

**Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors' Perceptions of Safety Concerns
Related to the Impact of Concealed Firearms at Kansas Public 4-Year Higher
Education Institutions**

C. Jason Kegler
B.A., Saint Mary College, 1996
M.L.S., Fort Hays State University, 2009

Submitted to the Graduate Department and Faculty of the School of Education of Baker
University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Doctor of Education in
Educational Leadership

Tes Mehring, Ph.D.
Major Advisor

Harvey Foyle, Ph.D.

Randy Weber, Ed.D.

Date Defended: May 1, 2017

Copyright 2017 by C. Jason Kegler

Abstract

The number of school shootings has dramatically increased since the late 1990's. The Kansas State Legislature legalized the possession of concealed firearms on university campuses. The purpose of this qualitative study was to determine Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors', those in charge of campus security at Kansas public universities, perceptions of campus safety related to the 2013 Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act which legalized concealed firearms on university campuses in Kansas. Additionally, each university's weapons policy was evaluated for similarities and differences. Six members of the CRLED were interviewed. The participants offered their perspectives on campus safety and the impact of lawfully concealed firearms. Through qualitative interviews and document analysis, data were gathered and analyzed to determine themes.

Four themes emerged which reflected the participants' perceptions related to campus safety and the Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act. These themes included: (a) The presence of firearms on campus will impact the university; (b) firearms and other concerns are threats to campus safety; (c) the concerns expressed by campus constituents are similar; (d) there is a need for training to promote an understanding of the mental aspects of firearms. The findings present implication for university constituents and researchers interested in knowing the impact of lawfully concealed firearms on members of the CRLED.

Dedication

This study is dedicated to my parents, Carl Kegler Jr. and Mary Lou Kegler. It was because of their personal sacrifice and understanding of the benefits of education that I have been able to complete this journey. The persistence and support you both have provided me has been a tremendous influence on my life and have made me into the person I am today.

Acknowledgements

First, giving all of the praise and glory to our Father in Heaven and His Son, Jesus Christ. Ever since I was a little boy I have been led by my faith. It was that faith which enabled me to complete this educational quest. The first quote which I relied on to make it through this journey was, “I can do all things through Christ, who strengthens me” (Philippians 4:13). The second quote is from the poem, *Footprints in the Sand*, by Mary Stevenson, “My precious child, I love you and would never leave you. During your times of trial and suffering when you only see one set of footprints, it was then that I carried you”. Thank you for the strength and for carrying me through this journey.

Secondly, I would like to thank my lovely and beautiful wife, Terra for having the patience and understanding throughout this process. Thank you for the many sacrifices you made to ensure I had the space and time to work. To my three beautiful children, Raveyn Mishae, Carl Dierks, and Kyron Tate, I love you all more than anyone could ever imagine. Thank you for understanding when dad needed to do homework while we were on vacation, or when I was gone most every Tuesday evening. I hope this is an example for you that through hard work, passion and dedication, you can achieve anything you desire. To my sister, Monya, thank you for timely talks and encouragement and for always supporting me, even when you thought I was crazy!

To my dissertation committee I am indebted to each of you for aiding me through this process. Dr. Harvey Foyle, thank you for your invaluable comments and guidance on my research. Dr. Peg Waterman, I truly appreciate all of the valuable feedback you provided related to the methodology and data analysis phase of my project. Dr. Tes Mehring, thank you for the numerous hours you spent reading drafts of this document,

supporting me whether it be in class or with research, and encouraging me to persevere through the process of completion. A special thanks to my friend Dr. Randy Weber, who sat on my committee and encouraged me to pursue this goal. Thank you for the support, encouragement, and kind words when I needed them the most. To my cohort 11 classmates, especially Sarah, I appreciate your support and the challenging discussions we had throughout this journey. To my colleagues at Neosho County Community College, the Allen County Sheriff's Office, and Pittsburg State University, thank you for being patient when I was stressed and supporting me when I wasn't sure how this would end. To the many family, friends, colleagues, and supporters who were not specifically mentioned, I must say thank you all very much.

Finally, to the Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors, thank you for allowing me the opportunity to become part of your group over the last year and a half. The role you play in maintaining safety on your campus goes unnoticed (which is a sign you are doing your job) and is often times underappreciated. Yet, each of you perform your duties to the best of your abilities and you do it with such class and professionalism. Thank you on behalf of all of your university constituents.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Dedication	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Table of Contents	vi
List of Tables	x
Chapter One: Introduction	1
Background	3
Problem Statement	6
Purpose of the Study	9
Significance of the Study	10
Delimitations	10
Assumptions	11
Research Questions	12
Definition of Terms	12
Organization of the Study	14
Chapter Two: Review of Literature	15
Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs	15
Faculty Attitudes about Firearms on Campus	17
Student Attitudes about Firearms on Campus	18
Docking Institute of Public Affairs Faculty, Staff, and Student Studies	21
Kansas State Law	23
Rampage vs. Targeted Incidents	23

The Perception of Campus Police Officers by Members of the Campus	
Community	27
Campus Preparedness	28
Firearm Ownership	31
Firearm Related Deaths and Injuries.....	33
The Second Amendment and Campus Carry Laws	35
Summary	37
Chapter Three: Methods	38
Research Design.....	38
Selection of Participants	40
Measurement.....	41
Researcher's Perspective	44
Data Collection Procedures.....	45
Data Analysis and Interpretation	48
Limitations	50
Summary	51
Chapter Four: Results	52
The Presence of Firearms on Campus will Impact the University	54
The Illegal Presence of Concealed Firearms	54
Increased Probability of an Accidental Discharge and Self-Harm	55
Additional Costs.....	57
Adequate Security Measures.....	58
Firearms and other Concerns are Threats to Campus Safety	60

The Greatest Threat to Campus Safety	60
The Impact of Firearms on Campus Crime.....	62
The Concerns Expressed by Campus Constituents are Similar.....	63
Students.....	64
Faculty and Staff	65
Administrators.....	67
Residence Hall Staff	68
Campus Police Officers	69
There is a Need for Training to Promote an Understanding of the Mental Aspects of Firearms.....	70
Analysis of university weapons policies.....	72
Summary.....	75
Chapter Five: Interpretation and Recommendations	76
Study Summary.....	76
Overview of the Problem	76
Purpose Statement and Research Questions	78
Review of the Methodology.....	78
Major Findings.....	79
Findings Related to the Literature.....	80
More Guns, More Crime, Injury and Suicide	80
Threats to Campus Safety	81
Disapproval of Faculty, Staff, and Students	82
Costs Associated with Prohibition of Firearms	82

Conclusions.....	83
Implications for Action	84
Recommendations for Future Research	85
Concluding Remarks.....	86
References	87
Appendices.....	99
Appendix A. University Weapons Policies	100
Appendix B. Demographic Inquiry	139
Appendix C. Research and Interview Questions	141
Appendix D. IRB Form and Approval	145
Appendix E. Consent Form	151

List of Tables

Table 1: Policy Violation Reporting	74
---	----

Chapter 1

Introduction

The right to carry weapons is at the heart of the principles the United States was founded upon. The Constitution of the United States of America allows “A well-regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a Free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed” (U.S. Const. amend. II). As a result of shootings in communities (e.g., San Bernardino and Planned Parenthood of Colorado), schools (e.g., Columbine High School, Sandy Hook Elementary School, and others), and higher education institutions (e.g., Virginia Tech University, Northern Illinois University, University of Alabama in Huntsville, and others) (Stanford Geospatial Center & Stanford Libraries, 2016), concerns have been raised regarding who has the ability to limit when, where, and by whom those rights can be exercised. The prevalence of shooting incidents has called into question the perception of safety in public spaces, such as on university campuses (Thompson, Price, Dake, Teeple, Bassler, et al., 2013). The concern for shootings and safety on campuses has led states such as Colorado, Kansas, and Texas to now allow patrons of college and university campuses to carry concealed firearms (National Conference of State Legislatures, 2016).

Individuals who support or oppose concealed firearms on campus all have individual perceptions, beliefs, and attitudes on this topic. Supporters of concealed weapons cite arguments such as the constitutional right to bear arms and the right of self-preservation. Vernick and Teret (1993) stated, “the Constitution grants an unfettered right to individuals to ‘keep and bear arms’, thus rendering any gun control proposal unconstitutional” (p. 1773). Related to the right of self-preservation, Lund (1987) noted,

“the Supreme Court correctly concluded that the Second Amendment protects an individual's right to keep and bear arms” (p. 103). Those who oppose legislation permitting concealed firearms on campus have expressed concerns for open discourse and lack of training or preparedness (Procon.org, 2017). The same individuals indicated an increase in the presence of guns will lead to higher crime rates and the potential for normal confrontations to become more lethal (Procon.org, 2017).

For those on either side of the issue, data and research exist which address perceptions, beliefs, and attitudes toward campus safety and firearms on campus (Jang, Kang, Dierenfeldt, & Lindsteadt, 2015; Thompson, Price, Dake, & Teeple, 2013). In 2015, Jang et al. conducted a study of weapons possession among college students at a Midwest university and concluded factors such as age and gender play a role in the comfort level of weapons possession. Thompson, Price, Dake, & Teeple, (2013) also found students were not in favor of concealed firearms on campus. On the opposite side, groups like Students for Concealed Carry (2016) on their website promoted “individuals - age twenty-one and above, in most states - who possess valid concealed handgun licenses/concealed carry weapons permits to be afforded the same right to carry on college campuses that they are currently afforded virtually everywhere else” (para. 8). Stearns (2009), a Representative from Florida, wrote “The right to bear arms is more than a Constitutional right: every human being has the natural unalienable right to self-defense” (para. 7).

Kansas Governor, S. Brownback, during the 2013 Legislative Session amended the 2006 Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act by signing Senate Bill 2052 which permitted concealed firearms for those who are 21 and over in any public building in the

State (Kansas Attorney General, 2017). This amended law originally required a state issued permit. The 2013 law also established a 4-year exemption for public colleges and universities within the state, which allowed time to prepare for the changes including the creation of a campus firearms policy. In 2015, Senate Bill 45 was signed by Governor Brownback which again amended the Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act (Kansas Legislature, 2017). Senate Bill 45 removed the requirement for the permit making it legal for any person over the age of 21 to conceal and carry a firearm within the state. The law excluded persons convicted of domestic violence or a felony from the right to conceal and carry (Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act, 2013). In December 2016, the Kansas Board of Regents accepted the public universities' weapons policies (Kansas Board of Regents). As the Kansas State Legislature and the Kansas Board of Regents adopted laws and policies related to conceal and carry, no research was conducted which examined the current perception of the Kansas public university police chiefs (Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors) about campus safety. This study focused on the perceptions of the Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors regarding campus safety beginning July 1, 2017 when the Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act is implemented.

Background

There have been several iterations of the concealed carry law in Kansas. In 2004, then Kansas Governor K. Sebelius vetoed legislation which would have allowed Kansans to lawfully conceal and carry firearms (Painter, 2006). Then again in 2006, Governor Sebelius vetoed Senate Bill 418 which would have allowed citizens the right to conceal and carry guns (Rothschild, 2006). The victory was short lived because prior to the end

of the 2006 legislative session, lawmakers overrode the governor's veto which made Senate Bill 418 Kansas' first conceal and carry law. The law, better known as The Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act, allowed Kansans the right to conceal and carry firearms as permitted by the Second Amendment of the United State Constitution. The Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act prohibited the carrying of concealed weapons in specific locations, including but not limited to churches, schools, and government buildings. The new law also gave private business owners the right to prohibit or restrict concealed weapons on their premises (Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act, 2013). On January 3, 2007, the State of Kansas issued the first conceal and carry licenses (Kansas Attorney General, 2016).

Since the passage of the original Personal and Family Protection Act in 2006, Kansans have watched as several other states reacted to mass shootings. In April 2007, 32 students and staff at Virginia Tech University were gunned down along with another 24 injured by Seung-Hui Cho, who later turned the gun on himself (Stanford Geospatial Center & Stanford Libraries, 2016). Less than one year later, Northern Illinois University also endured a campus mass shooting where 14 students and staff were injured, and seven including the shooter died (Boudreau & Zamost, 2008). In Huntsville, Alabama a university professor killed three and wounded three others during a departmental meeting in February of 2010 (Stanford Geospatial Center & Stanford Libraries, 2016). Each of these massacres occurred in areas designated as gun free zones, contained within educational settings. The individuals present at the time of each shooting did not have the opportunity to exercise their right to bear arms in an effort to

protect themselves. These individuals either waited for the shooter to end his rampage, or waited for police intervention.

In 2013, members of both the Kansas House of Representatives and Senate discussed and amended the Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act making it legal for anyone with the proper permit to conceal and carry guns in all public offices, including hospitals, churches, and schools (Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act, 2013). The law was created to offer citizens the opportunity to keep safe in the event they are faced with a dangerous or violent individual. Due to the financial strain and the preparation needed to enforce the new laws related to firearms on campus, 4-year public universities, among other public higher education institutions in the state of Kansas, were provided an exemption until July 1, 2017. This voluntary exemption, which had to be requested prior to July 1, 2013 allowed for public colleges and universities across the state of Kansas to prepare students, faculty, and staff for concealed firearms to be permitted on campus (B. Smith, personal communication, April 24, 2014). It is important to note, the amended law was only applicable to public higher education institutions (Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act, 2013).

During the exemption phase, several university presidents, the chancellor at the University of Kansas, and other officials spoke publicly about their opposition to the law. S. Shepard (2015) explained, “The University of Kansas chancellor and 70 of the school’s distinguished professors have formally spoken out against the concealed carry of guns on campus” (para. 1). University of Kansas Chancellor B. Gray-Little said, “I want to be clear that I am not in favor of allowing concealed carry on university campuses” (Shepard, 2015, para. 3). In March of 2014, the Council of Regents Law Enforcement

Directors had an opportunity to express their perspective on allowing concealed firearms on campus. In an address to legislative teams, the Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors made it clear they were opposed to pending legislation related to allowing firearms on campus (M. McCracken, personal communication, May 18, 2016).

Legislators stayed the course and decided not to reverse their earlier decision. As a result, the July 1, 2017 implementation date for firearm possession on public university and community college campuses was maintained.

Problem Statement

Thompson, Price, Mrdjenovich, and Khubchandani (2009) wrote “Campus police chiefs have the unique responsibility of ensuring student safety on campuses and assessing any imminent threats to the campus community” (p. 248). Beginning on July 1, 2017 across all public universities in the state of Kansas, patrons were allowed to legally carry concealed firearms while on university property. This is uncharted territory for universities especially given the fact that at the time the law was established, Kansas public universities had never experienced a mass shooting incident on any campus (Stanford Geospatial Center & Stanford Libraries, 2016). The lack of mass shooting incidents on Kansas 4-year public institution campuses lends itself to the idea that historically, universities have always been thought of as places relatively safe from gun violence. According to Sulkowski and Lazarus (2011), the number of violent attacks nationwide has risen as the number of students has increased, but comparatively speaking, the campuses are safer than the communities in which they are located.

The Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act (2013) included the following words, “The carrying of a concealed handgun shall not be prohibited throughout any state

or municipal building in its entirety unless such building has adequate security measures at all public entrances to ensure that no weapons are permitted” (p. 11). The Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act (2013) defined “Adequate Security Measures” as the:

use of electronic equipment and personnel at public entrances to detect and restrict the carrying of any weapons into the state or municipal building, including...metal detectors, metal detector wands, or any other equipment used for similar purposes allows individuals. (para. 13)

The Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors, among others, recognized this would be a tremendous cost burden for all institutions, especially when budgets were cut. In July 2013, M. Johnson of the *University Daily Kansan*, wrote “This is indicative of a problem for many institutions and municipalities across Kansas that don’t wish to allow firearms on their grounds or in their buildings – the cost of abstention may simply be too high” (para. 6). In lieu of the enormous price tag associated with equipping every entrance with metal detectors and armed personnel, universities (in Kansas and Texas) decided to allow the exemption to expire and have prepared to have firearms on campus (Arant, 2017).

Organizations such as the National Rifle Association (NRA) and Students for Concealed Carry (SCC) supported the decision to allow responsible citizens with the proper permits to lawfully carry concealed weapons. In a statement on the SCC website, the group explained its stance in the following manner,

We simply want those individuals—age twenty-one and above, in most states—who possess valid concealed handgun licenses/concealed carry weapons permits to be afforded the same right to carry on college

campuses that they are currently afforded virtually everywhere else.

(Students for Concealed Carry, 2016, para. 8)

Supporters of concealed carry validated their stance with the argument that not allowing citizens to carry weapons makes everyone vulnerable to an attack thus creating a void in public safety. These individuals suggested that the absence of guns leads criminals to ‘target’ locations where they will encounter no resistance. University of Kansas student K. Strawder, offered an opinion (as cited in Williams, 2015), “At the end of the day, no gun legislation or sign on the door is going to stop someone from committing some heinous act. I would much rather have the option to protect myself” (para. 33). While this may make those individuals who desire to possess a firearm feel safer, there is no guarantee that other people without firearms feel any safer, knowing there may possibly be people with concealed firearms in the room.

Conversely, there are those who disagree with the idea that having more guns on campus makes them safer. In 2008, L. Sprague, President of the International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators (IACLEA) wrote, “IACLEA’s Board of Directors believes ‘concealed carry’ initiatives do not make campuses safer” (p. 1 para. 2). Studies found many Kansas public university students and employees were in agreement about the prohibition of firearms on campus (Docking Institute of Public Affairs, 2015, 2016).

This safe environment is critical for the education process to take place. L. Hutchinson (2003) found that teachers in higher educational institutions need to provide a safe environment in order to maximize the amount of learning for students. Research conducted by A. Maslow (1943) directly related feeling safe as one of the base needs for

human motivation. Thus, the actions taken by Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors as they design campus plans related to concealed firearms may have an impact on the manner in which learning takes place for students.

While the debate between whether or not campuses are safer with the presence of firearms on campus continues, one fact will remain the same. Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors are expected to ensure campuses are safe even with the presence of more guns. The feeling of safety is critical to the success of students and patrons at the university. Regardless of their personal feelings or beliefs, members of the Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors must be prepared for public university patrons who have the legal right to possess concealed firearms beginning July 1, 2017 (M. McCracken, personal communication May 18, 2016).

Current literature provides information related to the perspectives of students, faculty, and even university presidents regarding the concealment of firearms on campus. Few studies have addressed the safety concerns of university police chiefs. At the time of this study, there had been no research conducted perceptions of campus safety related to concealed firearms held by the Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this qualitative study was to determine Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors', those in charge of campus security at Kansas public universities, perceptions of campus safety related to the 2013 Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act which legalized concealed firearms on university campuses in Kansas. The researcher further sought to understand perceptions about campus safety once concealed weapons are allowed on public university campuses beginning July 1, 2017. The

researcher also examined to what extent members of the Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors have been involved in preparing their respective campuses for the arrival of lawfully concealed weapons. A final purpose was to evaluate similarities and differences among each university's weapons policy.

Significance of the Study

This study may be significant to university police chiefs in other states as those institutions examine the idea of allowing concealed carry and the impact this has on campus safety. Students and other patrons of Kansas public universities will also benefit from this study. Ivy (2001) wrote, "Higher Education Institutions must understand the image that they portray...is both an accurate and [favorable] reflection of the institution" (p. 276). Transparency related to the change in the laws specific to concealed firearms on campus is beneficial for all. Supporters, including the parents of current students, alumni, and donors to each school's foundation, will also find interest in knowing what each institution is doing to maintain a safe environment conducive to learning. Those individuals, who live within the communities in which these institutions are located, should also have a vested interest in the findings of this study. Governing bodies such as the Kansas Board of Regents (KBOR) will also find significance in this study. The results of this study will allow for a better understanding of the anticipated impact of concealed guns on campus.

Delimitations

"Delimitations are those characteristics that limit the scope and define the boundaries of [the] study" (Simon, 2011, p. 2). The following self-imposed delimitations were recognized as part of this study:

- The sample for this study was limited to Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors from public higher education universities.
- This study was not created to obtain feedback from police chiefs from public community colleges or technical colleges in Kansas.
- This study limited the geography of the participants to those located in the State of Kansas. The study was not created to obtain feedback from police chiefs outside of the State.
- This study was conducted prior to the July 1, 2017 implementation of the Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act which allows for the lawful possession of firearms on Kansas public universities.
- Interviews were conducted with the six Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors. As a result, common themes were representative of those who were interviewed. Common themes may not relate to public university police chiefs in states outside of Kansas.

Assumptions

The researcher adhered to the following assumptions while conducting this study:

- Questions were answered to the best of the respondent's ability.
- Each public institution was prepared to abide by the provisions of the Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act.
- There were no plans by any of the institutions to enact security guards with metal detectors at every university entrance as described in the Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act as adequate security measures.

- Kansas State Statute currently allows for the lawful possession of firearms outside of university controlled facilities. This study examines the possession of firearms within university facilities.

Research Questions

“Scholars have reiterated the fact that research questions are shaped by the purpose of a study and in turn form the methods and the design of the investigation” (Tashakkori & Creswell, 2007, p. 207). This study was guided by four research questions:

RQ1. What are the perceptions of Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors about campus safety prior to implementation of the Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act (2013) effective July 1, 2017?

RQ2. What do Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors perceive will change regarding campus safety once concealed firearms are permitted on campus effective July 1, 2017?

RQ3. What adjustments to current policies, practices, perceptions, or procedures have been made to address campus safety once concealed firearms are on campus effective July 1, 2017?

RQ4. What similarities and differences exist among the weapons policies of each university effective July 1, 2017?

Definition of Terms

There are several terms which are used throughout this study. The Kansas Board of Regents (2016) defined weapons, handguns, and firearms in the following manner:

Weapons-

- (1) Any object or device which will, is designed to, or may be readily converted to expel bullet, shot or shell by the action of an explosive or other propellant;
- (2) Any handgun, pistol, revolver, rifle, shotgun or other firearm of any nature, including those that are concealed or openly carried;
- (3) Any BB gun, pellet gun, air/C'02 gun, stun gun or blow gun;
- (4) Any explosive, incendiary or poison gas (A) bomb, (B) min, (C) grenade, (D) rocket having a propellant charge of more than four ounces, or (E) missile having an explosive or incendiary charge of more than ¼ ounce;
- (5) Any incendiary or explosive material, liquid, solid, or mixture equipped with a fuse, wick or other detonating device;
- (6) Any tear gas bomb or smoke bomb; however, personal self-defense items containing mace or pepper spray shall not be deemed to be a weapon for the purposes of this policy;
- (7) Any knife, commonly referred to as a switch-blade, which has a blade that opens automatically by hand pressure applied to a button, spring or other device in the handle of the knife, or any knife having a blade that opens or falls or is ejected into position by the force of gravity or by an outward, downward or centrifugal thrust or movement;
- (8) Any straight-blade knife of four inches or more such as a dagger, dirk, dangerous knife or stiletto; except that an ordinary pocket knife or culinary knife designed for and used solely in the preparation or service of food shall not be construed to be a weapon for the purposes of this policy;
- (9) Any martial arts weapon such as nunchucks or throwing stars;

(10) Any longbow, crossbow and arrows or other projectile that could cause serious harm to any person; or

(11) Any other dangerous or deadly weapon or instrument of like character.

Handgun-

(1) A pistol or revolver which is designed to be fired by the use of a single hand and which is designed to fire or capable of firing fixed cartridge ammunition; or

(2) Any other weapon which will or is designed to expel a projectile by the action of an explosive and which is designed to be fired by the use of a single hand.

Firearm-

Any handgun, rifle, shotgun, and other weapon which will or is designed to expel a projectile by the action of an explosive. (pp. 90-91)

Organization of the Study

The study consists of five chapters. Chapter 1 included the following sections: background of the study, statement of the problem, purpose statement, significance of the study, delimitations, assumptions, research questions, definition of terms, and an overview of the methodology. Chapter 2 contains the literature review. The purpose of chapter 3 is to provide an explanation of the design and research methodology. This explanation includes information on the data collection, data analysis, limitations, measurement, and interpretation of the data. In chapter 4, results including common themes from the interviews and analysis of each institution's weapons policy are summarized. Finally, in chapter 5 the researcher provides a summary of the study, significant findings, and recommendations for future research, implications for action, concluding remarks and literature supportive of the findings.

Chapter 2

Review of Literature

The purpose of this qualitative study was to determine Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors', perceptions about campus security as they anticipated concealed weapons on public university campuses beginning July 1, 2017. The researcher also examined to what extent members of the Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors have been involved in preparing their respective campuses for the arrival of lawfully concealed weapons. A final purpose was to evaluate each university's weapons policy for similarities and differences.

This chapter reviews current literature related to the following topics: Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs, faculty and student attitudes about campus safety and concealed carry, Kansas state law, Docking Institute of Public Affairs Kansas public institution employee and student surveys, and rampage vs. targeted incidents. The public's perception of campus police, campus preparedness, firearm ownership, firearm related deaths and injuries, and the Second Amendment and campus carry laws, are also examined in the literature review.

Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs

According to A. Maslow (1943) there are five hierarchically different levels of motivation: 1) physiological, 2) safety, 3) social, 4) esteem, and 5) self-actualization. Maslow (1943) noted prior to the advancement to the next level, the current level must be satisfied with the goal being to achieve self-actualization. The Board of Trustees at Allen Community College in Iola, Kansas agreed with Maslow's stance on motivation as it related to safety. The institution's Mission Statement indicates the school will, "provide

quality educational and support services in an atmosphere that is caring, safe, and conducive to learning” (Allen Community College, 2016). Students for Gun Free Schools also concurred with Maslow and Allen Community College. In a whitepaper, Students for Gun Free Zones (2016) asserted, “In order to foster a healthy learning environment at America’s colleges and universities, it is critical that students and faculty feel safe on campus” (p. 2).

A 2014 study conducted by Rahman and Nurullah, supported Maslow’s assertion of the fulfilment of lower level needs prior to the advancement to higher level needs. Rahman and Nurullah (2014) found the motivation of private bank employees to be significantly impacted by safety needs when compared to public bank employees in Bangladesh, while other areas related to Maslow’s Hierarchy had an insignificant impact. Rahman and Nurullah (2014) concluded the lower level needs of employees at both public and private banks in Bangladesh must be met prior to ascending up the hierarchy as described by Maslow. They found the claims established by Maslow to have credibility across cultures. The findings of Rahman and Nurullah provided credence to the idea of bank employees needing to feel safe in order to reach higher levels of functionality.

