graduates. Contrary to the widespread perception, this research clearly indicates that the effect of producing college graduates in a given state on the state's overall college attainment is close to proportionate. More specifically, the intrastate effect of new college graduates on college attainment appears to be at least 90% and most likely higher. That is, for every 100 people graduating from college in a state, the state's overall college-educated population increases by 90 or more. In fact, for graduates from public colleges, the effect appears to be fully proportionate.

On average, states graduating relatively high numbers of college students experience only a small net loss of graduates. States graduating lots of college graduates also create lots of jobs for college graduates. The evidence also clearly reveals that new college graduates in a state have no noticeable impact on either unemployment or wages of college graduates in the state. The wage premium from having a college degree is not affected by having relatively high numbers of college graduates.

The Northeast is different from the rest of the United States in terms of higher education. Relatively more college education in the Northeast occurs in private institutions. Presumably this is the main reason why public support for higher education in the Northeast is much lower than in the rest of the nation. In addition, more students in the Northeast cross state lines to attend college, and, because the states are smaller geographically, their labor markets are generally more integrated with those in neighboring states.

For these reasons, the within-state effect of college graduates on attainment is somewhat lower in the Northeast than in the rest of country. Nonetheless, the intrastate effect of new college graduates on college attainment in the Northeast appears to be about 80% or more, and the effect is even higher for graduates from public colleges in the Northeast (about 94%). The evidence indicates that the net loss of college graduates is considerably smaller than popularly believed. So it is still in individual New England states' interests to get more students into their colleges. But there is also more reason for interstate cooperation in higher education in New England compared with the rest of the nation.

Philip A. Trostel is a professor of economics and public policy in the University of Maine's School of Economics and the Margaret Chase Smith Policy Center and faculty affiliate in the Wisconsin Center for the Advancement of Postsecondary Education at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. This article is based on P. Trostel, "The Impact of New College Graduates on Intrastate Labor Markets," Wisconsin Center for the Advancement of Postsecondary Education Working Paper No. 11, 2007. Email: philip.trostel@maine.edu.

Insecure?

Keeping New England college campuses safe from violence

ALYSSA FRANZOSA

On April 16, 2007, Seung-Hui Cho traded in his title as "student" for one of "gunman." That day, Cho, a student at Virginia Tech, was responsible for the deadliest shooting spree by a single person in U.S. history, killing 33 people, including himself. Ten months later on Valentine's Day, Steven Kazmierczak joined Cho in the ranks of student gunmen, killing five people on the Northern Illinois University campus and then taking his own life.

Though unrelated, these violent acts are linked in their impact. They engender fear in students, parents, faculty members and campus administrators that on any given day, one student might become a murderer — or a murder victim.

The threat of campus insecurity exists nationwide, and colleges throughout the country are overhauling their safety initiatives. Last year, Massachusetts Gov. Deval Patrick and the state Department of Higher Education commissioned four experts on the subject to author a report, *Campus Violence Prevention and Response: Best Practices for Massachusetts Higher Education*. The July 2008 report analyzes past and present practices for safety and violence prevention, and recommends better, more comprehensive practices to keep Massachusetts students safe.

So, what exactly *should* be done to provide a safer campus?

"The way to treat [the threat of campus violence] is the same way one treats something like fire safety," says Bridgewater State College psychology professor Elizabeth Englander, one of the report's four authors. "You let people know you are thinking about it and that you know how to react."

Communication is key and, in an age when students get the bulk of their campus information online, the Internet must play a vital role in a college's security communications. "This generation is apt to go first to the website," Englander says. "It's an important avenue."

The UMass Amherst police department webpage, just two clicks from the university's main homepage, offers a good model for content and organization. The site directs students to the university's Clery reports, which colleges are required to publish annually, disclosing campus security policies and three years of crime statistics. The police site also includes a daily crime log, safety alert bulletins, guidelines in the event of an active threat, and an anonymous witness form (a feature that the Massachusetts report found lacking on many college sites).

The threat of campus insecurity exists nationwide, and schools throughout the country are overhauling their safety initiatives. But with the pressure so high to keep campuses safe, some schools are struggling to measure up.

Though federal law requires colleges to publish and distribute Clery reports, students must take it upon themselves to review a college's crime statistics. It's also up to the students to take advantage of the safety measures their colleges provide. What can colleges do to encourage participation? The Massachusetts report recommends that campuses include public safety as part of orientation for incoming students. In addition, all schools are required to have an emergency notification system that will alert students through email, phone and text message if a threat is present. But students should also be made aware of exactly how the system will be used and what information will be transmitted.

The University of Rhode Island in 2007 ran an awareness campaign, encouraging students to sign up to receive email and text message alerts in the event of a threat on campus via eCampus, URI's online record-keeping system. As an incentive, students who registered early were entered in a drawing for a free iPod.

The Massachusetts report also recommends that campuses make mental health services easily accessible to students. Such services must be promoted to students who otherwise would not seek out the services on their own. Former University of New England President Sandra Featherman wrote on this topic in the Summer 2004 issue of THE NEW ENGLAND JOURNAL OF HIGHER EDUCATION (then called CONNECTION). "More students are arriving at college today with emotional issues than just five years ago," noted Featherman, "and there has been dramatic growth in the severity of the problems. These students are creating a need for significant expansions in college counseling services."

New England's land-grant universities have set up websites for counseling services to make counseling centers more accessible to students. The University of Maine, for example, established a counseling center and website that students can go to for assistance with any number of issues. In a section on the site called "Sigmund Says" a virtual Sigmund Freud helps stressed students who "just need advice from an old friend."

Still, students who show no signs of emotional problems to campus counselors may offer disturbing hints to college faculty through means such as their writing or art. Faculty and staff should be prepared to recognize unusual behavior and know what to do in such cases, the Massachusetts report notes. At Virginia Tech, Seung-Hui Cho's teachers had no formal guidelines, but instinct told them something was amiss with the student. Lucinda Roy, former chair of Virginia Tech's English department, decided that Cho's writing was so disturbing she needed to remove him from class and instruct him one-on-one. After the massacre, Roy told CNN that the decision had to be made on her own, because since the threats were not specific, the campus could take no official action.

Katherine Newman, professor of sociology and public affairs at Princeton University, wrote in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* that those at Virginia Tech did "exactly what we would want them to do. They alerted the counseling staff to the scary writing submitted by the shooter; they tried to cajole him into treatment; and they warned the police."

The key to fighting campus insecurity is not to create fear or diminish freedom, but rather to keep resources available, raise awareness that threats exist and maintain open lines of communication.

The Massachusetts report recommends that colleges have in place a formal procedure to train faculty and staff in recognizing and dealing with a student whom they see as a threat. The University of Connecticut, for one, provides a downloadable guide for faculty on its website titled "Helping Students in Distress."

The key to fighting campus insecurity is not to create fear or diminish freedom, but rather to keep resources available, raise awareness that threats exist and maintain open lines of communication. Says Englander: "You never want to lose sight that the freedom of information flow is the most critical element of higher education and you can't tamper with it."

Alyssa Franzosa is an editorial intern at THE NEW ENGLAND JOURNAL OF HIGHER EDUCATION. Email: afranzosa@nebhe.org.