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Abstract
The NaBITA 2016 survey, which included responses from more than 300 participants at institutions across the country, revealed that overall, institutions are recognizing the importance of having a Behavioral Intervention Team to address concerning behavior. Gains are evident in various areas, from methods used to measure violence risk to BITs' online presence. However, not all news is good, with some schools still woefully behind the curve in identifying and addressing concerning behavior. This article explains the results of the survey in detail.
Introduction

Every two years, NaBITA administers a national survey to understand characteristics and common practices related to Behavioral Intervention Teams (BITs). These survey results are then summarized in The Journal of Campus Behavioral Intervention Teams (JBIT) and shared back with the NaBITA membership. Similar to the dashboard in a car or cockpit of an airplane providing critical information needed to drive or fly, the NaBITA survey provides information on best practices and emerging trends critical to BIT administrators when making decisions about BIT processes and resources.

The survey was sent out to the 924 members of the NaBITA Listsev. During the months of May and June, 313 responses were collected from schools across the nation to better understand team membership, operations, and processes. This represents a 34 percent response rate.

As with any survey methodology, there are limitations to the data provided from this project. The survey is predominantly disseminated through the NaBITA membership, so results are likely to skew toward the use of BITs at institutions and the use of NaBITA-related tools and resources. The 2016 NaBITA Survey also had a lower response rate than the previous two administrations, down from roughly 500 in 2014 and 800 in 2012. Given those factors, we need to acknowledge some limitations related to generalizations or trends identified in the survey data.

Despite these limitations, the biennial survey represents one of the only snapshots of data available about the institutional use of BITs, their team characteristics, and common practices. This article summarizes the descriptive information gathered from the survey and includes a discussion of the current results compared to the previous two survey administrations. Appendix A includes a graphic summary of the results. Appendix B includes the complete list of survey questions. Through continuous observation of institutional BIT processes through a survey “dashboard,” it is our hope that we as a field can identify areas where BITs are functioning effectively and efficiently, and opportunities for course corrections for improved BIT performance.

Demographics

The survey identified the demographic breakdown of the schools responding to the NaBITA Survey, specifically asking about institutional type and size. Thirty-nine percent of respondents indicated they were affiliated with two-year community colleges, while 59 percent identified with four-years’ schools and another 2 percent said they work at for-profits. Fifty-eight percent of those completing the survey indicated that they work at a residential institution, and 42 percent came from a non-residential school. The average number of students living on campus was 3,110, with a range from 20 students to 27,000 students. Of those indicating that their schools had a residential component, 77 percent shared that they work at a public school, while 22 percent were from a private school. In terms of school sizes, 6 percent of schools had enrollments of fewer than 1,000 students, 19 percent had 1,001–3,000 students, 20 percent had 3,001–7,000 students, 30 percent had 7,001–15,000 students, and 25 percent had more than 15,000 students.

Team Membership

The survey asked respondents to identify the number of members on their BITs, as well as the various departments and positions represented on the BIT. Questions also explored the use of Case Managers by the BIT. In terms of team membership, 9.6 individuals was the average size of teams. The following list below represents the most common departments and positions represented on the team:

- Counseling (91 percent).
- Housing and Residential Life (91 percent).
- Police/Campus Safety (90 percent).
- Dean of Students (76 percent).
- Student Conduct (74 percent).
- Academic Affairs (53 percent).
- Health Services (37 percent).
- Faculty Representative (35 percent).
- Human Resources (32 percent).
- VPSA (31 percent).
- Case Manager (31 percent).
- Student Activities (25 percent).
- Legal Counseling (18 percent).
- Admissions (9 percent).
- Greek Life (6 percent).

While a third of the teams include a member who is a Case Manager, many respondents (19 percent) said their teams use a Case Manager who works across a
variety of part-time areas, such as Title IX, retention, and academics. Only 14 percent responded that they had a dedicated case management member of the team, either through the conduct office (11 percent) or the counseling center (7 percent). Thirty-two percent said that the Case Manager handles more than 40 cases, while 6 percent handle 0–10 cases, 4 percent handle 11–20 cases, 3 percent handle 21–30 cases, and 2 percent handle 31–40 cases.

**Mental Health**
Eighty-eight percent of all the schools represented in the survey had a Mental Health Counselor or mental health services. Among two-year schools, 72 percent had a Mental Health Counselor or services, while 98 percent of four-year schools had a Mental Health Counselor or services.