Patrick (2013) examined college student employees’ attitudes toward the workplace. The research found Generation Y college students workplace motivations were less about safety and more about job quality. It was also found gender had no impact on workplace motivation. Patrick noted future supervisors of Generation Y students may have to reexamine their perspective of motivation. The research conducted by Patrick (2013) acknowledged a shift in attitudes within members of Generation Y.

Faculty Attitudes about Firearms on Campus

As noted by Rund (2002), university campuses should be a place where the focus is on the expansion and sharing of ideas which mutually benefit society. Both faculty and students have asserted that firearms on campus will hinder the learning process and limit what was once healthy academic dialogue (Thompson, Price, Dake, Teeple, Bassler, Khubchandani, et al. 2013; Thompson, Price, Dake, & Teeple, 2013). The addition of more firearms adds difficulty to the university mission to provide a safe place conducive to learning (Thompson, Price, Dake, & Teeple, 2013).

State legislatures throughout the United States have explored the idea of changing state laws to allow for the concealment and carry of firearms on university campuses since 2004 (Bennett, Kraft, & Grubb, 2012). Lawmakers sought to change the laws to allow citizens with the proper licensure to conceal and carry firearms as a method of protecting themselves and those around them from danger. Thompson, Price, Dake, & Teeple (2013) found many faculty members who participated in their survey were not interested in having students, faculty, staff, or patrons carry concealed firearms on campus. Regardless of the opposition from faculty, legislators in many states have moved forward with laws which permit the possession of concealed firearms. Per the National Conference of State Legislatures (2016) the following states allow anyone who is eligible under state law to conceal and carry firearms on the campuses of public institutions of higher education: Arkansas, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas (beginning July 1, 2017), Mississippi, Oregon, Texas, Utah, and Wisconsin.

In a 2011 study conducted by Bennett, Kraft, and Grubb, researchers found that 78% of the faculty members surveyed at four universities in the state of Georgia either

opposed or strongly opposed legislation which would permit the legal possession of concealed firearms on campuses while only 17% supported legislation. Bennet et al. (2011) sampled 287 potential respondents with a return rate of 55% or a total of 158 actual responses.

A similar study published in 2013 by Thompson, Price, Dake, & Teeple addressed a larger cross section of faculty members at public institutions in various states. Of the nearly 800 responses, Thompson, Price, Dake, & Teeple (2013) discovered 94% of faculty were not in favor of their respective state allowing people to conceal and carry on campus. The study also noted if provided an opportunity to lawfully conceal and carry a firearm on campus, 97% of the faculty who responded would opt out of the chance to carry a concealed firearm (Thompson, Price, Dake, & Teeple, 2013). Researchers examined whether respondents would feel safer carrying a firearm on campus. Most respondents, 94%, disagreed with the idea that they would feel safer. Thompson, Price, Dake, & Teeple (2013) found the concerns most often supported by respondents which lead to not feeling safe include mistakenly being shot while trying to defend themselves (85%), accidental discharges where someone is injured or killed (87%), increased rates of suicide (70%), and increased rates of fatal homicide (83%).

Student Attitudes about Firearms on Campus

Bouffard, Nobles, Wells, and Cavanaugh (2011) examined whether or not student support for policies allowing concealed firearms on campus existed. The researchers specifically studied students at public universities in Texas and Washington. Findings indicated feelings of uneasiness and apprehension toward policies which allow for the concealment of firearms on campus. Researchers noted policy changes which allow the

possession of concealed firearms on campus failed to increase student perceptions of safety.

Per Thompson, Price, Dake, Teeple, Bassler, Khubchandani, et al. (2013) the population with the largest benefit-risk ratio, the students, have emphatically denounced the presence of concealed firearms on campus. When asked about the procurement of a conceal and carry permit, 78% of respondents indicated they were not likely to make the effort to obtain a legal permit. Thompson, Price, Dake, Teeple, Bassler, Khubchandani, et al. (2013) noted when it comes to carrying on campus, students supported the successful completion of a firearms training course (96%) and mandated time on a shooting range (88%). Thompson, Price, Dake, Teeple, Bassler, Khubchandani, et al. (2013) also examined students who thought they would feel safer carrying firearms on campus. The majority of respondents, 77%, disagreed with the idea that they would feel safer. Thompson, Price, Dake, Teeple, Bassler, Khubchandani, et al. (2013) found the concerns most often supported by respondents which lead to not feeling safe included mistakenly being shot while trying to defend themselves (81%), accidental discharges where someone is injured or killed (76%), increased rates of suicide (65%), and increased rates of fatal homicide (75%).

Gender and race play a large role in feelings of safety in the presence of concealed firearms (Hemenway, Azrael, & Miller, 2001). Thompson, Price, Dake, Teeple, Bassler, Khubchandani, et al. (2013) noted more Caucasian males reported feeling safe in the presence of concealed firearms when compared to Caucasian females, African American males, or African American females. Jang, Kang, Dierenfeldt, and Lindsteadt (2015) found that males were almost four times more likely to carry a weapon

on campus than their female counterparts. In the study conducted by Jang, et al. (2015) race did not play a significant role in the determination of concealed firearm possession. This finding is directly opposed to the study conducted by Thompson, Price, Dake, Teeple, Bassler, Khubchandani, et al. (2013) where it was discovered that Caucasians were more likely to feel safe if concealed firearms were present. Caucasians were more likely to possess concealed firearms.

A study conducted by Cavanaugh et al. (2012) found that among students, amending laws and university policy to allow for the legal possession of firearms in classrooms was dependent upon variables such as class location and the comfort level of students with firearms. In 2003, Smith projected 40% of permit holders would carry their weapon on a daily basis. Cavanaugh et al. (2012) found that currently fewer than 5% of all students in classrooms have a concealed carry permit. Based on the information offered in several studies (Cavanaugh et al., 2012; Smith, 2003) there would be significant gaps in which many students in classrooms would not have a firearm.

Eaves, Shoemaker, and Griego (2016) surveyed nearly 450 undergraduate students at Stephen F. Austin University about school shootings, the Second Amendment, and university weapons policies. The researchers concluded the students who participated in their research study did not approve of legislation designated to allow the presence of concealed firearms on campus. Eaves et al. (2016) noted nearly 50% of the respondents planned to obtain a permit to lawfully conceal firearms. Researchers found 30% of the respondents in the Texas study owned firearms. The reported number of firearms owners in a similar study conducted in Kansas was 24% (Docking Institute of Public Affairs, 2015).

Docking Institute of Public Affairs Faculty, Staff, and Student Studies

As Kansas public higher education institutions prepared for the arrival of concealed firearms on campus, presidents of each institution's faculty senate, requested the Docking Institute located at Fort Hays State University conduct a study focused on the faculty and staff attitudes and perceptions of campus safety related to guns on campus. Faculty and staff at the six public universities and the University of Kansas Medical Center were invited to participate in the study in the fall of 2015. The results of the survey indicated the majority of faculty and staff, 70%, preferred not to have concealed firearms on campus (Docking Institute of Public Affairs, 2016). Employees at the University of Kansas (82%) had the highest rate of support to amend the law not allowing firearms on campus. Pittsburg State University (61%) and Fort Hays State University (60%) employees were more likely than their counterparts at other institutions to favor allowing firearms on campus. Both of the latter institutions are located in primarily rural locations. Primm, Regoli, and Hewitt (2009) found that many people who reside in rural areas were often introduced to firearms at a younger age, which allowed for a higher level of comfort with firearms. Primm et al. (2009) concluded that for Americans in rural settings, firearms have a higher instance of recreational use, are a natural part of the culture, and are simply a way of life. Patten, Thomas, and Wada (2013) provided additional support when they compared individuals who resided in urban areas to those residing in rural areas. Patton et al. argued that rural Americans are more likely to be comfortable with the presence of firearms than their counterparts from urban settings. Primm et al. (2009) believed this to be a result of the lack of positive interactions most people in urban areas experience related to firearms. This may lead to

why there is a disparity in preference to allow firearms on campus between employees at either Pittsburg State University or Fort Hays State University and the University of Kansas.

The Docking Institute of Public Affairs (2016) also reported 54% of respondents favored the allocation of resources to meet the “adequate security measure” requirement if no one is allowed to conceal and carry firearms in campus buildings. The “adequate security measures” terminology placed in the Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act (2013) mandated all public entrances to buildings have armed security staff and metal detectors for those who enter the building if concealed firearms were prohibited. The Docking Institute of Public Affairs (2016) found that of those individuals who participated in the study, 82% indicated the propensity to feel less safe if they knew students were allowed to conceal and carry, while this number dropped to 53% if faculty and staff were allowed to carry a concealed handgun.

Once the Presidents of the University Faculty Senates commissioned the 2015 Docking Institute of Public Affairs study, the Student-Faculty Committee commissioned a survey designed for students. The Docking Institute of Public Affairs (2015) noted the student preference (55%) for an amendment to the law which would prohibit concealed firearms on campus was considerably lower than the employees’ response (70%).

The Docking Institute of Public Affairs (2015) noted a small section (19%) of the students surveyed indicated a willingness to pay for resources designed to meet the “adequate security measures” standard. Students unwilling to pay the fee or who indicated the decision was dependent upon the amount exceeded 75%. Of the students willing to pay the additional fee, the Docking Institute of Public Affairs (2015) found

66% expressed the desire to pay no more than \$50 per semester, compared to 10% who agreed to pay more than \$100 per semester for the added safety features.

Kansas State Law

In 2006, the Kansas State Legislature established the Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act which allowed those with a concealed firearm permit to carry a firearm everywhere but government buildings and schools. The law required institutions to post signs where concealed firearms were prohibited. A 2013 amendment to the Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act gave public institutions of higher education in Kansas until July 1, 2017 to comply with the mandate to either provide adequate security measures or allow patrons 21 years of age or older to conceal firearms while on campus. To comply with the Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act, the Kansas Board of Regents required institutions to submit their weapons policy by the end of 2016 for review and approval. At the December 2016 Kansas Board of Regents Meeting, the Board accepted each institution's policy with an effective date of July 1, 2017 (Kansas Board of Regents, 2016). The weapons policy for each Kansas public institution is provided in Appendix A.

Rampage vs. Targeted Incidents

In the 1998 book, *More Guns, Less Crimes*, J. Lott argued that increasing the number of guns would minimize the effectiveness of rampage shooters. Lott (1998) claimed individuals responsible for mass shootings often look for targets where they would encounter the least amount of resistance from others who are legal to carry firearms. Lott's analysis created confusion between rampage and targeted killers. Targeted killers and rampage killers were the focus of Langman's (2009) book, *Why Kids*

Kill: Inside the Minds of School Shooters. Langman (2009) defined targeted killings as instances where the killer is looking for specific individuals as their target. The researcher defined rampage killings as instances where the killer intends to harm as many random people as possible.

Lankford (2013) published the results of a comparative analysis of suicide terrorists and rampage, workplace, and school shooters in the US between 1990 and 2010. Lankford found rampage shooters, school shooters, and suicide terrorists reported many of the same personal struggles, social problems, and perception of crisis events before their attacks were launched. Lankford (2013) commented workplace shooters were fundamentally different than the other types of killers examined. The researcher noted since many of these incidents were manifestations of personal problems with family members, friends, or issues in the workplace, there was an opportunity for successful intervention to occur.

Due to the numerous personal struggles of rampage shooters, it is likely these individuals had spent time planning their attack (Vossekuil, Fein, Reddy, Borum, & Modzeleski, 2002). Vossekuil et al. conducted studies which found school shootings were rarely impulsive acts. These acts were usually planned in advance. When researchers could establish a date from which planning of the attack began, it was discovered planning occurred at least two days prior to implementation and in some cases planning was between six and eight months prior to the event (Vossekuil et al., 2002).

Kalish and Kimmel (2010) noted rampage killers often legitimized their killing spree as a method of revenge for the wrong which had been previously done to them. Newman and Fox (2009) found rampage shootings were often done in public spaces,

targeted current students, had multiple options as targets, and had targets chosen based on their symbolism, such as an administrator. Madfis and Levin (2013) argued the unpredictability and impulsive nature which society tends to utilize when speaking of mass killers is not appropriate to describe rampage shooters. The execution of the shooter's plan to kill has a feel of redemption for a life already lost (Madfis and Levin, 2013).

Larkin (2009) concluded shootings categorized as rampage shootings were often caused by the need to retaliate against a perceived wrong or injustice. Larkin (2009) identified the shooting at Columbine High School in 2007 to be the first time in modern history where active killer events were not perpetrated by the typical student who was a "loner". Columbine gave voice to a group of students who had previously been marginalized and offered a blueprint for how to express outrage, anger, and frustration (Larkin, 2009). Researchers and perpetrators alike have discovered and admitted the role Columbine has played on subsequent rampage shootings (Larkin, 2009). As noted by Larkin, the influence of the rampage shooting at Columbine was felt worldwide as there continues to be those who imitate and research how the attack was carried out, thus establishing rampage shootings as a phenomenon in our everyday culture.

Shultz, Cohen, Muschert, and Flores de Apodaca (2013) studied 215 school shootings between 1990 and 2012 where there was at least one fatality. The results of the study concluded 12% (25 incidents) were rampage shootings, while 67% (142 incidents) were classified as targeted. Remaining shootings (31% or 48 incidents) were placed into a category labeled as other. The total number of deaths recorded during the rampage shootings was 135, fewer than the 179 deaths resulting from targeted shootings.

Shultz et al. (2013) identified targeted incidents as those events when an individual or individuals intended to kill, or injure, at least one person who was the target. The researchers found between 1990 and 2012 targeted school shootings occurred at a rate nearly six times the number of rampage school shootings. In the 2002 Safe Schools Initiative (SSI), Vossekuil et al. noted the choice of location and potential targets had to be purposeful. The term 'targeted' derived from the efforts of the Secret Service to predict probable perpetrators of violent attacks on protectees.

Muschert (2007) described targeted killers in the same manner others have defined rampage killers. The main difference was that victims were specifically targeted by the killer. Targets were selected in advance of the shooting spree because of perceived wrongs done, or because of a specific title, according to Reddy, Borum, Berglund, Vossekuil, Fein, & Modzeleski, et al. (2001). Muschert (2007) also noted the primary reason for the targeted attack is to assert revenge for perceived wrongdoings. Langman (2009) believed targeted killers are those looking for revenge. They include gang members, drug dealers, and those suffering from intense personal issues.

Reddy et al. (2001) evaluated incidents of targeted violence and compared the effectiveness of risk vs. threat assessment. The researchers concluded there was a difference between making a threat and someone who poses as a threat. The researchers found many of those who complete an attack, often times do not issue direct threats. Therefore the potential for targeted acts of violence are not always predetermined by what the alleged perpetrator does or says prior to the carrying out the act of violence.

The methods of school active killers can be separated into three categories, targeted, random, and ambiguous (Langman, 2015). Langman (2015) and Shon (2012)

found the school shooter could be placed in one of the following three specific domains related to mental status: psychopathic, psychotic, and traumatized. Langman (2015) acknowledged college killers may have elements of being psychopathic or psychotic, but were unable to identify any college perpetrator who had been subjected to trauma.

The Perception of Campus Police Officers by Members of the Campus Community

In 2000, Sloan, Lanier, and Beer concluded the role of university police officers varies greatly from the roles played by their counterparts in municipal law enforcement. In addition to enforcing jurisdictional laws, university police officers are mandated to support the mission, vision, and purpose of their employers. Municipal law enforcement officers enforce the laws within their jurisdiction. Gehrand (2008) described the role of campus police as it evolved over time from that of a night watchman, to where it is today, which in some cases includes statutory authority. As stated by researchers (Jackson, 1992; Sloan, et al., 2000) the role of university police is to mitigate the impact of crime within the community, while maintaining campus decorum, increase awareness of crime prevention skills, and to protect the community.

In 2007, Wada explored the legitimacy of the role of university police officers through the perspective of both police officers and undergraduate students at a university in Washington. Wada (2007) found university police officers were caught in a situation where they must explain their role within the university community. According to Wada, several of the university police officers interviewed reported feeling as though they were not well received by members of the campus community as legitimate law enforcement officers. Wada (2007) also noted only 56.6% of the students surveyed knew officers from university police organizations attend the same police academies as officers

employed by local municipalities. In contrast, 41% of the students were not aware of the shared training opportunities among University Police and Municipal Police Officers (Wada, 2007). Researchers (Bordner & Peterson, 1983; Wada, 2007) found student perceptions of university police have remained consistent throughout the last 30 years.

In 2011, Wilson and Wilson found there to be significant support for heightening the sense of professionalism and perception of campus law enforcement officials. The researchers sought to determine the level of support which existed for the arming of campus police officers. According to Wilson and Wilson, 44% of women, 57% of blacks, and 53% of non-Hispanics supported the existence of armed campus law enforcement officers. The respondents to the survey included faculty, staff, students, parents, spouses, and other community members.

Wilson and Wilson (2011) asserted there was no difference in the university community perception regarding campus police when compared to the perception of law enforcement officials who serve the public. According to Wilson and Wilson (2011), racial minorities and females strongly supported the additional enhancement of professionalism, yet the female population surveyed had a lower acceptance of campus police and guns. The researchers concluded that having campus law enforcement officers who are trained, armed, and have similar responsibility and authority as their municipal law enforcement counterparts was beneficial to the university community.

Campus Preparedness

Sheffield, Gregg, and Lee (2016) argued campus settings are prime places for both natural and man-made disasters. Natural disasters at most universities include severe weather, earthquakes, hurricanes, tornadoes, and floods. Man-made disasters

generally include utility emergencies, fires, explosions, chemical spills/fumes/vapor emergencies, and hazardous materials breaches. Additional events campuses need to be prepared to address include accidents and serious injury to faculty/staff/students, individuals who are in crisis, and events involving hostages, terrorists, violent intruders, or shootings. Universities must utilize forward thinking to be prepared for, and be aware of, potential physical or virtual threats (Sheffield et al. 2016). Regardless, Sheffield et al. (2016) concluded disasters on university campuses cannot be dismissed, and it is the role of university personnel to be prepared to address a myriad of potential events which may impact the university community.

“Safety concerns are at the forefront of many people’s thoughts. It is a college’s duty to address these concerns with diligence to allay their fears of violent attacks” (Baker & Boland, 2011, p. 696). Baker and Boland (2011) further supported the idea of a college campus viewed by the constituents as an educational refuge created to support the manifestation of ideas to foster growth among faculty and students. According to Baker and Boland (2011), this way of life is under attack due to a growing number of violent acts committed within campus communities. Rund (2002) expressed how important it is for universities to maintain a campus which is safe and caring, open to discourse challenging independent free thinking, and is void of discriminatory practices. Rund (2002) added:

A safe campus is one that provides students the opportunity to pursue their academic potential in an environment free of discrimination, intimidation, or threat to physical or emotional well-being. The safe campus is one that responds to such threats and takes decisive, corrective action to eliminate

them. A safe campus is one that is monitored for safety, one where the various dimensions of the environment are routinely evaluated and adjustments are made as appropriate. (p. 9)

Lenhardt (2007) noted even after events which occurred on the Virginia Tech University campus in April of 2007, other American colleges and universities remained susceptible to the threat of violence. Lenhardt (2007) recommended university administrators remain vigilant to the potential for violence while utilizing prevention strategies to mitigate the negative impact such events have on the community. Lenhardt recommended crime prevention techniques, strategies, and tools be provided for both faculty and students to encourage awareness of the potential for crime to occur.

Baker and Boland (2011) found faculty, staff, and students who were surveyed expressed confidence in the safety and preparedness of a small liberal arts women's college in Pennsylvania. The college reported low numbers of incidents where students or staff were victimized, with even less action (i.e. reporting of the incident) being taken following victimization (Baker & Boland, 2011; Sloan et al., 2000). The researchers also noted a significant number of respondents have begun the process to maintain personal safety, even though they acknowledge this to be a responsibility of the institution. The survey also gave credibility to the idea that those surveyed believed their campus to be safer than other college and university campuses (Baker & Boland, 2011).

Seo, Torabi, Sa, and Blair (2012) found enrollment size had a significant impact on the perception of preparedness of campus safety. The researchers noted smaller institutions tended to not have adequate safety and security personnel in place to protect students. The researchers concluded the response to a crisis event at small institutions

would be limited. The researchers also found smaller institutions, when compared to larger institutions, were not as likely to have students who understood the complexities of emergency protocol and procedures.

Firearm Ownership

In order to examine conceal and carry laws, one must understand the numbers of actual firearm owners within our society. Researchers noted there appears to be a higher ownership rate of firearms among households in rural areas when compared to urban households (Primm et al., 2009). The images of violence and criminal activity and violence may add to the negative association homeowners in urban areas often possess about guns (Primm et al., 2009). The introduction to firearms at a young age in rural areas tends to create a friendly and favorable association held by many of those who grew up in non-urban areas. Primm et al. (2009) argued in rural areas, gun ownership is a way of life, not just a tool used for protection.

With more gun owners comes the potential for death or harm, whether intentional or unintentional. Siegel and Rothman (2016) studied the correlation between firearm ownership levels and suicides rates in states and found higher levels of suicides occurred in states with higher numbers of firearm owners. Siegel and Rothman (2016) supported the claims of other studies which found a substantial relationship between firearm ownership and suicide rates of males. The researchers were not able to establish the same relationship among females.

Not only is there a strong relationship between firearm ownership and suicide, but in a 10-year study from 1988-1997 published by Miller, Azreal, and Hemenway in 2002, researchers found a statistically significant relationship between gun ownership and

homicide among adults. Miller et al. (2002) found in some cases, the homicide rate in states with higher gun ownership was 35% greater when compared to states with a lower gun ownership. Researchers noted the information reported by firearm owners did not account for the possibility of homeowners with multiple firearms (Miller et al., 2002). The numbers reported by Miller et al. (2002) provided a reflection of the actual availability of firearms. When compared to the number of homicides, there is cause for concern.

Miller et al. (2002) studied the correlation between firearm ownership and firearm related deaths in children 5 to 14 years of age. The researchers concluded among children from 5 to 14 years of age, the number of accidental deaths caused by firearms was greater in areas where more guns were present (Miller et al., 2002). The researchers were not able to statistically differentiate between violent tendencies of young people living in areas where firearm ownership was prevalent as opposed to areas where firearm ownership was limited. Miller et al. (2002) asserted there to be a statistical correlation between suicide (including gun related or other means) and states with high levels of gun ownership. In an editorial comment to the study conducted by Miller et al. (2002), Richmond, Schwab, and Branas (2002), trauma specialists from the Firearm Injury Center at Penn University, indicated children in the top five states for gun ownership were 16 times more likely to die from accidental firearm injuries, seven times more likely to die from firearm suicide, and 3 times more likely to die from firearm related homicide than were their counterparts in the five states where gun ownership was the lowest.

Firearm Related Deaths and Injuries

Fatalities involving children and adolescents caused by firearms are on the rise in America (Stiglets, 2001). Per Stiglets (2001) and Voelker (1995) deaths related to firearms have surpassed the numbers of deaths resulting from natural causes in young adults. Individuals 15-24 years of age account for one-quarter of the injuries associated with firearms (Stiglets, 2001). Stiglets (2001) stressed educating adolescents on safe firearm handling and etiquette, proper storage of firearms, and the correct use of firearms has proven to have a significant impact on reducing the number of firearm related deaths and injuries.

In 2002, Karger, Billeb, and Koops studied 624 gunshot autopsies of which 32 were considered accidental. In the 32 accidental incidents, 29 (91%) were shot by another individual, while the remaining 3 (9%) were considered self-inflicted (Karger et al., 2002). The study conducted by Karger et al. (2002) found in 6 of the 7 cases which involved children between the ages of 4 and 14, the children believed the gun to be a toy meant to be played with instead of a real firearm designed to cause death. Similar to what other researchers found, Karger et al. (2002) concluded mistakes such as carelessness and improper storage committed by humans were the most common reason these accidents occurred.

Accidental discharges result in various self-inflicted injuries. Cosco and King (2015) published a study which examined 69,111 firearm related injuries. In the study, Cosco and King (2015) found 1% (667) of the injuries sustained were people who shot themselves in the foot by either an actual firearm or by some type of air gun. However, Cosco and King (2015) noted instances of Americans shooting themselves in the foot was

an extremely rare occurrence.

A 2013 study conducted in Norway by Gjertsen, Leenaars, and Vollrath found 89% of all firearm related deaths were categorized as suicides. In the same Norwegian study, researchers found 3% of the deaths were considered accidental which indicated these are rare events (Gjertsen et al., 2013). Gjertsen et al. (2013), found in over 5,000 deaths initiated by firearms, 164 were instances of accidental discharge. Males were involved in 158 (96%) of the accidental discharge incidents. Researchers noted the reduced number of firearm related deaths at the beginning of the 1990's, with a significant reduction in the number of suicides attributed to males (Gjertsen et al., 2013). Norwegian officials were unable to conclude the existence of a relationship between more stringent gun laws and the rate of suicides (Gjertsen et al., 2013).

Accidental discharge of firearms contributed to nearly 30% of the deaths of children between the ages of 5 and 14 during a 10-year period between 1988-1997 (Miller et al., 2002). In a study published by Charles (2000), the researcher concluded no matter how much safety training and safety precautions were taken, the risk of an accidental discharge is never zero. The researcher indicated although it is rare, firearms have been known to be defective and may cause injury (Charles, 2000).

Grossman, Reay, and Baker (1999) discovered many of the firearms used by children and adolescents in accidental firearm injuries, suicide attempts, or suicide completion, were from firearms found in the victim's home or the home of a relative or friend. Grossman et al. (1999) studied 132 instances where 63 resulted in death and 69 resulted in injuries. Suicide accounted for 46 (73%) of the deaths and accidental discharge another 10 (16%) (Grossman et al., 1999). The researchers examined the

nonfatal injuries reported and found 13 (19%) to be suicide attempts and 55 (80%) to be accidental. Grossman et al. (1999) expressed the need for policies related to the proper storage and containment of firearms, especially where children and adolescents are present.

