct faculty are also transitory in their employment. However, because it is just as likely for a violent act to occur during a class managed by an adjunct faculty member as it is for a full-time faculty member, it is imperative for adjunct faculty to receive the same training as full-time faculty.

- Consider providing a comprehensive training regimen where every new faculty and staff member is held accountable for receiving initial training upon employment. The training should include prevention efforts, reporting, evacuations and response to acts or threats of violence. Because the information provided can have a mental “expiration date,” it is crucial that refresher trainings are also offered and required of all staff and faculty.

_A network of experts providing training in the areas of threat assessment and disaster response_
- Student awareness is also critical as students will many times be the first to know about a potential threat or concern. During the assessor’s student focus group discussion, the question was asked to whom one should report an incident. Most students provided answers that did not align with best practice. In addition, when asked about what they recalled from their orientation (Note: One transfer student was not required to attend), the students recalled very little, indicating they did not specifically know what to do in an active shooter situation. When pressed further, however, they provided personal ideas somewhat in line with the RUN-HIDE-FIGHT response strategy.

**B-2) PREVENTION - Procedural and Electronic**

**FINDINGS**

The College has an extremely robust closed-circuit television (CCTV) system. While most any organization can point to areas needing additional cameras, the assessor found that the cameras provided surveillance of key areas, specifically the typical ingress and egress to campus routes.

- Effective camera placement, resolution and recording is critical in identifying a known threat when there is anticipation that a threatening situation may be coming to the campus.
- Identification, whether it be in the normal course of business or during crisis situations is important. All staff members are provided with a photo identification card that is to be worn visible on their person.
- The assessor found a high compliance rate; however, this should always be a practice that is continually encouraged.

**ASSESSOR TEAM COMMENTS**

Continued support of CCTV development is encouraged. These are important tools that support prevention as well as post-incident investigations. Likewise, the mere presence of CCTV can have a deterring effect.

- While PBSC certainly has one of the higher compliance rates of identification badge usage, the usage should be continually promoted, encouraged and required. Likewise, staff should be trained on how to react to someone on campus without identification (i.e., make an inquiry of anyone unknown who is not displaying their identification badge).
B-3) PREVENTION - Communication and Reporting

FINDINGS

A key component to violence prevention is communication that prevents information from falling into “silos”, where information is not shared between individuals or departments.

- Information which may seem inconsequential, when matched with other supporting information can create a very different picture that may lead someone to a recognition of threatened violence.

COMMUNICATION/REPORTING

In meetings and discussions with different persons throughout the campus community, the assessor discussed the culture of communication, specifically whether community members feel comfortable in sharing and do they know with whom or what department they should share information.

- Generally, most staff and faculty members felt that sharing of information was good and they felt they knew to whom to report incidents or information.
- Not surprisingly, as is very common in higher education, the students did not feel as comfortable as did staff and faculty, with sharing information and reporting incidents.

An important component of encouraging reporting is knowing who to call. The Security Department has put great effort into making sure that every classroom and other physical areas throughout campus have clearly visible signs indicating the Security Department’s telephone number. This strategy has been effective: the students the assessor spoke to all referred to the number posted prominently above the door.

- Each campus has its own unique number for notifying security. The number goes directly to the security dispatch area (of that campus) or can be forwarded to the security duty cellphone.
- On campuses that do not provide 24-hour security presence, the phone does not transfer and remains unanswered after business hours.

LANGUAGE

All classes presented at PBSC are presented in English (except for classes specifically teaching dialogue such as a foreign language class). However, not every student is fully fluent in English. Likewise, it can be anticipated that not every family member who may receive information from the college or not every continuing education student is fluent.
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in English. The assessor did not find any emergency preparedness or response documents in a language other than English.

- The Department of Enrollment Management reported that 5,272 students indicated their primary language was not English. The College also has 235 International students.

ANONYMOUS REPORTING

Anonymous reporting of incidents is an important component of information sharing. The College uses Ethics Point as an online portal for reporting concerns.

- The Assessor found the portal easy to find as a top list item in a Google search. According to staff, the institution is also researching an app based anonymous reporting and notification system to enhance their communications.

INTERNAL COMMUNICATION

In many higher education institutions there are deficits in the communication exchanges between student adjudication offices (Student Affairs/Services) and the security, public safety or police departments that serve the campus community. The assessor found, based on several conversations and documentation, that generally PBSC has a good two-way communication flow between student affairs and security. All parties should continually refresh their level of sharing to make sure information related to students of concern for threats of violence is transmitted back and forth so that appropriate monitoring, sanctions and observations can occur.

The Security Department prepares and distributes “Be on the Look Out” (BOLO) bulletins for safety concerns or persons who may be a threat to campus safety. The bulletins are provided to senior staff, key institutional staff, patrol supervisors and dispatch, and are placed within the BOLO book at the Security Department. The BOLO system breaks down the barriers of information sharing and is effective for communicating threats.