**BIT Processes**
The survey asked for information about BIT processes to gauge how long teams have been in existence, the mission and purpose of teams, their meeting frequency, record management practices, and the use of risk rubrics and other advanced BIT tools. Ninety-seven percent of schools shared that they have a Behavioral Intervention, Student of Concern or Threat Assessment Team, with most teams being in existence for about six years, on average. However, some teams were more than 20 years of age, while others had been in existence for as little as a year.

Sixty-seven percent reported having a student-focused BIT, while 8 percent said they had an employee-focused BIT. Forty-five percent of teams jointly monitor faculty and staff concerns in addition to student concerns, while fifty-five percent do not.

When institutions have a satellite campus, they approach the development of the BIT in several ways. Nine percent of teams have a dedicated team on their satellite campuses, 18 percent have a representative from the BIT assigned to the satellite campus, and 33 percent have no team or representative on the satellite campus.

Forty-one percent of teams meet weekly, while 30 percent met twice a month. Only 12 percent of teams meet as needed or quarterly. On average, teams cancel 11 percent of their meetings. Of concern, more than a dozen teams reported that they canceled close to 50 percent of their meetings each year.

Ninety-one percent of BITs represented in the survey kept centralized records, while 7 percent of schools reported that teams members keep their own, individual records. Of concern, four schools indicated that they kept no BIT records. For teams that keep centralized records, Maxient (39 percent) was the most commonly cited record-keeping system, followed by Symplicity (12 percent), Microsoft Access/Excel (10 percent), an in-house-designed system (10 percent), and pen and paper files (10 percent).

In terms of measuring risk, 60 percent of teams use a risk rubric to objectively measure risk. This is an important increase, up from 50 percent of teams in 2016. Of those teams using objective risk and threat assessment rubrics, the following describes which rubrics they most commonly use: the NaBITA Threat Assessment Tool (62 percent), SIVRA-35 (27 percent), VRAW² (7 percent), and WAVR-21 (5 percent). Other measures used include the SIGMA Threat Scale, MOSAIC, homegrown systems, and the RAGE-V. For teams that use the NaBITA Threat Assessment Tool, only 34 percent reported that they use it for each case. Thirty-eight percent said they use the tool for more serious or time-consuming cases.

The most common types of cases handled by the BITs represented in the survey were as follows:

- Psychological cases (e.g., anxiety, depression, or psychosis): 53 percent.
- Minor conduct cases (e.g., vandalism, classroom behavior, or disruption): 19 percent.
- Alcohol/drug policy violations: 10 percent.
- Major conduct cases/law enforcement cases (e.g., sexual assault or threatening behavior): 8 percent.
- Title IX and/or sexual assault: 5 percent.
- Academic dishonesty: 5 percent.

**Education and Marketing**
The NaBITA Survey collected information about how BITs educate their campus communities about their processes and purpose. This included questions related to team name, logo, website, and other marketing strategies, as well as how they encourage reporting to the team.
The most common team names remain Behavioral Intervention Team (40 percent), CARE (30 percent), and Student of Concern (10 percent). Sixteen percent of the teams surveyed said they had developed a logo, while 84 percent had not done so. Examples of these logos are included in Appendix C.

Fifty-nine percent of teams reported that they have a website. Of those schools with websites, common content includes:

- Contact email (69 percent).
- Contact phone (67 percent).
- Team mission statement (62 percent).
- Online report form (61 percent).
- List of what to report (60 percent).
- Team membership list (57 percent).
- FAQ about team (26 percent).
- Next step after a referral is made (21 percent).
- Faculty classroom guide (20 percent).
- Privacy/confidentiality information (20 percent).
- Team protocols (15 percent).
- Team policies (9 percent).
- Risk rubric (7 percent).
- Annual report (3 percent).

Eighty-five percent of teams receive online or phone reports as their most common manner of referral. Teams report that direct communication with the team Director (64 percent) and notification to the central office in charge of the team (33 percent) are other common ways of receiving referrals.

Seventy-seven percent of the teams represented in the survey market their BITs through in-person trainings. Other common ways to market the BIT include through a dedicated BIT website (72 percent), through handouts and flyers (45 percent), through student and parent orientations (45 percent), and through the school newspaper (6 percent). Of concern, 7 percent of teams do not try to make the community aware of their existence. More novel ways of marketing their BITs to the campus community included through the use of marketing items like pens, stress balls, and magnets (16 percent), and a promotional video (5 percent).

