

*Julie Gregory*

## University Branding Via Securitization

### ABSTRACT

This article represents a call to understand school safety audits as central to processes of institutional branding. It argues that reading safety audits through a branding optic helps to draw out their uses in providing support for the augmentation of techno-security apparatuses on campuses and to contextualize them vis-à-vis increasing tendencies to govern universities in accordance with business models of management. While safety audits are generally endorsed as necessary for helping university administrators ensure the safety of students, faculty and staff, the more critical reading provided here draws attention to their entanglement with administrative efforts to construct commoditized university narratives. This paper substantiates and extends research by scholars who make note of the ongoing configurations of educational institutions in accordance with intertwining military and corporate logics. The discussion begins with a review of research by scholars who are highly critical of this trend. Next, the paper offers an exploratory case analysis of links between documents produced by one Canadian university's administration regarding a sexual assault on that campus in 2007, the undertaking of a university-wide safety audit, and institutional investments in increased security measures. The article concludes with reflections on the importance of counter-rationalizations to this relatively new model of university governance.

### RÉSUMÉ

Cet article représente une invitation à concevoir les évaluations de sécurité comme étant centrales aux processus du développement de marque de l'université. Nous soutenons que la lecture des évaluations de sécurité dans l'optique du développement de marque permet de souligner les usages de celles-ci pour justifier la présence augmentée des appareils techno-sécuritaires sur les campus et de les mettre en contexte par rapport à l'évolution de la gouvernance des universités vers des modèles plus proches de l'industrie. Bien que les évaluations de sécurité soient généralement appuyées comme étant nécessaires pour aider les administrateurs d'université à assurer la sécurité des étudiants, de la faculté, et des employés, l'approche plus critique présentée ici attire l'attention sur leur point d'intrication avec les efforts de la part de l'administration pour mercantiliser le milieu universitaire. Cet article affirme et élargit la portée des recherches par des intellectuel(le)s qui notent la configuration d'établissements d'enseignement qui continue de se faire selon des logiques

militaires et industrielles entrelacées. Notre analyse commencera par un survol de la recherche par des intellectuel(le)s très critiques de cette tendance. Par la suite, cet article offrira une étude de cas exploratoire des liens entre les documents produits par l'administration d'une université canadienne suite à une agression sexuelle commise sur ce campus en 2007, l'entreprise d'une évaluation de sécurité à l'échelle de l'université, et les investissements de la part de l'institution dans des mesures de sécurité augmentées. L'article conclut par des réflexions sur l'importance des idées qui vont à l'encontre des justifications de ce modèle de gouvernance assez nouveau.

**KEYWORDS:** corporatization; militarization; safety audits; techno-security; university governance



In recent years, there has been an increase in research that promotes branding as an important tactic to be used by university administrators (see, for example, Bélanger, Syed and Mount 2007; Chapleo 2010; Wæraas and Solbakk 2009). In these works, the term “branding” is used to denote “the whole range of criteria that go [in]to mak[ing] up the quality of a university” (Jevons 2006: 466). In keeping with this explanation, a university brand is understood as

a manifestation of the institution's features that distinguish it from others, reflect(s) its capacity to satisfy students' needs, engender(s) trust in its ability to deliver a certain type and level of higher education, and help(s) potential recruits to make wise enrolment decisions. (Bennett and Ali-Choudhury 2009: 85)<sup>1</sup>

According to these scholars, development of a strong university brand is of paramount importance if administrators are to attract and retain promising students, faculty and staff. More broadly, branding is understood to be an essential process by which universities are to maintain their positions—or, more cynically, their images—as vital social institutions.

Running parallel to this scholarship is work by academics who read universities as militarized and corporatized (see, for example, Saltman and Gabbard 2003). More specifically, there is a large body of work by scholars who are critical of the continual “shaping of...[educational] institutions in synchrony with military goals” (Lutz 2002: 723) and increasing tendency for “universities to behave like, and make closer ties with, multinational, for-profit businesses” (Entin 2005: 26). According to this second group of scholars, it is not enough to understand these trends as compatible; instead, militarization and corporatization are to be recognized as intertwined and mutually reinforcing logics that shape the ways multiple social institutions are structured and governed.

Scholars such as Henry Giroux (2008) and Mark Neocleous (2008) note a resurgence of collaborations between government and higher education in the form of new “disciplines and sub-disciplines to further the security project” (Neocleous 2008: 162). For these scholars, such trends threaten to reposition universities from institutions “crucial for both the education of critical citizens and the defense of democratic values” to ones whose main function is to produce and disseminate “militarized knowledge[s]” and subjectivities (Giroux 2008: 58). The argument here is clear: rather than ceding to the anti-democratic, authoritarian and capitalist ideologies propelling these developments, scholars must remain steadfast in their commitments to cultivate institutions that train people to “challenge militarized [and market-based] notions of identity, knowledge, values, ideas, social relations and visions” (Giroux 2008: 68; see also 2002).

