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Response Metrics

The survey was administered to 12,790 faculty, staff, and students (1800 faculty; 4749 staff; and 6241 graduate students); and 3,647 responded yielding a 29% response rate. The response sample was representative of the TTU population; the participants’ spanned thirty-two (32) areas/divisions, and 179 departments within those divisions and area. However, 1,146 individuals elected not to select a department, representing 31.4% of the sample. The following bar graph depicts campus participation:
Sample representation depicted in a numeric table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFO Area</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Sciences</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>39.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media &amp; Communications</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rawls</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual &amp; Perf Arts</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Law</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Pres for Research</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASNR</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info Technology</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Affairs</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>66.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Campus</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>66.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Education</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTUISD</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Tech System</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Dept. Selected</td>
<td>1146</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3647</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the areas that have departments that are designated in the Banner Information Systems, the following graphs display number of respondents by department:
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Gun-Free Zone Feedback

1. Respondents clearly indicated that functions or locations serving alcohol should be designated as a gun-free::
2. On the other hand, respondents indicated that the free speech area should **not** be designated as a gun-free zone:

![Bar chart showing frequency of responses to gun-free zone questions.]

**Gun-Free Zone Detailed Questions**

1. **Public Areas:** Respondents rated athletic events, the Student Union Building, and Recreational Sports Center as the most favored places to designate as “gun-free.” Results from the survey:

![Bar chart showing public areas and their respective frequencies.]

- Athletic Events: 2380
- Athletic Training: 266
- Allen Theatre: 319
- Maedgen Theatre: 115
- Escondido Theatre: 48
- Museum: 287
- Planetarium: 61
- Rec. Sports: 1607
- SUB: 1947
- NRHC: 82
- None: 777
- Other: 601

---
In the “other” category, the following additional areas were noted, with the first four items by far the most frequent:

a. Entire campus  
b. Faculty offices  
c. All classrooms  
d. Library  
e. Holden Hall  
f. Engineering Key  
g. Residence Halls  
h. Doak Conference Center  
i. West Hall  
j. Hemmle Recital Hall  
k. Memorial Circle  
l. Rawls College of Business  
m. Chemistry Building  
n. United Spirit Arena  
o. Physics Building

2. **Vulnerable Populations**: Respondents expressed the highest concern over areas serving patients, such as the Psychology Clinic and the Student Wellness Center, but also expressed a lower level of concern in all the categories:

![Bar chart showing vulnerable populations](image)

In contrast, 762 individuals indicated “none,” suggesting that none of these audiences should be considered when selecting “gun free” zones. Suggestions from the “other” category:

a. Faculty offices  
b. Entire campus
c. Classrooms
d. International Students, Faculty (they cannot carry a weapon)

3. **Hazardous Materials** – Participants indicated that research labs with various chemical substances should be considered for gun-free zone designation, and 931 did not think hazardous areas should be gun-free:

In the “other” category, respondents listed the top additional suggestions:

- a. Entire campus
- b. Grounds maintenance
- c. Kitchen areas with poisonous cleaning liquids
- d. Any area that requires a badge for entry
- e. All research labs, including faculty offices
- f. Art Studio, especially sculpting studios
- g. All utilities and all plants

4. **Faculty Addendum**

The option “faculty offices” was inadvertently left off of the survey, and to compensate, we administered a two question survey to faculty through the President of the Faculty Senate. Six-hundred and twelve (612) faculty completed the survey, and indicated the following with regard to the importance of faculty offices being designated as gun-free zones:
Suggestions for Campus Resources
The final quantitative question yielded strong support for a wide spectrum of support resources, as depicted in the following chart:
The “other” category contained a number of policy, resource, and safety suggestions. The most frequent suggestions:

1. Don’t admit students with a history of mental illness
2. Refuse to comply with the legislation; fight congress
3. Create an anonymous system for faculty and students to submit instances of feeling intimidated by a gun holder
4. Prohibit students under 25 from concealed carry or open carry
5. Keep entire campus gun-free
6. Mental health awareness and support
7. Campus gun registration
8. Metal detectors in every building, or at least some buildings
9. Required training
10. Open discussion about why someone would need to carry a gun on campus; address any fears or concerns
11. Background check of students
12. Start a competitive sharp shooting team
13. Annual, mandatory mental health screenings for gun carriers
14. Publish a list of all students, faculty, and staff that have a permit and carry a weapon.
15. Hire more police officers, and add blue lights on campus
16. Improve campus lighting
17. Invest in lobbying efforts to repeal this legislation
18. University issued bullet-proof vests
19. Mandatory Emergency Action Planning for those that carry guns
20. Additional emergency alert systems in classrooms, such as overhead announcement systems and door locks
21. Designated gun educators added to staff ranks
22. Require chips on guns
23. Leverage the military veterans on campus to help train
24. Eliminate the irrational fear of guns with evidence-based education
25. Panic button installation in all classrooms
**Qualitative Data Analysis**

The final question allowed respondents to express any other thoughts or information that they would like the committee to review. 1,648 participants provided feedback, and the comments were categorized into four primary areas: favor campus carry; oppose campus carry; recommendations for committee; and miscellaneous:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Comment</th>
<th>Number of Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – Favor Legislation</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Oppose Legislation</td>
<td>631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Recommendations</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – Miscellaneous</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A few common themes emerged, and the final, complete comments are contained in **Appendix A** (256 pages):

1. Respondents appreciated the opportunity to voice opinions, concerns
2. The emotional nature of the issues is well documented throughout the comments, note that profanity was not removed, and grammar/spelling errors not corrected;
3. The campus has grave concerns about the implications of this legislation, regardless of their own position on the legislation
4. Strong, compelling arguments for and against, and serious ignorance about the legislations, the ability institutions have to refute, and the purpose of the survey (despite clear explanatory text).

The faculty addendum also included an open-ended question, and those answers are contained in **Appendix B**. Upon careful review, no new themes emerged, the content remained emotional and fear-based, and the level of concern is clearly reflected in the comments.