ROLE OF ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONS IN COUNTERTERRORISM: INSTITUTING PERSONNEL RELIABILITY PROGRAMS (PRP)

Dr. Iram Khalid *

Abstract: Recent wave of terrorism after Operation Zarb-e-Az'b has witnessed a dispersal of terrorist elements and has also initiated targeting of soft vulnerable non-kinetic social outlets as a means to deal considerable counter value collateral damage. Where one purpose of such a strategy could be to divert attention of law enforcement away from terrorist nerve centers, another noteworthy factor is that academic institutions are extremely vulnerable given their overall design and security layout. Apart from infrastructural deficiencies, academic institutions also house a considerable diversity of students and employees; therefore, there may be an instance of diffusion of extremist or terrorist elements both as operatives and as collaborators. Attacks on Army Public School Peshawar and Bacha Khan University revealed that terrorists had sufficient information and infrastructural knowledge that allowed them relative ease of operation. Personnel Reliability Program (PRP) is a mean to consolidate available data and information regarding any individual working in an organization. It enhances outreach of the organization in verifying inclinations and predispositions of any prospective individual aspiring to join an institution. PRP in academic institutions would be an enhancement of personal information collection procedure only to maintain consistent verification of on-campus activities as a means to further scrutinize not only miscreants but terrorist prone elements. The object is to allow a database that can be verifiable with NADRA, intelligence authorities, and other law enforcement authorities without physical intervention that can introduce caution and allow sufficiency of time to prepare a response.

Keywords: Counterterrorism, Personnel Reliability Program, security, verification, academic institutions

---

* Dr. Iram Khalid is Professor, Department of Political Science, University of the Punjab, Lahore (Email: iramkrc.polsc@pu.edu.pk).

Introduction

Pakistan in its war on terrorism initiative has entered what may be called the most crucial phase of counterterrorism. Where it is sufficiently easy to mark targets and conduct an operation where combatants are confined to one particular region, it is equally perilous to allow any proliferation of counterforce and countervalue targets. Once there is diffusion of terrorist elements in city centers or other non-combat layers, it becomes very difficult and expensive to contain the damage. Damage in this connotation means loss of life by arbitrary terrorist activities and cost of deploying law enforcement agencies in urban counterterrorism initiatives.[1] Local law enforcement is already too busy in combating crime and other activities while the armed forces are deployed at multiple fronts ranging from border patrol to avoiding conventional warfare and from border security violations to transnational bellicosity. In this situation, it becomes increasingly important that major focus be kept on developing a mechanism that ensures maximum information sharing among institutions so as to frequently update existing databases with relevant and verifiable information. Considering the fact that terrorist organizations frequently employ a specific age group and target a specific social dilemma, academic institutions can provide vital information reserved in the form of both staff recruitment and student admission procedure. The information reserved by academic institutions can not only be counterchecked by various national databases but can also be a source of reevaluating any vulnerability. Such information reduces time to physically confirm locations or peculiarities regarding any collaborator or terrorist element that might have diffused in social surroundings until activated by their managers or otherwise initiated.[2]

Academic institutions have been most vulnerable targets for five compelling reasons: Firstly, they offer little professional resistance that can preemptively dissuade any aggression. Secondly,

---

[1] For details, see Michael Fredholm, *Understanding Lone Actor Terrorism: Past Experience, Future Outlook, and Response Strategies* (Routledge, 2016).

[2] Ibid.

their security is mostly either untrained or underequipped to counter a trained and well-equipped terrorist. Thirdly, organizational structure of security at academic institutions is mostly questionably competent. Fourthly, large number of people allows better cover and sufficient psychological and physical damage. Fifthly, delay in reaction time by local law enforcement allows them sufficient time and flexibility of operations to inflict maximum casualties before appropriate forces are deployed.[3] The Army Public School (APS) Peshawar incident in 2014 marked a turning point in counterterrorism strategy in Pakistan. Where a national decision was taken to amend the constitution to accommodate capital punishment and national action initiatives, no prominent policy guidelines were drafted or even tabled with respect to revisiting security parameters for academic institutions to further discourage such incidents. Later in 2016, attack on the Bacha Khan University in the same province marked another turning point of counterterrorism policy options for Pakistan.[4]