When asked how their college or university approached training their team, respondents said they used webinars (60 percent), books and journals (38 percent), tabletop exercises (31 percent), the NaBITA annual conference (30 percent), and other conferences (36 percent).

Open-Ended Questions

We asked survey participants to share what they felt were the most significant weaknesses of their teams. Respondents shared concerns over lack of training, insufficient budgets, consistently and objectively rating risk, canceling too many meetings, the need for more organization, lack of attendance by members, and inadequate support from high-level administrators.

When asked about what makes their teams most effective in working through cases, the respondents indicated: diverse and multi-disciplinary membership, training of team members, good communication/collaboration, expertise of members, and clear processes and support rose to the top of the response list.

Some of the biggest challenges facing teams as they work through cases include the time spent on cases, poor communication, tracking information and flow, following up, lack of case management, conducting objective assessments, lack of mental health expertise, difficulty with the mandated assessment process, legal and institutional policy challenges, training, and communicating with faculty.

Discussion

The NaBITA Survey continues to show increased use of BITs by colleges and universities, up from 92 percent in 2012 to 97 percent in 2016. Most BITs are now approximately six years old, about the same age as NaBITA. The percentage of survey respondents representing community colleges continues to increase, from 24 percent in 2012 to 33 percent in 2014 and finally, to 39 percent in 2016. A similar trend has occurred in the representation of non-residential college responses, increasing from 25 percent in 2012 to 33 percent in 2014 and finally, to 39 percent in 2016. A similar trend has occurred in the representation of non-residential college responses, increasing from 25 percent in 2012 to 42 percent in 2016. These increases may be a reflection of the continued expansion of community colleges across the nation, as well as non-residential educational options designed for the needs of working adults, but they also demonstrate the use of BITs on an increasingly diverse array of campuses.

The core team membership of most BITs appears to remain similar to 2012, with counseling, police, and Deans of students/conduct being represented on the highest percentage of teams. However, there are some fluctuations.
in other membership areas. The average number of team members has increased by one representative since 2014, perhaps representing the need for schools to include specialized representatives depending on the needs of individual institutions. As one example, faculty representation on teams continues to increase, from 27 percent in 2012 to 35 percent in 2016. On the other hand, health services representation decreased from 42 in 2012 to 37 percent this year. These shifts may reflect a desire by campuses for greater integration of faculty into student service and support areas, as well as a continued differentiation between primary and behavioral health services.

More representative of BIT trends is the marked increase in the use of Case Managers by BITs. Survey data indicates that one-third (31 percent) of BITs nationwide include a Case Manager. Only 18 percent of BITs included one in 2012 and 20 percent in 2014. Unfortunately, the percentage of Case Managers dedicated to the BIT has not increased, remaining at approximately 14 percent. The increasing use of Case Managers in a variety of student support areas and interacting regularly with the BIT, however, is encouraging.

Some BIT characteristics reported by survey respondents indicate a nationwide move towards the adoption of best practice recommendations. For example, BITs continue to expand their scope and purpose beyond students to monitoring faculty and staff behavior as well. Results showed an increase from 30 percent in 2012 to 42 percent in 2014 to 45 percent in 2016.

Survey respondents also reported an increased use of centralized record-keeping systems, up to 91 percent in 2016 from 85 percent in 2015 and 74 percent in 2012. Maxient remains the most popular record-keeping system, and its popularity is growing. Fourteen percent of respondents said they used it in 2012, but today that number is up to 39 percent. Because the use of a centralized record-keeping system is essential for ensuring tracking cases brought to the BIT’s attention, identifying patterns of behavior, and ensuring proper follow-up, it’s encouraging to see so many BITs represented in the survey making use of such a system.

Another recommended practice increasing in use by NaBITA survey respondents in the use of a standard risk rubric. In 2012, only 32 percent of teams reported using a risk rubric. Today, that number is up to 61 percent. The NaBITA Threat Assessment Tool and the SIVRA-35 continue to be commonly used, with this year’s survey finding a 5 percent increase in the use of the NaBITA Threat Assessment Tool and a 13 percent increase in the use of the SIVRA-35 since the last survey administration.

In terms of meeting frequency, this year’s survey identified a continuing trend towards weekly meetings. In 2012, 38 percent of teams met weekly, and this year, that figure was 41 percent. However, teams are also canceling more of their meetings. Results showed an increase from 8 percent of team meetings cancelled in 2014 to 11 percent of team meetings cancelled in 2016. Of greater concern are some schools indicating that more than 50 percent of their meetings are cancelled annually.