ASSESSOR TEAM COMMENTS

Communication is crucial, and the sharing of concerns prevents the silo effect, where information is not being conjoined because of barriers to communication. As mentioned, these barriers appear more frequently in the student population than to the staff and faculty.

A network of experts providing training in the areas of threat assessment and disaster response
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There are many reasons for these communication barriers including disinterest in becoming involved, fear of retaliation, belief that the information is insignificant, and the seemingly unclear or difficult path to reporting.

- When the assessor met with students, they indicated a lack of understanding regarding when and where to report concerns. When presented with a scenario-based question that should have resulted in the response, “Contact security or student affairs”, the students struggled to respond accurately. Furthermore, while discussing their background of knowledge in reporting, including what incidents to report, the students could not recall anything from their original new student orientation. Their lack of recall demonstrates a common occurrence in higher education, but is a concern nonetheless, and is an area requiring additional focus. The assessor team recognizes that transient student populations pose a greater challenge; however, the need for more effective training still exists.

- Reaching those whose first language is not English is crucial. While the assessor was informed that all students spoke some English, as all classes are presented in English, the students interviewed indicated they knew of at least one student who did not speak English and would certainly struggle to read a document written in English. One student even relayed a story about her parents who do not speak or read English: they receive text messages and other sources of information from the school but do not understand what they mean or how serious or urgent the message may be.

- While it is nearly impossible to provide all documents in all languages, consider providing emergency directions, drill announcements and basic emergency preparedness and response in the most common language(s) beyond English. In time of crisis this will help ensure all community members are afforded an equal opportunity to stay safe.

As mentioned in the findings, the Security Department has done an outstanding job posting their telephone number throughout campus. The number goes directly to the dispatch center at each campus. Also noteworthy is the department’s efforts in promoting recognition of the number and in encouraging community members to store the number in their phones.

The individual phone number for security (which is different on each campus) could cause confusion for the student who is on a different campus for a non-routine activity, needs assistance and calls the number that was programmed into their phone. Certainly, the receiving dispatcher would transfer the call to the appropriate campus.
dispatch; however, depending on the campus, the student may not get a response from dispatch if the call is made after security staffing hours.

- While it could be a logistic or cost prohibitive strategy, it is recommended the College consider investing in a unique, district-wide, security phone number answered 24/7. The outcome is that no concern, tip, or piece of information will go unreported because of process; clear and easy reporting is crucial.

B-4) PREVENTION - Intelligence

FINDINGS

EXTERNAL

The sharing of information from law enforcement agencies that promotes a prevention agenda is generally good. When copies of arrest reports are requested they are generally received in a timely response.

The assessor was provided examples where outside law enforcement agencies were proactive in their sharing of information relevant to students or potential threats to the campus.

Furthermore, law enforcement agencies possess units, expertise and access to information that is not normally available in a college security department. Specifically, they possess assets of a behavioral analysis team. The assessor learned of examples where the security department reached out to this unit for their expertise and insight. This is an excellent example of coordinated efforts and use of resources that support prevention efforts.

The department has been invited to attend the Violent Crimes Task Force which also promotes information sharing. In addition, the department participates in the K-16 Southeast Regional Domestic Security Task Force which promotes safety sharing and planning between emergency services, education and certain private entities.

INTELLIGENCE GATHERING

The department makes use of a third-party vendor (Social Sentinel) to monitor social media leakage of potential threats, planned activities that may be contrary to the mission of the College, and more. This exemplifies modern and professional approaches to using resources.
The Crime Stoppers program is an important tool for encouragement of crime tip sharing. The department works with Crime Stoppers to assist with solving of crimes.

The threat assessment and security services are enhanced by a daily review of the arrest blotter for the county and cities. Security staff review the blotter and connect those who have been arrested with their student status to determine if the actions for which they were arrested could impact the safety of the campus community as well as the perpetrator’s continued attendance at the College.

Background checks and information gathering are enhanced using TLO and Accurint reporting and investigative tools.

**ASSESSOR TEAM COMMENTS**

Intelligence gathering in a security department can at times be challenging as certain pieces of information are available only to law enforcement agencies. To bridge this gap, departments must foster excellent working relationships with their law enforcement partners that are based on trust. Trusting professional relationships open portals to better information flow and sharing.

- PBSC has developed this important relationship with local law enforcement agencies to allow for appropriate sharing of information as well as support for investigations. In addition, the department is using modern tools and processes for security departments to conduct investigations.
C-1) PREPAREDNESS - Drills

FINDINGS

The institution has one of the most successful drill programs seen by the assessor. Each campus conducts, on average, six drills per year. The drills are evacuations (such as from fire), in Place and Lockdown. Each drill is conducted twice, once for the morning classes and once for the evening classes.

Each campus has an Emergency Coordinator who organizes a group of Building Coordinators each responsible for a building or portion of a building. The Building Coordinators are responsible for training faculty and staff in evacuation, shelter in place and lockdowns. The Coordinators likewise help coordinate the drills and during evacuations, insure all persons have evacuated the building.