Underlining factors that were noteworthy in detailing a comprehensive counterterrorism policy in line with a prospective Nation Action Plan strategy was an undermined and inadequately addressed academic sector in terms of security policy. Academic institutions, like hospitals and recreational layers, cannot segregate and deny access to public; and therefore, pose a more diverse threat as has been the case twice. Basic security policy for academic institutions generally revolves around enhanced fencing of premises, increment in guard patrols, assisted patrols and inspections by local law enforcement agencies, communication of intelligence reports regarding threat perceptions and security vulnerabilities, and installation of CCTV systems. However, a major shortcoming in this is the human factor. Law enforcement agencies conduct what is

---

[3] Jeremy D. Finn and Timothy J Servoss, "Security Measures and Discipline in American High Schools," in *Closing the School Discipline Gap: Equitable Remedies for Excessive Exclusion*, ed. Daniel J. Losen (New York: Teachers College Press, 2015): 44–58.

[4] Marisa R Randazzo and J Kevin Cameron, "From Presidential Protection to Campus Security: A Brief History of Threat Assessment in North American Schools and Colleges," *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy* 26, no. 4 (2012): 277–90.

known as a 'Personnel Reliability Program' in ascertaining operational proficiency of an individual working in an organization. The basic aim is to ensure that such individuals who have been reported to have performed their duties negligently or have displayed malfeasant behavior towards the institution are segregated and then either removed from duty or otherwise transferred. This, to an extent, maintains a regularized mechanism for organizational efficiency without damaging institutional integrity or weakening operational capabilities.[5]

Personnel Reliability Program, hereinafter referred to as PRP, works on ten cardinal principles: First, any complaint is authenticated for legitimacy so as to validate its reliability. Second, it then follows a background analysis of information received with context to complaint lodged. Three, once adequate analysis has been affirmed the accused is monitored for further validation. Four, if accusation is authenticated, the accused is segregated from sensitive work layers and restrained to minimal performance to observe resistance. Five, if complaint is not authenticated then complainant and accused are both analyzed for personal rivalry/professional rivalry. Six, any employee found in contravention of organizational integrity is interrogated. Seven, if employee is found guilty upon interrogation, necessary action is taken. Eight, a constant but periodic evaluation is conducted of all personnel working in an organization to ensure that vulnerabilities are not ignored. Nine, after necessary action, reports and databases are updated to keep record for further use. Ten, this procedure is cyclic and confidential to avoid breach or compromise of PRP.[6]

Articulating Personnel Reliability for Academic Institutions: Challenges and Operational Policies

It may be plausible that academic institutions are not sensitive nuclear installations or military headquarters so as to install a PRP

---

[5] Jeffrey Lyne Jenkins, "Alleviating Insider Threats: Mitigation Strategies and Detection Techniques" (PhD Dissertation, University of Arizona, 2013).

[6] Ibid.

mechanism as per military structure; and it is also pertinent to mention that such a policy would not perform with accuracy and efficacy if applied to academic institutions; however, considering that academic institutions cannot formulate such a policy option is also assumptive if not fictional.[7] Academic institutions are centers that house confidential information of all participants (in this instance, 'participants' shall refer to employees, students, visitors, and miscellaneous persons interacting within an academic institution); and this information, though apparently very basic, can offer an entire tracing record in cases of security anomalies. One of the biggest challenges in counterterrorism arises when participants of an academic institution are supposed to be involved in post-incident investigation procedure but their records are either not updated or verified. Vitality of information is paramount as it can serve as a post-disaster management apparatus and can also serve as an assisting factor in investigation.[8]

A major challenge in this policy would be understanding diversity attached with the term 'academic institution;' because it ranges from preliminary schooling to post-graduate universities, and one uniform policy would be difficult if not impossible. In such an instance, a basic mechanism can be devised that will serve all academic institutions to a generic level, and further enhancements can be tailor-made according to desired strata of academic institutions. Purpose here is to maintain a system of human resource accountability for segregating vulnerabilities not necessarily in the ambit of discrimination. Considering that academic institutions are designed to accommodate people from diverse echelons of the society, and any such attempt in segregating or denying rights to participate in an academic institution would be in contravention to freedom of education is assumptive. Academic criterion is already a mechanism that ensures candidate screening; but since that selection

---

[7] Robert Ladd Thorndike, *Personnel Selection: Test and Measurement Techniques* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1949).