BITs are increasingly providing online reporting options, with 85 percent of teams receiving online or phone reports as their most common manner of referral. BITs should continue to offer multiple ways to report concerns to ensure they are not missing a referral because the reporting source does not feel comfortable with the reporting options.

In 2016, all forms of advertising also increased, with the exception of the school paper. Additionally, fewer teams report doing no advertising of their teams on campus. That’s good news, because if students and others don’t know about the BIT, referrals are unlikely to make their way to the BIT.

The use of BIT websites continues to increase, with 59 percent of teams reporting that their team has one. That’s up from just 10 percent in 2014. Teams continue to find effective ways of communicating about their purpose and processes through websites. One particularly outstanding website identified in the survey belonged to the University of Rochester. It is well designed, includes video as well as text-based information about the team, and uses information from its end-of-year report to educate the community. It can be found at www.rochester.edu/CARE/.

When we consider the 10 core qualities of BITs identified in the CORE-Q10 Checklist (Van Brunt, 2015), we see areas of positive growth as a field in the areas of scope of purpose, education and marketing, record management, and the use of risk rubrics. Yet when we
consider the responses to the open-ended questions, alongside the patterns of information within the other survey responses, a need to focus on the overall assessment and quality assurance around our BIT processes becomes clear. Results indicate that while teams initially adopt recommended practices, there are still many inconsistencies in team operations, as well as a lack of sustainability in those processes through the course of the BIT year.

Reference
2016 NaBITA SURVEY SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

More than 313 responses were collected from schools across the country for the 2016 NaBITA Survey. This handout summarizes the key findings from that survey. Note: not all percentages add up to 100 because not all respondents answered every question and some questions allowed for multiple responses to be chosen.

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION TYPE</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community college</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional college/university</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For-profit institution</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential institution</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public institution</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private institution</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For-profit institution</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average # students on campus</td>
<td>3,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-residential school</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION SIZE</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1,000 students</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,001–3,000 students</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,001–7,000 students</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,001–15,000 students</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;15,000 students</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BIT BASICS

97%: Schools with a Students of Concern/Threat Assessment/Behavioral Intervention Team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BIT Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student-focused BIT</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee-focused BIT</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-focused TAT</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee-focused TAT</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45% of teams monitor faculty and staff concerns in addition to student concerns, up slightly from 42% in 2014.

6 Years: The average length of time that BITs surveyed have been in existence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BIT Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meet weekly</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice monthly</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As needed or quarterly</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average meetings cancelled</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MULTI-CAMPUS SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multi-campus Options</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9% Have a dedicated team on their satellite campuses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18% Have a representative assigned to their satellite campuses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33% Have no team or representative on their satellite campuses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BIT MEMBERSHIP

AVERAGE BIT SIZE: 9.6 persons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and Residential Life</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police/Campus Safety</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Students</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Conduct</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Services</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Representative</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPSA</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Manager</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activities</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Counseling</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Life</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BIT RECORDKEEPING
Keep centralized records 91%
Individual members keep own records 7%

This is an increase from 85% of teams in 2014.

RISK MEASUREMENT
60% of teams measure risk objectively with a risk rubric. That’s up from 50% in 2014.

Of teams using objective rubrics:
NaBITA TA Tool 62%
SIVRA-35 27%
VRAW² 7%
WAVR-21 5%

Other measures named by respondents included the SIGMA Threat Scale, MOSAIC, homegrown systems, and the RAGE-V.

For teams that use the NaBITA Threat Assessment Tool:
Use it for each case 34%
Use it for more serious/time-consuming cases 38%

CASE MANAGEMENT
Use case manager across a variety of part-time settings (e.g., Tile IX, retention, academics) 19%
Have a dedicated member of the BIT serve as case manager 14%
Access case manager through the conduct office 11%
Use case manager through the counseling center 7%

AMONG TEAMS WITH CASE MANAGER
Handle 0–10 cases 6%
Handle 11–20 cases 4%
Handle 21–30 cases 3%
Handle 31–40 cases 2%
Handle 41+ cases 32%

MENTAL HEALTH
80% of respondents had a mental health counselor or mental health services on campus
Two-year schools 72% Four-year schools 98%

TEAM NAMING & LOGO
MOST COMMON NAMES
Behavioral Intervention Team 99 schools
CARE Team 75 schools
Students of Concern Team 25 schools

www.nabita.org
MOST COMMON REFERRAL METHOD
Online or phone reports 85%
Reports made to team Director/Chair 64%
Reports made to office in charge of team 33%