The Emergency Coordinators plan the drills with the campus Provost and conduct the drills in coordination with the Security Department. Following the drill there is a debrief session to identify any deficiencies or needed repairs to notification systems. The department has also developed a standardized drill after action report form that is completed by the campus emergency coordinator. This form is very well done and provides a framework for identifying the successes and challenges associated with the drill.

The drills are advertised through email and printed postings throughout the campus. The notifications are usually distributed about two weeks before the drill. The College feels that an unannounced drill may be too stressful for some members of the campus community.

Police and fire representatives are invited to attend and observe any of the drills. On certain occasions emergency service providers do observe the drills.

The institution does not regularly conduct table-top or functional drills testing the response of internal responders for active violence. There are no scheduled full-scale active violence drills. However, one was held at the Boca Raton campus approximately two years ago.
ASSESSOR TEAM COMMENTS

Many institutions struggle to conduct drills, claiming time commitments, resistance, planning obstacles, etc., as reasons for the neglect. However, as mentioned previously, PBSC is commended for the quantity and overall quality of drills conducted each year on each of the five campuses.

- There are many different formats used for drills as well as for the timeline and pre-drill notification messaging. The most common argument in favor of pre-drill notification is that by providing significant advanced notice, there is a reduction in anxiety and less frustration over educational interruptions. Pre-drill notification also helps insure someone does not mistake the drill for a real-life event and react unexpectedly.

- However, significant advanced notification may, in fact, reduce some of the “realism” of the drill. More importantly, when all community members are made aware of the drill far in advance (e.g., several days or more), someone could see the advance notice as an opportunity to plan an act with potentially adverse consequences. Knowing days before the drill, as well as the exact time of the drill, and the designated open area (safe assembly area) where the entire student body, faculty and staff will be assembled, could provide a potential opportunity for an act of violence.

- To alleviate the potential risk of scheduled congregating, the institution may want to consider a specific request to law enforcement to have at least one armed, visible law enforcement officer at each drill. Also consider increasing the visibility of security staff in the areas of evacuation.

- After Action Reports (AAR) are crucial to determining the effectiveness of a drill and identifying weakness, gaps or malfunctions that need repair. PBSC format of a round table discussion with all Building Coordinators, Emergency Coordinator and Security is in best practice. Likewise, the AAR standardized form used throughout the College is a professional and effective tool.

- Certainly, one could argue that there can never be “too many” drills. However, the frequency and variety of drills conducted by PBSC would stand up to countless institutions around the country as a model of best practice.

- Drills are not only about evacuations, sheltering in place and lockdown. They should include other topics that are drilled upon in different formats, such as “table-top” exercises. These exercises would generally focus more on the management and response to an incident, and not involve any real-world activity.
beyond the roundtable/table top discussion. At least one table-top drill per year that tests the ability of staff and management to respond to an incident would be highly beneficial.

- There is great value in conducting full-scale drill events, specifically for active violence incidents. These drills bring together all resources to test the systems of entities in a combined, multi-jurisdictional, multi-disciplinary approach. Full scale drills require extensive planning, notifications and organizational commitment. Timing of these drills is also crucial as the ideal is to conduct them in a manner that will not adversely impact the educational environment and/or surrounding neighborhoods.

**C-2) PREPAREDNESS - Programming and Structural**

**FINDINGS**

Every classroom, and many common areas, have an emergency procedure posting that provides occupants with brief directions on what to do in an emergency.

**ACCESS CONTROL FOR LOCK DOWNS**

The ability to instantaneously lock all exterior doors during an active violence situation and go into “lockdown” status is critical. The Loxahatchee campus is the only building that currently has exterior access control and can be fully locked down from the security department.

Since there is no electronic access control, allowing for instantaneous and safe lockdowns, the Security Department has established procedures where, during an active violence incident, officers first take refuge. When cleared and directed by law enforcement, they respond to the buildings and manually lock the doors. Also, all buildings are equipped with a “Knoxbox” that provides emergency services with a master key to the building if Security is unable to respond or provide them with a key.

**BOMB THREATS**

Bomb threats are possible and do occur. The Security Department has developed a procedure for responding to these threats. All desks and offices have been provided with a bomb threat checklist that can be used to prompt the call taker to respond appropriately.
COUNSELING SERVICES

The College has counseling staff to whom students may be referred. In the event an officer has contact with a person in mental health crisis, they can escort the person to the counseling center. In addition to onsite counseling services, Bay Care mental health providers can also be activated or consulted.

RESPONSE TRAINING FOR ACTIVE VIOLENCE

Every semester the department sends an email to all campus community members with a link to the RUN-HIDE-FIGHT video. This strategy of active violence response is recognized throughout the country and by federal law enforcement as effect response modeling. The department does not offer any classroom training opportunities for RUN-HIDE-FIGHT other than the yearly drills in classrooms.