[8] Claire Mayhew and Duncan Chappell, "Workplace Violence: An Overview of Patterns of Risk and the Emotional/Stress Consequences on Targets," *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry* 30, no. 4 (2007): 327–39.

is made on the basis of academic proficiency and not personal inclination, the risk of collaboration or terrorist itself poses a great threat. Object is not denial of admission or employment but maintaining consistency with the overall security atmosphere and separating bellicosity from compliance.[9]

Academic institutions already pose certain fundamental restrictions on participants interacting within institutional premises to ensure that there is not commitment of crime or criminal activity that can jeopardize other participants or subvert the purpose of said institution. Possession of narcotics, arms, ammunition, and volatile substances without authorization beyond specified premises; questionable, defamatory, or slanderous material against sensitive personalities; political affiliations and other extraneous effects are contraband; and academic institutions reserve the right to initiate internal or external legal action ranging from expulsion to arrest, if required. The basic purpose of these restrictions is to discourage proliferation of unauthorized and criminal factions to interfere in premises and use it as a cache, because law enforcement agencies are often denied entry in academic institutions without duly served notices and authorization from requisite academic officer. PRP is to ensure that if there is proliferation of such factions or contraband material, it be reported immediately so as to avoid any escalation of the situation. For educational institutions, PRP can work as a verifications mechanism regarding participants that are either suspiciously engaged in political or other activities or are found involved in providing, aiding, or abetting use or dispensation of contraband items on campus premises. It would further encourage calculation of 'ghost' employees, students, or staff that have either remained unnecessarily absent from dispensing their duties or have been reported to have been involved or nominated in criminal activities. PRP would also ensure that students, organizations, or employees do not possess any extremist views that either incites hatred towards a specific sect, social background, ethnicity, or

---

[9] Ryan Crow, *Personnel Reliability Programs* (McLean: Project Performance Corporation, 2004), http://www.ppc.com/modules /knowledgecenter/prp.pdf.

locality, because such remarks can further lead to violence that can be used as a leverage to conduct terrorist activity.[10]

Dissecting Personnel Reliability Programs: Separating PRP from Employee Assistance Program

Political inclinations or personal proclivities towards a certain activity can generate debate and can also encourage difference of opinion; however, projection of a specific extremist view can not only be perilous to academic performance but also be used to incite vengeful activities. Understanding personal challenges of people engaged on campus administration is imperative in learning the core issue of extremism, a precursor to terrorism. Though it may be difficult to define terrorism in one single comprehensive domain that includes all necessary possibilities of traits of a terrorist, but a fair assumption is where a specified belief system encourages any individual to engage in violence, either through use of force or threat of force, causing loss of life or property or propaganda to subdue normal processes or by use of deadly force which is deemed otherwise illegal by law of the land. By virtue of this definition, which is just a combination of factors necessary to constitute a very basic act of terrorism, one can trace elements present in an academic institution that can facilitate application of PRP to counteract given individual or collective socio-psychological anomalies. Since personnel within the academic staff are principally responsible for maintaining information vital to academic integrity as well as premises security, their consistency with state law and efficient conflict management skills are necessary for ensuring further securitization of an academic institution.[11]

---

[10] Priyanka Chaurasia et al., "Countering Terrorism, Protecting Critical National Infrastructure and Infrastructure Assets through the Use of Novel Behavioral Biometrics," *Behavioral Sciences of Terrorism and Political Aggression* 8, no. 3 (2016): 197–211.

[11] Michael Lawrence Porter, "Combating Insider Threats: An Analysis of Current United States Insider Threat Policies and Necessary Improvements" (Thesis, College of Graduate Studies at Angelo State University, May 2014).