Interestingly, the literatures on branding and militarization-corporatization generally do not intersect with each other. The aim of this article is to urge scholars interested in the militarization-corporatization of universities to consider the ways in which “security”-related initiatives figure into the “various...marketing strategies...employed in the academic world as universities search for ways to improve [their] ranking[s]” (Bunzel 2007: 152).<sup>2</sup> More specifically, in light of findings that Canadian “applicants are placing greater relevance on a safe campus environment when selecting a university,” I argue for the importance of considering the commission of safety audits as one administrative strategy used in efforts to construct strong university brands (Carroll 2004: 1); stated simply, university branding and securitization are intimately linked.

To support this reading, the ensuing discussion is dedicated to analyzing the confluences between mediated representations of a sexual assault that occurred at Carleton University in 2007, the subsequent execution of an institution-wide safety audit, and administrative depictions of Carleton as an especially responsible and progressive institution. The primary data used to facilitate this exploratory analysis is derived from internally generated, publicly available reports and news releases available via the university’s website. A main assumption informing this methodological choice is that these documents are representative of the claim-making activities of their authors. As such, I assume that they speak to the images of the university that their authors wish to project to current and prospective students, employees and the population at large. Carleton is intended to serve here as an exemplary case of the ways in which processes of militarization-corporatization are intertwined with processes of university branding; this trend, however, is certainly not limited to this institution. In order to preclude such an interpretation, the following analysis is supplemented with data derived from widely accessible documents that speak to similar trends occurring at other Canadian universities.

Before embarking on this analysis, I review research by scholars who are critical of the infusion of military-corporate logics into school spaces. The review begins with

work by scholars who note the ways various tragedies—including but not limited to rampage school shootings (Newman et al. 2004)—are used to justify changes to the physical landscapes of educational institutions. Next, I provide a review of work by scholars who note overlaps between corporate-military logics and more general shifts in university governance and policy. The central claim to emerge from this discussion is that universities are governed by a business model of management that prioritizes economic security over personal and community safety.

## Militarization and Corporatization of Schools

A number of scholars have highlighted the links between high-profile shootings on school campuses and increased support for, and moves toward, securitized educational institutions (Addington 2009; Fox and Savage 2009; Snell et al. 2002). Melanie J. Bliss et al. note that such events have been found to influence parental “support for intrusive solutions to school violence, such as searching students’ belongings and installing armed guards and metal detectors” (2006: 276). Likewise, Randall R. Berger writes that “[t]he climate of fear generated by recent school shootings has spurred school administrators to increase security through physical means (locks, surveillance cameras, metal detectors) and to hire more police and security guards” (2002: 119). When read positively, these changes are applauded as confirmation of an ongoing need to police educational spaces and youth more broadly (see, for example, Benigni 2004; Stein 2005). Read through a more critical lens, however, these modifications are indicative of the extent to which purported solutions can themselves be violent. In this context, Berger (2003) notes that with the increased policing of schools comes the relative diminution of students’ rights. Similarly, Paul J. Hirschfeld (2008) and Aaron Kupchik and Nicolas Ellis (2008) reveal that many of the measures implemented by school administrators in the name of safety and security function in ways that criminalize already marginalized youth. As such, these scholars provide further support for arguments that the promotion and expansion of fortified schools is symptomatic of the extent to which policing schools is accepted as an almost unquestioned necessity (Casella 2006; Kupchik and Bracy 2010: 21) and how, more generally, policing has become the accepted paradigm for responding to a range of social problems (Simon 2007).<sup>3</sup>

At the same time, these more critical scholars maintain that too much onus is placed on individuals (and/or institutional representatives) to mitigate risks of victimization through the consumption of security gadgets (Garland 2001). They argue that the promotion of situational crime-prevention methods bolsters neo-liberal forms of governance and does nothing to challenge normative distributions of power. To support this claim, consider Torin Monahan’s (2006) findings that educational administrators often hire professionals with direct military connections to help them in their efforts to provide safe and secure school environments. He notes, moreover, that many of “the ‘solutions’ [these groups] provide to their clients

are explicitly militaristic ‘command and control systems’ developed in government laboratories” (12).

Carrie A. Rentschler (2003) applies this logic to efforts to deter violence on post-secondary campuses. Rentschler points out that the changes made to the University of Illinois campus following the murder of a female employee hindered the development of close relationships among the various people who use that space. In particular, Rentschler asserts that tactics such as erecting fences, removing and trimming shrubbery, and installing more lighting reproduce the faulty assumption “that threats of violence [necessarily] come from outside the university” (243). In other words, Rentschler asks readers to consider how manipulations made to campus architectures sort and divide people spatially, protect and prioritize capital over people and foster an environment in which sexualized violence is made invisible and, therefore, especially difficult to discuss, critique and prevent.

A common claim informing these criticisms is that liberal-humanist understandings of safety and security drive the techno-security modifications made to campuses.<sup>4</sup> Tyson Lewis, for example, argues that the “logic that drives implementation of safety measures [in schools] is far from ideologically neutral” (2003: 335). In addition to reinforcing confluences of “safety with surveillance and security with militarism,” he continues, these changes are representative of “a largely neoconservative and neoliberal agenda... bent on retracting civil liberties [of some citizens] and expanding the disciplinary mechanisms of the state” (335). Stated bluntly, the argument here is that alliances between educational institutions and police enacted through security provision are less about ensuring the well-being of all students and staff and more about solidifying linkages between education, militarism and capital (see also Kupchik and Monahan 2006).