LOCKDOWN/LOCK OUT KEYS

The institution has established a “lock-out keys” program and structure. All faculty and staff are provided with a key that can be used to lock a classroom door from the inside. The key disables the external locking mechanism keeping persons secure inside the classroom. Students, student workers, contractors and potentially new or limited duration staff do not have access to the keys. There are no “loaner” keys available.

SIGNAGE

The institution should be commended for its directional signage throughout each of the campuses. For critical incidents, from first responders responding in, to persons escaping from a threat, visible and clear signage is crucial. The assessor found directional signage to be clear and highly visible, both in and out of buildings.

There was no signage observed by the assessor related to weapons on campus. As a visitor, or even a student or staff who have not reviewed college policies, this could be an open invitation to the unknown violation of policy.

STOP THE BLEED

Sadly, the necessary “supplies” of educational buildings has changed. Being prepared for a violent incident or even a serious life-threatening injury is now the norm. Staff have not been trained on “stop the bleed” techniques and there are no tourniquets strategically placed in buildings or carried by security staff.
ASSESSOR TEAM COMMENTS

The ability to “lockdown” a facility during a critical incident cannot be undervalued. In researching countless incidents of mass violence, there are very few incidents where suspects have foiled structure lockdowns, instead focusing their efforts on areas that are easily accessible.

- Timeliness in lockdowns is critical. Without modern electronic access control systems, this response tool is limited or non-existent. Aside from the Loxahatchee campus, exterior doors remain unlocked during a critical incident unless law enforcement feels that it is imperative or safe enough for unarmed security officers to go systematically door to door and lock them. One can imagine many scenarios where this strategy is not practical, safe or timely.

- The “lockout” keys are one of many different approaches to active violence response. The keys allow for an instructor or other authorized/equipped staff to lock a room door from the inside, disabling the exterior lock mechanism and locking the door. Certainly, the value is that if the perpetrator has a regular key to the room they will not be able to enter. Also, immediately shutting the door and locking it reduces exposure time (compared to the time it takes to use a key on the outside of the door to switch the locking mechanism to “lock” before going back inside).

- The review team did discuss this process and had some general considerations to share. According to staff, there is no process in place for issuing a key to a staff member who may have failed to bring their key with them on a given day. Likewise, there was no way to ensure every room user (instructor, substitute, continuing education instructor, adjunct) received their key upon first usage of the room.

- This creates a potential scenario where the instructor is unable to secure him/herself and the students in the classroom during active violence. Likewise, and as can be expected in a mass violence incident, persons will quickly run to whatever room they find open to hide and barricade. In this scenario the students could be in a room where no one has a key to lock the door.

- Other options are available, including door bolts, lock disablers etc. However, every time you introduce something beyond the typical door lock, you potentially set persons up for challenges that consume additional seconds or minutes. Likewise, anytime you require the room occupants to bring a locking tool, or whenever a tool is expected to be left in the room, you run the risk of that tool missing, forgotten, misplaced or used for unintended purposes.
ASSESSOR TEAM COMMENTS (continued)

- Relying on traditional, recognizable, locking mechanisms helps to ensure ALL campus community members can lock themselves in a room during a crisis. Certainly, there is the concern that the suspect may have a key to the room, but that has rarely been the case in past incidents.

- While there are numerous violence response programs available, the traditional "RUN-HIDE-FIGHT" is recognized by the federal government and endorsed by Bolante.NET and numerous other threat assessment and response experts. The program is in use at PBSC and is found to be a straightforward, easy to remember response plan for all individuals.

- The Security Department does promote RUN-HIDE-FIGHT by sending a community wide announcement each semester and providing a link to the brief video. It is unknown how many view or re-view the video demonstration. When the assessor asked students, they all indicated that they had not watched it even though most stated that they saw the email regarding the video.

- We strongly suggest identifying better ways to promote active violence response and to improve viewership by all members of the campus community. For some learners, and to promote the importance of viewership, a classroom or role-player presentation can be effective.

- The assessor found excellent use of signage around each of the campuses. Directional and building signage, parking lot evacuation areas, security office locations and more were extremely well noticed. These signs are important for first responders during a critical incident. The college should be commended and encouraged to continue with their effective signage projects.

- It is important to provide weapons prohibition signage advising persons entering buildings and in parking lots. Consider placing weapons prohibition signs at each building entrance and parking area.

- Although the chances of an active violence incident remain very low, preparedness for an event should always remain high. “Stop-The-Bleed” is a national campaign to promote skills and deployment of materials to assist the severely wounded immediately following a mass casualty event. Many organizations now train their responders (security) on use of tourniquets and other bleed stopping materials and deploy these tools in every building.
C-3) PREPAREDNESS - Communications

FINDINGS

CAMPUS WIDE PUBLIC ADDRESS COMMUNICATION (VOLCOM)

The Volcom system is truly the hallmark of the College’s notification system. While not unique to PBSC, it is more of a rarity to find systems such as this in other institutions. The Volcom system provides an emergency button in each classroom, that when activated, notifies Security Dispatch. The department can then listen in and converse with persons inside of the classroom. The system also allows for Security to instantaneously make an announcement throughout a campus (or the district) for emergency response (such as lockdown, evacuate, etc.). The system includes speakers outside of the classroom and throughout common areas, building exteriors and parking/pedestrian areas. The institution should be commended for this critical investment in campus community safety.