Psychological Factors: Precursors to Institutional Vulnerability

Academic scrutiny process is designed to focus primarily on maintaining academic qualifications as a principal criterion for evaluating any prospective employee. For academic purposes, this is somewhat authentic source of ascertaining appointment of the most effective candidate out of the selection pool.[12] This applies not only to faculty employed to serve for academic purposes but also to other staff employed for the purpose of regulating institutional proficiency. Self-assessment schemes or inclinations are often neglected, which means that employees are often at leverage to share their social and religious views, some leading to conflict of ideologies and later leading to violence in worst case scenario. Though psychological assessment may pose subjectivity in its results, after due deliberation by experts, it can serve as a marker to understand behavioral defects in employees.[13] One factor could be habitual practices of harsh prejudice towards a particular sect, race, or ethnicity, or frequency in violence prone behavioral approach or even projection of beliefs that are otherwise controversial and instigating. Psychologically, prime focus is not on views but reactionary responses in their practical manifestations. Hypothetically, if an employee resorts to verbal or physical abuse on normal exchange of views, reprimand is necessary for such an employee based upon premises oriented disciplinary malfeasance; but PRP will also ensure that after reprimand such employee does not enhance his aggressive outreach. Main purpose is to develop a verification mechanism to examine behavioral aggression among employees and administrative personnel in charge of sensitive campus information like locations, maps, and counterforce targets that can raise collateral damage. Aggression as well as stress is a prime focus of PRP in order to contain spread of aggression leading to reckless actions, which can cause security

---

[12] Qing Hu et al., "Why Individuals Commit Information Security Violations: Neural Correlates of Decision Processes and Self-Control," presented at the Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences (HICSS), January 6–9, 2014.

[13] Chaurasia et al., "Countering Terrorism," 197–211.

ruptures and can provide leverage to terrorist elements aiming to infiltrate campus premises.[14]

Religious Inclinations: Indicating Social Grey Areas

Religious belief is not a subject matter of criticism or in any way whatsoever a subject matter of alert because religious interaction or viewpoint is not inherently objectionable. The reason for mentioning religious inclination in this context is prejudice against members of other religions or sectarian groups either by exchange of harsh comments or controversial debates that can induce aggression jeopardizing institutional cohesion. Employees engaged in unnecessary exchange of individual or group biasing need to be reprimanded according to institutional procedures, but they should be observed for post-reprimand surreptitious behavior.[15]

The purpose of PRP is not to segregate on sectarian beliefs or inclinations but to determine quotient of emphasis on aggressive compulsion from one individual to another necessitating aggression. Such individuals are to be evaluated initially for any background information. Noteworthy is the fact that disciplinary reprimand follows creation of groups of like-minded individuals focusing on disciplinary reprimand as prejudicial activity favoring one group over the other. This serves as a precursor to organized violence or misuse of authority for personal gratification, both of which can be detrimental to institutional integrity. Such a situation can be effectively used to create an opinion against institutional hierarchy; and if such groups exert appropriate influence, they can provide sufficient vacuum for terrorists to infiltrate premises or institutional structure for prospective actions. The purpose is not to discourage anti-religious sentiment in work premises or denial of religious obligations to employees but to maintain a consistent check over individuals who have displayed bellicose behavior under pretext of

---

[14] Adam Lankford, "A Comparative Analysis of Suicide Terrorists and Rampage, Workplace, and School Shooters in the United States from 1990 to 2010," *Homicide Studies* 17, no. 3 (2013): 255–74.

[15] For details, see Jennifer Doyle, *Campus Sex, Campus Security* (California: Semiotexte Smart Art, 2015).

religious misinterpretation. PRP mechanism segregates individuals with religious bellicosity without overacting or under-acting over given incidents. This mechanism is purpose-built to differentiate between singular instances from pattern in accused individual/groups. The aim is to identify dominant religious patterns in individuals frequently reported to be involved in controversial subject, discourse, or aggressive religious dogmatism.[16]

Quiescent Collaborators/Terrorists: Major Challenge for Academic Institution Security

The most difficult of personnel categories that can be accommodated in PRP priority list are those who actually have extremist views and may even have aggressive tendencies inducing violence. Such personnel can be categorized as extremely dangerous individuals; because their information can be fabricated or otherwise insufficient to allow proactive decision making in counterterrorism. Such individuals are not only cautious of their surroundings but are also vigilant of any institutional actions. Such individuals tend to remain dormant with respect to their questionable activities and either use aforementioned individuals as a distraction or employ small-scale activities that are otherwise unnoticeable considering academic institutions are not considered 'sensitive installations' and the term 'countervalue' does not apply per se.