Between 1991 and 2004 Schwartz (2006) found the average number of suicides among college students to be 6.5 per 100,000 people, nearly half of the 12.6 per 100,000 people recorded who commit suicide within the general population. Schwartz (2006) reported the results of a study conducted in the 1980's by Silverman, Meyer, Sloane, Raffel, and Pratt (1997), who found the rate of suicide to be slightly higher at 7.5. Researchers argued the decline in suicide rates may be the result of a decline within the male population attending college during the same time frame, or possibly could be a result of the establishment of university counseling offices (Schwartz, 2006).

Duke, Resnick, and Borowsky (2005) stated the availability of guns has a direct correlation and impact on deaths or injuries resulting from firearm violence. Duke et al. (2005) opined society must recognize the tremendous impact gun violence has on the individual. Researchers found this impact can be a result of the way gun violence is sensationalized within the media or violence associated with our communities, either of which has been proven to negatively impact the development of children (Duke et al, 2005).

The Second Amendment and Campus Carry Laws

In a landmark case, the Supreme Court of the United States established the Second Amendment applies to a lone citizen's right to personal protection (District of Columbia v. Heller, 2008). The court upheld the language of the United States

Constitution which allows for, “The right of the people to keep and bear arms” (U.S. Const. Amend II). The case was heard by the US Supreme Court because lower courts were unable to determine if the District of Columbia had the right to restrict possession of firearms by citizens (District of Columbia v. Heller, 2008). The opinion of the court offered by Justice A. Scalia noted the Second Amendment had limitations as to who and where firearms could be possessed. Specifically, Justice Scalia appeared to support limitations on convicted felons and possession in educational or government buildings (District of Columbia v. Heller, 2008).

The decision made in the case of the District of Columbia v. Heller could only be applied to locations controlled and maintained by the federal government (Arrigo & Acheson, 2016). In the 2010 case of McDonald v. City of Chicago, the Supreme Court decided the answers to the right to carry questions should be made at the state level as established in the Fourteenth Amendment (McDonald v. City of Chicago, 2010). Morse, Sisneros, Peres, and Sponsler (2016) noted the following states allow for guns on campus via either state law or court rulings: Arkansas, Colorado, Idaho, Mississippi, Oregon, Texas, Utah, and Wisconsin. The authors cited the following states as locations where the prohibition of firearms on campus occurs by either state law or governance board decision: Washington, California, Nevada, Wyoming, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Louisiana, Missouri, Illinois, Tennessee, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Michigan, Ohio, New York, New Jersey, and Massachusetts.

Texas Senate Bill 11 (2015) effective August 1, 2016 established the ability for students 21 years of age, or older, to lawfully carry concealed firearms while in university owned buildings. The law expressly prohibited the open carry of firearms while on

campus (Texas Senate, 2015). Anyone interested in the ability to lawfully carry a concealed firearm on campuses in Texas must possess a license (Texas Senate, 2015).

The Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act (2013) has many of the same provisions as the Texas law. In Kansas, however, there is no requirement for a person to obtain a permit to lawfully conceal a weapon while on public higher education campuses located within the state.

Summary

This chapter reviewed pertinent and key scholarly literature related to concealed firearms in society. Chapter 2 examined the importance for people to feel safe and the impact this has on growth and development. The chapter also reviewed the attitudes toward safety related to firearms of faculty, staff, and students nationwide, and in the state of Kansas. Then chapter 2 discussed rampage vs. targeted shootings and the perceptions held by campus community members of campus police. Firearm ownership and the number of deaths or injuries associated with firearms were also discussed. Finally, the laws associated with firearm possession including the second amendment and Kansas state law were explored. Each section of chapter 2 emphasized an important aspect related to the existence of concealed firearms on university campuses. Chapter 3 describes the methods, research design, selections of participants, measurements, researcher's perspective, data collection and analysis, and the limitations of this study.

Chapter 3

Methods

The purpose of this qualitative study was to determine Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors', those who are in charge of campus security at Kansas public universities, perceptions about the 2013 Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act which allowed concealed firearms on university campuses in Kansas. The researcher further sought to understand perceptions about campus safety once concealed weapons are allowed on public university campuses beginning July 1, 2017. The researcher also examined to what extent members of the Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors have been involved in preparing their respective campuses for the arrival of lawfully concealed weapons. A final purpose was to evaluate similarities and differences among each university's weapons policy. Chapter 3 contains the following sections: research design, selection of participants, measurement, data collection, data analysis and synthesis, the role and perspective of the researcher, and the limitations of the study.

Research Design

The research design selected to study the perception of campus safety among members of the Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors at the six public universities in Kansas was qualitative. Creswell (2009) believed "qualitative research is a means for exploring and understanding the meaning individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem" (p. 4). Utilization of this research method allowed for the exploration and understanding of the perceptions of the Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors at Kansas public universities about campus safety, specifically

how concealed firearms would impact campuses after implementation of the Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act effective July 1, 2017.

The researcher chose phenomenological research as the specific research strategy used to conduct this study. “The purpose of the phenomenological approach is to...identify phenomena through how they are perceived by the actors in a situation” (Lester, 1999, p. 1). As defined by Lester, the specific phenomenon in this study was campus safety, the identified phenomenon was concealed firearms on campus, and the actors were Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors at public universities in Kansas. Lester (1999) stated, “Phenomenological methods are particularly effective at bringing to the fore the experiences and perceptions of individuals from their own perspectives” (p. 1). Lunenburg and Irby (2008) stated, “In a phenomenological research design, the researcher is concerned with clarifying the specific and recognizing phenomena through the eyes of the participants” (p. 90). To obtain and identify the specific phenomena, the researcher used the interview technique. Kvale (2006) explained, “An interview has been defined as a meeting where a reporter obtains information from a person, as a meeting with another person to achieve a specific goal, and more generally, as a conversation with a purpose” (p. 483). The interview process allowed the researcher to gain greater insight into the perceptions of campus safety held by each of the participants. This type of qualitative research created specific opportunities for thematic analysis of the perceptions of members of the Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors about campus safety related to concealed firearms on campus.

Selection of Participants

The population for the current study included all police chiefs of public universities in the United States. The sample was non-random and included the members of the Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors from the six public universities in Kansas. The researcher used purposive sampling as the method to define the research sample. Lunenburg and Irby (2008) defined purposive sampling as “a sample based on the researcher’s experience or knowledge of the group to be sampled” (p. 175). The current sample selection was based on the researcher’s desire to better understand how members of the Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors at the six Kansas public universities would be impacted by an upcoming implementation of state law allowing concealed carry of weapons on university campuses. The purpose of the study was shared with a member of the Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors to ascertain the level of interest for potential participation in this study. Interactions with various members of the group at conferences, during on-campus meetings, via email, and telephone occurred to better gauge interest, to clarify the research topic, and determine the process of communicating with participants. The researcher established the requirement the Kansas C-Post (the state’s law enforcement accrediting agency) must recognize participants of this study as commissioned law enforcement officers. An additional criterion required each participant to be the chief law enforcement officer within his or her agency. In agencies where the chief law enforcement officer was not able to participate in the study, the researcher interviewed the most senior ranking commissioned officer within the agency.

Measurement

The researcher created both a demographic inquiry (Appendix B), as well as an interview protocol to obtain data from each of the participants. The demographic inquiry was used to gather informational data and to ensure each respondent met the requirements to participate in the study. The following questions were asked as part of the demographic inquiry:

- a. Are you a member of the Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors for the university police agency which employs you?
- b. Please list the year in which you received your law enforcement commission.
- c. How many full-time certified law enforcement officers are employed by your institution? How many part-time officers?
- d. How many years of experience do you have as a university law enforcement officer?
- e. Please specify any special training you have received related to concealed firearms?

The interview protocol utilized a semi-structured interview method as the primary data collection source. According to Lunenburg and Irby (2008), “The interview can be structured.... ask factual...or future based questions, and allow the interviewee to add any additional information at the end of the interview” (pp. 91-92). Lunenburg and Irby (2008) also indicated the researcher should have research questions and an interview protocol which have already been certified as valid (p. 92). The following research questions and interview protocol (Appendix C) guided this study:

RQ1. What are the perceptions of Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors about campus safety prior to implementation of the Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act (2013) effective July 1, 2017?

IQ1(a). In light of the July 1, 2017 implementation of the Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act of 2013, please describe your current thoughts on campus safety and how concealed carry will impact the university.

IQ1(b). What specific concerns do you have about the added presence of firearms?

IQ1(c). Please provide any additional information, insights, or thoughts that you would have regarding safety concerns directly related to the changes in the Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act (2013).

RQ2. What do Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors perceive will change regarding campus safety once concealed firearms are permitted on campus effective July 1, 2017?

IQ2(a). What are students' views of safety as they anticipate concealed weapons on campus?

IQ2(b). What are university faculty and staff views about campus safety as they anticipate concealed weapons on campus?

IQ2(c). What are university administration views about campus safety as they anticipate concealed weapons in the on campus?

IQ2(d). What are residence hall staff views about campus safety as they anticipate guns on campus and in residence halls?

IQ2(e). What additional information, insights, or concerns would you like to add regarding the climate of your campus related to the anticipation of concealed weapons?

RQ3. What adjustments to current policies, practices, perceptions, or procedures have been made to address campus safety once concealed firearms are on campus effective July 1, 2017?

IQ3(a). In anticipation of the July 1, 2017 implementation date for the Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act, many Regents institutions reviewed and recommended changes to the current weapons policy. What recommendations for changes to your current weapons policy have been adopted in your weapons policy?

IQ3(b). How will your campus inform members of the general public about how to remain compliant with the institutional weapons policy?

IQ3(c). How will your campus inform students, faculty, staff, and administrators about how to remain compliant with the institutional weapons policy?

IQ3(d). What additional information, insights, or concerns would you like to add regarding the preparation of either your agency or your institution for the arrival of lawfully concealed weapons on campus?

RQ4. What similarities and differences exist among the weapons policies of each university effective July 1, 2017?

IQ4. What information, insight, or concerns would you like to add about the weapons policy at your institution effective July 1, 2017?

The interview protocol guided the interview interactions with each of the participants. Interview questions originated from the research questions which were used to guide this study. Finally, the interview questions were created from a format which involved the use of open-ended questions. Qualitative “interviews involve unstructured and generally open-ended questions that are few in number and intended to elicit views and opinions from the participants” (Creswell, 2009, p. 181). The goal for the interview process was to provide each participant with an opportunity to openly discuss perceptions about campus safety and the potential impact of concealed weapons.

According to Kimberlin and Winterstein (2008), the value of research is dependent on the reliability and validity of the research instruments. The authors added, instruments can be reliable without being valid, but for an instrument to be valid the instruments must also be reliable (Kimberlin & Winterstein, 2008). “Validity is often defined as the extent to which an instrument measures what it purports to measure” (Kimberlin & Winterstein, 2008, p. 2278). To effectively interpret the results of the research, validity and reliability were established. To establish validity, the researcher utilized member checking as part of the interview protocol. Koelsch (2013) described member check as a process in which participants are provided relevant sections of their interview to review for accuracy.

Researcher’s Perspective

Bias has the potential to be present during qualitative research. Per Miyazaki and Taylor (2008), “Researcher interaction bias could affect results in almost any data collection method that involves human interaction between researchers and their subjects

of study” (p. 780). Individual researcher factors which could have caused the researcher to be biased during the data collection and data analyses included the following:

- a. Not only did the researcher serve as a Campus Judicial Officer (CJO), but the researcher also served as a Law Enforcement Officer.
- b. The researcher trained university patrons on Active Shooter Training Protocol.
- c. As the son of a Law Enforcement Officer, the researcher has always had exposure to concealed firearms.

The researcher remained fully aware of the biases and the potential impact previous experience may have had on the authenticity and credibility of the study. As both a law enforcement officer and a university employee, the researcher was aware of potential biases. The researcher pledged to maintain objectivity throughout the study, as the results were reported based on the collection and analysis of the data.

Data Collection Procedures

Prior to the collection of any information, the researcher was required to receive approval from the Baker University Institutional Review Board (IRB; Appendix D). The Baker IRB form was submitted for consideration on February 15, 2017 and the research was approved on March 3, 2017.

The data collection phase consisted of several different tasks. The first task was to provide information which introduced the study to the potential participant. An overview of the study (including purpose and significance statements), interview questions, the researcher’s vitae, and a consent form (Appendix E) were emailed to each member of the Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors. This information

provided to each participating member of the Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors was created to enhance the credibility of this study. The researcher allowed 3-5 business days for the participant to review the materials.

Once the 3-5 business days had elapsed, the next task for the researcher was to contact solicited members of the Council of Regents Law Enforcement Director via telephone to answer preliminary questions and clarify the purpose of the study. The researcher explained each participant would be assigned a number code to ensure anonymity. The researcher and participant mutually agreed upon a time for the interview. Lastly, the researcher sent an email reminder about the upcoming meeting to each participant two days before the scheduled interview date.

On the day of the interview, the researcher traveled to the location mutually agreed upon. Each interview was scheduled for sixty minutes and was held in either an office or a conference room setting. At the beginning of each interview, the researcher asked each participant to sign the consent form. By signing the consent form, the participant acknowledged notification of the researcher's intent to audio record the interview and agreed to participate in the interview knowing s/he could withdraw at any point without reprisal. Specifically, participants were informed that during the interview if they disagreed with a line of questioning, it would be their choice to request not to answer or remove themselves from the study.

Turner (2010) recommended a few moments of casual and generic conversation prior to the start of the interview. The purpose of this casual conversation was to establish a rapport with each participant. The general topic of this portion of the interview was about the climate of their campuses. An informal approach to the

interview allowed the conversation to move in a direction determined by the flow of the interaction.

The researcher utilized interview procedures created with the assistance of Baker University research faculty. The procedures established a protocol for the researcher to follow allowing for uniformity and continuity between each of the interview sessions. This structure guided the interview sessions.

Throughout the interview, the researcher took notes and paid close attention to “(a) careful listening, (b) nonverbal cues, (c) the progress of the conversation, (d) probing when needed, (e) taking notes, and (f) not responding during the interview” (Lunenburg & Irby, 2008, p. 91). Each of these actions offered a wealth of information for the researcher. While the words which were spoken explained the story, these actions provided substance and value to the story being told and offered the researcher the opportunity to begin to develop a framework in which specific comments from each participant could be grouped.

The interviews included a combination of demographic and open-ended questions. For ease of both the researcher and the respondent, minimal note taking occurred. The minimization of distractions created by note-taking and responding to statements made by the respondent, allowed for more in-depth thought and attention. Utilization of pre-determined questions provided an opportunity for each participant to have a similar experience during the interview. With prior verbal and written permission of each respondent, the researcher created an audio recording of each interview. Each respondent understood the audio recording was confidential and that direct quotes would be part of the study. Respondents were reassured this study involved an analysis of

central themes. This led to the appropriate engagement by the researcher and allowed for the creation of follow-up questions where appropriate.

The interviews concluded with a discussion regarding the institutions' revised weapons policy. After each policy had been approved at the Kansas Board of Regents in December of 2016, the researcher obtained a copy of each university's weapons policy. The researcher discussed the institution weapons policy with each Council of Regents Law Enforcement Director. Interviewees were asked to verify weapons policy changes and were provided an opportunity to comment on the policy to be implemented effective July 1, 2017. After all of the interviews had been completed, university weapons policies were reviewed for similarities and differences in how each institution defined how firearms would be retained specific to the type of holster, what spaces would be considered off limits, how reports of firearms would be managed by university police as well as human resources and student conduct personnel, and what constitutes possession.

Once all interviews were completed, a certified court stenographer transcribed each audio recording. The transcriptions were analyzed to determine central themes. Once the transcripts had been created, the researcher utilized the Dedoose software to process the data. All original recordings and original transcripts were maintained in a secure location for five years.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

Participants of the study provided the researcher with a wealth of knowledge and information based on their individual perspectives. The next task for the researcher was to complete data analysis and interpretation. "The process of data analysis involves making sense out of text and image data" (Creswell, 2009, p. 184). To make sense of the

interviews, the researcher initiated the process of coding. Seidel and Kelle (1995) explained coding as the association of phenomena to establish general categories and themes. Marks and Yardley (2004) defined themes as “a specific pattern found in the data in which one is interested” (p. 57). Basit (2003) indicated the coding of these categories could be used to create conversational patterns to aid in the analysis of the data. The researcher independently examined each transcript for words, phrases, or constructs to assist with the establishment of the general categories and themes.

Once the themes had been established, the next phase was to conduct thematic analysis. Thematic analysis allows for the creation of categories (Marks & Yardley, 2004). In this phase, the researcher relied on the process of inductive logic to modify categories based on each of the individual interviews. Themes were expanded or reduced based on the analysis.

To address research and interview question 4, the researcher conducted a review of each university’s weapons policy to establish where similarities in reporting occurred. Also, the researcher examined the procedures for concealed weapons policy violations each university intended to implement July 1, 2017. Lastly, the researcher reviewed the safety mechanisms, such as definitions of holster retention, possession, and spaces deemed exempt at each university. The ultimate purpose for this aspect of the research was to determine what similarities and differences existed among each university’s weapons policy.

The researcher shared the findings with the peer reviewers to detect possible bias and influence. Peer reviewer #1 was a commissioned officer with more than 15 years of experience in law enforcement who was employed by the sheriff’s office in Allen

County, Kansas. Peer reviewer #2 was a licensed medical professional with more than 12 years of experience in student healthcare settings. These individuals independently reviewed the transcripts and the results to conclude if the results determined by the researcher were subjective. Both peer reviewers were provided an opportunity to review interview notes, recordings, and emerging themes. After the peer reviewers examined the data, both met individually with the researcher to discuss the data. Peer reviewers asked the researcher questions to clarify areas of the analyses appearing to be biased. Discrepancies were discussed and clarified to the satisfaction of both the researcher and reviewers. It was the intent of the researcher to not allow potential bias to ruin the objectivity of the analysis and reporting of both the data and the results.

Limitations

As defined by Lunenburg and Irby (2008), limitations are concepts which fall outside of the researcher's ability to regulate. This study was limited by the number of 4-year public universities located in the State of Kansas. There are numerous other public, private, 4-year and 2-year schools as well as non-profit and for-profit institutions, but only six public 4-year universities are in the State of Kansas. The study was also limited by each institution's decision to accept the 4-year exemption originally offered by the state. Had any of the institutions chosen to forego the 4-year exemption period, participants would have a better understanding of the impact concealed firearms carried on campus. Lastly, the Kansas Legislature made a motion to allow the exemption for universities to indefinitely remain in place. This may have had an undetermined impact on the perceptions of those individuals interviewed since the legislative discussion occurred approximately one month prior to the interviews.

Summary

The purpose of this qualitative study was to determine Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors, those who are in charge of campus security at Kansas public universities, perceptions about campus safety once the Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act was implemented July 1, 2017. The researcher also examined to what extent members of the Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors had been involved in preparing their respective campuses for the arrival of lawfully concealed weapons. An evaluation of each university's weapons policy was conducted to establish where similarities and differences existed.

Six police chiefs (Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors) from public higher education universities in Kansas were interviewed for this study. These individuals had the inherent responsibility for safety on their respective campuses. To collect the data, the researcher utilized face-to-face interview techniques. The researcher recorded and transcribed the interviews with the permission of each participant.

Recorded interviews and transcripts were reviewed by the researcher and two peer reviewers. The researcher used coding as a method of data analysis, based upon transcriptions of each of the interviews. Themes were established from the data which had been coded to aid in the analysis. Each university's weapons policy was reviewed. Content analysis was used to determine consistencies or differences across the six university policies. Themes identified from the interview transcript analysis, as well as summary of university policy consistencies and differences, were forwarded to the peer reviewers to be analyzed. The results of data analysis and interpretation are discussed in chapter 4.

Chapter 4

Results

The purpose of this qualitative study was to determine Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors', those in charge of campus security at Kansas public universities, perceptions of campus safety related to the 2013 Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act which legalized concealed firearms on university campuses in Kansas. The researcher sought to understand perceptions about campus safety prior to and anticipated once concealed weapons are allowed on public university campuses beginning July 1, 2017. The researcher also examined to what extent members of the Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors (CRLED) have been involved in preparing their respective campuses for the arrival of lawfully concealed weapons. A final purpose was to evaluate similarities and differences among state universities' weapons policies.

The researcher collected data from six current members of the CRLED who agreed to share their perceptions of safety concerns related to the impact of concealed firearms at Kansas public 4-year universities. Each participant was randomly assigned a numeric value between 1 and 6 in order to maintain anonymity and confidentiality. For example, CRLED #4 indicated this participant was the police chief at university 4, but offered no identifiable information about the university or the individual interviewed. The following descriptors provide characteristics of the participants and university law enforcement agencies represented in this study:

- a. Years of experience in current position: 18 months to 13 years.
- b. Gender: five participants were male and one was female.

- c. Law Enforcement Experience: Each member was certified by Kansas C-Post.
Two participants had been members of large metropolitan municipal agencies, while one had been a member of the Kansas Highway Patrol. Each had more than 20 years of experience in law enforcement.
- d. Agency Personnel: The smallest agency was made up of 11 officers including the chief. The largest agency contained more than 30 officers and 8 administrators including the chief.
- e. Education: Five received bachelor's degrees and one obtained master's degrees or higher.

Qualitative data from the participants' responses to open-ended interview questions were analyzed to help gain a deeper understanding of:

- The perceptions of Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors about campus safety prior to implementation of the Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act (2013) effective July 1, 2017.
- Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors perception of changes regarding campus safety once concealed firearms are permitted on campus effective July 1, 2017.
- The adjustments to current policies, practices, or procedures which have been made to address campus safety once concealed firearms are on campus effective July 1, 2017.
- The similarities and differences among the weapons policies of each university effective July 1, 2017.

Four themes emerged from the Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors' perception of campus safety related to the lawful possession of concealed firearms on university campuses in Kansas:

- a) The Presence of Firearms on Campus will Impact the University;
- b) Firearms and Other Concerns are Threats to Campus Safety;
- c) The Concerns Expressed by Campus Constituents are Similar;
- d) There is a Need for Training to Promote an Understanding of the Mental Aspects of Firearms;

In addition, campus weapons policies were reviewed to determine similarities and differences.

The Presence of Firearms on Campus will Impact the University

The first and most prominent theme discussed within each of the six interviews centered on the presence of guns on campus. The participants appeared to be consistent with their views on the presence of firearms and the impact to their respective campuses. A detailed explanation of the perception of the CRLED is described below.

The illegal presence of concealed firearms. Each of the participants acknowledged the likelihood of the presence of concealed firearms already on campus. The perceptions of CRLED #3 supported the idea of concealed firearms currently within the buildings of universities in Kansas. “We probably already have that [illegally concealed firearms] going on” (CRLED #3). According to CRLED #3, “After July 1 there might be a slight bump but not a significant number [more] than what we’re already dealing with now”. CRLED #4 explained the presence of concealed firearms in this manner, “As law enforcement officers, we treat everyone as if they are carrying a

weapon. Why would we think any differently just because we are on university campuses?”

Interviews conducted with CRLED #1 and #2 yielded similar perceptions. CRLED #1 explained the current existence of concealed firearms in the following manner, “I would say that they [firearms] are already here and concealed. We just don’t see them, nor have we had any problems or issues”. CRLED #2 stated, “I believe there are weapons currently on this campus [in] spite of our policy, which does not allow for the possession of concealed firearms on campus at this current time”. CRLED #2 further explained, “While it is a very small percentage it is still happening”. CRLED #2 identified, “Nearly 4 years ago, the law allowed for concealed carry in all spaces except for schools, colleges, universities, and municipal buildings. Why would we think our campuses don’t have guns either accidentally or intentionally?”

Increased probability of an accidental discharge and self-harm. Among the CRLED there was a real concern for the potential for an accidental discharge. CRLED #2 recalled, “Recently a gun owner accidentally discharged his firearm as it was unlawfully stored in his sock at a graduation ceremony”. CRLED #6 also commented on this incident, “It is amazing no one was seriously injured or killed”. CRLED #2 explained the outcome of such events as “situations where no one wins. The gun owner loses and the public becomes more fearful of the potential of this happening in their presence”.

As stated by CRLED #6 in reference to a recent event where a firearm was accidentally fired in the residence hall of one of the 4-year universities in Kansas, “Just ask our counterpart at Kansas State University. I am pretty sure they will agree that the

probability of accidental discharges is likely to increase as more students decide to possess concealed firearms”. CRLED #4 agreed with CRLED #6,

The student most likely failed to check the barrel for a round in the chamber.

When the trigger was pulled, a shot was fired and caused injury to the student.

The residence hall incident at KSU makes that university the ‘poster child’ for why firearms should not be allowed on university campuses.

It is important to note, both CRLED #4 and #6 thought the student involved in this incident at Kansas State University was not 21 years of age. Additionally, CRLED #4 also noted the presence of the firearm in the residence hall not only violated current university policy, but also violated current state statute.

According to CRLED #2, “Universities in Kansas could potentially be one accidental shooting away from a bystander being killed. Is that what has to happen before we alter the law”? CRLED #6 stated, “I understand an accidental discharge is just that, an *accident*. The lives impacted by such an event will have a lasting impression on those involved regardless of the level of injury sustained”.

The potential for self-harm was also a serious concern among all members of the CRLED. “I remember hearing that within the last couple of months, a student had taken their own life at one of the institutions in the state. That could have easily been one of my students who made that choice” (CRLED, #2). In February of 2016, a student at Emporia State University took his own life. This information was widely known among CRLED once the interviews began. Each of them offered their condolences to the Police Chief and the campus community at Emporia State University. CRLED #2 noted, “Students do not often times understand the finality of this type of decision. I understand

any ‘weapon’ could be used to carry out this act. It just happened to be the case this individual chose a firearm”. CRLED #3 and #6 suggested the ease with which self-harm can be completed with the use of firearms leads to the method being used more frequently.

Additional Costs. Several of the participants noted the new law will increase dollars spent on campus safety. Since each agency already had commissioned officers who were issued firearms, there would not be additional dollars spent on equipment. The additional cost would mainly be spent on personnel and training.