The College uses Blackboard Connect as its primary emergency notification system. Students and staff are placed into the phone system database when they begin school/employment. They do have the ability to opt-out and remove themselves from the system. This popular system allows for key groups notification or broad based all community members. The system will send texts, phone messages and email. Staff reports no specific problems. Staff shared that testing is done routinely “amongst themselves” to make sure the system is operating. Many educational organizations grapple with the issue of some persons who are on campus for very short periods (one day class, seminar, etc.) that may not be part of the emergency notification system and consequently would be unaware of systems other than the public address messaging.

Emergency Notifications, as the name implies, are of the utmost time sensitivity. In an active violence incident many educational organizations still have a hierarchy decision making process in place that requires layers of administrative approval before sending a communitywide emergency message. PBSC has a streamlined and effective approach. In most circumstances, a dispatcher will relay the suggested message to the on-duty supervisor; once approved, the message is broadcast. However, and to PBSC’s credit and forward thinking, a dispatcher has discretion to immediately broadcast an emergency message if they are unable to immediately gain supervisor oversight.

EMERGENCY AND BUILDING COORDINATORS

The Emergency Coordinators and Building Coordinators, mentioned previously, are equipped with radios at each of the campuses to orchestrate evacuations and other emergency response. These radio channels are different than those used by the
Security Department. It is the assessor’s understanding that each campus provides the security supervisor (sergeant) with a campus radio that allows them to communicate with the building coordinators.

SECURITY COMMUNICATIONS

Redundancy of communications is critical, and an organization should never rely on only one communication portal. PBSC provides every security department with a cell phone to support their efforts and allow for communication if the radio system becomes inoperable.

The security department portable and mobile radios contain all security radio channels of each campus (although each campus may work on a different channel) so that officers responding to a different campus can still communicate with onsite officers. The radio repeater system does not connect campuses to one another through radios - they are strictly for communicating at a single campus. The radio system is closed and has no connection to outside services (law enforcement).

ASSESSOR TEAM COMMENTS

The College’s diligence in installing the Volcom system districtwide should be commended. This tool is, as mentioned above, a hallmark of internal notification that provides for two-way communication as well as campus-wide emergency communications.

- Blackboard Connect is also a critical communication tool that can reach those who are not on campus but may be on their way to campus, or those who may not immediately hear notifications from the Volcom system or other more appropriate messaging or media tools. If the assessor was understanding correctly, security staff indicated they routinely test the system amongst themselves. We recommend periodic system-wide tests that include a stress load test and the timeliness of transmission.

- Communications between responders, whether it be security, law enforcement or building coordinators during a crisis, is critical. Currently, the security department does not have radio interoperability with their outside law enforcement partners. It is strongly recommended that this discussion take place, and to allow direct radio communications, even if only used during a critical incident. During a mass violence incident there will be incomprehensible amounts of radio traffic as well as phone traffic tying up College phone systems and 9-1-1 law enforcement systems. Consequently, communication under appropriate protocols between law
enforcement and security could be a necessity, as outside emergency services responding to the campus may need directional help, request for maps, etc.

- Radio interoperability within the College system is also crucial during a crisis. However, the current system does not allow for a security officer to talk directly with an emergency or building coordinator other than through a single radio that is assigned to the campus's Security office. Critical incidents can evolve at a breakneck pace and relayed communication is often an impediment to timely response.
FINDINGS

The 2018 Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) was provided to the assessor. The plan details the college district’s response to emergencies in a systematic and easy to read format. The report review and update are scheduled yearly, which is in alignment with best practices.

The plan appropriately separates the Emergency Management Teams into Policy and Operations designations to more appropriately manage the incident. The role of each member of the emergency management team is clearly outlined with lines of succession.

The EOP provides reasonable authority to the designated incident commander to manage the early stages of the incident and then supported management through the Emergency Management Team.

The EOP appears to be based on National Incident Command System (ICS), however it does not follow all the specifics of ICS.

ASSESSOR TEAM COMMENTS

- The assessor was provided with the 2018 Emergency Operations Plan and conducted a thorough review of the plan contents and compared them against industry norms, standards and best practices. PBSC should be commended for preparing a professional, comprehensive and complete EOP. The review team found the document easy to read, well organized and orderly.

- As mentioned in the findings, the plan generally follows the National Incident Command Systems (ICS) structure. The ICS system was developed to provide continuity of response, accurate reporting, structured leadership, ability to transfer command or tasks and remain in structural order.