TEAM MARKETING
Through in-person trainings 77%
Dedicated BIT website 72%
Presentations 69%
Website 69%
Handouts and flyers 45%
Student and parent orientation 45%
Brochures/Pamphlets 44%
Posters 18%
Marketing items like pens/stress balls 16%
School paper 6%
Promotional video 5%

OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES
MOST SIGNIFICANT WEAKNESSES OF TEAMS
• Lack of training
• Insufficient budgets
• Consistently and objectively rating risk
• Canceling too many meetings
• The need for more organization
• Lack of attendance of members
• Support from high level administration

WHAT MAKES TEAMS MOST EFFECTIVE
• Diverse and multi-disciplinary membership
• Training of team members
• Good communication/collaboration
• Expertise of members
• Having a clear process and support

BIT WEBSITES
59% of teams reported having a website, up from 49% of teams in 2014.

WEBSITES MOST COMMONLY CONTAIN
Contact email 69%
Contact phone 67%
Team mission statement 62%
Online report form 61%
List of what to report 60%
Team membership list 57%
FAQ about team 26%
Next step after referral is made 21%
Faculty classroom guide 20%
Privacy/Confidentiality Information 20%
Team protocols 15%
Team policies 9%
Risk rubric 7%
Annual report 3%

BIGGEST CHALLENGES AS TEAMS WORK THROUGH CASES
• Cases are time-consuming
• Poor communication
• Tracking and information flow
• Follow-up challenges
• Lack of case management
• Lack of objective assessments
• Insufficient mental health expertise
• Difficulty with mandated assessment process
• Legal and institutional policy challenges
• Training and communicating with faculty
Appendix B

1. Informed Consent

You are being asked to participate in a research project conducted through NaBITA and the NCHERM Group, LLC.

Nature and Purpose of the Project: We invite you to participate in a voluntary research study that will focus on Behavioral Intervention Teams at colleges and universities in the United States. The purpose of the research study is to gather descriptive and demographical information from colleges and universities regarding their Behavioral Intervention Teams (BITs).

Explanation of Procedures: In this study, you will be asked to complete a short (5–10 minute) online survey.

Discomfort and Risks: The study has no known anticipated risks. Your participation is strictly voluntary. If you decide to participate, you are free to not answer any question, and you may withdraw from the study at any time.

Benefits: Possible benefits will be to obtain a better understanding of the structure and characteristics of Behavioral Intervention Teams and assist NaBITA and The NCHERM Group, LLC. with resources and training.

Confidentiality: Your responses will remain anonymous, and no identifying information will be asked of you except for minor demographic data. By filling out the survey, you share your implied consent to participate in the study.

Refusal/Withdrawal: Refusal to participate in this study will have no effect on any future services from NaBITA or The NCHERM Group. Anyone who agrees to participate in the study is free to withdraw from the study at any time with no penalty.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact the principal investigator, Brian Van Brunt, at brian@ncherm.org

2. College/university Name: [open ended]

3. My college/university is...
   - 2-year
   - 4-year

4. My college/university is...
   - Community college/technical
   - Traditional
   - Online
   - For-profit

5. My college/university is...
   - Residential
   - Non-residential

6. My college/university is...
   - Public
   - Private
   - Private and proprietary

7. My college/university FTE (full-time equivalent) student population is...
   - Under 1,000
   - 1,001–3,000
   - 3,001–7,000
   - 7,001–15,000
   - 15,001+

8. What is your campus’s residential population? [open-ended]

9. Does your college/university have a Mental Health Counselor and/or mental health counseling services?
   - Yes
   - No

10. If your college/university has a Mental Health Counselor and/or mental health counseling services, do they offer...
    - Mandated assessment for suicidal students with...
16. What percentage of meetings are cancelled in a given year? [open-ended]

17. If you only have one team, what is the primary focus?
   - Threat assessment
   - Behavior intervention/students of concern/care
   - Our campus has more than one team

18. Do you have a team that jointly monitors student and faculty/staff concerns?
   - Yes
   - No

19. How are concerning behaviors and/or threats reported to the team (i.e., How does a team become aware of a concerning behavior and/or threat)? (Check all that apply.)
   - Online report
   - Phone
   - Director of team
   - Central office in charge of BIT
   - Anonymous
   - Other (please specify):

20. How does the team make your community aware of your team? (Check all that apply.)
   - We don’t try to make people aware of our team.
   - School paper
   - Handouts and flyers
   - Student/family orientation
   - Parent programs
   - In-person training to staff/faculty
   - Website
   - Other (please specify):