Over half of the CRLED planned to request additional positions. Their expressed concerns were for both officer safety and the safety of the general public. CRLED #4 noted, “The nature and concerns of an individual in possession of a firearm create a potential major officer safety issue. It is not safe to send a single officer to this type of call”. CRLED #1 explained, “Not only are these incidents a safety concern for the officers, but the entire campus community is at risk”. Safety is such a concern that the CRLED planned to establish protocol, at their respective institutions, which mandated a minimum of two officers responding to any call where a firearm was involved. CRLED #6 commented, “The reality of the situation is the offices with the resources to afford additional officers will do so. The smaller agencies will have to adjust and supplement with local agencies”.

CRLED #4 explained that in 2008 many campus police agencies went through a reduction in their personnel. “My agency lost nearly one-fourth of our officers due to the budget cuts. It was like this agency was penalized since we maintained a safe environment for our campus community”. CRLED #1 echoed the sentiments of CRLED

#4, “This agency lost officers because of budget restraints. Those officers were replaced by video cameras, which do not always tell the whole story and require an individual, who could be working in a capacity of service to our community”. CRLED #6 noted after losing personnel, instead of spending dollars on cameras, a few of the agencies sought Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) with local municipalities. The MOUs provided additional support to university police agencies as the agreement included personnel and equipment.

Five of the CRLED discussed the importance of increasing training requirements for not only their officers, but for their staff, primarily the dispatchers. CRLED #1 indicated the “the importance of having a good dispatcher who receives that initial phone call should not be understated. The information they obtain during the first few seconds of the call is critical to the response”. CRLED #6 explained the agency’s stance,

I am confident a request for additional officers will be denied. My approach will be to increase the pay for dispatchers. These individuals are often the lifeline between the person on the phone and my officers. It is important that we compensate these individuals for the work they are required to do.

Adequate Security Measures. This term, adequate security measures, is used in the Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act to define areas where security personnel and metal detectors are in place. The CRLED and the institutions they represent have a hard time justifying the use of such means. “According to the new law, armed police officers with metal detectors are required at every public entrance to a facility, in order to comply with the adequate security measures” (CRLED #2). The CRLED all agreed the

cost to retrofit buildings with permanent adequate security measures would be too burdensome for institutions to manage.

The new law allows institutions to designate locations for use with temporary adequate security measures. “Many institutions have designated events with more than 5,000 in attendance as opportunities to deploy the adequate security measures. For the larger universities, this means at football and basketball games, as well as certain other events on campus” (CRLED #4).

Three of the CRLED reported athletic departments have decided to purchase magnetometers and other metal detecting security devices. In addition, athletics will employ either university police officers, or officers from local agencies to comply with the law and prohibit concealed firearms at sporting events. Emotionally charged events such as athletic events are not good venues to have people with access to firearms. “If a firearm is accidentally discharged at a venue where 10,000 or more people are located, the potential for serious bodily harm is great. That’s making the assumption no one was killed” (CRLED #6).

The CRLED understood the inception of adequate security measures would be costly. “In a time where budgets are being trimmed, implementing adequate security measures would be counter-intuitive and is just not feasible. This is not a fee which can be passed on to students, it is just too great” (CRLED #6). CRLED #6 could see a situation in the future where ‘security fees’ become part of the overall university fee structure. “I know there are campuses which have implemented safety/security fees. This is just not a concept which has caught on here” (CRLED #6). The CRLED would

prefer to have the funding to add additional officers for patrol. “I would prefer to have those officers be able to interact with the public, not stationed at a door” (CRLED #2).

Firearms and Other Concerns are Threats to Campus Safety

A second prominent theme discussed among CRLED was the perception and reality of crime on campus. The CRLED described perceptions about campus safety prior to the lawful presence of guns on campus. Participants unanimously boasted about how safe their respective campuses have been. CRLED #3 explained, “We are no different than any other place. Crime occurs in our community, but relatively speaking, the crime is low when compared to the areas surrounding my campus”. CRLED #3 pointed out that for many of the campuses there are high crime numbers, “...crimes ...classified as property crimes...[and there are a few] violent [personal] crimes on campus”. CRLED #4 noted, “Our campus has been recognized as a pretty safe campus. We have not had any major issues other than those incidents that a normal campus would go through”. Each of the CRLED had examples to support the idea of their campus as a safe place.

The greatest threat to campus safety. In the opinion of the collective CRLED group, firearms will not be the greatest threat to campus safety after implementation of the law July 1, 2017. The CRLED believed the greatest threat continues to be the use and abuse of alcohol by students who are not of legal consumption age. CRLED #3 explained, “The biggest safety concern will not be the presence of guns on campus. Rather, my agency will always fight alcohol abuse until some type of reform is created”. CRLED #3 attributed problems related to alcohol often arise from easily obtained fake ID

cards. “Each year, we find multiple students in possession of fake IDs. Many of them report buying the IDs from websites” (CRLED #3).

While the consumption of alcohol by underage students is illegal, this is not the only concern for members of the CRLED. “Excessive consumption of alcohol tends to lead to more abhorrent behaviors” (CRLED #6). “My agency has found alcohol to be a factor in many of the reported rapes which have occurred to members of our university community” (CRLED #3). According to CRLED #3, “The alcohol culture of America is one of the main reasons why alcohol is a threat. Students see their parents drink in social settings which encourages the same behavior from the students”.

One other threat created by the consumption of alcohol is students, regardless of their age, who consume alcohol then decide they are not too impaired to drive. Programs such as Safe Ride are available in many of the communities where Regents institutions are located. CRLED #1 stated, “Nationally, drunk driving accidents are on the decline. Students appear to be using Safe Ride programs and designated drivers more regularly”. CRLED #6 reported, “During a previous semester our Safe Ride Program provided transportation to more than 1,000 students. This is an important service offered to the students of this University”.

As a whole the CRLED appreciated the efforts of their on-campus counterparts such as housing and wellness/prevention. CRLED #2 explained, “Even if those organizations reach one student, it is one more person who has the ability to make a difference. One more person to join us in the fight to end the illegal consumption of alcohol”. CRLED #6 noted, “I am happy when one of these groups requests assistance

from our office for the purpose of education and prevention. It is a positive sign when the students take the initiative”.

The CRLED were also excited to have support from local and state agencies in the fight against alcohol abuse. Agencies such as the Kansas Traffic Resource Safety Office (KTRSO) and Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC) partner with Regents schools to conduct education and enforcement operations. CRLED #6 expressed, “The University and the community support the efforts of these state agencies to create a safe environment for our students. There may be upset students early in the process, but when it comes to lives saved, I’m a firm believer”.

According to CRLED the conversation among administrators related to threats to campus safety have increased. CRLED #2 reported mandatory representation by a staff member from university police at weekly meetings with administrators on how the new law may change campus culture. “It has been nice to partake in discussions with my administration about the threats to campus safety. Their engagement has been wonderful” (CRLED #2). “The whole issue of conceal and carry has made administrators around the state more aware of the potential threats. We need to make sure these threats do not impact the learning process for our students” (CRLED #6).

The Impact of Firearms on Campus Crime. The CRLED agreed the impact of concealed firearms will have little to no impact on the overall campus community. CRLED #1 indicated concealed firearms will have no impact on the crime statistics especially after the newness wears off. CRLED #5 stated, “Concealed firearms will not negatively impact the amount of crime we experience on campus”.

The rationale members of the CRLED used to come to this conclusion was provided by campus police chiefs in various states. “Other states have had this in place for years, this is nothing new. Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming have had permitted concealed weapons on campus for years” (CRLED #4). “I spoke to chiefs at universities in Colorado, police chief to police chief. They reported this to be a non-issue related to an increase (or decrease) in crime on campus” (CRLED #3). CRLED #3 commented the investigation into trends in others states found no “offensive or defensive” use of concealed weapons. Most of what was experienced by other states was loss of property. Examples included a gun left in a class or a loaded magazine [a cartridge which inserts into a firearm and holds the bullets] found on the ground.

Participants acknowledged concealed firearms could easily have an impact on campus crime if the weapon is misused. CRLED #3 noted there were “plenty of items in the office, which if misused would increase crime on campus”. Generally, the CRLED indicated firearms and various other items, when properly utilized benefit our society. The problem occurs when these items, including firearms, are misused or abused. The misuse and abuse tend to be what creates problems.

The Concerns Expressed by Campus Constituents Are Similar

The third emergent theme centered on the perceptions of various campus constituency groups. Those groups consisted of students, faculty and staff, administrators, and police. The perceptions of each group had been part of studies conducted by the Docking Institute of Public Affairs (2015, 2016). The CRLED reported various interactions with members of the groups studied by the Docking Institute of Public Affairs. Therefore, participants were asked questions related to their

understanding of where the constituency groups stood on the topic of concealed firearms on campus.

Students. The perceptions of students as noted by members of the CRLED are no different than what was reported by the Docking Institute of Public Affairs. CRLED #5 stated, “The Docking Institute...probably gives you a better idea of the general feeling”. Other members of the CRLED agreed the work completed by the Docking Institute of Public Affairs offered the best perspective on the entire student population within the campus community.

CRLED member #5 believed students prior to their attendance at campus forums had already selected their individual perspective on the topic. “The people who attended campus forums were typically students with an interest in the right to carry. We understand there is a silent majority who displayed apathy toward the idea of concealed firearms on campus” (CRLED #5). On the topic of students who had selected a position, CRLED #2 stated, “Those who are against it are pretty vehemently against it, but those who are for it are fairly strong”.

As a whole, the CRLED agreed many of the students on their respective campuses denounced the idea of concealed weapons on campus. It was reported by multiple participants that the population of out of state students had begun to decline in recent years because of the concerns about guns on campus. According to CRLED #2, the focus of students should not be on who has the gun. Rather, the focus should be on achieving the best education possible. CRLED #2 thought the number of students in opposition to the law was nearly 90% on campus. This number was much higher than the aggregated number, 55%, published by the

Docking Institute of Public Affairs (2015). As noted by CRLED #4, “Students across the Regents system do not feel safe knowing the person next to them is carrying a gun”. “In my interactions with students on this campus, it is clear their desire is to keep the current exemption in place and not allow weapons on this campus” (CRLED #6).

Faculty and Staff. In a similar manner, the CRLED were asked about their perspective on the opinions of faculty and staff on their campus. Much of the perspective gained came from CRLED interactions with faculty and staff in meetings, casual conversation, and various other work related activities.

The perspective CRLED had about the opinions of faculty and staff were consistent with what they reported for the students. CRLED #4 explained, “Faculty [and staff] are really against guns on campus”. To explain the position in more detail, CRLED #4 reported being aware of employees who chose to retire out of fear of guns on campus. Additionally, CRLED #4 described instances where employees had declined position appointments due to concerns about violence on campus related to the presence of firearms.

During the interview with CRLED #3, the discussion moved toward a theoretical employee of the institution who had worked more than 25 years. This person always had an interest in firearms. By law, if this individual decided to conceal a firearm, there would be no way to prohibit this decision. CRLED #3 noted faculty members according to the law are not allowed to ask if an individual is carrying a concealed weapon. This will force faculty members to relinquish control of who might be in possession of a concealed firearm. In their classes, “Professors

and educational folks like the ability to control their respective environments. With respect to controlling who has firearms in a classroom, faculty members cannot ask” (CRLED #3).

CRLED #5 reported a significant amount of panic and fear as faculty and staff prepare for lawful possession of firearms on campus. This was supported by comments made by CRLED #2: “F. E. A. R. is False, Emotions, Appearing, Real. Our faculty [and staff] are facing an irrational FEAR of guns on campus. This is irrational because none have been on campuses where guns were allowed and something bad happened”. This position was confirmed by CRLED #6, “Much of what people know about guns on campus is born out of FEAR of the unknown. I understand those fears and where they come from”.

One final area related to CRLED’ perceptions about faculty and staff views about concealed carry on campus was the interpretation of the law vs. university policy. Members of the CRLED agreed regardless of the information previously provided to employees, the law and the policy were enforced differently, even though they were essentially the same. “We created our policy so that it would in no way conflict with the law” (CRLED #3). CRLED #5 clarified the law when the comment was made, “There are no criminal consequences associated with this crime [concealed weapon on campus]. They were removed from the law just before the legislature made it a law”.

CRLED #6 provided a simplified explanation of how the law works on campus. A person cannot be arrested for a violation of the Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act. The arrest will be because that individual failed to comply

with the law and was asked to leave. If that person did not leave when told to by law enforcement the next step would be an arrest for trespassing. Policy violations, which do not turn into law violations, are to be reported to the appropriate university office for potential administrative action.

“As I speak with people from various offices on campus, they see our [campus law enforcement] role as the policy enforcers, but in reality, our jobs are much different. We enforce state statute” (CRLED #6). CRLED #2 added, “A violation of university policy does not constitute grounds for an arrest. Our role is to support University Policy, while making sure the laws of the state are not violated”.

Administrators. The CRLED also shared their perceptions about the views of university administrators (i.e. those with the title of Associate Vice-President, Vice-President, Provost, or President) toward concealed carry on campus and the impact this may have on campus safety. It was the perception of the CRLED that respective administrators were extremely concerned about campus safety, but maintaining perspective and promoting each University’s Mission and Vision. CRLED #4 expressed, “The University Administration are 100% against guns on campus. This comes from the President all the way down. The opinion seems to be since we have not had any incidents students should not have to carry firearms”.

The CRLED acknowledged the challenges associated with being a university administrator. “Higher education administrators are really interested in collaborative efforts between the university and community” (CRLED #1). The CRLED have accepted the innovative nature of the university setting. “My job is to maintain the safety of this campus. My administrators have a job to do, and so do I” (CRLED #2).

Residence Hall Staff. Residence hall staff were another important group discussed by members of the CRLED. As explained by CRLED #6, the residence hall staff play a similar role in housing as law enforcement does in the public.

“Housing staff are like cops in they are often the people in housing who can either ruin the day [enforcement of unpopular policies] or brighten someone’s day [support a resident during a tough time]” (CRLED #6).

The CRLED indicated, “Residence hall staff are not in favor of guns in the residence halls” (CRLED #4). CRLED #4 noted the chaotic nature of residence halls as a reason for the prohibition of guns. “A typical residence hall floor is occupied by 25-30 residents with one student staff member, [who is also] a professional staff member, and is a leader within the residence hall while navigating the complexities of life as a college student” (CRLED #4). CRLED #1 added the potential abuse of alcoholic beverages can produce a “powder keg” type situation.

CRLED #2 indicated the potential for conflict in a residential hall setting as another reason guns should not be allowed on campus. “Roommate conflicts and other tensions associated with many people sharing the same space often cause tempers to flare” (CRLED #2). CRLED #2 noted “Housing staff have always been trained in de-escalation tactics. This takes on a whole new meaning when you introduce firearms into the equation”.

CRLED #4 noted several accommodations under review for the housing assignment process. The housing application was altered to inquire if the resident had a preference for living with a roommate who was 21. Another accommodation offered at limited institutions was the availability of lockboxes as a method to secure

a weapon when not in the owner's possession. "Housing has done their very best to offer a variety of options to accommodate as many of their residents as possible" (CRLED #4).

Campus Police Officers. Throughout the interviews, many of the CRLED shared their own perspective. The participants indicated a strong support of the second amendment rights of everyone. "Let me be clear, the Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors support the second amendment and the rights afforded because of it" (CRLED #3). CRLED #4 stated, "We are not opposed to the Second Amendment".

The 2013 Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act removed the mandatory training requirement for any non-law enforcement officer wishing to lawfully conceal a firearm. "I am even more concerned now that there are no required training hours than [compared to] when people received at least eight hours of training" (CRLED #2). CRLED #4 showed support for mandatory training hours, "It is our belief that those individuals who plan to lawfully conceal and carry should be forced to pass a firearms basic skills training course".

CRLED #6 indicated concern for the 'lack of acceptance' displayed by the majority of citizens. "Members of the CRLED opposed the legislation when it was first introduced and still oppose it today" (CRLED #6). Instead of time spent developing methods to circumvent the law, CRLED have accepted the law and worked toward the successful implementation effective July 1, 2017.

There is a Need for Training to Promote an Understanding of the Mental Aspects of Firearms

The fourth and final emergent theme was the mental aspect related to the possession of a firearm. The mental preparation and ability to fully understand the responsibility of carrying a firearm was iterated multiple times in the interviews with CRLED. No subthemes were identified within this emergent theme.

CRLED who addressed this theme discussed the lack of understanding of both the liability and responsibility associated with firearms. CRLED #2 indicated some people possess a 'John Wayne' complex. This complex is characterized by a person who thinks concealed carry happens like it does in the movies. "People think they will conceal their weapon and when the time comes, they will eliminate the threat. There is something about that moment your gun is drawn and you squeeze the trigger with your sights on a living human being" (CRLED #2). Participants pointed out that people underestimate the difficulty of concealing a firearm. "It is really difficult to completely conceal a firearm, especially if you are not used to it. Imagine trying to hide a paper weight on your hip all day, that's what carrying concealed is like" (CRLED #2).

Among the CRLED there is disagreement on concealment. Several members think the firearm has to be completely concealed all of the time. This level of concealment includes not even an imprint of the firearm is displayed. "The concealment of a firearm is more difficult than people expect. Concealment means the weapon is not to be seen" (CRLED #1). CRLED #4 has less concern about a holstered weapon as a violation of the policy. "I am more concerned about what the person with the gun is doing with it. An accidental display of the weapon does not concern me" (CRLED #6).

CRLED #4 commented on the stress level and proficiency associated with shooting a gun. “The average citizen does not understand the stress response experienced when shooting at someone who is shooting back at you. I know of officers who failed to respond because of the enormous amount of stress” (CRLED #4). The mental preparation needed to accurately perform without freezing is a matter of life or death. CRLED #4 acknowledged shooting under stress is much different than “shooting at paper targets”.

CRLED #6 commented on the importance of being mentally prepared to act. It was noted that in the shooting incident where former Congresswoman Gabby Giffords was wounded, there were at least two individuals with concealed weapons who failed to act. “I cannot imagine being one of the two people with guns who failed to act [in the Gabby Giffords incident] and another person lost their life. That’s not something I want to experience” (CRLED #6).

The mental aspect has such life altering ramifications, many of the CRLED do not carry when they are off duty. “I do not believe that our society has degraded to the point that I feel the need to always have a firearm in my possession” (CRLED #2). CRLED #3 echoed similar thoughts, “In all of my years as a law enforcement officer there has only been one time where I needed something off my duty belt when I wasn’t working. That item was not my gun, it was a set of handcuffs”. When this information was provided to CRLED #4 about the lack of desire to carry off duty, the response was simple, “That should speak volumes to those ‘John Wayne’ types who believe it is their mission to save the world”.

Analysis of University Weapons Policies

The final aspect of research conducted was the completion of an analysis of each institutions weapons policy. The purpose of the analysis was to determine where both similarities and differences existed within the individual policies. Additionally, the researcher sought to know the strategies planned for implementation.

The researcher was surprised to find out the basic tenets of policy adopted at all public universities in Kansas was originally drafted by Emporia State University (ESU). Other universities used the work completed by ESU as a template from which to draft their own policy. Similarities such as language defining weapons, acceptable retention devices, restrictions and adequate security measures were taken directly from state statute. The major differences between the policies was what occurs once the original threat has been resolved, and who is responsible, or what document is utilized, to address policy violations.

Where applicable, language was altered to reflect campus locations and positions. Table 1 offers a glimpse of each university's policy in terms of who is responsible for resolving the violation by constituent group. The table examined how each university was to address policy violations after the initial police investigation was completed. For example, the table indicated students and faculty at each institution were administered sanctions from different areas within the university structure and may have utilized different university documents. When asked about the titles University Police and Police & Safety CRLED #6 replied "Both have the same functions on campus. Police & Safety utilized non-commissioned officers to assist with daily functions, whereas University Police do not". The CRLED indicated the names Behavior Intervention and Threat

Assessment Team, Threat Management Team, and Critical Incident Response Team performed the same functions on each campus, they just had different names based on campus location.

Table 1

Policy Violation Reporting

Institution	Restricts Possession	Committed Violation			
		Student	Faculty	Staff	Community
ESU	President, Police & Safety	VP for Student Affairs	Provost/VP for Academic Affairs	Athletic Director, VP for Admin. and Finance, President	Police & Safety
FHSU	President, University Police	VP for Student Affairs	Human Resources	Human Resources	University Police
KSU	President, University Police, Threat Management Team, Critical Incident Response Team	University Code of Conduct	University Code of Conduct	University Code of Conduct	University Police
KU	University Police	University Code of Conduct	University Code of Conduct	University Code of Conduct	University Police
PSU	President, University Police	Behavior Intervention and Threat Assessment Team	Behavior Intervention and Threat Assessment Team	Behavior Intervention and Threat Assessment Team	University Police
WSU	University Police	Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards	Human Resources	Human Resources	University Police

Note. ESU = Emporia State University, FHSU = Fort Hays State University, KSU = Kansas State University, KU = Kansas University, PSU = Pittsburg State University, WSU = Wichita State University.

Summary

This study was designed to determine the perceptions of the Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors about campus safety and the presence of concealed firearms prior to and in accordance with the Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act. The data provided by the CRLED were analyzed to determine themes in perceptions of campus safety related to the presence of lawfully concealed firearms. In addition, similarities and differences in adopted weapons policies were determined. Chapter 5 provides an interpretation of the data results and a discussion of implications for action, and recommendations for future research.

Chapter 5

Interpretation and Recommendations

The purpose of this qualitative study was to determine Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors', those in charge of campus security at Kansas public universities, perceptions of campus safety related to the 2013 Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act which legalized concealed firearms on university campuses in Kansas. The researcher further sought to understand perceptions about campus safety once concealed weapons are allowed on public university campuses beginning July 1, 2017. The researcher also examined to what extent members of the Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors (CRLED) have been involved in preparing their respective campuses for the arrival of lawfully concealed weapons. A final purpose was to evaluate similarities and differences among the universities' weapons policies. Chapter 5 provides a study summary, including a review of the problem statement, the purpose of the study, research questions, methodology, and major findings. This chapter also relates the findings of the study to current literature and concludes with a discussion of implications for action, recommendation for future research, and concluding remarks.

Study Summary

Overview of the Problem. This study was designed to determine the perceptions of the Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors related to campus safety prior to, and in anticipation of, the presence of concealed firearms in accordance with the Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act. An overview of the problem, purpose statement and research questions, review of the methodology, and major findings are summarized in this section.

The Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act (2013) legalized concealed carry of firearms at public universities in Kansas beginning July 1, 2017. The lack of mass shooting incidents on Kansas 4-year public institution campuses lends itself to the idea that historically, universities have always been thought of as places relatively safe from gun violence. This safe environment is critical for the education process to take place. Thus, the actions taken by Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors (CRLED) as they design campus plans related to concealed firearms may have an impact on the manner in which learning takes place for students.

The CRLED, among others, recognized the Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act (2013) created a tremendous cost burden for all institutions, especially when budgets were cut. In lieu of the enormous price tag associated with equipping every entrance with metal detectors and armed personnel, universities (in Kansas and Texas) decided to allow the exemption to expire and have prepared for the presence of firearms on campus (Arant, 2017).

This issue has supporters on both sides. Supporters of concealed carry validated their stance with the argument that not allowing citizens to carry weapons makes everyone vulnerable to an attack, thus creating a void in public safety (Lott, 1998). While this may make those individuals who desire to possess a firearm feel safer, there is no guarantee people without firearms feel safer, knowing there may possibly be others with concealed firearms in the room (Sprague, 2008). A 2015 study conducted by the Docketing Institute of Public Affairs provided evidence stating many Kansas public university students and employees were in agreement that firearms should be prohibited from college campuses.

While the debate between whether or not campuses are safer with the presence of firearms on campus continues, one fact remains the same. Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors are expected to ensure campuses are safe even with the presence of more guns. The feeling of safety is critical to the success of students and patrons at the university.

Current literature provides information related to the perspectives of students, faculty, and even university presidents regarding the concealment of firearms on campus. Few studies have addressed the safety concerns of university police chiefs. At the time of this study, there had been no research focusing on CRLED perceptions of campus safety related to concealed firearms.

Purpose Statement and Research Questions. The purpose of this qualitative study was to determine CRLED perceptions of campus safety related to the lawful possession of concealed firearms on state university campuses in Kansas prior to implementation of the Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act. The researcher also sought to understand perceptions about campus safety once concealed weapons are allowed on public university campuses and examined to what extent members of the Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors were involved in preparation for concealed carry at their respective campuses. Finally, the researcher evaluated university weapons policies to find areas of similarities and differences.

Review of the Methodology. Upon receipt of the approved Baker University IRB form on March 3, 2017, the researcher emailed members of the CRLED the study overview including purpose and significance statements, interview questions, the researcher's vitae, and a consent form. After 3-5 days, the researcher contacted each

member and established a meeting time, and location for the interview. Each participant completed a consent form prior to the interview which lasted approximately sixty minutes. The interviews were recorded and included a combination of demographic and open-ended questions as well as a discussion related to each university's weapons policy. Once all interviews were completed, a certified court stenographer transcribed each audio recording. The Dedoose software was used to analyze interview transcriptions for an analysis to determine central themes. All original recordings and original transcripts were maintained in a secure location for five years.

The weapons policies from each of the six public state universities in Kansas were collected and analyzed to determine similarities and differences. Policies tenets and reporting structures were reviewed. Lastly, the plan for policy implementation by each university was examined.

Major Findings. Analysis of data collected from the interviews identified four emerging themes: (a) The presence of firearms on campus will impact the university; (b) firearms and other concerns are threats to campus safety; (c) the concerns expressed by campus constituents are similar; (d) there is a need for training to promote an understanding of the mental aspects of firearms. The participants indicated a strong belief in the prohibition of firearms on campus, especially by those without the proper training and understanding of firearms. The participants believed firearms currently exist on campus even though by policy they are banned. Participants reported major constituency groups (i.e. students, faculty and staff, administration, residence hall staff, and campus police) favored an extension of the current exemption which prohibits concealed firearms on campus. Each participant expressed concern for the mental aspects related to the

possession of a firearm. Mental aspects included the use of a firearm under high stress and understanding the personal limitations, responsibility, and liability of utilization of a gun. Participants reported strong support for the second amendment, but just not on campus and definitely not without formal training. Finally, participants believed the greatest threat to campus safety is alcohol rather than guns.