Collateral damage refers to civilian causalities not engaged in any aggressive entanglements. Post Zarb-e-Az'b target acquisition by terrorists is mostly focused around dispersing operational forces within city limits and to exhaust operational capability of law enforcement. With such a strategy operating at undisclosed levels, state law enforcement remains either exhausted in protecting multiple possible targets or by focusing major locations – diluting focus on other centers that can be simultaneously targeted.[17]

---

[16] Ibid.

[17] Debra D. Bass, Richard Yep, and Jane Webber, *Terrorism, Trauma, and Tragedies: A Counselor's Guide to Preparing and Responding* (Alexandria: American Counseling Association Foundation, 2005).

Such individuals mostly retain their activities beyond campus premises, but frequency of activity patterns can indicate caution if not clarity of intentions. PRP induces a three-fold mechanism; firstly, it allows preparedness and preemptive actions for discouraging such entities without raising alarm; secondly, it isolates such individuals/groups from sensitive information relating to campus perimeter integrity that can be used as supplement information in a prospective terrorist activity; and thirdly, it allows for a pre-incident information sharing with law enforcement and institutional administration to manage any affiliates and collaborators. Considering the eventuality of a lone or group activity, PRP can serve as a collaborative effort against counterterrorism which involves law enforcement and institutional administration without providing preemptive information to such elements. Institutional mechanisms are neither designed to manage such threats nor are they equipped with adequate response mechanisms; they rely on counterterrorist law enforcement. Such reliance is primary in nature but initiation of a counterterrorism operation without proper vigilant information dispensation can induce panic and psychological trauma that hampers any counterterrorism operations.[18]

Employee Assistance Program (EAP) follows a similar pattern in instances where employees are prepared and sectioned for duties assigned to them. EAP maintains principal focus on assessing employees for personal vulnerabilities that can induce or encourage violence or other non-organizational anomalies. PRP is more inclined towards preparing an organizational report of vulnerable employees and proceeds to share it with appropriate agencies. EAP, on the other hand, relies on disciplinary proceedings within the institution and in cases where a particular section is dedicated to allow law enforcement to operate; but PRP specifically targets employees with terrorist prone tendencies either as collaborators or as operatives. EAP can be effectively employed as preliminary mechanism to PRP; and where EAP serves in collecting data about vulnerable employees, PRP can be employed to assess and analyze further by compartmentalizing employee effectiveness as well as terrorist inclinations. The objective is not to deploy a PRP mechanism for

---

[18] Ibid.

organizational inefficiency but specifically for security oriented fractures in institutional organization. PRP is tailor-made for security related situations and to construct an adequate database that can be employed by law enforcement agencies as a means to preempt future incidents.[19]

Instituting Personnel Reliability: Developing Enhanced Institutional Tiers

Contemporary security outline for academic institutions principally rely on post-incident information specifically in domain of terrorism. As far as security infrastructure itself is concerned, it encompasses a spectrum ranging from biometric and automated entrance points to installation of law enforcement contingents as security layer. Information sharing between law enforcement intelligence agencies and academic institutions does occur, but only in situation when an imminent threat or suspicion is communicated. PRP would be a mechanism that will preemptively attempt to isolate possible internal vulnerabilities and reduce focus of law enforcement to small-scale individuals to narrow investigative intelligence.[20] Security infrastructure of academic institutions does not introduce psychological analyses of employees to identify prospective vulnerabilities as well as maintenance of a dedicated structure of information separating organizational misfeasance and dereliction of duty from extremist notions leading to either security hazard through collaboration or through direct interference as operatives.[21]

An enhanced security framework for academic institutions would not be introduction of a new system but enhancement of instituted frameworks by introduction of a dedicated system of verification and analysis of vulnerable employees alongside EAP and basic security guidelines. Purpose of security officials is already divided into five layers: First layer compensates for perimeter

---

[19] Michael A Richard, *Employee Assistance Programs: Wellness/ Enhancement Programming* (Illinois: Charles C. Thomas Publisher, 2014).

[20] Ibid.

