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Foreword

Colleges and universities around the country are becoming more diligent and proactive in providing a safe environment for students, faculty, staff, and visitors to their campuses. Changes in the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) have given administrators “appropriate flexibility and deference” regarding the disclosure of educational records and information\(^1\). The U.S. Department of Education encourages schools and colleges to develop threat assessment programs and teams. These teams should include campus community members and may include non-employee members such as local police and health professionals. These non-employees can qualify as “school officials” with a “legitimate educational interest” under 34 CFR § 99.31(a)(1)(i)(B). Additionally, the Federal Bureau of Investigation supports the development of threat assessment teams in its report, *Mass Victimization: Promising Avenues for Prevention*\(^2\).

Our university has established the BIT Team to assist in addressing situations in which students, faculty, or staff are displaying behaviors that are concerning, disruptive, or threatening in nature and that potentially impede their own or others’ ability to function successfully or safely. These policies and procedures are designed to help identify persons whose behavior potentially endangers their own or others’ health and safety, or is disruptive to the educational or administrative processes of the university.

It is the responsibility of faculty, staff, and students to immediately report any situation that could possibly result in harm to anyone at the university. Any member of the campus community may become aware of an individual or situation that is causing serious anxiety, stress, or fear. It must be noted, however, that behavioral assessment should not be confused with crisis management. A “crisis” may be defined as a situation in which a person may pose an active or immediate risk of violence to self or others. In these cases, the university police should be contacted at 229-931-2245.

---


Team Mission & Vision

*The team mission defines the scope of team activities and provides a general sense of direction and guidance to the team. The mission becomes the basis for the team goals and how the team is evaluated. The mission also helps the campus community understand the team’s purpose.*

**BIT Mission:** The campus BIT Team engages in proactive and collaborative approaches to identify, assess, and mitigate risks associated with students, faculty, staff, and visitors exhibiting concerning behaviors or thoughts. By partnering with members of the community, the BIT Team strives to promote individual student, faculty, and staff wellbeing and success while prioritizing community safety.

**BIT Motto:** College should be challenging, not overwhelming. Let us help.

**Team Goals:**

- Provide a safe physical environment for members of the university community,
- Provide a safe emotional environment for the university community, and
- Promote peace of mind for friends and family of the university community.
Team Membership

The BIT Team consists of university personnel with expertise in human resources/employee assistance, law enforcement/threat assessment/tactical applications, university operations, medical and mental health, and student engagement. Membership is based on the position and not the individual. The members selected here have regular contact with campus community members in some manner, which will aid in the assessment of individual, and/or the authority to take the appropriate action, as needed. A collaborative process to assess concerning behavior will be used. Depending on the situation, additional personnel with specific areas of specialization or responsibility may be called upon to assist the team. The team may also consult other individuals as needed, such as a faculty member who has a concern about a student, a roommate, family member, local law enforcement, and/or a manager who has information concerning an employee. The BIT Team Chair will keep senior university officials advised of situations.

Director of Student Rights and Responsibilities: The Director of Student Rights and Responsibilities chairs the team and attends all meetings. The Chairperson organizes the agenda, performs a cursory rating with the NaBITA Threat Assessment Tool, ensures team members’ attendance, ensures that a risk level is assigned to each case during meetings, and coordinates the selection and implementation of interventions and follow-up for cases. The Dean maintains case data through an electronic reporting database.

Data Reporting Responsibilities:
- Brief overview of the incident report.
- Admission application: Did the individual check the box associated with a criminal history? Did the individual check the box noting having been suspended or expelled from another institution?
- Financial Aid/Bursar’s Office information: Is the individual having difficulty paying the tuition bill or experiencing other financial aid concerns?
- Withdrawal information: Did the individual previously withdraw from school? Was the withdrawal for a medical reason?
- Student organization information: Is the individual a member of a student organization or Greek Life? Are there systemic problems associated with that organization?

Student Conduct Officer: The Student Conduct Officer consults on cases involving on- and off-campus conduct violations, criminal charges, and academic disruptions. Student Conduct data is partitioned from the BIT Team. Conduct records are protected under FERPA and shared with the BIT Team by the Student Conduct Officer under the legitimate educational interest clause of FERPA.

Data Reporting Responsibilities:
- Conduct history of individual: Are there previous records of academic and non-academic discipline concerns?
- Are there reoccurring themes of behavior or possibly escalating behaviors? Is the individual well known to the student conduct office?
- In any previous cases, what was the level of assessment using the NaBITA Tool? If a behavioral baseline has been established for this individual, is the currently reported behavior in line with the assessment baseline or not?

**Faculty/Academic Affairs:** This individual also often serves as the primary contact in working with faculty, Department Chairs, and Provosts. As most institutions are concerned with shared governance, working closely with the faculty senate to select a team member is advisable. The contact could be a Dean, Department Chair, or other academic affairs administrator who carries enough positional leadership and influence to assist the team with gaining community buy-in or training and reporting. Additionally, it is best if this person has a good understanding and appreciation for student affairs structure and theory.

**Data Reporting Responsibility:**
- Review individual admission application: Does the individual’s application and transcripts from other institutions match? Did the individual write in the space asking why the person wanted to attend this institution? Is there an admission essay, and if so, what does it say?
- Academic history (e.g., high school and college transcripts, and recent grades from past terms): Are current grades consistent with what should be normally expected? Are there dips in grades with a return to normal? Is there anything about the degree program that impacts the situation?
- Current class attendance, participation, and demeanor: Is the individual attending? Was the person attending, but recently stopped? Does the individual take an active and constructive part in class discussions? Does the individual turn in assignments? What is the regular appearance and hygiene associated with the individual?
- Class disturbances addressed independently by the instructor: Has the instructor had any unreported issues with the individual, either during class or possibly online?

**Chief of Police:** Our campus has a sworn police department and the Chief attends each meeting. If the Chief is unable to attend, another officer attends the meeting. The Chief provides liaison communications with local and federal law enforcement agencies, consults on BIT Team cases that have court or law enforcement elements, and assists with interventions on campus requiring a police presence. Police records are kept separate from student conduct and BIT Team records. These records are protected by FERPA and shared with the BIT Team by the Chief under the emergency exception clause of the law.
**Data Reporting Responsibilities:**

- **Criminal History:** Was the individual hired or admitted to the institution with a known criminal history? Could the same type of behavior be taking place now?
- **Police Contact and Reports:** There may be a report with no charges of which only the police department is aware. The individual may be a repeat witness to events; this may bring into question whether the person is actually part of that problem. Has the individual been a recent victim of a crime?
- **Social Media:** Are posts by the individual dark or concerning? Do they have threatening statements or overtones? Who are the individual’s “friends,” and what do they post? What groups, activities, etc., does the individual like? Are there writings on social media that could possibly be evaluated using the VRAW² Campus Assessment Response and Education?

**Counseling Staff:** The Counseling staff attend the meetings and receive information from the team to ensure collaborative communication and consults on issues of mental health, crisis, and disruptive/dangerous behavior. The Counseling staff keep privileged medical treatment records. These records are protected by state confidentiality law, and information is only shared with the BIT Team when a student gives permission through a specific release of information or the expanded informed consent document (Appendix A). Exceptions to confidentiality law include danger to self and others on a need-to-know basis.

**Data Reporting Responsibilities:**

- The team member from the counseling center most likely will not share any knowledge of a particular individual unless a release has been signed or there has been a public incident, such as suicide attempt in a resident hall. The counseling representative may be able to speak professionally to the public knowledge of an event.
- Counselors may also be able to share professional insight in a general sense, such as recalling a similar situation when working at another institution.
- Counselors may assist by educating the team about certain disorders that present in the individual based on observable behaviors being described by other team members at the meeting.

**Residential Living Staff:** Residential Living staff members attend the meetings and offer insight into residential life students, after-hours emergencies, and targeted intervention with Resident Leaders (RLs). The Residential Life Staff members keep housing records and these records are covered under FERPA. Information is shared with the BIT Team under the legitimate educational interest clause of FERPA.

**Data Reporting Responsibilities:**

- **Incident Reports:** Are there any residence life incident reports on the individual? Have professional staff or student staff interacted with the individual?
• Room Condition: Does residence life have a vehicle for conducting a room inspection? Is the individual unusually clean? Is the room a health hazard? Are there pictures or posters of concern (e.g., depicting guns, death, or destruction)?
• Roommates’ Impression of the individual: BIT should be taken in obtaining this information as to not violate FERPA.
• Recent Room Changes: Does the individual have difficulty making friends? Is the individual intentionally creating a roommate conflict to drive others away and get a private room?
• Recent Maintenance Requests: Are there unusual patterns of requests? Is there more than what would be considered normal wear and tear on the room?

**Human Resources:** The Director of Human Resources (HR) speaks to issues related to reports concerning faculty or staff members, as well as student-employee situations. Depending on the need for privacy, the HR Director may work with a subset of the BIT Team to assess and develop intervention strategies for the faculty or staff in distress. Records for faculty and staff cases that come to the BIT Team are kept within the human resources database.

**Data Reporting Responsibilities:**
• Employment Records: Do the personnel files indicate a criminal history, letters of correction or reprimand, letters of accommodation, complaints from other employees, appeals, or grievances filed?