- If it has not yet been conducted, it is recommended that the plan be shared and discussed with emergency service providers to ensure structures are in place so that the initial response (and ongoing response) from the college will mesh well with outside emergency service responders who will also, most likely, follow the best practices of ICS.

A network of experts providing training in the areas of threat assessment and disaster response
D-2) RESPONSE - Armed and Unarmed

FINDINGS

PBSC has accomplished countless initiatives to increase campus safety and prepare for acts of violence. When assessing the option of moving the current PBSC force from unarmed to an armed department there are numerous factors that must be considered, and this report is not intended to provide an in-depth review of all the complexities of creating an armed organization. However, the assessor did review several critical cornerstone items necessary for creation of such a force.

➢ In review of the job qualifications of officers, the minimum qualifications do not appear to be in alignment with expectations of an officer who would be armed and authorized to use deadly force. The qualifications and the agreement by which current officers were hired under does not easily lend itself to this sort of transition.

   o As an example, there is a very limited statement on physical capabilities and personal safety risks. To put an officer in a position where they will have the option of using deadly force means they must (and will in almost all circumstances) refer to the use of force continuum which essentially means a proportionate use of force to the threat, in other words, other physical actions such as use of a defensive weapon requiring physical strength (i.e. a baton).

   o Likewise, and more common, would be the use of physical restraint requiring officers to engage in defensive and offensive physical contact.

It should be noted that, according to staff, in the last 10 years there have been no reported assaults against campus security officers. It would be only prudent and reasonable to assume with physical confrontations, there would be officer injuries.

The assessor requested and received an approximate tally of prior expertise of the current corps of officers to better understand their backgrounds and employment history as it may relate to an armed position.
The tally listed below indicates that only a small portion of the current staff has likely been in an enforcement-armed response position during their previous employments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Service</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General military service</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military (law enforcement)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sworn (armed) law enforcement</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Sworn law enforcement (unarmed)</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Security (armed)</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security (unarmed)</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior higher education security/law enforcement</td>
<td>11.54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

➢ The background process for officers is more common with non-sworn, unarmed positions. There is no psychological examination to determine their mental and psychological fitness for carrying, potentially using, and recovering from a shooting incident. Likewise, the background process is limited in personal history inquiries which may uncover other information that would deem the employee unsuitable to carry a firearm.

➢ As mentioned previously, it is imperative that an officer, who will be responsible for and have a duty to act against violent situations be provided with all available tools to affect compliance at the lowest level of force possible. The use of a firearm in law enforcement is rare, when compared to the use of physical restraint and other tools. The department currently has no defensive weapons which a necessary part of a transition to an armed (responsive) force would be.

➢ While officers may receive medical training, there does not appear to be a requirement within the officer job description. As with the use of any physical force, it is incumbent upon the officer to render aid to the offender as soon as it is safe to do so. This, as seen through countless incidents involving officer involved shootings or physical force, is scrutinized heavily post event.

➢ The assessor did not review the College’s insurance policy; however, it is assumed that insuring armed officers is not currently included in the policy. Officer involved shooting incidents carry immense potential for legal action and an organization must be insured appropriately. Furthermore, it should be expected that an armed officer would anticipate a certain level of indemnification for their added authority, exposure and job expectations.

A network of experts providing training in the areas of threat assessment and disaster response
➢ The department does not make arrests currently (private person or probable cause). To transition to an armed department, it would be necessary for officers to be able to take physical custody of a perpetrator for their own safety and the safety of others, essentially creating an arrest or detention. Training and authority would need to be provided.

➢ The department does not currently have the equipment necessary for transition to an armed force (such as weapons, range materials, ballistic vests, defensive weapons, handcuffs, etc.), nor does it have assigned staff to serve in critical training and preparedness roles such as rangemaster and armorer. Likewise, there are no known agreements in place for specific training (range) facilities that could be used extensively in the initial phases and then indefinitely for regular weapons qualifications and new officer training.

During the review process, the assessor contacted Director Louie Mercer of the Daytona State College, which is known to have an armed presence on campus to use as comparative information as a state college with onsite armed services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daytona State College</th>
<th>The college hires police officers from the local jurisdictions on a “detail” basis not under a contract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armed Officers</td>
<td>Armed officers are strategically scheduled and deployed where the College identifies a need. These officers are not assigned at all hours, however there are unarmed campus safety officers assigned during all hours. Primarily armed officers are staffed during peak enrollment periods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed Officer Deployment</td>
<td>The armed officer presence began in 2012 and the number of hours has increased each year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unarmed Officer Capabilities</td>
<td>No defensive weapons and not authorized to make arrests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process to Deploy Armed Officers</td>
<td>Process began in 2011/12, and there was no opposition to deploying armed “detailed” police officers to the campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio Interoperability</td>
<td>Each site/campus (7) has direct radio communications with the law enforcement jurisdiction it is located within.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Throughout the assessor’s onsite visit and followed by correspondence with staff and campus community members the question was presented of whether, in their opinion, the College should move to an armed presence. This was not a scientific sampling but rather a general inquiry without specific, predetermined answer choices.