[21] Finn and Servoss, "Security Measures."

security, second layer relies on maintaining security detail for physical protection, third layer is more towards technical assessment of security guidelines and communication of the same to law enforcement if required, fourth layer maintains concealment of sensitive information to campus integrity, and fifth layer maintains CCTV control facility. EAP works on six layers of employee integrity: first layer is psychological inconsistency, second layer is based on disciplinary irregularities, third layer is frequency of violent tendencies and aggressive behavior, fourth layer is focused on organizational efficiency, fifth layer is maintenance of record and information with isolated individuals placed under observation, and sixth layer resorts to disciplinary action that may range from psychological counseling to expulsion from organization.

EAP layers serve as foundation for PRP, on which further segregation can be made based upon nature of tendencies or behavioral issues. PRP then institutes a five layer prerequisite system: First, it identifies individuals that have been frequently engaged in posing aggressive notions or gestures detrimental to organizational sanctity, particularly towards matters pertaining to security. Second layer then isolates such individuals and maintains a patterned observation system to conclusively achieve confirmation of accusations. Third layer reevaluates background data through personal resources available and other organizations. Fourth layer is about informing appropriate agencies designated to conduct such operations. Sixth and last layer provides support information sharing to relevant agencies for maintaining consistency of operations.[22]

Tier One in PRP: Understanding Security Dynamics: Purpose of PRP is oriented only towards security dynamics of academic institutions; and where employee behavior is under question as to efficiency of an organization, the EAP becomes relevantly applicable. Academic institutions do not maintain an indigenous system of security at par with law enforcement or counterterrorism specialized units, but they are facing similar challenges. Academic institutions cannot employ extensive services of counterterrorism forces and intelligence agencies, because that would severely exhaust such forces in their designated jurisdiction.

---

[22] Ibid.; Also see Jenkins, "Alleviating Insider Threats."

An academic institution, after an incident, becomes further vulnerable both psychologically and physically. Introducing law enforcement as protection may be prudent but bears strain on law enforcement force structure as well as institutional performance. Academic security measures are designed to ensure minimum friction and operate as a delaying mechanism for appropriate forces to conduct their operations. Principal jurisdiction of academic institution security is preservation of campus integrity, provision of minimized deterrence against violent activities, collecting information regarding any suspicious activities, maintenance of record of habitual offenders, and ensuring an indigenous link with law enforcement for worst-case scenario eventualities.[23]

Academic institutions cannot afford engaging with terrorist elements because of their inferior training as compared to a terrorist and because of risk of high collateral damage in case of escalation of conflict. Administrative protocols for security personnel primarily rely on institution of delay for terrorist infiltration for two prime purposes: first purpose is inducing delay for evacuation of maximum number of participants, and second purpose is to allow appropriate forces designated for counterterrorist engagements to initiate operations. Security staff in this context serves as a ground intelligence network; which, through consistent radio contact, maintains an impregnable communications link that not only updates central security office at the university but can also be employed to steer terrorist elements towards a minimum damage zone.[24] Such a situation would include deploying barriers and hindrances effectively to discourage easy entrance on campus premises, organized evacuation plans for participants in an academic institution, obstructing access of terrorist elements to congested locations, and immediate information to security staff to authorize law enforcement deployment by state departments.

PRP focuses on security staff as a primary subject matter because of three reasons: First, security personnel are most informed about physical campus vulnerabilities. Second, their training and

---

[23] Amy Zegart, "Insider Threats and Organizational Root Causes: The 2009 Fort Hood Terrorist Attack," *Parameters* 45, no. 2 (2015): 35.

[24] Ibid.

communication capabilities can affect evacuation during crisis. Third, where security personnel are armed, they themselves can pose a hazard if inclined to be collaborators of operatives, severely jeopardizing campus integrity. PRP would then be applied on security staff for the purposes of assessing breaches and fissures in security layout, which serves as the first layer of securitizing academic institutions. Any security employee with appropriate motivation, behavioral anomalies, or ideological inconsistencies can adversely affect an entire counterterrorism operation. PRP can be employed to segregate such individuals and affect necessary action in order to preemptively curtail increment in crisis management inconsistencies.