**Director of Disability Services:** The Director of Disability Services consults and offers guidance on issues of academic, residential, and other accommodations. If this person is unable to attend a meeting, reports or other useful information should be sent to the Chair of the BIT Team. Records in the disability services office are protected under FERPA and exist in the DataKeeper record system. Information is shared with the BIT Team under the emergency exception clause of FERPA.

**First Year Experience Staff:** FYE Staff connects the BIT Team with academic retention efforts and academic advising information such as missed classes, family crises, mental health difficulties, and study problems. Retention records are kept in the StarFish software platform and shared with the BIT Team under the FERPA legitimate educational interest clause.

**Health Center Director:** The Health Center Director collaborates with the team on students having medical emergencies, mental health challenges (beyond counseling services), and other health-related concerns. Information in the health center is protected by state confidentiality law based on the licensure of the doctors and nurses employed there and under HIPAA. Information is only shared with the BIT Team when the student gives permission through a specific release of information or if the information falls under the HIPAA emergency exception.

**Title IX Coordinator:** The Title IX Coordinator attends the meeting when there is a Title IX matter that overlaps in a way that is useful for both the Title IX Coordinator and the BIT Team to discuss. Records for Title IX are kept separate and confidential from the BIT Team.
Auxiliary Members

Auxiliary Members do not attend meetings or have access to the database. These team members function as the eyes and ears to share reports with the team. These members also receive additional training when it comes to intervention and the management of students, faculty, and staff. The training includes NaBITA’s suicide gatekeeper program, as well as a mental health awareness and intervention programs.

- **First-Year Experience Faculty:** The BIT Team identifies several faculty members who work as part of the First-Year Experience Program. This semester-long course teaches students to avoid some of the common pitfalls in the college experience, such as procrastinating, poor social life/academic balance, losing contact with home/family, and poor study habits. These faculty members are given additional training and are often used by the BIT Team to help connect students to on-campus support resources.

- **Orientation Leaders:** Among the first people new students meet on campus are the group leaders during orientation events in the summer and January. These leaders receive training on basic mental health first aid, suicide prevention, group communication, leadership, and study skills. These leaders work with the BIT Team to share information and help connect students to BIT.

- **All Residential Staff Members:** Our college has a robust residential life program involving professional staff and student advisors (RLs). Both groups are trained in conflict resolution and mediation skills, as well as in mental health crisis de-escalation. Residential life stuffers serve to identify at-risk behaviors as they occur in the halls and assist with interventions.

- **Athletic Staff and Leaders:** Given the high number of students involved in athletics on campus, the BIT Team works collaboratively with the athletic department, coaches, and team captains to train them in mental health first aid, suicide awareness, and how to work with students who are struggling. Staff and student leaders are encouraged to share information with the BIT Team and often work in tandem to help students be successful at college.

- **Club/Student Organization officers:** Many student leaders on campus who work with clubs, organizations, and student government have been recognized as resources who can identify at-risk students and refer them to the BIT Team. These students are part of a larger safety net to ensure that students who are struggling are identified and connected to services through BIT Team referrals and follow-up.
- **Front Office Staff:** Front office staff members from several departments (including the registrar’s office, counseling, health, athletics, advisement, financial aid, and parking and transportation) have been chosen as auxiliary members based on their front-line position when working with students, faculty, or staff who are frustrated, disruptive, or dangerous in their offices. These employees receive additional training to de-escalate crisis situations and pass information onto the BIT Team for assessment and follow-up.
Team Functioning

Meetings
The team meets weekly on Tuesday afternoons from 9:30 AM -11:00 AM. The team meets in the conference room on the third floor of the Student Success Center.

Core team members can gather basic data on an individual in their respective areas. Members have policy and practice experience, and “have the authority to take independent action when needed.”3 For their data-reporting responsibilities, individual team members bring their respective data to the BIT table during the initial discussion of an individual.

Members will know about the individuals on the agenda prior to each meeting. This enables members to gather the expected information from their area and report to the team. As team members are delivering their reports, BIT should be taken not to interrupt the speakers, except to ask a clarification-type of question. Other members may take notes, but should remain unemotional and non-judgmental at this time.

While each meeting can be adjusted by the BIT Chair and the team membership, generally speaking, the first 15–30 minutes of the meeting are to be spent reviewing previous cases, obtaining updates, and assigning action items to team members. The remaining meeting time is spent going around the room and soliciting new cases from team members. When addressing new cases, the meeting flow is respectful of the Three Phase Process, which is at the heart of a BIT Team and consists of: 1) gathering and presenting data; 2) applying a rubric/analyzing data; and 3) implementing an appropriate intervention.

Team members who have new cases to share at the BIT Team meeting will, whenever possible, highlight and share these cases for the BIT Chair so that the person in that position can research the cases and better manage the meeting time and flow. This should be done before the meeting to allow the Chair time for research and meeting management planning.

Meetings are not rushed. The 90-minute time frame and commitment to weekly meetings reflects the BIT Team’s commitment to spending the time necessary to review cases thoroughly and without rushing to conclusion. It is the BIT Team Chair’s responsibility to keep the team on
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Meetings in Escalation task designated The Details
times and on BIT with team are conferences determine administrative the meeting Regular meeting, Preliminary meeting during opportunities investigate may Team this are dedicated Decision news, members, recorder be conducted Initial case may be canceled if the case is added to the next regular team meeting agenda as appropriate.

Initial Evaluation May Include:
1. Review of the BIT Team database and available information the individual.
2. Sending information out about the incident to other BIT Team members to begin gathering additional information about the individual.
3. Discussions to confirm areas of corroborating evidence.
4. Other relevant information as deemed appropriate to ensure the safety of the university community.
5. Determining an initial rating on the NaBITA Threat Assessment Tool. If the report indicates a more serious concern (i.e., moderate/elevated or above on the NaBITA tool) then the BIT Team Chair notifies pertinent team members to assess and mitigate the risk. It may be determined that additional assessment should occur prior to the next regular team meeting.
6. The case is added to the next regular team meeting agenda as appropriate.

- Preliminary Response Meeting: Once a report is received, a preliminary response meeting may be conducted by the BIT Chair and the BIT Team member having administrative responsibility for the individual. Other appropriate BIT Team members may be consulted and included during this initial evaluation. These team members will investigate the submitted report and, if appropriate, convene the BIT Team for an emergency meeting. Otherwise, these findings will be reported at the regular team meeting, as described above.

- Regular Team Meeting: Described above, these meetings occur every week and are designed to review previous cases, assess the status of interventions and follow-ups, determine risk ratings and interventions for new cases, and provide regular opportunities for training. Training may be scheduled or provided at regular meetings during quiet times and may include tabletop exercises, discussion of current topics in the news, reading assignments, and webinars. Other trainings should include attending conferences and similar opportunities when possible.
Case review will include:

1. Follow up on previous cases, update risk level, assign team member for intervention;
2. Briefing on the preliminary response meeting by the BIT Team Chair or designee;
3. Review of available data, documentation, interviews, and other relevant information;
4. General discussion guided by the D2T (see Appendix L);
5. Assignment of a risk rating on the NaBITA Threat Assessment Tool; and
6. Recommendations by the team for appropriate intervention(s).

- **Critical Incident Response Meeting (CIR):** In the event that an individual attempts or dies by suicide, there is an apparent threat or danger to the campus or community members, or an event has occurred that may require the immediate attention of the BIT Team, a CIR meeting may be called by the Chair. This should not be confused with an active crisis, which is managed by the university police. Any actions or recommendation of a CIR should be reviewed at the next regular team meeting.

**Phases of Operations**

- **Prevention:** While all phases of operations seek to prevent violence, harm, and crisis, the BIT Team also seeks to prevent the presence of concerns on the campus through education and initiatives related to various risk factors for violence and self-harm.
- **Data Gathering:** Data is gathered through reports to the BIT Team, review of academic and employment records, follow-up interviews, criminal history records, discussions with faculty, supervisors, family and friends, and any other means deemed appropriate and necessary.
- **Analysis:** Once submitted, the report will be forwarded to the BIT Chair and members of the team for review. The report will automatically become part of the electronic database used for the active assessment of persons of concern and to generate report data.
- **Assessment:** The team uses multiple assessment tools to rank level of risk to the community (e.g., the NaBITA Threat Assessment Tool, SIVRA-35, and WAVR-21).
- **Intervention:** The BIT Team will, by way of the appropriate university office or officials, investigate and respond to reported behavior indicating that a student, faculty, staff, or other university community member may pose a risk to self or others. Interventions are based on the NaBITA Threat Assessment Tool’s recommendations for action based on the established risk level.
- **Follow-up:** The BIT Team may refer students, faculty, or staff members to professional counseling, make recommendation(s) for the filing of criminal charges, facilitate medical withdrawals, assign the individual to the Case Manager, or take other actions deemed appropriate.
- **Evaluation:** The BIT Team evaluates the intervention, recording the number of students retained on their course of study, suspended, or permanently excluded from campus.
The BIT Team reviews cases to see what lessons can be learned for future interventions. It informs our anti-discriminatory practices by addressing issues of equality and diversity. Statistical data from the evaluations are then used as part of the annual report, which appraises the work we have achieved over the last academic year.