Findings Related to the Literature

A review of the literature was conducted to understand the available research related to perceptions of campus safety and the presence of concealed weapons on university campuses. The available literature related to how the presence of firearms impacted the numbers of crimes, injuries, and suicides was explored. The current study added to the research related to perceived threats to campus safety, perceptions of constituency groups about campus safety about concealed carry, and the costs associated with the prohibitions of firearms.

More Guns, More Crime, Injury, and Suicide. Duke et. al (2005) found evidence the availability of guns has a direct correlation related to the impact on deaths or injuries from firearm violence. The current study did not support this finding. The participants did not indicate a concern about the potential for increased firearm violence. CRLED #3 relied on data received from personal communications and studies in states like Colorado, Wyoming, and Texas which indicated no increase in violent crimes since conceal and carry has been implemented in university settings.

The most noted concerns in the literature related to weapons safety were accidental discharges, increased rates of suicide, and increased rates of fatal suicide (Thompson, Price, Dake, & Teeple, 2013). Events such as accidental discharges were

found to be extremely rare according to Karger et al. (2002). Even though the CRLED were concerned about an increase in accidental discharges, they indicated these events are so rare that it would not impact campus safety.

Threats to Campus Safety. A campus which addresses both internal and external threats to the community, while assisting students with completion of their goals and dreams, is a safe campus (Rund 2002). The current research reinforced Rund's opinion of safety. Participants indicated their campuses were safe places. The researcher concluded the CRLED were not concerned about campus safety being impacted once the law which allows concealed firearms on campus takes effect. There will likely be several students who will conceal and carry, but the CRLED anticipated those numbers are likely to decline after the law has been in effect. This conclusion offers support to the research findings from Bouffard et al. (2011) and Smith (2003) which indicated students are less likely to conceal and carry firearms once they have been allowed to do so. Participants of this study pointed to the difficulty in maintaining concealment of the weapon. They also indicated the weight of the weapon often makes wearing the weapon uncomfortable.

Universities must utilize forward thinking to be prepared for and be aware of potential threats (Sheffield et al., 2016). The CRLED expressed eagerness to have members of the university community take a proactive approach to campus safety. Several of the CRLED indicated more discussions related to campus safety need to occur on campuses. This finding supported Lenhardt (2007) who recommended university administrators remain vigilant in prevention and mitigation strategies to protect the university community. As reported by the CRLED, this is in stark contrast to previous

points in their careers when the perception of administrators appeared to be a ‘head in the sand’ approach.

Disapproval by faculty, staff, and students. Thompson, Price, Dake, & Teeple, (2013) found the addition of concealed firearms led to faculty, staff, and students all reporting they felt less safe. The Docking Institute of Public Affairs (2016, 2015) also found faculty, staff, and students were not comfortable in a classroom where students could possibly have a concealed firearm in their possession. Bennet et al. (2012) noted 78% of faculty members at universities in Georgia opposed legislation which permitted the legal possession of concealed firearms. The perceptions of the CRLED supported these views and findings. The CRLED indicated campus constituents (students, faculty, and staff) disapproved of concealed firearms on campus.

Bouffard et al. (2011) noted policy changes which allowed the possession of concealed firearms on campus failed to increase student perceptions of safety. The CRLED agreed many of the students on their respective campuses denounced the idea of concealed weapons on campus. It was reported by multiple CRLED the population of out of state students had begun to decline in recent years because of the concerns about guns on campus. Several participants noted students should not have to focus on who is carrying a firearm; rather the focus should be on the process of learning.

Costs Associated with Prohibition of Firearms. The current research supported literature offered by the Docking Institute of Public Affairs (2015) which indicated the majority of students were not interested in paying additional fees associated with installation of adequate security measures on state university campuses. According to the

Docking Institute of Public Affairs, students were supportive of the university allocating resources to meet the adequate security measures requirement. According to the CRLED in a time when budgets are being cut, the feasibility of the university paying the cost of these adequate security measures is not likely to happen.

Conclusions

Findings from the current research represented perceptions of the Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors' about campus safety and the implementation of the Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act of 2013. Four major themes were identified as a result of interviews with CRLED. In addition, a review of university weapons policies indicated that with few exceptions, the majority of the policies were similar. The CRLED did not anticipate concealed firearms having a tremendous impact on campus safety. They agreed the greatest threat to campus safety is alcohol abuse by both minors, and those who are of age, rather than firearms. Additionally, issues surrounding accidental discharges and the use of guns to self-harm were found to be concerns of the CRLED. The participants also acknowledged a need for increased funding for additional training, equipment, and personnel to adequately prepare for the presence of lawfully concealed firearms on campus. The current study was designed to add to existing research which has studied perceptions of varied university constituents related to the impact concealed firearms have on the university community. This study examined perceptions of chief law enforcement officers at six public universities in Kansas about current, as well as anticipated, campus safety once the Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act of 2013 allows concealed firearms on public higher education institutions in Kansas beginning July 1, 2017.

Implications for Action. The current study's findings present implications for students, parents of current and future students, employees, and patrons who utilize the services of Kansas public universities. Based on the fear and anxiety surrounding the implementation of this law, universities need to explore the potential to increase counseling services. Students, faculty and staff members might need additional support to cope with knowing concealed weapons are on campus.

Several of the universities have begun to implement individual trainings for the campus community. These trainings should be designed as an introduction toward lawfully concealing and carrying. Additionally, the training should emphasize the legal, ethical, and moral aspects of concealed weapons, as well as the mental preparations an individual accepts once the decision has been made to conceal and carry.

The participants in this study overwhelmingly agreed public universities in Kansas are safe and promote learning. The CRLED showed confidence in the university community to limit potential negative impacts of the new law. The CRLED indicated the need to have more conversations related to an individual's responsibility and liability associated with deciding to conceal and carry a firearm. Many of the participants expressed the desire to not have concealed firearms in the hands of students, employees, or patrons who have not received formal training. Universities should consider developing training opportunities that will prepare individuals who want to participate in concealed carry with appropriate knowledge.

Participants explained discussions and trainings had already begun by March 2017. These educational sessions have been designed to increase university constituent understanding about the rights and responsibilities associated with the new law.

Participants also noted the existence of information on university websites. Educational sessions should be continued and website information should be maintained.

Finally, participants acknowledged the importance of sharing university policy with campus constituents. The CRLED noted that all of the Regents universities in Kansas had to adopt policy compliant with the state law and approved by the Kansas Board of Regents. Members indicated the policies which take effect on July 1, 2017 are not designed to supersede state law. It will be important for universities to share institutional policy with constituents and provide details of the tenets of the state law.

Recommendations for Future Research. The current study findings suggested additional opportunities for future research. This study was limited to CRLED at Kansas 4-year public universities. Future studies could include how the law affects individuals responsible for campus safety at institutions not directly affiliated with the state universities (e.g., community colleges, private institutions, technical colleges, and for-profit higher education institutions).

Participants in this study included only those with law enforcement credentials. Future studies could focus on perceptions of campus safety from the perspective of university presidents, residence hall directors, deans of students, or others who interact directly with students. The perspectives of key community leaders in cities where public universities are located could also be interviewed about the impact concealed carry on university campuses has on views of campus safety from ‘town-gown’ perspective. The current study could also be expanded to determine perceptions of varied constituent based on geographic regions instead of within one state.

The current study focused on the perception of the CRLED prior to implementation of the Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act (2013). Future research could examine the perception of the CRLED after implementation. Another option for additional research would be to examine the perception of campus safety and the law after a critical incident has occurred on a campus involving an active shooter.

Concluding Remarks. The perceptions of the CRLED indicated public university campuses in Kansas were safe places where property crimes and minimal violent crimes existed. Participants indicated the greatest threat to campus safety after the Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act went into effect would remain the abuse of alcohol. The CRLED expected the lawful possession of firearms on university campuses to not impact campus safety. An analysis of university weapons policies found similarities related to weapons definitions, retention devices, and use of adequate security measures. Differences with university weapons policies were found in how policy violations were addressed within the university structure by constituency groups.

The CRLED noted university campuses were not the place for concealed firearms by individuals without formal training. The participants described the importance of those who plan to conceal and carry to know and understand their rights and responsibilities afforded by both the law and the institutional policy. Findings from interviews conducted in this study added to what is known about the impact of conceal and carry on campus safety. The current study's findings present implications for all university constituency groups to better prepare themselves for having concealed weapons on campus.

References

- Allen Community College. (2016). *Vision/Mission*. Retrieved Jan. 9, 2016
(<http://www.allencc.edu/index.php/about-allen/visionmission>)
- Arant, M. (2017). Concealed campus carry laws may mean big costs for public universities. The Council of State Governments. Retrieved from
http://www.csg.org/pubs/capitolideas/enews/cs20_1.aspx
- Arrigo, B. A., & Acheson, A. (2016). Concealed carry bans and the American college campus: A law, social sciences, and policy perspective. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 19(1), 120-141.
- Baker, K., & Boland, K. (2011). Assessing safety: A campus-wide initiative. *College Student Journal*, 45(4) 683-699.
- Basit, T. (2003). Manual or electronic? The role of coding in qualitative data analysis. *Educational Research*, 45(2), 143-154. doi 10.1080/0013188032000133548
- Bennett, K., Kraft, J., & Grubb, D. (2011). University faculty attitudes towards guns on campus. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 23(3), 336-355.
doi:10.1080/10511253.2011.590515
- Bordner, D. C., & Petersen, D. M. (1983). *Campus policing: The nature of university police work*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Boudreau, A., & Zamost, S. (2008, February 20). *Girlfriend: Shooter was taking cocktail of 3 drugs*. Retrieved from http://www.cnn.com/2008/CRIME/02/20/shooter.girlfriend/index.html?eref=rss_us

- Bouffard, J. A., Nobles, M. R., Wells, W., & Cavanaugh, M. R. (2011). How many more guns? Estimating the effect of allowing licensed concealed handguns on a college campus. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 27(2), 316-343
- Cavanaugh, M. R., Bouffard, J. A., Wells, W., & Nobles, M. R. (2012). Student attitudes toward concealed handguns on campus at 2 universities. *American Journal of Public Health*, 102(12), 2245-2247.
- Charles, M. T. (2000). Accidental shooting: An analysis. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 8(3), 151-160.
- Cosco, T. D., & King, J. H. (2015). Americans shooting themselves in the foot: The epidemiology of podiatric self-inflicted gunshot wounds in the United States. *Medical Journal of Australia*, 203(11), 458-461.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- District of Columbia v. Heller, 554 U.S. 570. (2008)
- Docking Institute of Public Affairs. (2015). *Student gun policy opinion survey*. Retrieved from <http://www.fhsustudents.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/Regents-Student-Gun-Survey-2015.pdf>
- Docking Institute of Public Affairs. (2016). *Campus employees' weapons survey*. Retrieved from [https://www.fhsu.edu/uploadedFiles/executive/docking/Regents%20FacultyStaff%20Gun%20Survey%202015%20\(2\).pdf](https://www.fhsu.edu/uploadedFiles/executive/docking/Regents%20FacultyStaff%20Gun%20Survey%202015%20(2).pdf)
- Duke, N., Resnick, M. D., & Borowsky, I. W. (2005). Adolescent firearm violence: Position paper of the Society for Adolescent Medicine. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 37(2), 171-174.

- Eaves, S., D., Shoemaker, M., A., & Griego, A., W. (2016). Students' opinions about concealed firearms on university campuses. In A. B. Commissiong, J. D. Rausch Jr, & X. Li (Eds.), *Politics Bureaucracy and Justice*, (pp. 16-26).
- Gehrand, K. A. (2008). Higher education policing: The new millennium. In *IACLEA: The first 50 years*, by the 50th Anniversary Publication Sub-committee (Eds.), pp. 67-76. Retrieved from the International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators website: http://www.iaclea.org/visitors/PDFs/IACLEA-ContentPages_67-126.pdf
- Gjertsen, F., Leenaars, A., & Vollrath, M. E. (2013). Mixed impact of firearms restrictions on fatal firearm injuries in males: a national observational study. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 11(1), 487-506.
- Grossman, D. C., Reay, D. T., & Baker, S. A. (1999). Self-inflicted and unintentional firearm injuries among children and adolescents: The source of the firearm. *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine*, 153(8), 875-878.
- Hemenway, D., Azrael, D., & Miller, M. (2001). National attitudes concerning gun carrying in the United States. *Injury Prevention*, 7(4), 282-285.
- Hutchinson, L. (2003, April 12). ABC of learning and teaching: Educational environment. *BMJ*, 326. Retrieved from <http://admin.faculty.londondeanery.ac.uk/guide-for-facilitators/guide-for-facilitators/files/ABC%20of%20Learning%20and%20Teaching.pdf>

- Ivy, J. (2001). Higher education institution image: A correspondence analysis approach. *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 15(6), 276-282. Retrieved from <http://library.pittstate.edu:2048/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/229204727?accountid=13211>
- Jackson, P. I. (1992). Minority group threat, social context, and policing. In A. E. Liska (Ed.), *Social threat and social control*. New York, NY: Praeger Publication.
- Jang, H., Kang, J. H., Dierenfeldt, R., & Lindsteadt, G. (2015). Weapon possession among college students: A study from a midwestern university. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 59(11), 1239-1259.
- Johnson, M. (2013, July 19). University claims exemption from new concealed carry law. *The University Daily Kansan*. Retrieved from <http://www.kansan.com>
- Kalish, R., & Kimmel, M. (2010). Suicide by mass murder: Masculinity, aggrieved entitlement, and rampage school shootings. *Health Sociology Review*, 19(4), 451-464.
- Kansas Attorney General. (2016, June 15). Licensing programs [Concealed Carry]. Retrieved from <http://ag.ks.gov/licensing/concealed-carry>
- Kansas Attorney General. (2017). *Kansas personal and family protection act: Other prohibited places state, federal and tribal properties*. Retrieved February 5, 2017 from <http://ag.ks.gov/docs/default-source/documents/other-places-where-concealed-carry-may-not-be-allowed.pdf?sfvrsn=14>
- Kansas Board of Regents. (2016). *Meeting agenda: December 14, 2016*. Topeka, KS: Kansas Board of Regents.

- Kansas Legislature. (2017). *2015-2016 Legislative sessions*. Retrieved on February 5, 2017 from www.kslegislature.org/li_2016/b2015_2016/measures/sb45/
- Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act, Kansas Statutes Annotated §§ 75-7c01-7c27 (2006 & Supp. 2011, 2013)
- Karger, B., Billeb, E., & Koops, E. (2002). Accidental firearm fatalities. *International Journal of Legal Medicine*, 116(6), 350-353.
- Kimberlin, C.L., & Winterstein, A.G. (2008). Validity and reliability of measurement instruments used in research. *American Journal of Health-System Pharmacists*, 65(1), 2276–2284.
- Koelsch, L. E. (2013). Reconceptualizing the member check interview. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 12(1), 168-179.
- Kvale, S. (2006). Dominance through interviews and dialogues. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12, 480-500. doi: 10.1177/1077800406286235
- Langman, P. (2009). *Why kids kill: Inside the minds of school shooters*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.
- Langman, P. (2015). *School shooters: Understanding high school, college, and adult perpetrators*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Lankford, A. (2013). A comparative analysis of suicide terrorists and rampage, workplace, and school shooters in the United States from 1990 to 2010. *Homicide Studies*, 17(3), 255-274.
- Larkin, R. W. (2009). The columbine legacy rampage shootings as political acts. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 52(9), 1309-1326.
- Lenhardt, A. (2007). U.S. campuses still vulnerable. *Sheriff*, 59(5), 17-18.

- Lester, S. (1999). *An introduction to phenomenological research*. Retrieved from <https://www.rgs.org/NR/rdonlyres/F50603E0-41AF-4B15-9C84-BA7E4DE8CB4F/0/Seaweedphenomenologyresearch.pdf>
- Lott, J. (1998). *More guns, less crime*. Chicago, IL: University Press of Chicago.
- Lund, N. (1987). Second amendment, political liberty, and the right to self-preservation, *The Alabama Law Review*, 39, 103.
- Lunenburg, F. C., & Irby, B. J. (2008). *Writing a successful thesis or dissertation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Madfis, E., & Levin, J. (2013). School rampage in international perspective: The salience of cumulative strain theory. In Boeckler, N., Seeger, T., Sitzler, P., & Heitmeyer, W. (Eds.), *School shootings: International research, case studies, and concepts for prevention* (p.79-104). New York, NY: Springer
- Marks, D. F., & Yardley, L. (2004). *Research methods for clinical and health psychology*. London, England: SAGE Publications
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370-396. doi:10.1037/h0054346.
- McDonald v. City of Chicago, Illinois, 130S. Ct. 3020 (2010).
- Miller, M., Azrael, D., & Hemenway, D. (2002). Firearm availability and unintentional firearm deaths suicide, and homicide among 5-14 year olds. *Journal of Trauma and Acute Care Surgery*, 52(2), 267-275.
- Miyazaki, A. D., & Taylor, K. A. (2008). Researcher interaction biases and business ethics research: Respondent reactions to researcher characteristics. *Journal of Business Ethics* 81(4), 779-795.

- Morse, A., Sisneros, L., Perez, Z., & Sponsler, B. A. (2016). Guns on campus: The architecture and momentum of state policy action. Retrieved from NASPA website: <https://www.naspa.org/rpi/reports/guns-on-campus-the-architecture-and-momentum-of-state-policy-action>.
- Muschert, G. W. (2007). Research in school shootings. *Sociology Compass*, 1(1), 60-80.
- National Conference of State Legislatures. (2016). *Data security laws: State government*. Retrieved from: <http://www.ncsl.org/research/telecommunications-and-information-technology/data-security-laws-state-government.aspx>
- Newman, K., & Fox, C. (2009). Repeat tragedy: Rampage shootings in American high school and college settings, 2002-2008. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 52(9), 1286-1308.
- Painter, S. (2006, March 3). Handgun bill silences Sebelius. *The Wichita Eagle*. Retrieved from <http://freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/1597558/posts>
- Patrick, A. B. (2013). *Generation Y college students: Workplace motivation attitudes*. (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.(Order No. 3554846).
- Patten, R., Thomas, M. O., & Wada, J. C. (2013). Packing heat: Attitudes regarding concealed weapons on college campuses. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38(4), 551-569.
- Primm, E., Regoli, R. M., & Hewitt, J. D. (2009). Race, fear, and firearms: The roles of demographics and guilt assuagement in the creation of a political partition. *Journal of African American Studies*, 13(1), 63-73.

- Procon.org. (2017) Should adults have the right to carry a concealed handgun. Retrieved from: concealedguns.procon.org
- Rahman, M. H., & Nurullah, S. M. (2014). Motivational need hierarchy of employees in public and private commercial banks. *Central European Business Review*, 3(2), 44.
- Reddy, M., Borum, R., Berglund, J., Vossekuil, B., Fein, R., & Modzeleski, W. (2001). Evaluating risk for targeted violence in schools: Comparing risk assessment, threat assessment, and other approaches. *Psychology in the Schools*, 38(2), 157-172.
- Richmond, T. S., Schwab, C. W., & Branas, C. C. (2002). *Firearm availability and childhood death* [Editorial commentary on the article “Firearm availability and unintentional firearm deaths, suicide, and homicide among 5-14 year olds” by M. Miller, D. Azrael, and D. Hemenway]. *Journal of Trauma and Acute Care Surgery*, 52(2), 267-275. Retrieved from <http://journals.lww.com/jtrauma/pages/default.aspx>
- Rothschild, S. (2006, March 24). Concealed guns approved. *Lawrence Journal-World*. Retrieved from http://www2.ljworld.com/news/2006/mar/24/concealed_guns_approved/
- Rund, J. A. (2002). The changing context of campus safety. *New Directions for Student Services*, 2002(99), 3-10.
- Schwartz, A. J. (2006). College student suicide in the United States: 1990-1991 through 2003-2004. *Journal of American College Health*, 54(6), 341-352.

- Seidel, J., & Kelle, K. U. (1995). Different functions of coding in the analysis of data. In Kelle, K. U. (Ed.), *Computer aided qualitative data analysis: Theory, methods, and practice* (p. 106-117). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications
- Seo, D. C., Torabi, M. R., Sa, J., & Blair, E. H. (2012). Campus violence preparedness of US college campuses. *Security Journal*, 25(3), 199-211.
- Sheffield, J., Gregg, J., & Lee, J. (2016). A commentary regarding campus safety and security for institutions of higher education. *Allied Academies International Conference Academy of Educational Leadership Proceedings*, 21(1), 18-22.
Retrieved from <http://library.pittstate.edu:2048/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/1787911776?accountid=13211>
- Shepard, S. (2015, December 7). KU chancellor, distinguished professors state opposition. *Lawrence Journal-World*. Retrieved from <http://www2.ljworld.com/news/2015/dec/07/ku-chancellor-distinguished-professors-state-oppos/>
- Shon, P. C. H. (2012). “Asian really don’t do this”: On-scene offense characteristics of Asian American school shooters, 91–07. *Asian Journal of Criminology*, 7(3), 251-272.
- Shultz, J. M., Cohen, A. M., Muschert, G. W., & Flores de Apodaca, R. (2013). Fatal school shootings and the epidemiological context of firearm mortality in the United States. *Disaster Health*, 1(2), 84-101.
- Siegel, M., & Rothman, E. F. (2016). Firearm ownership and suicide rates among U. S. men and women, 1981–2013. *American Journal of Public Health*, 106(7), 1316-1322.

- Silverman, M. M., Meyer, P. M., Sloane, F., Raffel, M., & Pratt, D. M. (1997). The big ten student suicide study: A 10-year study of suicides on Midwestern university campuses. *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior*, 27(3), 285–303.
- Simon, M. K. (2011). Dissertation and scholarly research: Recipes for success [Excerpt]. Retrieved from <http://dissertationrecipes.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/04/AssumptionslimitationsdelimitationsX.pdf>
- Sloan, J. J., III, Lanier, M. M., & Beer, D. L. (2000). Policing the contemporary university campus: Challenging traditional organizational models. *Journal of Security Administration*, 23(1), 1.
- Smith, T. W. (2003). A seeded sample of concealed-carry permit holders. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 19(4), 441-445.
- Sprague, L. A. (2008, August 12). *Concealed carrying of firearms proposals on college campuses* (Position Paper). Retrieved from International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators website: http://www.iaclea.org/visitors/PDFs/ConcealedWeaponsStatement_Aug2008.pdf
- Stanford Geospatial Center & Stanford Libraries. (2016). *Stanford Mass Shootings in America, courtesy of the Stanford Geospatial Center and Stanford Libraries*. Retrieved from <https://library.stanford.edu/projects/mass-shootings-america>
- Stearns, C. (2009). *Should adults have the right to carry a concealed handgun? (Pro vs. Con)*. Retrieved from ProCon.org of Controversial Issues website: <http://concealedguns.procon.org/view.answers.php?questionID=001609>
- Stiglets, C. (2001). Unintentional injuries in the young adult male. *Journal of the American Academy of Nurse Practitioners*, 13(10), 450.

- Students for Concealed Carry. (2016, June 15). *FAQ [Do You Advocate Every Student and Teacher Carrying Handguns on Campus]*. Retrieved from <http://concealedcampus.org/faq/>
- Students for Gun Free Schools. (2016). *Why our campuses are safer without concealed handguns*. Retrieved from <http://www.studentsforgunfreeschools.org/SGFSWhyOurCampuses-Electronic.pdf>
- Sulkowski, M. L., & Lazarus, P. J. (2011). Contemporary responses to violent attacks on college campuses. *Journal of School Violence*, 10:4, 338-354.doi: 10.1080/15388220.2011.602601
- Tashakkori, A., & Creswell, J. W. (2007). Exploring the nature of research questions in mixed methods research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1, 207-211.
- Texas Senate Bill 11. (2015). Retrieved from <http://www.legis.state.tx.us/tlodocs/84R/billtext/pdf/SB00011F.pdf#navpanes=0>
- Thompson, A., Price, J. H., Dake, J., & Teeple, K. (2013). Faculty perceptions and practices regarding carrying concealed handguns on university campuses. *Journal of community health*, 38(2), 366-373.
- Thompson, A., Price, J. H., Dake, J. A., Teeple, K., Bassler, S., Khubchandani, J., ...Stratton, C. (2013). Student perceptions and practices regarding carrying concealed handguns on university campuses. *Journal of American College Health*, 61, 243-253.
- Thompson, A., Price, J. H., Mrdjenovich, A. J., & Khubchandani, J. (2009). Reducing firearm-related violence on college campuses – Police chiefs’ perceptions and practices. *Journal of American College Health*, 58(3), 247-254.

- Turner, D. W., III. (2010). Qualitative interview design: A practical guide for novice investigators. *The Qualitative Report*, 15(3), 754-760. Retrieved from: <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR15-3/qid.pdf>
- U. S. Constitution, Amendment II
- Vernick, J. S., & Teret, S. P. (1993) Firearms and health: The right to be armed with accurate information about the second amendment. *American Journal of Public Health*, 83:12, 1773-1777. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.83.12.1773
- Voelker, R. (1995). Taking aim at handgun violence. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 273(22), 1739-1740.
- Vossekuil, B., Fein, R. A., Reddy, M., Borum, R., & Modzeleski, W. (2002). *The final report and findings of the Safe School Initiative*. Washington, DC.
- Wada, J. C. (2007). *Betwixt and between: The perceived legitimacy of campus police*. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (Order No. 3277070). <http://library.pittstate.edu:2048/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/304793225?accountid=13211>
- Williams, M. R. (2015, December 8). University of Kansas is preparing for guns. *The Kansas City Star*. Retrieved from <http://www.kansascity.com/news/politics-government/article48704335.html>
- Wilson, C. P., & Wilson, S. A. (2011). Perceived roles of campus law enforcement: A cognitive review of attitudes and beliefs of campus constituents. *Professional Issues in Criminal Justice*, 6(1), 29-40.