The assessor found no one that was in complete, immediate and strong support of switching to an armed force. Most individuals who indicated they may entertain the idea or may be supportive indicated it was an important response capability that the College currently does not have.

Many individuals, including the students that the assessor spoke with, indicated they were not overly in favor of moving to an armed force. When asked about their lack of support, several felt an armed force was not necessary, or that it may change the culture of the campus. Several on both sides of the opinion spectrum indicated they felt well protected by the services provided by the Security Department coupled with the responsiveness of law enforcement.

- It should be noted that in some other states the right for permitted students and staff to carry concealed weapons in classis authorized by law. However, this is not currently supported by Florida state statute.

- The Security Department provided the assessor with a report prepared and presented by Director Smith to Board of Trustees on May 15, 2018 (Appendix C). The report provides an overview of response options (arming). The assessor reviewed and discussed the contents with Director Smith.

The information provided appears accurate and will be referred to in the following paragraphs.

Most active shooter incidents conclude within 5 minutes of the beginning of gunfire. Consequently, the timely and immediate response to the violence is crucial as every minute spent with no engagement of the shooter could result in additional injuries or deaths.

Certainly, one can assume that an armed, on-site responder who is highly familiar with the campus would have the best response time to the incident. However, there are many factors that can extend the response time, even for those responders on campus.

A network of experts providing training in the areas of threat assessment and disaster response
According to Director Smith’s report, the following are AVERAGE response times from outside law enforcement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>AVERAGE Anticipated Response Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lake Worth</td>
<td>PBSO</td>
<td>No more than 2 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach Gardens</td>
<td>Palm Beach Gardens Police</td>
<td>No more than 5 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boca Raton</td>
<td>FAU Police, Boca Raton Police</td>
<td>No more than 5 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belle Glade</td>
<td>PBSO</td>
<td>Several minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loxahatchee</td>
<td>PBSO</td>
<td>Several minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In comparing to other institutions within the consortium, Director Smith found 12 had an unarmed security force, one had an armed contract force and one had a mixed unarmed and contracted armed force. Three had contracted police agency services.

**ASSESSOR TEAM COMMENTS**

- Determining the appropriate response model to active violence is the difficult decision all educational institutions face. Too minimal of an approach could unduly put persons at greater risk and potentially increase liability, while an extremely aggressive approach may begin to detract from the educational mission and culture of the campus. It can also have the unintended effect of significantly increasing liability.

- A logical starting point in the discussion is to consider an organization’s potential exposure based on geographic location, the organization’s access to emergency services, frequency of threats, physical barriers, etc. Unfortunately, the traditional, “logical” thought processes have been interrupted recently by numerous incidents of violence in educational facilities that should have been rated low on the spectrum of potential exposure to violence.

- Therefore, we must assume there is an equal share of exposure regardless of the organization, with some having extenuating factors that increase concern for active violence occurrences. The discussion must be centered around the awareness, prevention, preparedness and response efforts.
ASSESSOR TEAM COMMENTS (continued)

- While the anticipated goal is for assessment and prevention efforts to effectively prevent or alter a planned attack, it is incumbent upon the organization to invest equal efforts into planning for a response to an incident.

- Evolving an unarmed security force to an armed presence, as outlined, involves numerous complexities, including training, hiring of the right staff, budgeting for financial implications and adjusting to procedural changes. When assessing the impact of this kind of change, many believe an armed presence will create a cultural shift. However, research and reports assessing cultural change indicate as many arguments showing no significant cultural change as there are for showing significant cultural change within the campus community.

- As seen in other locations, where non-sworn, unarmed departments moved to armed security/public safety or to a full police status, there was significant response in terms of those for and those against. There are national examples where even fully-sworn police departments were unarmed for a period because of the public outcry of “guns on campus”.

The purpose of this report was not to assess the campus climate in terms of acceptance of an armed force. It is highly recommended that if the institution prefers to explore or begin preparations for such a transition that appropriate campus climate and opinion surveys are conducted.

While the discussion in this report has focused more on an armed or unarmed private security force, there exists other options, as detailed in Chief Smith’s report. Other options could include a limited deployment of armed officers (such as only supervisors), contracting directly with a private security firm that provides armed officers or contracting with a local law enforcement agency to provide services, as well as a combination of any of these options.

Consider if while arming select members of the department, you are truly accomplishing the anticipated goal, being that you can effectively respond and stop and attacker. With limited coverage by arming only select staff, you may be simply duplicating the services of outside law enforcement as their response time may be equal or better. Likewise, there is complicated messaging in explaining to the campus community which officers are armed and why some are not. Moreover, should an incident occur, and the only armed officer is off campus, delayed or unable to engage the perpetrator, the community is likely to vehemently respond.