- **Training and Development:** Based on the evaluation, the BIT team develops monthly training goals and activities to improve team functioning. Examples of this are provided in Appendix F.

**Team Responsibilities**

The BIT Team is responsible for:

1. Developing and implementing educational and training programs for all members of the university community with regard to behavioral assessment. This should include publications and promotional materials designed to create awareness, understanding, and participation with the BIT Team.
2. Maintaining a current website, which can be easily accessed from the university’s home page and other relevant departmental pages. This site should include links to informational and referral sites, and instructions for filing a report with the BIT Team.
3. Receiving, coordinating, and assessing referrals received from faculty, staff, students, and others regarding persons of concern.
4. Coordinating interventions and resource assistance for persons of concern.
5. Reviewing applications for admission to the university of students who indicated that they have a criminal record or currently have charges pending; or students who were suspended or expelled from a previously attended college or university. This will be accomplished by means of a BIT Team subcommittee with the Director of Student Rights and Responsibilities, Chief of Police, and admission office (see Appendix M).
6. Reviewing applications for readmission of students who were suspended for disciplinary reasons or who were involuntarily administratively withdrawn from the university. These applications will be brought to the attention of the BIT Team by the Director of Student Rights and Responsibilities.
7. Reviewing applications for readmission to the university from students who received a medical/hardship withdrawal. This will be accomplished by means of a BIT Team subcommittee with the Director of Student Rights and Responsibilities, Director of Counseling, Director of Student Health, and the Director of Disability Services. This process is in place to provide transitional assistance to students who voluntarily withdrew from the university.
8. Providing an annual report to the Vice President for Student Affairs.
Team Communication & Silo Reduction

Communication is the *sine qua non* of an effective BIT Team. Team members receive training to address the barriers to effective communication. The BIT Team operates more effectively when there is a sense of trust and connection among its members. This trust and connection is developed through ongoing conversations, frequent meetings, trainings, and discussions when tensions exist. The Team Chair watches over communication trends to ensure that problems are identified and addressed early and effectively.

**Keys to Effective BIT Team Communication**

1. **Leave Your Hierarchy at the Door:** Team members are encouraged to operate on equal footing when it comes to conversations. The BIT Team avoids hierarchy or shutting down conversations based on supervisory authority or positional power. Conversations are egalitarian and all team members are encouraged to talk and share their perspectives.

2. **Stay in Your Lane:** While conversation is encouraged, there is another saying from NaBITA about staying in your lane. This refers to the idea that team members should be BITful about speaking outside of their areas of expertise or over-relying on unique personal experiences when making decisions. For example, conduct staff should not review health or mental health reports, and law enforcement should not be discussing the appropriateness of an emotional support animal accommodation on campus. This requires maintaining a balance, as the BIT Team values a diversity of perspectives. This diversity of opinion is set against the backdrop of respect for each other’s areas of expertise.

3. **Play Devil’s Advocate:** The BIT Team avoids coming to decisions based on superficial concord. Diverse perspectives and “what if” scenarios should be essential to vetting the quality of an assessment and the likelihood of a successful intervention. This does not mean outright discord and harmful debate and disagreement are encouraged; rather, it means that team members make space at the table for alternative viewpoints.

4. **See the Forest for the Trees:** The BIT Team encourages team members to have vigorous discussions related to cases. These discussions should challenge conventional thinking and stress logic and solution-focused interventions. Team members are strongly encouraged to see each case as just that — a single event — and not to allow past frustrations or disagreements to shade future discussions.

In terms of silo reduction, each department wrestles with the privacy (and sometimes privilege) of its information, and when and how it can appropriately be shared with the team. Most departments within the team keep records based on FERPA and have wide latitude to share information under the law’s legitimate educational interest clause.
At the heart of this policy is the challenge between respecting the privacy needs of the individual while also ensuring the safety of the community. There will always be an appropriate tension between these two goals. This issue is more pressing for our counseling and health departments, which must follow professional ethical standards and state confidentiality laws and/or HIPAA, in addition to FERPA, and these often have a higher standard of protection in terms of what information can be released.

Both health and counseling departments have requirements to share limited information when there is an imminent risk of suicide or harm to others. This is discussed in state law and the scope of practice for mental health clinicians, doctors, nurses, and other medical providers. The more challenging issue arises when the BIT Team is discussing a student who is known to health and/or counseling, and the privileged information kept within those departments would be useful for the team to guide its assessment and intervention, but it does not meet the standard for release.

To this end, counseling has adopted an expanded informed consent document that permits the disclosure of information to the BIT Team at a standard lower than imminent risk or Tarasoff, or harm to others. This is described in the expanded informed consent document included in Appendix A. Health services does not use the same document and instead decides based on the severity of the circumstances in each case whether the Director of Health can share information with the team based on HIPAA’s emergency exception clause.

Nurturing the Referral Source
Cultures of reporting do not exist in a vacuum. The members of campus communities and those who interact with the BIT Team possess critical information about at-risk members of the community, as well as those who may be becoming “at risk.” One of the challenges for the BIT Team is to activate, create, and operate channels of communication that allow for a flow of information from those who have it to those who need it — BIT Team members. Creating and nurturing the channels will facilitate the information flow, but the BIT Team must also reach out to the campus and related community to teach what concerning behavior looks like, what baseline behaviors are (and thus what deviations look like), and what to do with reports when concerning behavior is observed or suspected.

To this end, once a report is received from the community, the BIT Chair will reach out to the referring source by email, telephone or a face-to-face conversation. This is done to 1) ask how the referrer is doing personally regarding the report, as there are some instances of trauma associated with making a report and it is important to BIT for the reporter; 2) confirm the details of the report, as the reporter may have missed relevant details and clarification may be

---

4 As of 2012, 33 states have adopted a mandatory duty to protect for mental health professionals in statute or common law, 11 states have a permissive duty, and six states are described as having no statutes or case law offering guidance. A duty to warn or protect is mandated and codified in legislative statutes of 23 states, while the duty is not codified in a statute but is present in the common law supported by precedent in 10 states. (Tarasoff v. Regents of University of California, 1976)
needed to discover the observed behaviors; and 3) ask the reporter to partner with you as a continuing observer as the BIT Team implements certain interventions to assist the individual.

Other communications are tailored for specific situations and approved by the Team Chair. There are times when the team should consider bringing the reporter (faculty/staff) onboard to assist in the intervention process. FERPA gives the BIT Team latitude to enlist relevant faculty or staff members as an aid to assist persons of concern. While this helps to nurture the referral source and keep the faculty/staff member more connected to the team, it also provides a collaborative approach to intervention and case management.

**Team Training**
The BIT Team is dedicated to the continuous improvement of the team through research and training. The BIT Team’s training approach is made up of two central tenets. The first is a dedication to planning and developing a training schedule to reinforce content knowledge. The goal is for the team to develop and maintain a culture of learning and dedication to finding new information and building on existing best practices. The second involves inter-team dynamics.

**Content Knowledge**
The team conducts at least one tabletop exercise each semester to discuss the assessment and intervention response to hypothetical scenarios. These are drawn from the NaBITA books *Ending Campus Violence, Best BITS, The Prevention and Management of Mental Health Emergencies*; the Magna publication *Tabletop Exercises for Threat Assessment Teams*; and the Paperclip Communication publication *Campus Mental Health Case Studies*.

Each team member has completed at least one of the following courses prior to joining the team:

- NaBITA’s two-day Best Practice Certification Course ([www.nabita.org](http://www.nabita.org))
- NaBITA’s two-day Foundations Certification Course ([www.nabita.org](http://www.nabita.org))
- Proactive Resolutions HCR-20 Training ([www.proactive-resolutions.com](http://www.proactive-resolutions.com))
- Association of Threat assessment Professionals’ Threat Assessment Training/Certification ([www.atapworldwide.org](http://www.atapworldwide.org))

Additional training is encouraged, such as:

- NaBITA’s two-day Case Management and Intervention Course
- NaBITA’s one-day course on suicide prevention (PASS — Prevent Another Student Suicide) and mental health interventions (Lend a Hand)
- The Higher Education Case Management Association (HECMA) Roundtable
- The Association of Student Conduct Administrators (ASCA) Conference or Institute
- National or regional conferences by the Association of Threat Assessment Professionals (ATAP)
Legal updates and input concerning state and federal law, communication standards, and involuntary commitment. Trainings should cover not only the laws, but also the exceptions to the laws.

The BIT Team also looks at the potential to bring in experts from these groups to consult or train locally and/or on campus.

The team’s training schedule for the upcoming year is listed in Appendix F.

Inter-Team Dynamics
The second tenet of the team’s training is addressing inter-team dynamics. The team members have completed both a Myers-Briggs-style inventory and StrengthFinder 2.0 to help them to better understand how they approach problems and group communication. Each year, the team rotates the responsibility for a half-day retreat to discuss how team communication worked during the past year and ways to improve team cohesion and trust.
Community Engagement & Education

The BIT Team recognizes that educating the community about what to report is one of the most essential aspects of having a successful and effective team. Driving a multi-faceted marketing strategy is a list of concerns the team needs community members to report. The list of these concerns is included in Appendix B.