Appendices

Appendix A: University Weapons Policies

EMPORIA STATE UNIVERSITY

3Z. POLICY ON WEAPONS POSSESSION (approved by Administrative Team 2006; revised 08/08, approved by President 8/21/08 as Interim Policy; FSB 08001 approved by President 10/22/08; revised by President's Weapons Policy Task Force 05/16, approved by President __/__/__)

3Z.01 INTRODUCTION

Beginning on July 1, 2017, the concealed-carrying of a handgun as described in this policy is permitted on campus. Otherwise, the Emporia State University campus, facilities, and programs are weapons-free in conformity with Kansas Board of Regents Policy on Weapons Possession. Each entrance to campus buildings and facilities will be posted in accordance with applicable statutes and regulations. Other areas approved by the President may be posted as allowed by law. Nothing in this policy will be read to prohibit possession of weapons on campus as necessary for the conduct of Board approved academic programs or university approved activities or practices. The General Counsel of ESU must be notified of the use of a weapon during the conduct of any such program, activity, or practice, and that office will subsequently notify the Board of Regents. Law enforcement officers and active military personnel are exempted from this policy while acting within the scope of their employment, as are weapons stored securely at the University Office of Police and Safety pursuant to University procedures.

For the purpose of this policy, "weapons" means:

1. Any object or device which will, is designed to, or may be readily converted to expel bullet, shot or shell by the action of an explosive or other propellant;
2. Any handgun, pistol, revolver, rifle, shotgun or other firearm of any nature, including concealed weapons carried pursuant to the Personal and Family Protection Act, and amendments thereto;
3. Any BB gun, pellet gun, air/C02 gun, blow gun, or devices designed to shoot electric darts (e.g. a Taser);
4. Any explosive, incendiary or poison gas (A) bomb, (B) mine, (C) grenade, (D) rocket having a propellant charge of more than four ounces, or (E) missile having an explosive or incendiary charge of more than ¼ ounce;
5. Any incendiary or explosive material, liquid, solid or mixture equipped with a fuse, wick or other detonating device;

6. Any tear gas bomb or smoke bomb; however, personal self-defense items containing mace or pepper spray shall not be deemed to be a weapon for the purpose of this policy;
7. Any knife, commonly referred to as a switch-blade, which has a blade that opens automatically by hand pressure applied to a button, spring or other device in the handle of the knife, or any knife having a blade that opens or falls or is ejected into position by the force of gravity or by an outward, downward or centrifugal thrust or movement;
8. Any straight-blade knife of four inches or more such as a dagger, dirk, dangerous knife or stiletto; except that an ordinary pocket knife or culinary knife designed for and used solely in the preparation or service of food shall not be construed to be a weapon for the purposes of this policy;
9. Any martial arts weapon such as nunchucks or throwing stars;
10. Any longbow, crossbow and arrows or other projectile that could cause serious harm to any person; or
11. Any other dangerous or deadly weapon or instrument of like character.

3Z.02 CARRYING AND STORAGE OF HANDGUNS

1. Purpose. The purpose of this section is to describe how handguns may be carried and stored on the campus of Emporia State University in as safe a manner as possible pursuant to Kansas law [The Private and Family Protection Act, K.S.A. 75-7c01 et seq.]
2. Geographic Applicability. This policy is applicable only within the geographic limits of the campus of Emporia State University and within locations owned or leased by the University that are not part of the University campus, provided that such locations are located within the State of Kansas.
3. Campus Gun Free Locations with Adequate Security Measures. Each location within the geographic applicability of this policy designated as gun free with permanent “adequate security measures,” as defined by Kansas law, will be identified in this policy. There are no University locations that have been designated as gun free with permanent adequate security measures. The University may from time to time designate a specific location as temporarily gun

free and use temporary adequate security measures as defined and required by law. Appropriate notice will be given and appropriate signage used whenever this temporary designation is to be made, including notice to the Kansas Board of Regents Governance Committee for any necessary approvals.

4. Prohibitions. Open carry of firearms by any means is prohibited. The carrying of any rifle, shotgun, or other long gun by any means is prohibited. The carrying of any firearm, concealed or otherwise, is prohibited in any location or under any circumstances prohibited by applicable federal or state law.
5. Restrictions to the Carrying of a Concealed Firearm Pursuant to Kansas Law: Kansas law states that the only type of firearm that an individual can carry while concealed is a handgun. The following restrictions apply to the concealed carrying of a handgun pursuant to Kansas law and the violation of any of the following restrictions is a crime under Kansas law:
 - a) An individual in possession of a concealed handgun must be at least 21 years of age [K.S.A. 21- 6302(a)(4)];
 - b) A handgun cannot be carried by an individual under the influence of alcohol or drugs, or both, to such a degree as to render the individual incapable of safely operating the handgun [K.S.A. 21- 6332];
 - c) A handgun cannot be carried by an individual who is both addicted to and an unlawful user of a controlled substance [K.S.A. 21-6301(a)(10)];
 - d) A handgun cannot be carried by an individual who is or has been a mentally ill person subject to involuntary commitment [K.S.A. 21-6301(a)(13)];
 - e) A handgun cannot be carried by an individual with an alcohol or substance abuse problem subject to involuntary commitment [K.S.A. 21-6301(a)(13)];
 - f) A handgun cannot be carried by an individual who has been convicted of a felony crime [K.S.A. 21-6304];
 - g) An automatic handgun cannot be carried [K.S.A. 21-6301(a)(5)];

- h) A cartridge which can be fired by a handgun and which has a plastic-coated bullet with a core of less than 60% lead by weight is illegal [K.S.A. 21-6301(a)(6)];
 - i) Suppressors and silencers cannot be used with a handgun [K.S.A. 21-6301(a)(4)]; and,
 - j) Handguns cannot be fired in the corporate limits of a city or at a dwelling, or at a structure or vehicle in which people are present, except in self-defense [K.S.A. 21-6308, 6308a].
6. **Concealed Carry Defined.** Individuals who carry a handgun on campus must carry it concealed on or about their person at all times. With respect to this policy, concealed means completely hidden from view and does not reveal the weapon in any way, shape, or form, except when using the handgun in self-defense or when transferring the handgun to safe storage. “About the person” means that an individual may carry a handgun if it can be carried securely in a suitable carrier, such as a backpack, purse, handbag, or other personal carrier designed and intended for the carrying of an individual’s personal items. Moreover, the carrier must at all times remain within the exclusive and uninterrupted control of the individual. This includes wearing the carrier with one or more straps consistent with the carrier’s design, carrying or holding the carrier, or setting the carrier next to or within the immediate reach of the individual.
7. **Carrying Safety.** Holsters are required. Every handgun carried by an individual, whether on their person or in a carrier, must be secured in a holster that completely covers the trigger and the entire trigger guard area and that secures an external hammer in an un-cocked position through the use of a strap or by other means. Handguns with an external safety must be carried with the safety in the “on” position. The holster must have sufficient tension or grip on the handgun to retain it in the holster even when subjected to unexpected jostling. Semiautomatic handguns must be carried without a chambered round of ammunition. Revolvers must be carried with the hammer resting on an empty cylinder.
8. **Handgun Storage.** Handgun storage at Emporia State University is prohibited, except in the following two circumstances: (1) in an individual’s privately-owned or leased motor vehicle when the vehicle is locked (if unattended) and the handgun is secured in a location within the vehicle that is not visible from outside the vehicle; or (2) in an individual’s on-campus residential unit when the handgun

is secured in a holster and in an approved storage device (see below). Handgun storage by any other means than specifically permitted in this policy is prohibited.

9. **University Approved Storage Device.** The University does not provide approved handgun storage devices to any person under any circumstances. Each individual who stores a handgun in an on-campus residence must provide their own approved storage device. A University approved storage device has each of these characteristics: (1) it is of sufficient size to fully enclose the handgun while secured in an approved holster; (2) it is constructed of sturdy materials that are non-flammable; (3) it has a combination, digital, or other secure locking device that can only be unlocked by the individual using the storage device, but devices secured exclusively with a key lock are prohibited; and, (4) the device is constructed specifically for the storage of a handgun and/or ammunition. All ammunition stored in an on-campus residence must be stored in an approved storage device.

10. **Prohibited Storage.** It is prohibited for any person to store a handgun on campus: (1) in any University classroom, lab, office, or facility; (2) in a residence hall, except in the residential unit of the individual who is at least 21 years of age, who legally owns the handgun, and when the handgun is secured in an approved storage device; (3) in a motor vehicle that is unlocked and unattended or when the handgun is visible from outside the vehicle; (4) in any other location and under any circumstances except as specifically permitted by this policy and by state or federal law; and, (5) all handguns must be stored unloaded, which means the magazine, cylinder, barrel or any other means of internal ammunition storage in preparation for firing the handgun must contain no ammunition while being stored on campus.

11. **Reporting, Investigation, and Determination.** All reports of suspected violation of the conceal carry policy are made to ESU Police & Safety by picking up any Emergency Campus Phone or by calling: 620-341-5337 (5337 if called on campus).
 - a. ESU Police & Safety will conduct an initial investigation to determine whether the report describes a criminal matter and/or a policy violation. Police & Safety is solely responsible for deciding the extent of investigation necessary to make this determination.
 - b. At any time beginning with receipt of a report, ESU Police & Safety has the authority through this policy to disarm and/or temporarily confiscate a

firearm and issue a restriction to not carry a concealed firearm on campus pending results of the weapons policy violation determination. The decision whether to confiscate and/or issue a restriction prohibiting conceal/carry will be made by Police & Safety when there is probable cause to believe that a Weapons Policy violation has occurred or continued possession and carrying by the alleged policy violator will create imminent danger to self or others. This authority does not supersede or alter the authority of Police & Safety to confiscate a firearm during a criminal investigation. A confiscated firearm will be stored and handled by Police & Safety according to their policies.

- c. At any time after a report of suspected Weapons Policy violation has been made to Police & Safety and continuing through the date the final determination has been made in the matter, the President may take any temporary action as determined necessary by the President to ensure the safety of the University and of its students and personnel. Such temporary action may include, but is not necessarily limited to: prohibiting an alleged policy violator from carrying a concealed firearm anywhere within the geographic limits of this policy; if a student is the alleged policy violator, temporary suspension from one or more classes in which the student is enrolled, or a change in the student's class schedule, or the placement of restrictions or conditions on the student in order to continue with normal class attendance and participation; if an employee (faculty or staff) is the alleged policy violator, temporary administrative leave with or without pay, or the placement of restrictions or conditions on the employee in order to continue with the employee's normal employment.
- d. When ESU Police & Safety has finished its initial investigation:
 - i. When the conclusion is that no crime has been committed and the Weapons Policy has not been violated, no further action will be taken and the matter is closed.
 - ii. When the conclusion is that a crime has been committed, but the Weapons Policy has not been violated, the incident will be handled as a criminal matter only.
 - iii. When the conclusion is that both a crime may have been committed and the Weapons Policy may have been violated, the matter will continue to be handled by the police as a criminal matter, but the policy violation incident report and any findings will be submitted to the appropriate University official for handling pursuant to the

- Weapons Policy. Police & Safety will have no further involvement in the policy investigation, except as requested.
- iv. When the conclusion is that a crime has not been committed, but that the Weapons Policy may have been violated, the incident report will be turned over to the appropriate University official for handling pursuant to the Weapons Policy. Police & Safety will have no further involvement in the policy investigation, except as requested.
 - e. When Police & Safety has concluded that the Weapons Policy may have been violated, the incident report, findings, and any other appropriate information from the initial investigation will be submitted to the appropriate University official as described below. In those cases that include a criminal investigation, Police & Safety will release criminal investigative materials in accordance with standard law enforcement protocol.
 - i. President or designee, if the alleged violator is a direct report to the President.
 - ii. Vice President for Student Affairs or designee, if the alleged violator is a student.
 - iii. Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs or designee, if the alleged violator is a member of the faculty in any tenured or non-tenured faculty classification.
 - iv. Executive Director of Intercollegiate Athletics or designee, if the alleged violator is a coach.
 - v. Vice President for Administration and Finance or designee, if the alleged violator is an unclassified non-faculty or non-coach employee, a University Support Staff employee, or any other University employee (not including student employees).
 - vi. ESU Police & Safety, if the alleged violator is a visitor to the University campus or is any person not described above.
 - f. Once the investigation materials have been received from Police & Safety, the process to be followed for determining whether the policy has been violated is:
 - i. Student. The matter will be handled through the Student Code of Conduct as a student conduct issue.
 - ii. Faculty. The faculty member may, at the faculty member's sole discretion, select either an informal resolution or a formal resolution, except that the Provost may require a formal resolution in any case when the Provost believes an informal resolution is inappropriate. An

informal resolution will be handled by the Provost and the faculty member working together to make all findings and conclusions. The informal resolution would be appropriate only when the alleged policy violation and any anticipated sanction would not interfere with the faculty member's academic career. The formal resolution process for any faculty member, tenured or non-tenured, would be handled as follows: The Provost will appoint one or more investigators as necessary to determine whether and how the policy was violated. The investigator(s) will prepare a written report describing the investigation methods, findings, and containing a recommendation to the Provost about potential sanctions. Based on this written report, the Provost will make appropriate findings and set any sanctions on a case by case basis. When the final determination of the Provost calls for the termination of a tenured faculty member, this decision is subject to review pursuant to University Policy 1B.0906 Procedure for Faculty Review Prior to Dismissal for Cause of Tenured Faculty. The final determination of the Provost in all other faculty cases is subject to review pursuant to University Policy 1E.01 Grievance Policy.

- iii. Coaches. The matter will be handled through UPM 1C.0105 Administrative Athletic.
- iv. Unclassified Non-Faculty or Non-Coach Employee. The matter will be handled through UPM 1C.01 Appointment, Evaluation, Retention, and Termination.
- v. University Support Staff. The matter will be handled through UPM 2F. Disciplinary Action and Grievance Procedures; UPM 2H. Termination of Employment; or, UPM 2I AFSCME Local Union Agreement, whichever is applicable to the employee in question.
- vi. Direct Report to the President. The President will appoint one or more investigators as necessary to determine whether and how the policy was violated. The investigator(s) will prepare a written report describing the investigation methods, findings, and containing a recommendation to the President about potential sanctions. Based on this written report, the President will make appropriate findings and set any sanctions on a case by case basis. The President's decision is final.
- vii. Visitor or Other Person. Police & Safety will complete the investigation and act as an advisor to the President to assist in determination of the appropriate sanction, if any. The President's decision is final.

Sanctions. The determination of which sanction(s), if any, that will be imposed following a determination that the Weapons Policy has been violated will be handled on a case by case basis. Notwithstanding the type and nature of sanctions that may be described in University policies, the appropriate sanction for violation of the Weapons Policy can be anything determined pursuant to the applicable policy as appropriate, including expulsion or termination from the University. The guiding theme when determining the appropriate sanction is to ensure that the Weapons Policy violation will not be repeated and that the safety of University students and personnel is assured.

Knowingly Making a False Report. Each report of a suspected policy violation must be made in good faith. The conclusion after an investigation of a report that there has been no policy violation does not mean, by itself, that the report was not made in good faith. Knowingly making a false report of a policy violation is prohibited and will be investigated through the same process as described within this policy for the investigation of a suspected policy violation, with appropriate sanctions being assessed upon confirmation that a false report was made.

Training. All University students and personnel who are regularly within the geographic applicability of this policy are required to receive training concerning this policy. Training will include learning where this policy applies, how a handgun is carried and stored pursuant to this policy, how to report a suspected violation of this policy, how reports are investigated, the potential sanctions upon confirmation of violation of this policy, and other topics relevant to this policy. The University will not conduct any training for students or personnel in the use of firearms, firearm safety, firearm cleaning and maintenance, firearm ownership or transfer of ownership, or any other topic not necessary for understanding and complying with this policy. The General Counsel's Office is responsible for ensuring that appropriate training in this policy is conducted.

FORT HAYS STATE UNIVERSITY

Gun Policy

The purpose of this section is to describe how concealed handguns may be carried and stored on the campus of Fort Hays State University in as safe a manner as possible pursuant to Kansas law [The Private and Family Protection Act, K.S.A. 75-7c01 et seq.]

Everyone on Campus

Concealed Carry Defined. Individuals who carry a handgun on campus must carry it concealed on or about their person at all times. With respect to this policy, concealed means completely hidden from view and does not reveal the weapon in any way, shape, or form. “About” the person means that an individual may carry a handgun if it can be carried securely in a suitable carrier, such as a backpack, purse, handbag, or other personal carrier designed and intended for the carrying of an individual’s personal items. Moreover, the carrier must at all times remain within the exclusive and uninterrupted control of the individual. This includes wearing the carrier with one or more straps consistent with the carrier’s design, carrying or holding the carrier, or setting the carrier next to or within the immediate reach of the individual. Exceptions to concealed carry at all times is during times of transfer from concealed to approved storage and for use in self-defense.

Geographic Applicability. This policy is applicable only within the geographic limits of the campus of Fort Hays State University and within locations owned or leased by the University that are not part of the University campus, provided that such locations are located within the State of Kansas. Leased locations leased and controlled by an entity that may lawfully exclude or permit firearms at their premises (concealed or otherwise) may choose at their sole discretion to exclude or permit concealed firearms from their premises, notwithstanding a lease with the University.

Campus Gun Free Locations with Adequate Security Measures. Each location within the geographic applicability of this policy designated as gun free with permanent “adequate security measures,” as defined by Kansas law, will be identified in this policy. There are no University locations that have been designated as gun free with permanent adequate security measures. The University may from time to time designate a specific location as temporarily gun free and use temporary adequate security measures as defined and required by law and per KBOR policy. Appropriate notice will be given whenever this temporary designation is made.

Prohibitions. Open carry of firearms by any means is prohibited. The carrying of any rifle, shotgun, or other long gun by any means is prohibited. The carrying of any firearm, concealed or otherwise, is prohibited in any location or under any circumstances prohibited by the applicable federal or state law.

Restrictions to the Carrying of a Concealed Firearm Pursuant to Kansas Law:

Kansas law states that the only type of firearm that an individual can carry while concealed is a handgun. Nothing in this policy is intended to replace municipal, state or federal law regarding weapons, firearms, explosives and other hazardous objects or substances or be inconsistent with the rights afforded a lawfully commissioned peace

officer. The following restrictions apply to the concealed carrying of a handgun by Kansas law and the violation of any of the following restrictions is a crime under Kansas law:

- An individual in possession of a concealed handgun must be at least 21 years of age [K.S.A. 21-6302(a)(4)];
- A firearm cannot be carried by an individual under the influence of alcohol or drugs, or both, to such a degree as to render the individual incapable of safely operating the firearm [K.S.A. 21-6332];
- A firearm cannot be carried by an individual who is both addicted to and an unlawful user of a controlled substance [K.S.A. 21-6301(a)(10)];
- A firearm cannot be carried by an individual who is or has been a mentally ill person subject to involuntary commitment [K.S.A. 21-6301(a)(13)];
- A firearm cannot be carried by an individual with an alcohol or substance abuse problem subject to involuntary commitment [K.S.A. 21-6301(a)(13)];
- A firearm cannot be carried by an individual who has been convicted of a felony crime [K.S.A. 21-6304];
- An automatic firearm cannot be carried [K.S.A. 21-6301(a)(5)];
- A cartridge which can be fired by a handgun and which has a plastic-coated bullet with a core of less than 60% lead by weight is illegal [K.S.A. 21-6301(a)(6)];
- Suppressors and silencers cannot be used with a firearm [K.S.A. 21-6301(a)(4)]; and,
- Firearms cannot be fired in the corporate limits of a city or at a dwelling, or at a structure or vehicle in which people are present, except in self-defense [K.S.A. 21-6308, 6308a].

Carrying Safety. Holsters are Required. Every handgun carried by an individual, whether on their person or in a carrier, must be secured in a holster that completely covers the trigger and the entire trigger guard area and that secures an external hammer in an un-cocked position through the use of a strap or by other means. Handguns with an external safety must be carried with the safety in the “on” position. The holster must have sufficient tension or grip on the handgun to retain it in the holster even when subjected to unexpected jostling. Semiautomatic handguns must be carried without a chambered round of ammunition. Revolvers must be carried with the hammer resting on an empty cylinder.

Handgun Storage. Handgun storage at Fort Hays State University is only allowed in the following circumstances: (1) in an individual’s privately-owned or leased motor vehicle when the vehicle is locked and the handgun is secured in a location within the vehicle that is not visible from outside the vehicle; (2) in an individual’s on-campus residential unit when the handgun is secured in a holster and in an approved storage device (see

below); or (3) in an employee's office within an approved storage device (see below) that is placed in a non-visible location such as a desk drawer or non-visible location.

Employees may only store their own handgun in their offices. The office must be locked when the employee whose office it is is not there and no overnight storage in offices.

Handgun storage by any other means than specifically permitted in this policy is prohibited.

Approved (per policy definition) Storage Device. The University does not provide approved handgun storage devices to any person under any circumstances. Each individual who stores a handgun in an on-campus residence must provide their own approved storage device. An approved storage device has each of these characteristics: (1) it is of sufficient size to fully enclose the handgun while secured in an approved holster; (2) it is constructed of sturdy materials that are non-flammable; (3) it has a combination, digital, or other secure locking device that can only be unlocked by the individual using the storage device, but devices secured exclusively with a key lock are prohibited; and, (4) the device is constructed specifically for the storage of a handgun and/or ammunition. All ammunition stored in an on-campus residence must be stored in an approved (per policy definition) storage device.

Reporting, Investigation, and Determination. All reports of suspected violation of the conceal carry policy are made to FHSU Police by picking up any Emergency Campus Phone or by calling FHSU Police at 785-628-5304 or by calling 911.

FHSU Police will conduct an initial investigation to determine whether the report describes a criminal matter and/or a policy violation. Police are solely responsible for deciding the extent of investigation necessary to make this determination.

At any time beginning with receipt of a report, FHSU Police have the authority through this policy to disarm and/or temporarily confiscate a firearm and issue a restriction to not carry a concealed firearm on campus pending results of the weapons policy violation determination. The decision whether to confiscate and issue a restriction prohibiting conceal/carry will be made by Police when there is probable cause to believe that a Weapons Policy violation has occurred or continued possession and carrying by the alleged policy violator will create imminent danger to self or others. This authority does not supersede or alter the authority of Police to confiscate a firearm during a criminal investigation. A confiscated firearm will be stored and handled by Police according to their policies.

At any time after a report of suspected Weapons Policy violation has been made to Police and continuing through the date the final determination has been made in the matter, the

President may take any temporary action as determined necessary by the President to ensure the safety of the University and of its students and personnel. Such temporary action may include, but is not necessarily limited to: prohibiting an alleged policy violator from carrying a concealed firearm anywhere within the geographic limits of this policy; if a student is the alleged policy violator, temporary suspension from one or more classes in which the student is enrolled, or a change in the student's class schedule, or the placement of restrictions or conditions on the student in order to continue with normal class attendance and participation; if an employee (faculty or staff) is the alleged policy violator, temporary administrative leave with or without pay, or the placement of restrictions or conditions on the employee in order to continue with the employee's normal employment.

When FHSU Police have finished their initial investigation:

- When the conclusion is that no crime has been committed and the Weapons Policy has not been violated, no further action will be taken and the matter is closed.
- When the conclusion is that a crime has been committed, but the Weapons Policy has not been violated, the incident will be handled as a criminal matter only.
- When the conclusion is that a both a crime may have been committed and the Weapons Policy may have been violated, the matter will continue to be handled by the police as a criminal matter, but the policy violation incident report and any findings will be submitted to the appropriate University official for handling pursuant to the Weapons Policy. Police will have no further involvement in the policy investigation, except as requested.
- When the conclusion is that a crime has not been committed, but that the Weapons Policy may have been violated, the incident report will be turned over to the appropriate University official for handling pursuant to the Weapons Policy. Police will have no further involvement in the policy investigation, except as requested.

When Police have concluded that the Weapons Policy may have been violated, the incident report, findings, and any other appropriate information from the initial investigation will be submitted to the appropriate University official as described below. In those cases that include a criminal investigation, Police will release criminal investigative materials in accordance with standard law enforcement protocol.

- Vice President for Student Affairs or designee, if the alleged violator is a student.
- Human Resources, if the alleged violator is an employee.
- FHSU Police, if the alleged violator is a visitor to the University campus or is any person not described above.

Once the investigation materials have been received from Police, the process to be followed for determining whether the policy has been violated is:

- **Student.** The matter will be handled through the Student Code of Conduct as a student conduct issue.
- **Faculty/Staff:** The matter will be handled by Human Resources as a violation to any policy on campus.

Sanctions. The determination of which sanction(s), if any, that will be imposed following a determination that the Weapons Policy has been violated will be handled on a case by case basis. Notwithstanding the type and nature of sanctions that may be described in University policies, the appropriate sanction for violation of the Weapons Policy can be anything determined pursuant to the applicable policy as appropriate, including expulsion or termination from the University. The guiding theme when determining the appropriate sanction is to ensure that the Weapons Policy violation will not be repeated and that the safety of University students and personnel is assured.

Knowingly Making a False Report. Each report of a suspected policy violation must be made in good faith. The conclusion after an investigation of a report that there has been no policy violation does not mean, by itself, that the report was not made in good faith. Knowingly making a false report of a policy violation is prohibited and will be investigated through the same process as described within this policy for the investigation of a suspected policy violation, with appropriate sanctions being assessed upon confirmation that a false report was made.

Training. All University students and personnel who are regularly within the geographic applicability of this policy are required to receive training concerning this policy. Training will include learning where this policy applies, how a handgun is carried and stored pursuant to this policy, how to report a suspected violation of this policy, how reports are investigated, the potential sanctions upon confirmation of violation of this policy, and other topics relevant to this policy. The University will not conduct any training for students or personnel in the use of firearms, firearm safety, firearm cleaning and maintenance, firearm ownership or transfer of ownership, or any other topic not necessary for understanding and complying with this policy. The General Counsel's Office is responsible for ensuring that appropriate training in this policy is conducted.

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

University Weapons Policy

.010 Introduction

Kansas State University prohibits the possession and use of firearms, explosives, and other weapons on any University campus, with certain limited exceptions, which include use of weapons as part of approved University Programs, use of weapons by law enforcement personnel, and the lawful concealed carrying of handguns, as provided below. This policy is in accordance with Kansas Board of Regents (“Board”) Policy and state law, K.S.A 75-7c01, et seq.