Tier Two in PRP: Confidentiality in Institution

PRP is a mechanism that operates by utilizing available scrutiny procedures; but instead of ceasing at only organizational reprimand, enhances the outreach of an academic institution by constructing reliable database for future use within and beyond academic institutions. PRP maintains confidentiality of information gathering mechanisms by initiating a framework dependent upon six core notions: Firstly, it relies on departmental or organizational reports as foundation; secondly, it evaluates inconsistencies more thoroughly for confirmation of accusations; thirdly, it allows academic institutions to countercheck information with relevant government agencies for affirmation; fourthly, any disciplinary action taken in context is not publicized so as not to raise caution towards collaborators and accomplices; fifthly, all information is kept separate from normal disciplinary or organizational malfeasance oriented discourse; and sixthly, PRP is kept as a clandestine mechanism within normal disciplinary activities and primarily focuses on individuals posing physical security malfunctions that can later postulate dire consequences.

The aim in confidentiality is to preserve sensitive information under authorized control. Unauthorized personnel should neither have access to sensitive information nor should they be ignored if frequency of access is stressed. Sensitive information in this context is campus maps; location of security staff weapons cache; information pertaining to previously apprehended people; information pertaining to any law enforcement operations, specifically pertaining

to collaborative campus reinforcement under counterterrorism initiatives; access to CCTV database and security routine; access to communication link and information dispatched thereof; routine of high profile campus officials and staff for purposes of abduction; and presence of covert law enforcement authorities in vulnerable campuses either highlighted as targets or already targeted. Such information is not only reserved as confidential but breach of the same by an employee can cause severe dents in operational capabilities of campus security staff and their collaborative network with law enforcement.

Tier Three in PRP: Understanding Challenges

Academic institutions are diverse organizations with multiplicity in frequency of interactions. This implies that academic institutions are not designed as a vital component in counterterrorist operations but do serve as a major target for want of higher collateral. In the same regard, academic institutions cannot deny access to participants but can manage the same through protocols and requisite conditions of access. Employees are a particular section in academic institutions that secure more ease of access and operational leniency as compared to other participants. An employee has access to zones otherwise declared out of bounds; and hence, more emphasis of securitization of academic institutions relies on employee integrity. A major challenge, therefore, is employing candidates that neither pose a hazard during crisis management nor do they compromise security integrity of campus by supplying information to assailants or assisting in a terrorist incident.

Social factors following reprimand are a challenge for academic institutions, because they can create groups and resistance through social pressure. Academic institutions are not like other institutions, where compartmentalization cannot be sufficiently counteracted by use of caution and observation. PRP is a means to facilitate this vacuum. PRP would maintain vigilance towards individuals who have been reprimanded for security related issues; and if they have not been removed from campus, they are kept in a constant check. Those who have had severity or reprimand to the extent of expulsion are to be informed about to requisite law

enforcement for proper action and vigilance beyond campus jurisdiction.

Conclusion

Academic institutions do not have adequate information and security systems that can match any intelligence agency or law enforcement, but they can construct a working system of evaluation and information that can serve as a pre-incident safety measure. Employees can play vital role in managing any calamity or incident; but if they act as collaborator or terrorist operative, they can dent and damage any counterterrorist operations by increasing collateral damage or instituting hostage situations that involve multilayered crises. PRP is designed to regulate academic institutions in their security dimension, as they are vulnerable to both terror attacks and criminal activities that can encourage terrorism.

The purpose is to maintain an information database that accommodates most updated information on individuals highlighted as 'hazardous' or 'questionable' pertaining to security oriented issues. PRP is an enhanced form of already implemented institutional protocols, because academic institutions do not usually have the appropriate mechanisms to deal with terrorist threats. Armed personnel on campus premises is not a principal feature of campus security, because their aggressive posture can instigate indiscriminate violence in order to warrant compliance to an assailant's demands – a highly unfavorable and undesirable situation.

The possibility of information exchange by an employee to miscreants is in itself a major setback to any counterterrorist operation against people who have diffused themselves with general public; and where it is difficult to identify such miscreants, leaving them unattended can further erode security. Institution of PRP is a step that ensures that academic institutions upgrade their protocols to adjust to terrorism as a possibility and to preempt any incident that can severely damage law enforcement.