It is the responsibility of faculty, staff, and students to immediately report any situation that could possibly result in harm to anyone at the university. Any member of the campus community may become aware of a troubling person or situation that is causing serious anxiety, stress, or fear. However, behavioral assessment should not be confused with crisis management. A crisis may be defined as a situation in which a person may pose an active or immediate risk of violence to self or others. In these cases, the university police should be contacted at 229-931-2245.

After-hour reports that come to the BIT Team are immediately triaged by the Chair of the team and the campus call center/dispatch during the evenings, weekends, and school closures. If the report indicates a more serious concern (e.g., moderate/elevated or above on the NaBITA Tool), then the BIT Team Chair notifies pertinent team members to assess and mitigate the risk.

When developing marketing content for the BIT Team, the following information is a priority to communicate through all the various outlets:

- **What to Report:** The BIT Team breaks down the “Disruptive and Dangerous” list to share with the community as to what they should report to the team. It is stressed that this reporting is not punitive, but instead designed to better connect students to services. The BIT Team is not the conduct office. Reports should be about helping an individual, not getting someone into trouble.

- **How to Contact the Team:** There are many ways to contact the team. Ideally, community members would fill out the BIT reporting form. The BIT Team recognizes that community members will have different levels of comfort when sharing information. The BIT Team is committed to allowing the community to report through its website, the BIT app, phone number, stopping by the office of BIT Team members, or through the central BIT Team email or emails of individual BIT members. Anonymous reports are also taken by the team.

- **Composition of the Team:** Community members have different levels of comfort sharing information with the team. Since gathering information is one of the most essential team functions, the BIT Team acknowledges that some students, faculty, and staff members may be more comfortable approaching a BIT Team member directly to make a report. Members of the team are clearly communicated to the community and available in Team Membership section of this manual.
The following outlines key methods for BIT Team advertising to the campus community.

- **Web:** The BIT Team maintains a Web presence to educate those in the community about the team. The website URL has an alias created by the IT department for ease of accessibility: [https://www.gsw.edu/campus-life/campusservices/judicialaffairs/behavioral-intervention-team](https://www.gsw.edu/campus-life/campusservices/judicialaffairs/behavioral-intervention-team)

- **Brochure:** The BIT Team has a brochure in printed form as well as a PDF that it makes available during training events and orientation. The brochure describes the team’s mission, what behaviors to report, and who is on the team. It also contains links to the website and other social media.

- **PowerPoint:** The BIT Team has a 15-slide PowerPoint presentation that it developed as a structured aid to go along with a half-hour talk on the BIT Team and what information the team seeks from the community. This slide show is used during classroom presentations, orientation events, and talks with faculty departments, staff offices, residential life, and athletics.
Documentation & Records

The BIT team keeps records in a shared database, partitioned apart from the student conduct records. Records from BIT Team meetings are entered primarily by the Case Manager or the BIT Team Chair to ensure consistency in the creation of records. During the week members also have access to the shared database to update cases.

Records are kept for seven years in the shared database, unless there is a pressing issue that necessitates that specific notes be kept longer. This is done at the discretion of the BIT Team Chair. Examples of this would include a student completing extended study on campus beyond seven years, or a student with elevated or above risk who leaves campus and presents a likelihood of return in future years.

Records are to be kept secure, and team members are expected to keep records safely firewalled and protected. Records should not be transmitted by email with identifying student, faculty, or staff information. Records should not be kept on unsecure USB or thumb drives. Information kept on laptop and computer systems should be under password protection.

Note Audit

Twice a year, the team meets to conduct a note audit. This involves the Chair (or that person’s designee) pulling a random set of 10 notes out of the shared database to be projected on a screen and reviewed during a 90-minute meeting. Notes are critiqued on their quality and suggestions for improvements are made in terms of note-keeping.

Notes for the BIT Team have three central qualities:

1. Describe briefly what happened with the person in question. What is the presenting problem?
2. Discuss the team’s analysis and rating on the NaBITA Threat Assessment Tool.
3. Indicate who the primary follow-up staff members are, as well as the expectations for intervention and future outreach and connection.

Notes should strive to follow these guidelines:

- **Be an Appropriate Length**: Notes should not be too lengthy (more than 300 words or several paragraphs) or overly short (several sentences). Notes should ideally consist of two to three sentences for each of the three areas mentioned earlier.
- **Be Objective and Fact-Based**: Notes should not have a negative tone or contain subjective opinions. Notes should explain the facts as they are presented to the team, describe a risk rating, and outline a plan of action without a negative tenor or attitude.
- **Not Be Overly Technical or Diagnostic**: BIT Team notes should not include diagnoses or coded language. Abbreviations, when used, should be clearly explained so that anyone reading the notes can follow them easily.
• **Leave No Doors Open:** When a significant safety issue is raised in a note (such as a suicide or danger to others), the following note should reference how the issue in the previous note was resolved or what follow-up was conducted. When a door is opened in the note regarding a serious issue, the door should be closed by addressing how the issue was resolved or what the current plan of action is.

When notes are reviewed, staff members should reference the previously described categories and traits to ensure that notes are adhering to best practices.

**Record Requests**
In the event that students request to see their BIT records, those records will be made available within one week to the student, but with the names of other students and/or reporting sources redacted. A printed copy of their record will be presented to them at no cost. The BIT Team Chair (or that person’s designee) will review the records with students prior to them leaving with the records.

In the event that faculty or staff members request to see their records, they will be made available through the Human Resources department’s policy.

**Record Expungement/Removal**
Student can request to have their BIT Team notes expunged. This would either entail the complete deletion of the record from the shared database system or the creation of a flag that precludes the notes from being shared with others when requested.

There are several reasons why students may request that their notes be expunged:
• concerns that the notes would be discovered as they apply for political office,
• the need to gain security clearance from the government or law enforcement for a job,
• to ensure they are not blocked from a teaching or nursing position, or
• a student learns of the documentation and is not comfortable having these records exist.

In the review, these reasons must be balanced against the ongoing relationship between the student and the college. The University doesn’t want to lose data they may need again in the future.

At the heart of the BIT Team’s work is the concept that collecting early alert information that may allow for early prevention. By casting this net wide, the BIT Team will create files on students who likely will not escalate beyond their initial incident of concern. For instance, imagine a professor reports a tearful student in class whose girlfriend broke up with him. While we would want the professor to pay attention to these types of scenarios, it would be reasonable to assume this is a low level mild risk on the NaBITA Threat Assessment Tool. If the student learns of this record, it would be equally reasonable for them to request a removal or expungement of the record.
When an expungement request is submitted, the Chair of the BIT Team will appoint two members, chosen based on the aspects of the specific case, to make up a review committee. They will discuss the request and come to a decision about the appropriateness of the removal of the records. This process will be completed within two weeks. For example, given the case described above, the team members may be from counseling and/or academic affairs.

The two members of the review committee will consider the following in making their determination:

- Low-level risk (i.e., mild and moderate), one-time events should be strong candidates for expungement. Higher risk events that have repeated over time are not good candidates for expungement.
- Events that occurred more than a year ago with no subsequent events or concerns should be considered for expungement. Events that have occurred recently (e.g., in the past few weeks or months) or have been repeated are not good candidates for expungement.
- The review committee should contemplate the likelihood of needing the information being requested for expungement in the future.

In the event that the record is not approved for expungement, efforts should be made to explain this decision to the student and consider the appropriateness of adding a summary or note to the file to provide a more positive context to the student’s current behavior (assuming the student is in good standing). The BIT Team may also consult with General Counsel at the college to gain another opinion about the decision.

The committee retains the authority to expunge, amend, or keep the note as it is. This provides for a more robust discussion with the student when the needs of the university to keep essential data and the desire of the student to have the data removed come into conflict.
Threat Assessment Rubrics

The team uses several risk rubrics to provide research-based, objective categories to drive intervention decisions. All cases are given a risk rating on the NaBITA Threat Assessment Tool of mild, moderate, elevated, severe, or extreme. Cases that involve writing with concerning content will be reviewed using the Violence Risk Assessment of the Written Word (VRAW²). Cases that are elevated on the hostility and violence scale of the NaBITA Threat Assessment Tool are considered for further assessment using the SIVRA-35, WAVR-21, or HCR-20. When students display strong religious, political, or social justice beliefs, and there is concern that they may use threats, intimidation, or violence to meet their ideological ends, the Radicalization Risk Rubric (R³) may be used.

NaBITA Threat Assessment Tool
The NaBITA Threat Assessment Tool was created in 2009 and updated in 2014 as a broad triage process to rate mental health concerns (e.g., distress, disturbance, and dysregulation/decompensation) and hostility and violence risks (e.g., hardening, contentious debate, action not words, images and coalitions, loss of face to target, threat strategies, limited destructive blows, fragmentation of the enemy, and plunging together into the abyss) and to provide a generalized risk rubric (mild, moderate, elevated, severe, or extreme).

The NaBITA Threat Assessment Tool provides a triage capacity to identity and classify risks over a broad set of concerns. The strength of this triage measure is in its ability to look broadly at a wide variety of risks to guide the intervention decisions of the BIT Team. Its expansive nature makes the tool not as helpful for the assessment of the specific risks in detail.