.020 Definitions

For purposes of this policy:

i. The term “weapons” includes:

(1) Any object or device which will, is designed to, or may be readily converted to expel bullet, shot or shell by the action of an explosive or other propellant;

(2) any handgun, pistol, revolver, rifle, shotgun or other firearm of any nature, including those that are concealed or openly carried;

(3) any BB gun, pellet gun, air/C’O2 gun, blow gun, or any Taser or similar electrical weapon that discharges a projectile;

(4) any explosive, incendiary or poison gas (A) bomb, (B) mine, (C) grenade, (D) rocket having a propellant charge of more than four ounces, or (E) missile having an explosive or incendiary charge of more than ¼ ounce;

(5) any incendiary or explosive material, liquid, solid or mixture equipped with a fuse, wick or other detonating device;

(6) any tear gas bomb or smoke bomb; however, personal self-defense items containing mace or pepper spray shall not be deemed to be a weapon for the purposes of this policy;

(7) any knife, commonly referred to as a switch-blade, which has a blade that opens automatically by hand pressure applied to a button, spring or other device in the handle of the knife, or any knife having a blade that opens or falls or is ejected into position by the force of gravity or by an outward, downward or centrifugal thrust or movement;

(8) any straight-blade knife of four inches or more such as a dagger, dirk, dangerous knife or stiletto; except that an ordinary pocket knife or culinary knife designed for and used solely in the preparation or service of food shall not be construed to be a weapon for the purposes of this policy;

(9) any martial arts weapon such as nunchucks or throwing stars;

(10) any longbow, crossbow and arrows or other projectile that could cause serious harm to any person; or

(11) any other dangerous or deadly weapon or instrument of like character.

ii. The term “handgun” means:

(1) A pistol or revolver which is designed to be fired by the use of a single hand and which is designed to fire or capable of firing fixed cartridge ammunition; or

(2) any other weapon which will or is designed to expel a projectile by the action of an explosive and which is designed to be fired by the use of a single hand.

iii. The term “firearm” includes any handgun, rifle, shotgun, and any other weapon which will or is designed to expel a projectile by the action of an explosive.

iv. The term “adequate security measures” shall have the same meaning as the term is defined in K.S.A. 75-7c20, and “building” shall have the same meaning as the term “state building” is defined in K.S.A. 75-7c20.

v. The term “campus” means any building or grounds owned by the University or the Board and any building or grounds leased by the University or the Board for state university use.

.030 Policy

i. General Rules on Open Carry and Concealed Carry on Campus

Open carry of firearms and possession of weapons other than concealed handguns shall be prohibited on campus, while concealed carry of handguns is permitted on campus, subject to the rules stated in this policy. All weapons are prohibited at all off-campus University sponsored or supervised activities, except that, as required by law, the University does not prohibit employees, who are legally qualified, from carrying a concealed handgun while engaged in the duties of their employment outside of KSU’s place of business, including while in a means of conveyance.

Nothing in this policy shall be read to prohibit possession of weapons on campus as necessary for the conduct of Board-approved academic programs or University-approved

activities or practices with the advance written approval of the Chief or Assistant Chief of the KSU Police Department, or by University police or security officers while acting within the scope of their employment.

It shall be a violation of Board and University policy to openly display any lawfully possessed concealed carry handgun while on campus, except as provided herein.

There are no University locations that have been designated as prohibiting concealed carry with permanent adequate security measures. The University may from time to time designate a specific location as temporarily prohibiting concealed carry and use temporary adequate security measures as defined and required by law. Appropriate notice will be given whenever this temporary designation is made, including notice to the Board and appropriate signage.

In addition, areas of buildings that have no public access entrances and are limited to restricted access entrances only may be off-limits to concealed carry, as determined by the University. “Restricted access entrance” means an entrance that is restricted to the public and requires a key, keycard, code, or similar device to allow entry to authorized personnel. “Authorized personnel” means employees of the University and any person granted authorization pursuant to K.S.A. 75-7c20(d)(2), who are authorized to enter a University building through a restricted access entrance. Appropriate signage will be provided in these areas.

ii. Prohibitions Based on State Law

Beginning July 1, 2017, any individual who is 21 years of age or older and who is lawfully eligible to carry a concealed handgun in Kansas shall not be precluded from doing so on campus except in University buildings and areas of buildings for which adequate security measures are provided, and except as otherwise prohibited by law.

Regardless whether the individual is otherwise lawfully eligible to carry a concealed handgun, the following restrictions apply to the carrying of a firearm by Kansas law, and the violation of any of the following restrictions is a crime under Kansas law and a violation of this policy:

- An individual in possession of a concealed firearm must be at least 21 years of age [K.S.A. 21-6302(a)(4)];
- A firearm cannot be carried by an individual under the influence of alcohol or drugs, or both, to such a degree as to render the individual incapable of safely operating the firearm [K.S.A. 21-6332];

- A firearm cannot be carried by an individual who is both addicted to and an unlawful user of a controlled substance [K.S.A. 21-6301(a)(10)];
- A firearm cannot be carried by an individual who is or has been a mentally ill person subject to involuntary commitment [K.S.A. 21-6301(a)(13)];
- A firearm cannot be carried by an individual with an alcohol or substance abuse problem subject to involuntary commitment [K.S.A. 21-6301(a)(13)];
- A firearm cannot be carried by an individual who has been convicted of a felony crime [K.S.A. 21-6304];
- An automatic firearm cannot be carried [K.S.A. 21-6301(a)(5)];
- A cartridge which can be fired by a handgun and which has a plastic-coated bullet with a core of less than 60% lead by weight is illegal [K.S.A. 21-6301(a)(6)];
- Suppressors and silencers cannot be used with a firearm [K.S.A. 21-6301(a)(4)]; and,
- Firearms cannot be fired in the corporate limits of a city or at a dwelling, or at a structure or vehicle in which people are present, except in self-defense [K.S.A. 21-6308, 6308a].

It shall also be a violation of this policy to otherwise possess, store, transport, trade, sell, or in any other way use a firearm in violation of any applicable law.

iii. Carrying and Storing Handguns

Each individual who lawfully possesses a handgun on campus shall be wholly and solely responsible for carrying, storing and using that handgun in a safe manner and in accordance with the law, Board policy and University policy. Nothing in this policy shall be interpreted to require individuals who lawfully possess a handgun to use it in defense of others.

Beginning July 1, 2017, each individual who lawfully possesses a concealed handgun on campus shall at all times have that handgun in their custody and control, and shall either:

- (1) carry it concealed on or about their person in a manner that complies with this policy, or;
- (2) keep it stored in any secure storage location provided by the university specifically for that purpose, at their residence, or in their privately-owned or leased vehicle.

Individuals who carry a handgun on campus must carry it concealed on or about their person at all times. With respect to this policy, “concealed” means completely hidden from view and does not reveal the weapon in any way, shape, or form. “About” the person means that an individual may carry a handgun if it can be carried securely in a

suitable carrier, such as a backpack, purse, handbag, or other personal carrier designed and intended for the carrying of an individual's personal items. Moreover, the carrier must at all times remain within the exclusive and uninterrupted control of the individual. This includes wearing the carrier with one or more straps consistent with the carrier's design, carrying or holding the carrier, or setting the carrier next to or within the immediate reach of the individual. Except in those instances where necessary for self-defense or transferring to safe storage and except as otherwise provided in this Policy, it shall be a violation of Board and University policy to openly display any lawfully possessed concealed carry handgun while on campus.

Every handgun carried by an individual, whether on their person or in a carrier, must be secured in a holster that completely covers the trigger and the entire trigger guard area and that secures any external hammer in an uncocked position. The handgun must be secured in the holster with a strap or by other means of retention. The holster must have sufficient tension or grip on the handgun to retain it in the holster even when subjected to unexpected jostling. Handguns with an external safety must be carried with the safety in the "on" position. Semiautomatic handguns must be carried without a chambered round of ammunition. Revolvers must be carried with the hammer resting on an empty chamber.

Handguns shall not be stored:

- (1) in any University classroom, lab, office, or facility;
- (2) in an on-campus residential unit, except in the residential unit of the individual who is at least 21 years of age, who legally owns the handgun, and when the handgun is secured in an approved storage device;
- (3) in any non-privately owned or leased motor vehicle; or,
- (4) in any other location and under any circumstances except as specifically permitted by this policy and by state and federal law.

Handguns may be stored:

- (1) in an individual's privately-owned or leased motor vehicle when the vehicle is locked (if unattended) and the handgun is secured in a location within the vehicle that is not visible from outside the vehicle; or,
- (2) in an individual's on-campus residential unit when the handgun is secured in a holster and in an approved storage device. Handgun storage by any other means than specifically permitted in this policy is prohibited.

For any on-campus residential unit that does not have adequate security measures, each resident who lawfully possesses a handgun on campus and elects to store the handgun they possess in the room to which they are assigned when not carrying it on their person

in a concealed fashion shall secure the handgun in a secure storage device that conceals the gun from view. Such storage devices shall be provided by the individual who possesses the handgun and must meet minimum industry standards for safe-keeping of handguns.

The University does not provide approved handgun storage devices to any person under any circumstances. Each individual who stores a handgun in an on-campus residence must provide their own approved storage device. An approved storage device has each of these characteristics:

- (1) it is of sufficient size to fully enclose the handgun while secured in an approved holster;
- (2) it is constructed of sturdy materials that are non-flammable;
- (3) it has a combination, digital, or other secure locking device that can only be unlocked by the individual using the storage device, but devices secured exclusively with a key lock are prohibited; and,
- (4) the device is constructed specifically for the storage of a handgun and/or ammunition. All ammunition stored in an on-campus residence must be stored in an approved storage device.

.040 Reporting and Temporary Actions

All reports of suspected violation of the concealed carry policy are made to the University Police Department by picking up any Emergency Campus Phone or by calling: 785-532-6412.

University Police will conduct an initial investigation to determine whether the report describes a criminal matter and/or a policy violation.

University Police have the authority to disarm and/or temporarily confiscate a firearm and issue a restriction to not carry a concealed firearm on campus pending results of the weapons policy violation determination. The decision whether to confiscate and issue a restriction prohibiting concealed carry will be made by University Police when there is probable cause to believe that a violation of this policy has occurred or continued possession and carrying by the alleged policy violator will create imminent danger to self or others. This authority does not supersede or alter the authority of University Police to confiscate a firearm during a criminal investigation. A confiscated firearm will be stored and handled by University Police according to their policies.

The Threat Management Team, the Critical Incident Response Team (CIRT), or the President may take any temporary action as determined necessary to ensure the safety of the University and of its students and personnel. Such temporary action may include, but

is not necessarily limited to: prohibiting an alleged policy violator from carrying a concealed firearm anywhere within the geographic limits of this policy; if a student is the alleged policy violator, temporary suspension from one or more classes in which the student is enrolled, or a change in the student's class schedule, or the placement of restrictions or conditions on the student in order to continue with normal class attendance and participation; if an employee (faculty or staff) is the alleged policy violator, temporary administrative leave with or without pay, or the placement of restrictions or conditions on the employee in order to continue with the employee's normal employment.

.050 Sanctions

Any individual who violates one or more provisions of this policy may be issued a lawful directive to leave campus with the weapon immediately. Any individual who violates the directive shall be considered to be in trespass and may be cited accordingly. Any employee or student of the university who violates one or more provisions of this policy shall be subject to discipline in accordance with applicable University codes of conduct. Any individual who violates state or federal law may be detained, arrested or otherwise subjected to lawful processes appropriate to the circumstances.

.060 Notice and Training

Notice of this policy, the Board policy, and the concealed carry law are given in this policy and shall also be given by way of reference to this policy in the University Handbook, the student conduct code and each housing contract. To the extent adequate security measures are used to prohibit concealed carry into stadiums, arenas and other large venues that require tickets for admission, the tickets shall state that concealed carry will be prohibited at that event. Signs will be posted as appropriate.

Locally or regionally available firearm safety instruction may be found by following this link: [link to a button on Vice President for Administration and Finance weapons policy site]

.070 Related Statutes and Regulations

K.S.A 75-7c01, et seq.

Kansas Board of Regents Policy on Weapons Possession

.080 Questions

Questions regarding this policy are to be directed to the University Police Department at (785) 532-6412 or to the Vice President for Administration and Finance at (785) 532-6226

PITTSBURG STATE UNIVERSITY

November 22, 2016

I. Introduction:

The possession and use of firearms, explosives, and other weapons are prohibited on the campus of Pittsburg State University, with the limited exception of concealed handguns as provided in this policy. The purpose of this policy is to describe how handguns may be carried, stored, and managed on the campus of Pittsburg State University in as safe a manner as possible. This policy is in accordance with the Kansas Board of Regents Policy and state law, K.S.A.75-7c01, et seq.

II. Geographic Applicability:

This policy is applicable only within the geographic limits of the Pittsburg State University campus. Campus is defined as any building or grounds owned by Pittsburg State University or any building or grounds leased by Pittsburg State University for state university use.

III. Definitions:

Weapons-

- (1) Any object or device which will, is designed to, or may be readily converted to expel bullet, shot or shell by the action of an explosive or other propellant;
- (2) Any handgun, pistol, revolver, rifle, shotgun or other firearm of any nature, including those that are concealed or openly carried;
- (3) Any BB gun, pellet gun, air/C'02 gun, any Taser or similar electrical weapon that discharges a projectile or blow gun;
- (4) Any explosive, incendiary or poison gas (A) bomb, (B) mine, (C) grenade, (D) rocket having a propellant charge of more than four ounces, or (E) missile having an explosive or incendiary charge of more than ¼ ounce;
- (5) Any incendiary or explosive material, liquid, solid, or mixture equipped with a fuse, wick or other detonating device;
- (6) Any tear gas bomb or smoke bomb; however, personal self-defense items containing mace or pepper spray shall not be deemed to be a weapon for the purposes of this policy;
- (7) Any knife, commonly referred to as a switch-blade, which has a blade that opens automatically by hand pressure applied to a button, spring or other device

in the handle of the knife, or any knife having a blade that opens or falls or is ejected into position by the force of gravity or by an outward, downward or centrifugal thrust or movement;

- (8) Any straight-blade knife of four inches or more such as a dagger, dirk, dangerous knife or stiletto; except that an ordinary pocket knife or culinary knife designed for and used solely in the preparation or service of food shall not be construed to be a weapon for the purposes of this policy;
- (9) Any martial arts weapon such as nunchucks or throwing stars;
- (10) Any longbow, crossbow and arrows or other projectile that could cause serious harm to any person; or
- (11) Any other dangerous or deadly weapon or instrument of like character.

Handgun-

- (1) A pistol or revolver which is designed to be fired by the use of a single hand and which is designed to fire or capable of firing fixed cartridge ammunition; or
- (2) Any other weapon which will or is designed to expel a projectile by the action of an explosive and which is designed to be fired by the use of a single hand.

Firearm-

Any handgun, rifle, shotgun, and other weapon which will or is designed to expel a projectile by the action of an explosive.

IV. Prohibitions and Restrictions to the Carrying of a Concealed Firearm Pursuant to Kansas Law:

Open carry of firearms by any means is prohibited. The carrying of any rifle, shotgun, or other long gun by any means is prohibited. It is a violation of University policy to openly display any lawfully possessed concealed carry handgun while on campus except when lawfully using the handgun in self-defense or when transferring to safe storage. Kansas law outlines the following restrictions to the concealed carrying of a handgun. Failure to comply with the following restrictions is a violation of University policy and Kansas Law:

- Individuals in possession of a concealed handgun must be at least 21 years of age [K.S.A. 21-6302(a)(4)];
- A firearm cannot be carried by an individual under the influence of alcohol or drugs, or both, to such a degree as to render the individual incapable of safely operating the firearm [K.S.A. 21-6332];
- A firearm cannot be fired in the corporate limits of a city, at a dwelling, structure, or vehicle in which a human is present, except in self-defense [K.S.A. 21-6308, 6308a];

- A firearm cannot be carried by an individual who is both addicted to and an unlawful user of a controlled substance [K.S.A. 21-6301(a)(10)];
- A firearm cannot be carried by an individual who is or has been a mentally ill person subject to involuntary commitment [K.S.A. 21-6301(a)(13)];
- A firearm cannot be carried by an individual with an alcohol or substance abuse problem subject to involuntary commitment [K.S.A. 21-6301(a)(13)];
- A firearm cannot be carried by an individual who has been convicted of a felony crime [K.S.A. 21-6304];
- An automatic firearm cannot be carried [K.S.A. 21-6301(a)(5)];
- Any cartridge which can be fired by a handgun and which has a plastic-coated bullet that has a core of less than 60% lead by weight, whether the person knows or has reason to know that the plastic-coated bullet has a core of less than 60% lead by weight is illegal [K.S.A. 21-6301(a)(6)];
- Any device or attachment of any kind designed, used or intended for use in suppressing the report of any firearm is illegal [K.S.A. 21-6301(a)(4)].

V. Carrying Safety Requirements:

Any individual who is 21 years of age or older and who is lawfully eligible to carry a concealed handgun is wholly and solely responsible for carrying, storing, and using that handgun in a safe manner and in accordance with the Kansas Law, Kansas Board of Regents Policy and University policy. Concealed means completely hidden from view and does not reveal the weapon in any way, shape or form.

Whether on their person or in a personal carrier, every handgun carried by an individual must be secured in a holster that completely covers the trigger and the entire trigger guard area and that secures any external hammer in an un-cocked position. The handgun must be secured in the holster with a strap or by other means of retention. The holster must have sufficient tension or grip on the handgun to retain it in the holster even when subjected to unexpected jostling. Handguns with an external safety must be carried with the safety in the “on” position.

The handgun must be in the person’s custody and control at all times with safety mechanism engaged. Handguns must be carried securely in a suitable carrier (backpack, purse, handbag, or other personal carrier designed and intended for the carrying of an individual’s personal items). The suitable carrier must at all times remain within the exclusive and uninterrupted control of the individual. This includes wearing the carrier with one or more straps consistent with the carriers design, carrying or holding the carrier, or setting the carrier next to or within the immediate reach of the individual.

VI. Campus Gun-Free Locations with Adequate Security Measures:

There are no University locations designated as gun free with permanent adequate security measures. The University may designate a specific location as temporarily gun free and use temporary adequate security measures as defined and required by law and Kansas Board of Regents Policy. Appropriate notice will be given whenever this temporary designation is made.

VII. Handgun Storage:

Handgun storage is prohibited at Pittsburg State University except in the following circumstances: (1) in an individual's privately-owned or leased motor vehicle when the vehicle is locked and the handgun is secured in a location within the vehicle that is not visible from outside the vehicle; or, (2) in an individual's on-campus residential unit when the handgun is secured in a holster and in an approved storage device (see below).

Approved Storage Device:

The University does not provide approved handgun storage devices to any person, under any circumstances. Each individual who stores a handgun in an on-campus residence must provide their own approved storage device. An approved storage device meets the following criteria:

1. Is of sufficient size to fully enclose the handgun while secured in an approved holster (as defined in Section V).
2. Is constructed of sturdy materials that are non-flammable
3. Has a combination, digital, or other secure locking device that can only be unlocked by the individual using the storage device. Devices secured exclusively with a key lock are prohibited.
4. Device is constructed specifically for the storage of a handgun and/or ammunition. All ammunition stored in an on-campus residence must be stored in an approved storage device.

Prohibited Storage:

Storage of handguns is prohibited in the following:

1. In any University classroom, lab, office, or facility;
2. In a residence hall, except in the residential unit of the individual who is at least 21 years of age, legally owns the handgun, and has the handgun secured in an approved storage device;
3. In a motor vehicle that is unlocked or when the handgun is visible from the outside of the vehicle;
4. In any other location or under any circumstances except as specifically permitted by this policy or the state or federal law.

VIII. Violations Process:

All suspected weapons policy violations will be reported to the University Police. Initial investigations will be conducted by University Police to determine if University or Kansas Board of Regents policy has been violated. If the investigation determines a crime has been committed, a separate criminal investigation will be conducted, unrelated to policy. If University policy has allegedly been violated, the matter will be reported to the Behavior Intervention and Threat Assessment Team.

When there is probable cause to believe that a weapons policy violation has occurred, or continued possession and carrying by the alleged policy violator will create imminent danger to self or others, University Police have authority to disarm and/or temporarily confiscate a firearm and issue a restriction to not carry a concealed firearm on campus pending results of the investigation.

The President, or his or her designee, may take any temporary action as determined necessary to ensure the safety of the University and of its students and personnel. Any individual who violates one or more provisions of this policy may be issued a lawful directive to leave campus with the weapon immediately. Any individual who violates the directive shall be considered to be in trespass and may be cited accordingly. Any employee or student of the university who violates one or more provisions of this policy shall be subject to discipline in accordance with applicable University codes of conduct. Any individual who violates state or federal law may be detained, arrested, or otherwise subjected to lawful processes appropriate to the circumstances.

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

Purpose:

The purpose of this policy statement is to adopt and implement the Board of Regents policy on weapons possession and to direct the creation and implementation of campus specific procedures at the University of Kansas, Lawrence, campuses and the University of Kansas Medical Center campuses.

Applies to:

All faculty, staff, students, visitors of the University of Kansas.

Campuses:

Lawrence, Edwards, Parsons, Juniper Gardens, Yoder, Topeka; Medical Center, Kansas City, Wichita.

Policy Statement:

As required by Kansas law (the Personal and Family Protection Act (“PFPA”)), concealed carry of handguns shall be permitted on University campuses, including all buildings and public areas of buildings owned or leased by the University that do not have adequate security measures, except in specified restricted access areas within buildings. Open carry of firearms and possession of weapons other than concealed handguns shall be prohibited on all University campuses, except for police instructors and their students who carry their service or training weapons openly as part of authorized police training conducted at the Kansas Law Enforcement Training Center’s (“KLETC”) Yoder campus. Nothing in this policy shall be read to prohibit the possession of weapons on University campuses (1) as necessary for the conduct of Board of Regents approved academic programs or University approved activities or practices, including those conducted by the Reserve Officer Training Corps faculty and their enrolled students and by the KLETC police instructors and their enrolled students, or (2) by University police or security officers or other law enforcement officers as defined by K.S.A. 75-7c22. The University of Kansas, Lawrence, campuses, and the University of Kansas Medical Center campuses shall develop campus specific procedures for the safe possession, use, and storage of such weapons.

Concealed Carry

Beginning July 1, 2017, any individual who is 21 years of age or older and who is not prohibited or disqualified by law and who is lawfully eligible to carry a concealed handgun in Kansas shall not be precluded from doing so on University campuses, including all facilities owned or leased by the University, except (1) in buildings and public areas of buildings for which adequate security measures are provided or, (2) in a specified restricted access area of a building. Within such restricted access areas, concealed carry will be banned. Individuals who are not employees of the University may be authorized access through a restricted access entrance only pursuant to a University screening process that is compliant with the provisions of the PFPA. The Executive Vice Chancellor (“EVC”) of the KU Medical Center will coordinate with the Chief Executive Officer (“CEO”) of the KU Hospital to determine implementation of these measures for purposes of reciprocity with respect to their respective employees.

Safety Measures

Each individual who lawfully possesses a handgun on any of the University campuses shall be wholly and solely responsible for carrying, storing and using the handgun in a safe manner and in accordance with the law, Board of Regents policy and University policy. This responsibility shall include the obligation at all times to be in control of the handgun and to keep it secure on his or her person and concealed from view when not in use for purposes provided by law. If a concealed handgun is carried in a handbag, purse

or backpack, the handbag, purse or backpack must be physically on or in the hands of the person carrying it.

Every handgun carried by an individual into any University building must be secured in a holster that completely covers the trigger and the entire trigger guard area and that secures any external hammer in an un-cocked position through the use of a strap or by other means. Handguns with an external safety must be carried with the safety in the “on” position. The holster must have sufficient tension or grip on the handgun to retain it in the holster even when subjected to unexpected jostling. Semiautomatic handguns must be carried without a chambered round of ammunition. Revolvers must be carried with the hammer resting on an empty cylinder.

The Director of the KLETC shall implement appropriate measures and procedures regarding concealed carry on the Yoder campus to assure the safety of students and instructors during training.

Nothing in this policy shall be interpreted to require individuals who lawfully possess a handgun to use it in defense of others.

No person shall use the fact or possibility that he or she is carrying a concealed weapon with the intent to intimidate another person except in defense of self or others.

Except for law enforcement officers, no person shall carry a firearm of any type, whether concealed or openly, into any secured area located in the offices and facilities of the University police (K.S.A. 75-7c20(g)).

The implementing procedures of the University of Kansas, Lawrence, campuses, and the University of Kansas Medical Center campuses shall include detailed provisions regarding how and where to report suspected violations of this policy, how faculty, staff and students shall be notified of the laws and policies pertaining to concealed carry on campus, and shall also provide interested students, faculty and staff with information about any known locally or regionally available firearm safety instruction.

Federal and State Restrictions on Firearms

The following state and federal laws apply to possession and use of firearms, including the carry of concealed handguns.

- Kansas law states that the only type of firearm that an individual can carry while concealed is a handgun;

- An individual in possession of a concealed handgun must be at least 21 years of age (K.S.A. 21- 6302(a)(4));
- A firearm cannot be carried by an individual under the influence of alcohol or drugs, or both, to such a degree as to render the individual incapable of safely operating the firearm (K.S.A. 21-6332);
- A firearm cannot be carried by an individual who is an unlawful user of and addicted to any controlled substance (as defined in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act, codified at 21 U.S.C. § 802) (K.S.A. 21-6301(a)(10));
- A firearm cannot be carried by an individual who is or has been a mentally ill person subject or has been subjected to involuntary commitment (K.S.A. 21-6301(a)(13));
- A firearm cannot be carried by an individual with an alcohol or substance abuse problem subject to involuntary commitment (K.S.A. 21-6301(a)(13));
- A firearm cannot be carried by an individual who has been convicted of a felony crime (K.S.A. 21- 6304(a)) or convicted in any court of a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year (18 U.S.C. 922(g)(1));
- Automatic firearms and sawed off shotguns cannot be carried (K.S.A. 21-6301(a)(5));
- A cartridge which can be fired by a handgun and which has a plastic-coated bullet with a core of less than 60% lead by weight is illegal (K.S.A. 21-6301(a)(6));
- Suppressors and silencers cannot be used with a firearm (K.S.A. 21-6301(a)(4));
- Firearms cannot be fired in the corporate limits of a city or at a dwelling, or at a structure or vehicle in which people are present, except in self-defense (K.S.A. 21-6308a and 21-6308(a)(1)(A));
- A firearm cannot be carried by a person who is a fugitive from justice (18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(2));
- A firearm cannot be carried by an individual who is an illegal alien (18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(5)(A));
- A firearm cannot be carried by an individual who has been discharged from the Armed Forces under dishonorable conditions (18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(6));
- A firearm cannot be carried by an individual who has renounced his or her United States citizenship (18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(7));
- A firearm cannot be carried by an individual who is subject to a court order restraining the person from harassing, stalking, or threatening an intimate partner or child of the intimate partner (18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(8)); and
- A firearm cannot be carried by an individual who has been convicted of a misdemeanor crime of domestic violence (18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(9)).