A network of experts providing training in the areas of threat assessment and disaster response
Some intuitions have entertained the discussion and, in some cases, hired armed private security. This is an option that may assist in diluting some liability. However, when using outside contract services, recognize they do not have the campus specific training that a campus employed officer may have. In addition, outside contracted service personnel may lack the same level of organizational investment staff and students possess, inadvertently sending the wrong message to the campus community.

Contracted outside law enforcement services, whether in whole to respond to all crimes, or in part, where officers are assigned solely to the campus, can be effective. However, if the contract is primarily a response model, then you are likely to receive a substantially limited amount of services compared to those offered by the law enforcement agency. If the contractual agreement involves assigning an officer to the campus, the question becomes how many officers, what are their hours, their responsibilities, etc. On a large campus, one armed officer may be as timely in responding to a violent incident as an officer responding from off campus. One armed officer on campus means there will most likely be short periods, even when scheduled, where s/he leaves the campus for meetings, emergencies or other reasons. If an incident were to occur while the only officer is away from the campus, how would that situation be received by the community? Likewise, the decision of the hours of service can certainly impact cost, but also response capability. If there are periods where there is any activity on campus and the armed law enforcement officer was not scheduled during that period and an incident occurs, what will the community response look like?

- This report is not intended to suggest, encourage and recommend any decision on arming of officers or other armed options. The purpose is to reaffirm the various options suggested by Chief Smith and to raise some of the most important questions that will need to be addressed in any future planning.

- It is crucial that an organization does not immediately draw the conclusion of “armed = safer”. As can be seen in mass shooting incidents throughout the country, there were numerous occasions, including in the state of Florida, where an armed presence did not dissuade the attacker. Conversely, there have been many instances where an immediate armed response was crucial in reducing the number of injuries and fatalities.

As diagrammed in this report, the estimated response time, according to Chief Smith’s report, to the Lake Worth campus is less than two minutes. Palm Beach Gardens and Boca Raton campuses also have a response time of less than five minutes. Remember: On average, active shooter incidents conclude within five minutes. More concerning is the Loxahatchee and Belle Glade campuses where response time is potentially extended.

A network of experts providing training in the areas of threat assessment and disaster response
The prudent recommendation is for the administration to have further discussion with PBSO to discuss response capabilities to Loxahatchee and Belle Glade. An argument for an armed presence could be made when based on suggested response times. However, the other campuses also have response times that probably would be longer than would occur with an armed officer on site. Should one or more campuses receive a higher level of onsite response capabilities than the others?

**D-3) RESPONSE - Post Incident**

**FINDINGS**

It must be clear that the chances of a mass violence incident occurring remain significantly low; however, it is only prudent and appropriate to develop plans and procedures in the event of an incident. It is also important to think in terms of any incident that may have impact throughout the campus community and beyond, not just active violence. This could include a horrific mass casualty event by natural causes, fire, suicide or more.

The assessor has reviewed the district’s 2018 Emergency Operations Plan (see “Preparedness – Emergency Operations Plan) and it addresses post event response. The College contracts with Aetna – Resources For Living and their Organizational Risk Management Center (ORMC). Through this service they can provide Employee Assistance Plan (EAP) response to the incident. Through this service they offer several different response models including sending staff to the College to support needs of involved or affected persons. The plan indicates that they are usually able, if requested, to respond onsite within a few hours.

The College community also has additional response resources such as the state “211” system which can provide resources, information and assistance. Likewise, the Palm Beach County Sheriff’s Office is available to respond and support during critical incident recovery.

The institution also recognized the importance of Critical Incident Stress Management (CISM) to assist community members manage the disaster behavioral health impacts from a traumatic event. Resources are available through their 3rd party provider (Aetna) with additional in-organization planning.
The College also has established framework (see Emergency Operations Plan) for deploying a Critical Incident Response Team (CIRT). The CIRT is comprised mostly of directors and executives of the institution and whose duty it will be to assistant employees in dealing with the immediate post incident impacts.

The school has a licensed, professional counseling staff and provides counseling services regularly with students. Counseling services is a strong supporter and service to those who may be in mental health crisis or following a significant event.

**ASSESSOR TEAM COMMENTS**

While it can seem reasonable to expect outside services will manage many response activities, those services will initially be focused on high priority law enforcement, fire and medical services. Services such as psychological first aid, caring for the compassionate (compassion fatigue), counseling, reunification, etc. are critical timely response items.

- PBSC is fortunate to have the services of Aetna (as outlined above) that appear to be substantial in their ability to respond. However, timeliness should be considered as activation of a Disaster Behavioral Health Team (utilizing Psychological First Aid Team as an intervention) which provides immediate behavioral health triage and service referrals, many times must be activated immediately following an event.

- The public expectation is that the College is appropriately supporting those needs while outside emergency services are managing the critical emergency components of the incident. Consideration should be given to establishing trained Disaster Behavioral Health Teams (using Psychological First Aid as an intervention), planning for compassion fatigue of providers, establishing of a triage room and long-term campus community member assistance programs. Bolante.NET does provide these services and is available to assist if requested.