The Violence Risk Assessment of the Written Word (VRAW²)
The VRAW² was created in 2015 following increasing number of cases in which college students shared concerning written communication through social media, creative writing classes, and over email. The VRAW² offers five factors (Fixation and Focus, Hierarchical Thematic Content, Action and Time Imperative, Pre-Attack Planning, and Injustice Collecting) that are then scored to provide a mild, moderate, elevated, severe, or extreme level of risk in line with NaBITA Tool.

The VRAW² has aided teams in focusing more objectively on the literature related to threat assessment when assessing threatening or concerning writing. While this has been helpful, it is a small subset of the overall type of assessment needed to accurately rate the risk of violence. The VRAW² provides teams with better footing when making decisions about intervention related to written concerns, but it lacks a focus on terrorism and extremist thought.

The Structured Interview for Violence Risk Assessment (SIVRA-35)
The SIVRA-35 was created in 2012 as an expert system. It is a structured set of items useful for those staff and faculty members to use with individuals who may pose a threat to the community. The SIVRA-35 is a guided structured interview useful for classifying risk into low,
moderate, and high categories based on concepts from existing threat and violence risk assessment literature.

The SVIRA-35 was designed to address targeted and strategic violence on college campuses, such as the Virginia Tech massacre and the shootings at Northern Illinois University, Umpqua College, and Santa Monica College, and by enrolled or recently enrolled college students at non-campus locations, such as James Holmes and Jared Loughner.

The Radicalization Risk Rubric (R³)
BIT Teams have become increasingly concerned with how to identify the potential for radicalization of students, faculty, and staff. Radicalism and extremism should be viewed on a continuum, from critical or counter-culture thinking to seeing violence as a reasonable pathway to bring about a desired change. The Radicalization Risk Rubric seeks to provide campus teams with an understanding of what to look for to identify and intervene with at-risk individuals who have radical thoughts and behaviors that are escalating to extremist violence and terrorism.

Historical Clinical Risk Management-20 (HCR-20)
The HCR-20, which is in its third version, is a structured professional judgment instrument used to assess risk and develop mitigation plans. The measure is well researched and evidence-based. The authors of the measure explain that risk and threat are always incompletely understood due to the uncertainty inherent in individuals’ choices. The HCR-20 is commonly used in psychiatric settings to determine release criteria, admission screenings, and inpatient psychiatric management, as well as to monitor risk in probation and parole settings.

The HCR-20 is a process rather than a singular tool producing a quantitative score or measure. The seven-stage process includes: 1) gathering information, 2) identifying the presence of risk factors, 3) determining the relevance of the risk factors, 4) formulation of the motivators for violence, 5) the development of risk scenarios, 6) management, and 7) final opinions.

Workplace Assessment of Violence Risk-21 (WAVER-21)
The WAVR-21 is a workplace violence risk assessment designed to assist human resource and threat assessment professionals to work through a structured set of dynamic and static risk factors to better estimate the likelihood of violence by an employee. Though designed with a workplace setting in mind, the WAVR-21 offers some guidance to those working in a higher education environment when it comes to identifying potential risks with students, faculty, and staff.
Team Interventions

The BIT Team receives reports of concerning behaviors involving students, faculty, staff, and non-campus community members. Once the NaBITA Threat Assessment Tool produces a risk rating of mild, moderate, elevated, severe, or extreme, the BIT Team decides on the type of intervention for the individual that matches the assessment of risk. The BIT Team will make that recommendation to the appropriate university official. The authority to take the recommended action or implement the intervention rests with the core members’ official capacity at the university. Possible actions may include some or all of the following:

1. Recommendations to appropriate university personnel, in line with the interventions associated with the NaBITA Threat Assessment Tool;
2. Recommendations to appropriate university personnel that may include, but are not limited to, referral to the student conduct or human resources offices for actions or sanctions consistent with the Student Handbook, Faculty Handbook, and Staff Handbook; in addition, the BIT Team may recommend that a student, faculty, or staff member receive a professional mental health assessment or other actions deemed appropriate;
3. Assignment of appropriate university personnel to the subject of the incident for follow-up and observation through the case management program;
4. Recommendation that the proper authority notify, within FERPA guidelines, the parents, guardians, and/or next-of-kin; and
5. Recommendations to appropriate university personnel regarding conditions of consideration for an individual to return as an active member of the campus community.

Psychological, Threat and Violence Risk Assessments

Additional tools, such as the SIVRA-35, VRAW², WAVR-21, or HCR20 may be used if the individual presents with an elevated risk on the NaBITA Threat Assessment Tool. This allows the team to gather more data to better inform the overall intervention.

Mandated assessment is the most important tool for a BIT Team, as it is the only mandated/conduct-like action that teams should engage in pursuing. The authority to require an assessment comes through the conduct office and requires an elevated level or above on the NaBITA Threat Assessment Tool. Mandated assessments allow teams to require an evaluation to better determine a person’s functioning and the context of the concerning behavior, and to offer essential consultation to the decision-makers at the institution. The process can involve a psychological evaluation, a threat assessment, or both. Mandated assessments are considered when a person crosses the elevated threshold on the NaBITA Tool.
Psychological evaluation involves counselors, therapists, psychologists, and social workers who have been trained to develop a rapport, obtain trust, and assess thoughts and behaviors through a combination of clinical interviews, structured questions, and the administration of psychological tests and measurements. These clinical assessments often draw on the skills and experience of the clinician to answer central questions about individuals’ potential risk to themselves and the community. These are short term in nature and may be conducted by the counseling center on campus (for students) and through the Employee Assistance Program (for faculty/staff). In the event that students refuse to be assessed by the counseling center staff, they may find an off-campus licensed professional who can conduct the assessment. The cost of the assessment is then covered by the students, and the licensed professionals are vetted by the counseling center.

Psychological evaluations also tend to be wide in scope, extending beyond a more limited assessment of a direct communicated threat. Psychological assessments are akin to flashlight in a dark room, scanning a broader area. There is also some arguably extended utility to a psychological assessment when the individual being assessed has some clear mental health problems, such as a past history of suicide attempts, delusions, paranoia, personality disorders, and anxiety. An evaluator trained in understanding these mental health issues in the context of an assessment of violence (not treatment) will bring added insight to the report and recommendations.

Threat or risk assessments are generally performed by nonclinical staff and are conducted by forensic professionals who work in the areas of human resources, workplace violence, law enforcement, or executive protection. The evaluator uses techniques to examine risk to the greater community by asking contextual questions about the nature of the threat and risk, using computer-aided models, and assessing risk factors used to determine a level of potential dangerousness. Threat assessments generally take place when a communicated threat has been made. Violence risk assessments occur regardless of the presence of a direct communicated threat.

Whether a psychological evaluation or threat assessment, the results of a mandated assessment can provide decision-makers with insight into how the person may be more successful on campus. If the person is required to leave campus for a time, the assessment can offer suggestions on how to better connect the individual to off-campus resources and treatment.

If a student is required to complete a mandated assessment, the person completing the assessment will have a list of questions that the referring party (BIT Team, conduct/judicial affairs, Dean, or Vice President of Student Affairs) would like to have answered. Some suggested questions may include:

- If the student is safe to return to campus, what are some measures we should put in place to reduce the risk of the student acting out in the future?
With the severity of the student’s threat, we are concerned about them returning to campus. How would you rate the severity of the current threat?

If we separate the student, what recommendations for treatment or further evaluation would you suggest prior to the student’s eventual return to campus?

Under what circumstances could the student safely return to campus?

What behaviors, thoughts, or attitudes would be important for the student to change prior to returning to campus?

Was the student motivated and cooperative with the assessment process, or do you have concerns about the validity of the assessment findings?

An understanding of the differences and potential limitation of psychological evaluations and threat assessments can help a team better select the appropriate course of action prior to a crisis event. Providing a clear question to be answered (e.g., current threat severity) will ensure the BIT Team receives a clear, concise, and beneficial outcome report.

Quality assessments begin with quality information. As such, when gathering information for an assessment, the BIT Team should obtain and provide the following documents and information to the person doing the assessment.

- **Incident Report**: Perhaps the most important pieces of information are the first-hand accounts of what happened. This allows the person conducting the assessment to question the individuals about their version of events, test for authenticity and deception, and explore clues about the behavior from a contextual perspective.

- **Schedule, Grade Point Average, and Transcript**: These documents provide a glimpse at students’ past academic behavior, clues to periods of time that may have been more academically difficult, and information about their current professors, class location, and frequency.

- **Residential Life History**: For students living on campus, this kind of information can provide some insight into social interactions, such as how a student reacts when confronted with rule violations and information regarding hygiene, sleep habits, and potential addictive behaviors.

- **Conduct and Judicial History**: This provides some insight into the student’s past behavior as it relates to following the law, code of conduct, and other policies. Information may shed light on parent involvement, substance abuse or dependence issues, and anger control and aggression.

- **Previous Treatment**: This would include access to inpatient psychiatric records, psychological testing, and medication history that could provide valuable mental health insight.

- **Collateral Data**: Having the ability to talk with students’ parents or others who have known them for a long period, and involve them early in the process of assessment, is helpful for several reasons. First, it provides a larger context for the students’ concerning behavior. It also begins to help the institution manage risk when parents are
involved at the start of the process, rather than calling them for the first time when their child has engaged again in violent or threatening behaviors.