Open Carry Prohibited

Except as otherwise specifically provided in the Policy Statement above, open carry of any firearm anywhere on any of the University campuses is prohibited. Each entrance to each building and facility on each campus shall be conspicuously posted with appropriate signs indicating that openly carrying a firearm into that building or facility is prohibited. Additional signs may be posted as appropriate.

Except in those instances where necessary for self-defense or transferring to safe storage and except as otherwise provided in this policy, it shall be a violation of University and Board of Regents policy to openly display any concealed carry handgun while on campus.

Regardless whether an individual is otherwise lawfully eligible to carry a concealed handgun, it shall be a violation of University and Board of Regents policy to commit any of the following offenses on University campuses:

- Possess a firearm under the influence of alcohol or drugs, as defined by K.S.A. 21-6332, and amendments thereto;
- discharge a firearm in violation of K.S.A. 21-6308, and amendments thereto;
- discharge a firearm within or into the corporate limits of any city in violation of K.S.A. 21-6308a; or
- otherwise possess, store, transport, trade, sell, or in any other way use a firearm in violation of any applicable law, including the Restrictions on Firearms specified above.

Beginning July 1, 2017, an individual who lawfully possesses a concealed handgun on campus shall at all times have that handgun in the individual's possession and control, and shall either keep it on his/her person with safety mechanism, if any, engaged, or stored 1) in any secure storage location provided by the university specifically for that purpose, 2) at the individual's residence, or 3) in his or her vehicle. If stored in a vehicle on campus, the handgun must be secured and concealed from view. For any dormitory or scholarship hall that does not have adequate security measures, each resident who lawfully possesses a handgun on campus and elects to store the handgun in the room to which he or she is assigned when not carrying it on the individual's person in a concealed fashion shall secure the handgun in a secure storage device that conceals the gun from view. Such storage devices shall be provided by the individual who possesses the handgun and must meet minimum industry standards for safe-keeping of handguns.

Adequate Security Measures

Beginning July 1, 2017, the University of Kansas, Lawrence, campuses and the University of Kansas Medical Center campuses shall determine whether and to what

extent otherwise lawfully possessed concealed handguns will be prohibited by provision of adequate security measures, permanent or temporary, at each public entrance to buildings or public areas within campus buildings. Each public entrance to each building where concealed carry is prohibited as provided in this paragraph shall have adequate security measures and all entrances, including restricted access entrances, shall be conspicuously posted with appropriate Attorney General-approved signs indicating that carrying a concealed handgun into that building is prohibited. Additional signs may be posted as appropriate. If the University of Kansas, Lawrence, campuses and the University of Kansas Medical Center campuses prohibit concealed carry pursuant to this paragraph, they will submit to the Chancellor or her designee a list of the buildings and public areas of buildings so designated, the rationale therefor, and a description of the adequate security measures to be provided. The University will consolidate the list and, pursuant to Regents policy, submit it to the Board of Regents office for review and approval by the Board of Regents Governance Committee.

The list shall be provided at the time such buildings and public areas are first identified as requiring adequate security and, as buildings or public areas of buildings are added to the list, at the time so amended. Once the Board of Regents Governance Committee has approved a building or area for provision of adequate security measures, re-approval of that building or area is not required.

Safety and security considerations may warrant the University of Kansas, Lawrence, campuses and the University of Kansas Medical Center campuses implementing adequate security measures on an as-needed, temporary basis in order to address a specific concern. These as-needed, temporary measures will be reported to the Chancellor or her designee in order to assure compliance with Board of Regents policy requiring that the University's annual security report to the Board of Regents include information regarding all instances in which adequate security measures were implemented on an as needed, temporary basis during the previous year and the reasons therefor.

Screening Process for Restricted Access Entrances

At the discretion and upon the approval of the Chancellor (or, if authorized by the Board of Regents, the Chancellor's designees), and in accordance with the PFPA, persons who are not employees of the University of Kansas may be granted access through a restricted access entrance upon issuance of an identification card that (1) includes the person's name and photograph and specifies that the person has been authorized access to a specific area through a restricted access entrance, and (2) contains the person's acknowledgement in a notarized statement that weapons are prohibited in restricted access areas and that violation of the prohibition may result in revocation of authorization to enter through the restricted access entrance. The EVC of the KU Medical Center

campuses and the Provost for the Lawrence campuses shall develop for approval by the Chancellor screening criteria for admission of individuals to enter a University building or area through a restricted access entrance. Such criteria shall be in accordance with the PFPA. The EVC of the KU Medical Center will coordinate with the CEO of the KU Hospital to determine implementation of these measures for purposes of reciprocity.

WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

11.19 / Weapons on University Property

Purpose:

It is the policy of the Kansas Board of Regents (hereinafter referred to as Board), to the extent permitted by law, to allow concealed carry of handguns and prohibit possession of other weapons and open carry of firearms on the University campus. This sets forth Wichita State University (hereinafter referred to as University) policy with regard to the presence of weapons on University property.

Preamble:

In view of the enactment of the Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act, subsequent amendments and Board policy, the Board has directed each state University to develop and follow policies and procedures for the safe possession and storage of lawfully possessed handguns and determine whether and to what extent otherwise lawfully possessed concealed handguns will be prohibited in any university buildings or areas of buildings.

Policy Statement:

- A. Beginning July 1, 2017, any individual who is 21 years of age or older and who is lawfully eligible to carry a concealed handgun in Kansas shall not be precluded from doing so on the Wichita State University campus except in buildings and public areas of buildings for which adequate security measures are provided, as restricted in this policy or Kansas Board of Regent's policy, and except as otherwise prohibited by law.
- B. There are no University buildings that have been designated as gun-free with permanent adequate security measures. The University may designate a specific location as temporarily gun-free, with appropriate signage, and use temporary adequate security measures after submission and approval by the Governance Committee of the Board. Appropriate notice will be given whenever this temporary designation is made.
- C. Each individual who lawfully possesses a handgun on campus shall be wholly and solely responsible for carrying, storing and using that handgun in a safe manner and in accordance with the law, Board policy and University policy. Nothing in

this policy shall be interpreted to require individuals who lawfully possess a handgun to use it in defense of others.

- D. Possession of weapons, other than concealed handguns, anywhere on any campus location shall be prohibited. This includes the open carry of any weapon, including a handgun or handguns. Every entrance to each building and facility at any campus location shall be conspicuously posted with appropriate signs indicating that openly carrying a weapon into that building or facility is prohibited. Additional signs may be posted as appropriate.

Definitions:

1. Weapons, firearms, explosives and other hazardous objects or substances covered by this policy shall include, but not be limited to, the following:
 - a) Any object or device which will, is designed to, or may be readily converted to expel bullet, shot or shell by the action of an explosive or other propellant;
 - b) any handgun, pistol, revolver, rifle, shotgun or other firearm of any nature, including those that are concealed or openly carried;
 - c) any BB gun, pellet gun, air/C'02 gun, blow gun, or any device, such as a Taser, which is designed to discharge electric darts or other similar projectiles; however, personal self-defense stun guns that do not fit with the preceding definition shall not be deemed to be a weapon for the purposes of this policy;
 - d) any explosive, incendiary or poison gas (A) bomb, (B) mine, (C) grenade, (D) rocket having a propellant charge of more than four ounces, or (E) missile having an explosive or incendiary charge of more than ¼ ounce;
 - e) any incendiary or explosive material, liquid, solid or mixture equipped with a fuse, wick or other detonating device;
 - f) any tear gas bomb or smoke bomb; however, personal self-defense items containing mace or pepper spray shall not be deemed to be a weapon for the purposes of this policy;
 - g) any knife, commonly referred to as a switch-blade, which has a blade that opens automatically by hand pressure applied to a button, spring or other

device in the handle of gravity or by an outward, downward or centrifugal thrust or movement;

- h) any straight-blade knife of four inches or more such as a dagger, dirk, dangerous knife or stiletto; except that an ordinary pocket knife or culinary knife designed for and used solely in the preparation or service of food shall not be construed to be a weapon for the purposes of this policy;
 - i) any martial arts weapon such as nun chucks or throwing stars;
 - j) any longbow, crossbow and arrows or other projectile that could cause serious harm to any person; or
 - k) any other dangerous or deadly weapon or instrument of like character.
2. The term “handgun” means:
 - a) A pistol or revolver which is designed to be fired by the use of a single hand and which is designed to fire or capable of firing fixed cartridge ammunition; or
 - b) any other weapon which will or is designed to expel a projectile by the action of an explosive and which is designed to be fired by the use of a single hand.
 3. The term “firearm” includes any handgun, rifle, shotgun, and any other weapon which will or is designed to expel a projectile by the action of an explosive.
 4. The phrase “adequate security measures” means the use of electronic equipment and armed personnel at public entrances to detect and restrict the carrying of any weapons into the University building, or any public area thereof, including, but not limited to, metal detectors, metal detector wands or any other equipment used for similar purposes to ensure that weapons are not permitted to be carried into such building or public area by members of the public. Adequate security measures for storing and securing lawfully carried weapons, including, but not limited to, the use of gun lockers or other similar storage options may be provided at public entrances.
 5. “Public area” means any portion of a University building that is open to and accessible by the public or which is otherwise designated as a public area by the board.

6. “Concealed” means completely hidden from view and does not reveal the weapon in any way, shape, or form.
7. “Approved storage device” should (a) be of a sufficient size to fully enclose the handgun while secured in an approved holster, (b) constructed of sturdy materials that are non- flammable, (c) have a combination, digital or other secure locking device that can only be unlocked by the individual using the storage device but devices secured exclusively with a key lock are prohibited, and (d) constructed specifically for the storage of a handgun and/or ammunition.

Procedures:

8. Individuals lawfully possessing a handgun, pursuant to this policy, should keep it completely concealed on or about their person at all times, maintain it within their immediate control and custody and not brandish or intentionally display the handgun except when lawfully using the handgun in self-defense or when to transfer to safe storage. This allows individuals to carry a handgun if it can be carried securely in a briefcase, backpack, purse, handbag or other similar personal carrier designed and intended for the carrying of an individual’s personal items so long it is within the exclusive and uninterrupted control of the individual. This includes wearing the carrier with one or more straps consistent with the carrier’s design, carrying or holding the carrier, or placing the carrier next to, or within the immediate reach of, the individual at all times.
9. Any employee, who is legally qualified, shall not be prohibited from carrying any concealed handgun while performing work for the University, including while in a means of conveyance, except in a campus building that has adequate security measures at all public access entrances to ensure that no weapons are permitted to be carried into such building and the building is conspicuously posted.
10. Weapons other than concealed handguns, as defined and allowed above, are not permitted on University property unless in the possession of a law enforcement officer, armored car security personnel, or private security pre-approved by the Chief of the University Police Department.
11. For the purposes of this policy, the term weapons would not include items or materials used in or necessary for the conduct of Board-approved academic programs or University-approved activities or practices. However, the University's Chief of Police should be notified about any such items or materials in advance of their use or presence on campus and mandate specific requirements

for the possession, use and storage of such items or materials, including notification of other necessary University personnel.

12. Beginning July 1, 2017, each individual who lawfully possesses a concealed handgun on campus shall at all times have that handgun in their custody and control, and shall either keep it on their person with safety mechanism, if any, engaged, or stored 1) in any secure storage location provided by or authorized by the university specifically for that purpose, 2) at their residence, 3) in an approved storage device within an individual's University office or 4) in their vehicle. If stored in a location provided or authorized by the university specifically for that purpose, the handgun must be secured in an approved storage device, concealed from view, and in a location that can be accessed only by the individual and the university. If stored in a vehicle on campus, the handgun must be secured in an approved storage device and concealed from view. For any dormitory or scholarship hall that does not have adequate security measures, a resident who lawfully possesses a handgun on campus and elects to store the handgun they possess in the room to which they are assigned when not carrying it on their person in a concealed fashion shall secure the handgun in an approved storage device that conceals the gun from view. Such storage devices shall be provided by the individual who possesses the handgun and must meet minimum industry standards for safe-keeping of handguns.
13. Handguns carried by individuals, whether on their person or in a carrier, must be secured in a holster that completely covers the trigger and the entire trigger guard area and that secures an external hammer in an un-cocked position through the use of a strap or by other means. Handguns with an external safety must be carried with the safety in the "on" position. The holster must have sufficient tension or grip on the handgun to retain it in the holster even when subjected to unexpected jostling. Semiautomatic handguns must be carried without a chambered round of ammunition. Revolvers must be carried with the hammer resting on an empty cylinder.
14. The concealed carry of a handgun by 1) an individual who is legally qualified to have a handgun and who has been screened in accordance with K.S.A. 75-7c20(d), 2) an employee who is legally qualified to have a handgun, and 3) those individuals identified in paragraph 10, above, is allowed while the individual is located in non-public areas within University buildings that have restricted access entrances that require a key, key card, code, or similar device to ensure only authorized individuals are allowed into those areas. The concealed carry of a handgun by any other individual in such non-public area is prohibited. Non-public areas with University buildings must be specifically approved by the President of the University, or the President's designee, after consultation with the University

Chief of Police and the University General Counsel. Each restricted access entrance where concealed carry is prohibited as provided in this paragraph shall be conspicuously posted with appropriate signs indicating that carrying a concealed handgun into that non-public area is prohibited. The signage should be in accordance with rules and regulations adopted by the Kansas Attorney General as described in K.S.A. 75-7c10.

15. The University Police Department should be notified of a suspected violation of this policy by telephone, electronic mail, in person or in writing. Within a reasonable period of time after receiving such notification, the University Police Department shall investigate the matter and report its factual findings to Human Resources if any employee is involved or the Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards (hereinafter referred to as Student Conduct) if a student is involved. If it is a visitor, the University Police Department shall have the authority to handle the situation as deemed appropriate. Upon receipt of the factual findings, Human Resources or Student Conduct may conduct an independent investigation to determine if a policy violation has occurred. Any employee or student of the university who violates one or more provisions of this policy shall be subject to discipline in accordance with applicable university codes of conduct. Any individual who violates one or more provisions of this policy may be issued a lawful directive to leave campus with the weapon immediately. Any individual who violates the directive shall be considered to be in trespass and may be cited accordingly. Any individual who violates state or federal law may be detained, arrested or otherwise subjected to lawful processes appropriate to the circumstances.
16. Nothing in this policy is intended to replace municipal, state or federal law regarding weapons, firearms, explosives and other hazardous objects or substances or to be inconsistent with the authority afforded a lawfully commissioned peace officer.
17. This policy is intended to apply and cover any building or grounds owned by the university or the Board and any building or grounds leased by the university or the Board for university use and located within the State of Kansas. Buildings and land owned by or both owned by and leased to third parties that otherwise might be located on ground owned by the University are not included. This policy may not be applicable on all locations leased by the University if the University is not the sole tenant of the leased property. Leased locations leased and controlled by an entity that may lawfully exclude or permit firearms at their premises (concealed or otherwise) may choose at their sole discretion to exclude or permit concealed firearms from their premises, notwithstanding a lease with the University so long as the University is not the sole tenant on the leased property.

18. All University students and employees will be notified concerning this policy prior to the effective date of the policy. This notification will include learning when this policy applies, the availability of any known local or regional firearm safety instruction, how a handgun is carried and stored pursuant to this policy, how to report a suspected violation of this policy, who investigates reports, the potential consequences upon confirmation the policy has been violated and other topics relevant to this policy.

Implementation:

This policy shall be included in the WSU Policies and Procedures Manual and shared with appropriate constituencies of the University.

Effective Date:

August 25, 2006

Revision Date:

July 14, 2007

May 5, 2008

July 14, 2008

June 1, 2010

September 24, 2013

November , 2016

Appendix B: Demographic Inquiry

Demographic Inquiry

- a. Are you a member of the Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors for the university police agency which employs you?
- b. Please list the year in which you received your law enforcement commission.
- c. How many full-time certified law enforcement officers are employed by your institution? How many part-time officers?
- d. How many years of experience do you have as a university law enforcement officer?
- e. Please specify any special training you have received related to concealed firearms?

Appendix C: Research and Interview Questions

Research and Interview Questions

RQ 1. As a member of the Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors what are your perceptions about campus safety and the presence of firearms prior to implementation of the Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act (2013) effective July 1, 2017?

IQ1(a). In light of the July 1, 2017 implementation of the Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act of 2013, please describe your current thoughts on campus safety and how concealed carry will impact the university.

IQ1(b). What specific concerns do you have about the added presence of firearms?

IQ1(c). Please provide any additional information, insights, or thoughts that you would have regarding safety concerns directly related to the changes in the Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act (2013).

RQ 2. What do the Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors perceive to be the views of students, faculty and staff, administration, and residence halls staff regarding campus safety once concealed firearms are permitted on campus effective July 1, 2017?

IQ2(a). What are students' views of safety as they anticipate concealed weapons on campus?

IQ2(b). What are university faculty and staff views about campus safety as they anticipate concealed weapons on campus?

IQ2(c). What are university administration views about campus safety as they anticipate concealed weapons in the on campus?

IQ2(d). What are residence hall staff views about campus safety as they anticipate guns on campus and in residence halls?

IQ2(e). What additional information, insights, or concerns would you like to add regarding the climate of your campus related to the anticipation of concealed weapons?

RQ 3. What adjustments to current policies, practices, perceptions, or procedures have been made to address campus safety once concealed firearms are permitted on campus effective July 1, 2017 and how will this information be communicated to your various constituent groups?

IQ3(a). In anticipation of the July 1, 2017 implementation date for the Kansas Personal and Family Protection Act, many Regents institutions reviewed and recommended changes to the current weapons policy. What recommendations for changes to your current weapons policy have been adopted in your weapons policy?

IQ3(b). How will your campus inform members of the general public about how to remain compliant with the institutional weapons policy?

IQ3(c). How will your campus inform students, faculty, staff, and administrators about how to remain compliant with the institutional weapons policy?

IQ3(d). What additional information, insights, or concerns would you like to add regarding the preparation of either your agency or your institution for the arrival of lawfully concealed weapons on campus?

RQ 4. What similarities and differences exist among each university's weapons policy effective July 1, 2017?

Appendix D: IRB Form and Approval



SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
GRADUATE DEPARTMENT

Date: _____
IRB PROTOCOL NUMBER _____
(IRB USE ONLY)

IRB REQUEST
Proposal for Research
Submitted to the Baker University Institutional Review Board

I. Research Investigator(s) (Students must list faculty sponsor first)

Department(s) **School of Education Graduate Department**

Name	Signature	
1. Dr. Tes Mehring	_____	Major Advisor
2. Margaret Waterman	_____	Research Analyst
3.		University Committee Member
4. Dr. Randy Weber		External Committee Member

Principal Investigator: _____Jason Kegler_____

Phone: 620-365-9781

Email: ckegler@pittstate.edu

Mailing address:
387 4600 Street
Elsmore, Kansas 66732

Faculty sponsor:
Phone:
Email:

Expected Category of Review: ____Exempt __X__Expedited __ __Full

II: Protocol: (Type the title of your study)

Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors Perceptions of Safety Concerns Related
to the Impact of Concealed Firearms at Kansas Public 4- year Higher Education
Institutions

Summary

In a sentence or two, please describe the background and purpose of the research.

Beginning July 1, 2017 patrons of Kansas 4-year public institutions will lawfully be permitted to conceal firearms while on campus. The purpose of this research is to ascertain how this law will impact campus safety through the eyes of those responsible for ensuring safety on campus, the Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors (CRLED).

Briefly describe each condition or manipulation to be included within the study.

Currently, there are no conditions or manipulation included in this study.

What measures or observations will be taken in the study? If any questionnaire or other instruments are used, provide a brief description and attach a copy.

Each subject will be asked to describe how each campus is preparing for the presence of lawfully concealed firearms on campus. Interviewees will also be asked about their perceptions of how faculty, staff, students, and administrators view campus safety in anticipation of the new law soon to be implemented. Each university's weapons policy will be reviewed to determine similarities or differences across the six university policies.

Will the subjects encounter the risk of psychological, social, physical, or legal risk? If so, please describe the nature of the risk and any measures designed to mitigate that risk.

The researcher does not anticipate the subjects will encounter any psychological, social, physical, or legal risks. The identity of each subject will remain confidential in order to protect the privacy of each participant.

Will any stress to subjects be involved? If so, please describe.

The researcher does not foresee any stress being place on the subjects during the research collection phase of this study.

Will the subjects be deceived or misled in any way? If so, include an outline or script of the debriefing.

The researcher will not deceive or mislead the subject in any way.

Will there be a request for information which subjects might consider to be personal or sensitive? If so, please include a description.

The researcher does not believe there will be a request for information in which the subjects may consider the information to be personal or sensitive.

Will the subjects be presented with materials which might be considered to be offensive, threatening, or degrading? If so, please describe.

Subjects will not be presented with any materials in this study.

Approximately how much time will be demanded of each subject?

Subject will be required to spend approximately 2-3 hours participating in this study. Included in the 2-3 hours are 60 minutes for the face-to-face interview, 30 minutes to review the preliminary information packet, 10-15 minutes for the conversation to schedule the interview, and the remaining time will be used in the event the subject has additional questions or discussions.

Who will be the subjects in this study? How will they be solicited or contacted? Provide an outline or script of the information which will be provided to subjects prior to their volunteering to participate. Include a copy of any written solicitation as well as an outline of any oral solicitation.

The subjects in this study will be members of the Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors, the six chief law enforcement officers from each of the six public universities in Kansas. They will first be solicited by an email with a phone call as a follow-up within 3-5 days of the email being sent.

What steps will be taken to insure that each subject's participation is voluntary? What if any inducements will be offered to the subjects for their participation?

Prior to the start of the interview, each subject will be asked to sign a consent form.

How will you insure that the subjects give their consent prior to participating? Will a written consent form be used? If so, include the form. If not, explain why not.

See consent form participants will sign prior to the interview.

Will any aspect of the data be made a part of any permanent record that can be identified with the subject? If so, please explain the necessity.

No aspect of the data will be made part of any permanent record which could identify the subject.

Will the fact that a subject did or did not participate in a specific experiment or study be made part of any permanent record available to a supervisor, teacher or employer? If so, explain.

No information will be made part of a permanent record which would be available to a supervisor, teacher, or employer.

What steps will be taken to insure the confidentiality of the data? Where will it be stored? How long will it be stored? What will be done with it after the study is completed?

The data will be stored under a number assigned by the researcher. Only the researcher will have access to the origination of each assigned number. The data will be stored for a minimum of 5 years from the date it was collected. Once the 5 years have lapsed, the data will be destroyed.

If there are any risks involved in the study, are there any offsetting benefits that might accrue to either the subjects or society?

There are no personal risks to participation in this study,

Will any data from files or archival data be used? If so, please describe.

The researcher will obtain weapons policies from the Kansas Board of Regents (KBOR) for each institution. No archival data will be used.

Baker University Institutional Review Board

March 3, 2017

Dear Jason Kegler and Dr. Mehring:

The Baker University IRB has reviewed your research project application and approved this project under Expedited Status Review. As described, the project complies with all the requirements and policies established by the University for protection of human subjects in research. Unless renewed, approval lapses one year after approval date.

Please be aware of the following:

1. Any significant change in the research protocol as described should be reviewed by this Committee prior to altering the project.
2. Notify the IRB about any new investigators not named in original application.
3. When signed consent documents are required, the primary investigator must retain the signed consent documents of the research activity.
4. If this is a funded project, keep a copy of this approval letter with your proposal/grant file.
5. If the results of the research are used to prepare papers for publication or oral presentation at professional conferences, manuscripts or abstracts are requested for IRB as part of the project record.

Please inform this Committee or myself when this project is terminated or completed. As noted above, you must also provide IRB with an annual status report and receive approval for maintaining your status. If you have any questions, please contact me at EMorris@BakerU.edu or 785.594.7881.

Sincerely,



Erin Morris PhD
Chair, Baker University IRB

Baker University IRB Committee
Joe Watson PhD
Nate Poell MA
Susan Rogers PhD
Scott Crenshaw

Appendix E: Consent Form

Consent Form

Please consider this information carefully before deciding whether to participate in this research.

Purpose of the research: To understand the safety concerns of members of the Council of Regents Law Enforcement Directors as it relates to the impact of concealed firearms at Kansas public 4- year higher education institutions

What you will do in this research: If you decide to volunteer, you will be asked to participate in one interview. You will be asked several questions. Every attempt will be made to insure the anonymity of each participant. With your permission, I will tape record the interviews so I don't have to make so many notes.

Time required: The interview will take approximately 1 hour or less.

Permission to Audio Record: I acknowledge and allow my interview to be audio recorded to ensure accuracy.

Risks: No risks are anticipated. If you feel uncomfortable answering any of the questions, we may skip them.

Benefits: This is a chance for you to tell your story about your experiences concerning the organizations use of business analytics and the decision made based on such analyses.

Confidentiality: Your responses to interview questions will be kept confidential. At no time will your actual identity be revealed. The recording will be erased upon completion of the transcription and uploading of finished assignment.

Participation and withdrawal: Your participation in this study is completely voluntary, and you may refuse to participate or withdraw from the study at any time. You may withdraw by informing the experimenter that you no longer wish to participate (no questions will be asked).

To Contact the Researcher: If you have questions or concerns about this research, please contact: Jason Kegler at 620-365-9781 or via ckegler@pittstate.edu. You may also contact the faculty member supervising this work: Peg Waterman, Associate Professor – Baker University, (816) 560-6384, Peg.Waterman@bakeru.edu.

Agreement:

The nature and purpose of this research have been sufficiently explained and I agree to participate in this study. I understand that I am free to withdraw at any time without incurring any penalty.

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Name (print): _____