21. How does the team communicate directly to the campus population? (Check all that apply.)
   - Brochures/pamphlets
   - Website
   - Presentations
   - Give out marketing items (e.g., stress ball, pens, magnets, etc.)
   - Posters
   - Promotional video
   - We don’t communicate directly to the campus population
   - Other (please specify):
22. How do you approach training for your team members? (Check all that apply.)
- We haven’t yet
- During summer and January
- At the annual NaBITA conference
- At other conferences
- Webinars
- Books and journals
- Tabletop exercises
- The NCHERM Group consultants
- NaBITA campus-hosted regional event
- Other consultants
- I don’t have a team
- Other (please specify):

23. How many members are on the team? [open-ended]

24. From what areas of campus do team members come? (Check all that apply.)
- Dean of Students
- Academic affairs
- Admissions
- Student activities
- Vice President of Student Affairs
- Police/campus safety
- Counseling
- Legal counsel
- Human resources
- Housing and residence life
- Case Manager
- Health services
- Faculty representative
- Student representative
- Greek life
- Student conduct
- Other (please specify):

25. What is the position title of the person who chairs the team? [open-ended]

26. Please cut and paste your mission statement. (Insert mission below or note if you do not have a mission statement.) [open-ended]

27. What is the name of the team? [open-ended]

28. Does your team have a website?
- Yes
- No

29. If your team has a website, which of the following elements are included on the website? (Check all that apply.)
- Contact phone
- Contact email
- Team mission/mission statement
- List of what to report
- Team membership list
- FAQ about team
- Online report form
- Faculty classroom guide
- Privacy/confidentiality information
- Team policies
- Team protocols
- Risk rubric
- Annual report
- Next steps once a referral is made
- We don’t have a website
- Other (please specify):

30. If your team has a website, please enter the URL here. The information will be made available as a resource on www.nabita.org. (If you do not have a website, please note.) [open-ended]

31. Does your team have a logo?
- Yes
- No

32. If you team has a logo, please enter the URL for the logo here. [open-ended]

33. Does your campus have a Case Manager?
- Yes, a dedicated one specifically for the team
- Yes, through the conduct office
- Yes, through the counseling center
- No
- Other (please specify):

34. If your campus has a Case Manager, what is their estimated caseload per year?
- 0–10
- 11–20
- 21–30
- 31–40
- 40+
- We don’t have a case manager
- I don’t know

35. Does your team keep centralized records?
36. If your team keeps records, what system do you use? (Check all that apply.)
- Maxient
- Awareity
- Symplicity
- Banner
- Adirondack Solutions
- Pave
- MS Access, Excel, or other similar office software
- In-house IT designed
- Pen/paper files
- We don’t keep records
- Other (please specify):

37. How does your team measure risks?
- Subjectively/case by case
- Objectively (the NaBITA Threat Assessment Tool, SIRVA-35...)

38. If your team measures risk objectively, what tools do you use? (Check all that apply.)
- The NaBITA Threat Assessment Tool
- WAVR-21
- HCR-20
- SIVRA-35
- VRAW²
- We don’t measure objectively
- Other (please specify):

39. If your team uses the NaBITA Threat Assessment Tool: We use it for...
- Each case that comes to the team
- Only for more serious or time-consuming cases
- We don’t use the NaBITA Threat Assessment Tool

40. Approximately how many cases in each of the categories does your team review annually? (Please provide a numerical number for each category.)

41. If your team has an operational budget, what is it? [open-ended]

42. If your team has a budget, what division or department is the source of the budget? [open-ended]

43. What do you believe is the most significant weakness of your team? [open-ended]

44. What do you believe makes the team most effective when working through cases? [open-ended]

45. What are some of the biggest challenges your team frequently faces as it works through cases? [open-ended]

46. What are you looking for in your future trainings? (Check all that apply.)
- Threat assessment foundation skills
- Team dynamics
- Marketing and advertising a team
- Cultural bias/microaggressions
- Record-keeping and documentation
- Training and educational opportunities for faculty
- Student suicide and self-harm (e.g., disordered eating, cutting, medical risk)
- Addressing silos among departments
- Practical skills in training in threat assessment
- Crisis de-escalation
- Assessment and effectiveness of campus BIT/TAT and CARE teams

47. What are some new tools, white papers, or resources that would be useful for NaBITA to develop? [open-ended]