- **Admissions Materials:** Many schools require students to write an essay to obtain admission. These narrative essays may provide some indication of motivation, or insight into past behavior or hopes for the future. An essay could help evaluators gain better context for understanding individuals’ frustrations if they were unable to achieve their dreams or goals. Some institutions also require students to report being suspended or expelled from previous institutions and/or previous convictions (outside normal traffic violations). This information provides the team with additional valuable information about past behavior.

While each case is unique and data about each individual is different, information contained in the documents listed previously will help your staff to best evaluate a student to provide BIT and safety to both the individual and larger campus community.

Another essential part of any assessment is the inclusion of a well-developed informed consent document. In keeping with the team’s value of respecting the autonomy of individuals, students are clearly informed of the process in which they are participating, and the informed consent document helps clarify that process for all parties involved.

An informed consent document clearly spells out the details of the mandated psychological or threat assessment process prior to students beginning an evaluation. The informed consent seeks to clarify questions prior to the evaluation occurring, including: What is involved in the assessment? How long will it take? Is there any cost? What happens if a student does not keep their appointment? The informed consent helps the student, evaluator, and referring department clearly understand what is required of the student prior to the evaluation getting underway. The informed consent document for threat or violence risk assessments completed on campus is included in the Appendix.

**Spectrum of Interventions**

Once a level of risk or threat is determined using an assessment tool, the BIT Team then deploys the intervention techniques and strategies appropriate to that level of risk. For example, one intervention strategy may be interim suspension. On this rubric, interim suspension is only considered at elevated risk situations, recommended at severe risk situations, and mandated for extreme risk situations when it is applicable.

BIT Team members deploy responses in a quality-controlled and consistent way. All elevated risk (level 3) cases are eligible for the same set of responses, which differ from the set of eligible interventions in severe risk cases, and so on.

The BIT Team will determine when members can/should/must meet with the individual. This might occur when the BIT Team determines that it is safe to do so, when the individual is likely to be forthcoming, when conveying BIT in person may be persuasive, and when more information is needed.
The list that follows describes various possible actions that may be appropriate for each risk level.

Mild Risk
- Meeting/soft referral by reporter;
- Behavioral contract or treatment plan with student or employee (if at all, only for low-level concerns);
- Student conduct or HR response;
- Evaluate for disability services and/or medical referral; or
- Conflict management, mediation, and problem-solving.

Moderate Risk
- Meeting/soft referral by reporter;
- Behavioral contract or treatment plan with student (if at all, only for low-level concerns);
- Student conduct or HR response;
- Evaluate for disability services and/or medical referral; or
- Conflict management, mediation (not if physical/violent), and problem-solving.

Elevated Risk
- Meeting/mandated referral by reporter;
- Evaluate parental/guardian notification;
- Obtain and assess medical/educational and other records;
- Consider interim suspension, if applicable;
- Evaluate for disability services and/or medical referral;
- Consider referral or mandated assessment; or
- Recommend using SIVRA-35 or other violence risk measure.

Severe Risk
- Possible confrontation by reporter;
- Parental/guardian notification obligatory unless contraindicated;
- Evaluate emergency no-contact order to others (FERPA/HIPAA/Clery);
- No behavioral contracts;
- Recommend interim suspension or paid/unpaid leave;
- Possible liaison with local police to compare red flags;
- Deploy mandated assessment;
- Evaluate for medical/psychological transport;
- Evaluate for custodial hold;
- Consider voluntary/involuntary medical withdrawal;
- Direct threat eligible;
- Law enforcement response;
Consider eligibility for involuntary commitment; or
SIVRA-35 or other violence risk assessment.

**Extreme**
- Possible confrontation by reporter;
- Parental.guardian obligatory unless contraindicated;
- Evaluate emergency notification to others;
- No behavioral contracts;
- Interim suspension or paid/unpaid leave if applicable;
- Possible liaison with local police to compare red flags;
- Too serious for mandated assessment;
- Evaluate for medical/psychological transport;
- Evaluate for custodial hold;
- Initiate voluntary/involuntary medical withdrawal;
- Law enforcement response; or
- Consider eligibility for involuntary commitment.
Quality Assurance

The BIT Team uses a NaBITA tool called the Core Q\textsuperscript{10} to assess its structure and function. The following are the 10 core qualities that are essential to the assessment of behavioral intervention, or BIT teams. A detailed scoring of each of these 10 factors is included in the Appendix. This BIT Team updates the scoring annually.

Core 1: POLICY

**Description:** Developing a clear sense of policy and procedures for a BIT Team is an essential task for any institution of higher education. A clear sense of direction and order of operations separates teams that are simply reactive to crisis events on campus from those that are thoughtful and strategic in their approach to proactively identifying risk and follow this risk through analysis, intervention, and follow-up. A quality policy allows a team to create a starting place for a structured and well thought-out approach to prevention, intervention, and management while providing opportunities for analysis, critique, and improvement to a team’s effectiveness and efficiency.

Core 2: TEAM TRAITS

**Description:** There are several core traits that are important to the team. These include leadership, team size, meeting frequency, and team membership. Teams should be strategic and intentional in making decisions about these traits, as opposed to allowing circumstances or outside constituencies to dictate these items.

Core 3: SILO COMMUNICATION ADDRESSED

**Description:** One of the key lessons following the 2007 Virginia Tech massacre was the importance of avoiding silos with communication of critical information. This business and marketing concept, known as the “the silo effect,” traditionally refers to a lack of coordination and integration between departments; thus, inadvertently failing to support each other. In higher education, we understand the silo effect as the isolation among departments that prevents cooperation and sharing of key information useful to address potential threats.

Core 4: EDUCATION & MARKETING

**Description:** A team can be set up and put together like a well-designed sports car, but it won’t be going anywhere without some gas in the tank. The gas here is the information we get from across campus. The gas stations are education and marketing to the community about what kind of behaviors should trigger a phone call, email, or direct report to a BIT Team member. To assume that the community already understands what to report is a dangerous proposition. Many communities are confused and scared when it comes to violence on campus, and, despite efforts to educate the faculty, staff, and student leaders about what behaviors should cause concern, the message needs to be continuous and well-targeted (marketed) to the stakeholders.
Core 5: NURTURING THE REFERRAL SOURCE
Description: The referral source is the most essential element of a team. It’s the person calling 911 to summon the police. It’s people calling for an ambulance and fire truck when they see a fire. This is about building this relationship between the BIT Team and community to improve communication.

Core 6: DATA COLLECTION
Description: Once information is reported to the BIT Team, the team must keep track of the data in a way that is secure and easily searchable. Data for data’s sake is an insufficient goal for a team. Data must be collected and stored in a fashion that provides access to team members and that provides the ability to analyze potential patterns that may exist beyond an individual team member’s memory. Simply stated, a quality data management system allows for data to be entered and stored in a way that is easily retrievable. Data must also be collected easily from stakeholders, with efforts to remove any obstacles along the way.

Core 7: RECORD MANAGEMENT
Description: Once data is collected, the team must have some mechanism in place to store and retrieve the data. The storage of the data must be secure. The data itself must be accessible to the team so the data can be used to better decision-making. Imagine the dashboard of a car. If the data presented here (i.e., gas levels, engine temperature, speed, oil pressure) was not easily accessible, it would not provide the driver with the information needed to operate the car efficiently. The record management systems used by a BIT team must address four key issues. These are access, pattern analysis, security, and accuracy.

Core 8: TEAM TRAINING
Description: A team requires training in several critical areas if it’s going to remain effective in its work. Training should address issues such as record-keeping; working within FERPA, HIPAA, and state confidentiality standards; threat assessment; mental health disorders; conduct issues; and emergency response.

Core 9: RISK RUBRIC
Description: Central to the analysis of data coming into the BIT Team is the use of risk rubrics to assist the team members in determining categories and levels of concern. These categories can be as simple as low, moderate, and high, or as complex as a team BITs to make them. The core purpose of using risk rubrics is to identify the level of risk or threat that an individual of concern poses, and then to develop an action plan to address the individual’s behavior, with the goal of mitigating or lowering the associated risk.

Core 10: QUALITY ASSURANCE
Description: There must be circularity to the assessment of the BIT Team. This involves seeing assessment as an ongoing process that does not have a fixed end-point. Assessing quality requires a commitment to the ever-changing nature of risk assessment and team dynamics. Team members rotate off the team or move on to new positions. New practices are developed to improve team efficacy and efficiency. Additional software and assessment tools become
available. All require a quality assurance plan that is structured, scheduled, and has the appropriate time and energy dedicated to it.
Appendix: Disruptive & Dangerous Behaviors

Examples of Disruptive Behaviors

- Taking/making calls, texting, using smart phones for social media, etc. during class.
- Students’ misuse technology in the classroom. Sneaking text messages from beneath the desk or having a laptop open to Facebook or other social media site during a lecture.
- Frequent interruption of professor while talking and asking of non-relevant, off-topic questions.
- Inappropriate or overly revealing clothing in the classroom, including extremely sexually provocative clothes, pajamas, or other sleepwear in the classroom.
- Crosstalk or carrying on side conversations while the professor is speaking.
- Interruptions such as frequent use of the restroom, smoke breaks, etc.
- Poor personal hygiene that leads to a classroom disruption or lack of focus.
- Use of alcohol or other substances in class. Attending class while under the influence of alcohol or other drugs.
- Entitled or disrespectful talk to professor or other students.
- Arguing grades or “grade grubbing” for extra points after the professor requests that the student stop.
- Eating or consuming beverages in class without permission (or against the class norms).
- Showing up to class in strange clothing (e.g., dressed in military gear, Halloween costumes when it is not Halloween, etc.)
- Reading magazines, newspapers (yes, they still read them, although usually the campus one), or books, or studying for other classes/doing other homework.

Examples of Dangerous Behaviors

- Racist or otherwise fixated (not just expressed once to press a button) thoughts, such as “Women should be barefoot and pregnant,” “Gays are an abomination to God and should be punished,” or “Muslims are all terrorists and should be wiped off the earth.”
- Bullying behavior focused on students in the classroom.
- Direct communicated threat to the professor or another student, such as, “I am going to kick your ass,” or “If you say that again, I will end you.”
- Prolonged, non-verbal passive-aggressive behavior, such as sitting with arms crossed, glaring or staring at professor, and refusing to speak or respond to questions or directives.
- Self-injurious behavior, such as cutting or burning, or exposing previously unexposed self-injuries.
- Physical assault, such as pushing, shoving, or punching.
- Throwing objects or slamming doors.
- Storming out of the classroom when upset.
- Conversations that are designed to upset other students, such as descriptions of weapons, killing, or death.
• Psychotic, delusional, or rambling speech.
• Arrogant or rude talk to the professor or other students.
• Objectifying language that depersonalizes the professor or other students.

**Examples of Disruptive Behaviors Online**
• Student posts non-relevant spam or unrelated personal advertising material in the forum discussion board.
• Frequent interruption of the professor’s questions, threaded discussion posts with non-relevant comments, or off-topic, personal discussions.
• Inappropriate or overly revealing pictures shared with members of the online community through their profile.
• Choosing a screen name or profile name that is offensive to others, such as [Smokingthedope420@university.edu](mailto:Smokingthedope420@university.edu) or [assman69@university.edu](mailto:assman69@university.edu).
• Posting or making comments while drunk or intoxicated. Attending online class discussions or lectures while under the influence of alcohol or other drugs.
• Arrogant, entitled, rude, or disrespectful emails or messages to professor or other students.
• Arguing grades or “grade grubbing” for extra points after the professor requests that the student stop.
• Inciting other students to argue with the professor over grades or other assessment-related expectations.

**Examples of Dangerous Behaviors Online**
• Racist or otherwise fixated thoughts such as “Gays should be stoned like back in Bible times,” “Men should go back to playing football and stop thinking so hard. Leave the mental heavy lifting to the ladies in the class,” “Muslims and Mormons are cults and should be wiped off the planet,” and others posted to the discussion boards to troll for a response or to incite an electronic “riot.”
• Bullying and teasing behavior through messages, emails, or online hazing.
• Direct communicated threat to the professor or another student, such as, “I am going to kick your ass,” or “If you say that again, I will end you.”
• Prolonged passive-aggressive behavior, such as constant disagreement with everyone and everything in class, challenging the professor’s credentials, and refusing to respond to questions or directives.
• Mentioning self-injurious behavior, such as cutting or burning self, or suicidal thoughts or intentions in online posts.
• Threats of physical assault such as pushing, shoving or punching.
• Threats of online assaults, like hacking a website, sharing personal information, or posting others’ pictures online without permission.
• Conversations that are designed to upset other students, such as descriptions of weapons, killing, or death.
• Psychotic, delusional, or rambling speech in posts.
- Arrogant, entitled, rude, or disrespectful messages to the professor or other students.
- Objectifying language that depersonalizes the professor or other students.
Appendix: Informed Consent for Risk/Threat Assessment

The college works to assist students who have been considered a potential risk to themselves or to the community. Our department provides qualified, local, reasonably priced assessments, evaluations, and treatment. After the initial evaluation is completed, treatment plans can be developed to meet individuals’ specific on- or off-campus needs (often determined in conjunction with campus student conduct or the BIT Team). Our services are offered to students to make the process easier and less expensive than off-campus alternatives. In some cases, our department may need to refer an individual to an off-campus setting. This could happen if the situation is deemed beyond our scope of practice or our department was unable to devote resources away from its primary role of counseling, education, and wellness.

Eligibility
Risk assessments are available to students referred by the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities or the campus BIT Team. There is no cost to students.

Initial Interview
All students are scheduled for an initial intake interview with an evaluator. The purpose of the initial interview is to gather information about the current incident, the student’s concerns, background information, pressures that may impact current problems, and to explain the risk assessment process.

Meeting
The initial meeting may last from 30–90 minutes, with a follow-up meeting scheduled as needed. Follow-up meetings are often scheduled to complete testing, gather more information, and clarify information provided during the first interview.

Confidentiality
The evaluator will release information from the meetings to outside parties only at the request of the student. Records are confidential and will not leave the department unless there is an emergency. We will not answer questions about any student from parents, family members, friends, significant others, professors, employers, or anyone else outside of the office conducting the risk assessment without expressed permission of the student.

We are committed to providing the best possible risk assessment to our students. The person conducting the risk assessment is bound by confidentiality, which means that what is said during the meetings remains confidential. There are a few exceptions to this rule:

1. Plans to harm self or specific others;
2. Permission provided by the client; and
3. Abuse of a child, adult, or elderly person.
You are encouraged to ask any questions about the informed consent or risk assessment process during the initial meeting and as you review this document. The risk assessment process requires the student to allow the evaluator to share information with the referral source when the evaluation is complete. Information is first reviewed and shared with the student prior to the information being shared with the referral source (BIT Team, student conduct, or police). **By signing this document, you give permission for this information to be shared with the office or person making the referral.**

**Record Storage**

Records and individual documents are maintained electronically. They are password-protected and accessible by the person completing risk assessment. Records will be kept for at least seven years after the date of the last contact with our department.

**Testing Data**

Raw data, such as answer sheets and test booklets, are protected by copyright and may only be released to trained clinicians. Assessment and testing data are provided in summary form and explained during the follow-up session.

**Email**

Email communication with the person conducting the risk assessment should be used in scheduling appointments only. We recognize the importance of email, but because it is not a secure medium of communication and our staff does not maintain 24-hour access to their email, it will not be used to discuss ongoing treatment issues.

**Student Rights & Responsibilities**

- I understand that I have the right to review credentials of staff members, including but not limited to education, experience, and professional counseling certification and licensure(s).
- I understand that I can terminate the relationship at any time (though this termination will be shared with the referral source).
- I will arrive on time for my meetings.
- If unable to keep an appointment, I will call the office at least 24 hours in advance.
- I will actively participate in the process by asking questions and staying involved.

I, ____________________________, a student at the university, agree to make every effort to keep all my scheduled appointments. If I have missed appointments, I am aware that limits may be imposed on the services available, and this will be shared with the referral source. I have read and understand the above information and I have had the opportunity to ask questions.

_____________________________  ____________________________
Student Signature                  Date

_____________________________  ____________________________
Witness Signature                  Date
Appendix : Team Audit

CORE-Q\textsuperscript{10} Checklist

The CORE Q\textsuperscript{10} checklist is provided to assist the BIT Team in conducting an internal audit. The checklist is divided into 10 categories to match the 10 key core qualities of a BIT Team. The reviewer enters a “0” to indicate “yes” if the item in question is present on the BIT Team. A score of “1” is entered to represent if the item is in progress of being addressed within the next few weeks. A score of “2” is entered to represent that the item is not present.

Scores are summed in much the same way as golf. Higher scores indicate a greater level of concern. Lower scores indicate that the team is close to the ideal goal. Each item also allows for the reviewer to write a narrative summary related to the item in question.

With multiple items for each section and a varying weight for each, the overall score sheds only some light on the BIT Team’s functioning. Scores above “50” indicate the need for further assessment and planning. It may also be helpful to rate each individual core quality score to better grasp the range of performance. A sample scoring is provided below.

BIT Team University’s CORE-Q\textsuperscript{10} Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Quality</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Team Traits</th>
<th>Silo</th>
<th>Marketing</th>
<th>Referral</th>
<th>Data Collecting</th>
<th>Record Manage</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Risk Rubric</th>
<th>Quality Assurance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The percentage is calculated by: 1- (score/possible)

BIT Team Assessment Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#1 Policy</th>
<th>Score 0, 1, 2*</th>
<th>Narrative Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Is there a written mission/purpose statement?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Does the statement address the scope of the team?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Does the statement identify the community members the team works with?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Does the statement outline the following phases of operation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data-gathering</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Does the team have a written manual?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Does the manual include:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission/purpose statement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of team membership</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting frequency and plan for slow times</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training plan to address campus referrals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outline behaviors reported to the team</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of how team take referrals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing plan to solicit referrals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of website</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview of data collection and storage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Template for meeting outline</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of risk rubric</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of when to use assessments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal communication and releases</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of team training plan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 = yes, 1 = in progress, 2 = not present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#2 Team Traits</th>
<th>Score 0, 1, 2*</th>
<th>Narrative Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Team size over four and under 12.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Team has enough members to effectively meet and process referral request.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Team has enough members to meet regularly and does not cancel meetings for other obligations.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Team does not have too many members that prevents open communication.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Team has a leader.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Team can bring together different personalities and expertise.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Team leader has the time, energy and focus to coordinate and drive the team's mission.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Team leader has the respect of the campus community.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Team leader has outstanding communication skills.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Team leader is dedicated to the training mission.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Team has rationale for meeting frequency based on training and needs of community.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Team meets weekly for one to two hours or (at minimum) twice a month.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3 Team cancels less than 20 percent of meetings. | 0
---|---
2.4 Team has core members that include Director of Student Rights and Responsibilities, Counseling, and Conduct staff. | 0
2.4 Team includes at least two of the following: residential life (if applicable), athletics, student actives, health services, legal, human resources, or academic affairs. | 0

0= yes, 1= in progress, 2= not present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#3 Siloed Communication Addressed</th>
<th>Score 0, 1, 2*</th>
<th>Narrative Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Team has plan to address siloed communication on campus.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 There has been a specific discussion of how counseling can share information with the team.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Forms and release of information have been developed to foster communication.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 The team has addressed FERPA, HIPAA, and state confidentiality standards through training and policy discussion.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 When referring out to psychological or threat assessment, there is an adequate sharing of information.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 The team has identified potential obstacles to sharing information and has a plan to address these obstacles.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0= yes, 1= in progress, 2= not present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#4 Education and Marketing</th>
<th>Score 0, 1, 2*</th>
<th>Narrative Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Behaviors of concerns listed in policy manual and used for training.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Behaviors include both in-class and outside-of-classroom categories.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 The list includes disruptive behaviors.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 The list includes dangerous behaviors.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 The list includes mental health problems.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 The team has identified potential obstacles to sharing information and has a plan to address this information.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 The list includes both face-to-face and online student behavior.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 The team has developed a website.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 The website includes contact phone number, team mission, and contact email.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 The website contains two of the following: list of behaviors to report, team membership list, online report form, FAQ about team, and faculty class guide. | 0 |

4.3 The team has a marketing plan to share information with faculty, staff, and student leaders. | 0 |

4.3 The team has a logo and graphic. | 0 |

4.3 The marketing plan involved graphics, flyers, and brochures that are shared with the community. | 0 |

0= yes, 1= in progress, 2= not present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#5 Nurturing the Referral Source</th>
<th>Score 0, 1, 2*</th>
<th>Narrative Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Does the team identify the stakeholders that should report to the BIT team?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Does the team identify faculty?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Does the team identify staff?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Does the team identify student leaders (such as team captains, residence life staff, and club advisors?)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Does the team have a plan to train and educate the community about how to report?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Does the team have a plan to train and educate the community about what the team does?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Does the team share with the community how to make a report to the team?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Does the team provide training to the community on identifying at-risk behaviors?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Does the team have a policy on how information can be shared back with the referral source given FERPA, HIPAA and confidentiality concern?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Is there a sample script of an email, letter or phone call that is shared back to the referral source?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Does this message contain information encouraging the referral source to share information again if the situation changes?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3 Does this message get sent out regularly to those who share a referral with the team? 0

0= yes, 1= in progress, 2= not present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#6 Data Collecting</th>
<th>Score 0, 1, 2*</th>
<th>Narrative Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Does the team have a plan to collect data from the community in terms of referrals?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Does this plan include the ability for community members to post an anonymous or semi-anonymous report?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Does the team seek referrals from a wide variety of communication mediums?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can they report by email or online form?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can the community report by phone?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can they report by personal visit to team member?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a plan for after-hours reports that include an immediate response?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Is the data from the multiple reporting sources recorded in a centralized manner to prevent accidental loss?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Is there a policy related to the security of information shared and kept in computerized files?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Does the policy manual or team training address the challenges of privacy when using email communication?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0= yes, 1= in progress, 2= not present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#7 Record Management</th>
<th>Score 0, 1, 2*</th>
<th>Narrative Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Does the team have a computer system to keep track of team records?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Does this record system provide easy data entry and access to data?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Do team members have the ability to search the database to recover information?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Do team members have the ability to search the database with robust keywords and narratives?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 Does the IT department support the security of the data system? Does it coordinate with any third-party vendors (where applicable)?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 Does the team protect against other security risks related to USB drives and laptops?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4 Is the data recorded accurately for each student who comes in contact with the team?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4 Does the record include date, name, ID #, residence hall, student status?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4 Does the data include presenting issues and relevant history (or references to other charts)?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4 Does the record include details about which offices will be involved in the assessment and follow-up plan?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0= yes, 1= in progress, 2= not present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1 Does the team leader have a dedication to training and educating the team members?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1 Does the team have a budget set aside for training during the year?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1 Does the team have tabletop exercises to use as training tools?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1 Does the team complete at least two tabletop exercises each semester?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2 Do team members have the opportunity to attend at least one of the four conferences (ACCA, ASCA, NaBITA, and ATAP)?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2 Has the team participated in at least one online training a semester?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3 Has the team explored the potential for an outside expert or consultant to train the team in the past year?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0= yes, 1= in progress, 2= not present
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9.1 Does the team have a risk rubric to categorize threat and risk to the campus?</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.1 Does the risk rubric have attached action items to each of the levels to guide team decision-making?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1 Is the rubric used consistently with the team?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1 Is the rubric used objectively with the team?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1 Is the rubric designed specifically for higher education settings?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1 Does the rubric indicate at what point the team should use a psychological assessment?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1 Does the rubric indicate at what point the team should use a threat assessment?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1 Does the rubric address both mental health disorders and violence/aggression?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1 Is the rubric accessible to all team members (not just those with advanced psychological training)?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 = yes, 1 = in progress, 2 = not present

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#10 Quality Assurance</th>
<th>Score 0, 1, 2*</th>
<th>Narrative Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.1 Is there a commitment by the team to assess its on-going functioning to find areas of improvement?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1 Does the team look for ways to improve internal team communication?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1 Does the team look for ways to improve communication between the team and the overall campus community?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1 Does the team discuss process issues related to applying the risk rubric and developing an action plan?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1 Does the team address on-going obstacles among team members or departments?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1 Does the team avoid rushing through meetings for the sake of finishing, rather than fully exploring cases?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1 Does the team address “elephant in the room” issues that prevent smooth communication?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1 Does the team use quiet times to address training issues?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2 Does the team generate end-of-semester reports?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.2</strong> Do these end-of-semester reports create data that is then used to improve team functions?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.3</strong> Does the team compare cases based on how they originally presented to the current rating of the case risk following intervention?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 = yes, 1 = in progress, 2 = not present
Appendix: Annual Confidentiality & Training Agreement

BIT Team

Annual Confidentiality and Training Agreement

I, ___________________________ understand that Georgia Southwestern State University has established the Behavioral Intervent Team (BIT) to assist in addressing situations where students, faculty, or staff are displaying behaviors that are concerning, disruptive, or threatening in nature that could potentially impede their own or others’ ability to function successfully or safely. These policies and procedures are designed to help identify persons whose behaviors potentially endanger their own or others’ health and safety or are disruptive to the educational or administrative processes of the university.

Please initial each statement below.

___ I understand the mission, goals, policies, and procedures of BIT Team, and agree to participate in meetings and training to the best of my ability.

___ I understand that all records associated with the BIT Team are subject to FERPA:

*Information from the education records of a student may be disclosed to university officials with a legitimate educational interest. A school official is a person employed by the university in an administrative, supervisory, academic or research, or support staff position (including law enforcement unit personnel and health staff); a person or company with whom the university has contracted, such as an attorney, auditor, or collection agent; or a person or a student serving on an official committee, such as a disciplinary or grievance committee, or assisting another school official in performing his or her tasks. A university official has a legitimate educational interest if the official needs to review an education record in order to fulfill his or her professional responsibility.*

___ I understand that many of the records are dynamic in nature and may not have been resolved, adjudicated, or otherwise completed at the time that I view them. As such, much care should be taken not to form judgments or use this information in decision-making without first checking with the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities.

___ I understand that none of the BIT Team records can be viewed, shared, or discussed with any non-BIT Team member due to their dynamic nature.

___ I understand that any requests by a non-BIT Team member to view or print a BIT Team record must be made to, and approved by, the Office of the Student Rights and Responsibilities, as some information may need to be redacted for non-BIT consumption to comply with FERPA.

Signed (BIT Team Member): ___________________________

Date: ___________________
Appendix: De-Escalation Decision Tree (D2T)
The De-escalation Decision Tree (D2T) designed by Chip Reese, Ed.D., is to offer members of Behavioral Intervention Teams a directed methodology of gathering data, applying a rubric / analyzing the data, and then intervening with an appropriate action. By utilizing the D2T, the BIT Chair can make the most effective use of the Team’s time to pull all the pieces of a case together. Administered properly, the D2T takes into consideration the NaBITA Threat Assessment Tool, SIVRA3S, and the VRAW2, while also assimilating the myriad of resources and information offered by the experts gathered around the BIT table.