Rather than interpreting fortified schools as manifestations of tyranny, Ronnie Casella (2010) suggests that they are better understood as the outcomes of security-industry employees and school administrators engaging in mundane business practices. Even Lewis concedes that the major revenue increases garnered by security companies from school administrators in recent years point more toward “a new, fear-drive surveillance economy” than to overly aggressive salespeople creating niches for useless commodities (2003: 336). Taken together, these analyses oblige researchers not to deny the possibility that techno-securitized campuses are promoted in good faith nor to ignore the importance of analyzing this trend with reference to the constitution of school shootings as media spectacles (Kellner 2007) and the increasing incursion of security technologies and related rationalities into our everyday lives (Casella 2003a).

Other scholars who study the organization of educational institutions in accordance with military-corporate logics look beyond architecture-related tactics to speak more directly to shifts in administrative forms of governance. Cris Shore and Susan Wright (2000, 2004), for example, point to an infusion of marketing

rationalities into university spaces in ways that produce new forms of organizational and employee accountability. Their main position is that contemporary universities are audit cultures insofar as they are characterized by

*inter alia*, a fixation with the measurement, quantification and “benchmarking” of seemingly all aspects of university life; the invention of a plethora of new “performance indicators” (not to mention the creation of a whole new vocabulary to enable the new auditor-experts to assess and rank “quality” and “excellence”) and an explosion of new league tables to render commensurable hitherto unimaginable phenomena...[which] must now be scrutinized, quantified, statistically ranked and “rendered visible” either to the consumer or, as in most cases, to the anonymous gaze of the State and its bureaucratic machinery. (Shore and Wright 2004: 100)

In sum, Shore and Wright’s main position is that the rise of university audit cultures is “geared less to enhancing quality itself than to strengthening...control over the workforce” (114).

In a similar vein, Gaye Tuchman offers an ethnographic account of how “processes of centralization, bureaucratization, and commodification” infuse the working environment at one American university (2009: 4). Tuchman does not read the tendency for employees at this university to make their activities more auditable as unique; instead, this practice is situated in relation to more insidious processes, which reinforce understandings of technology, efficiency, progress and excellence as one and the same and prompt the diffusion of policy-related fads within and across organizational fields (see also Best 2006). Again, like Shore and Wright (2000, 2004), Tuchman (2009) interprets many of the policies introduced within universities as efforts to increase employee accountability. More than this, however, Tuchman reveals them to be conscious administrative efforts to increase the standing—or perceived quality—of their respective universities, as represented by annual ranking reports. This analysis leads to the conclusion that, within the contemporary university, “knowledge is...subordinated to the needs of universities for profit and recognition” (Tuchman 2009: 11).

As a whole, the studies reviewed in this subsection substantiate arguments that when studying the changing material-discursive geographies of campuses, “it is not enough to identify the extent to which certain schools (particularly urban, non-white, [American, secondary] schools) increasingly resemble prisons” (Saltman 2007: 29). Rather, as Kenneth J. Saltman maintains, such environments must be studied “in relation to the enforcement of corporate economic imperatives and [the] rising trend towards ‘law and order’ that pervade...popular culture, educational discourse, foreign [and national] policy, and language” (30). In what follows, I build on this claim by situating securitization of post-secondary institutions in relation to fear as a dominant and productive governing rationality.

Specifically, I draw attention below to the links between the publicization of a sexual assault on Carleton University's campus, the undertaking of an institution-wide safety audit, and institutional investments in an augmented techno-security apparatus. The purpose of this discussion is to offer an explicit example of the entanglement of safety audits with administrative efforts to produce persuasive university brands. At the same time, the analysis offered directs attention toward the importance of challenges to this model of branding universities via institutional securitization.

### Responsibilization, Securitization and Branding

Just before the beginning of the fall 2007 semester, a female student was attacked and sexually assaulted on Carleton University's campus. This act of violence had a number of consequences. At the individual level, the young woman suffered various physical, psychological and economic consequences. In an article published in a local newspaper, for example, she is described as fearful that "public knowledge of the assault will cause both her and her family to be ostracized from their [religious] community" and that "public knowledge of the fact that she was sexually assaulted will hurt her prospects of marriage and a family life" (Seymour, 2009).

At the institutional level, this act of violence spurred administrators to conduct a university-wide safety audit. Returning to convergences between mediated fears of violence and the promotion of securitized campuses, consider that the commission of this safety audit is framed with reference to both "the *perception* of an increase in incidences of violence across North America, and...[to this] very serious sexual assault on the Carleton University campus" (Carleton University 2008: 1, emphasis added). A report published by York University's administration following a safety audit there also opens with similar reasoning:

Campus violence has become increasingly common in universities across North America. Consequently, senior administrators at York University have prioritized prevention of violence and crime—recent incidents of sexual assault and hate graffiti at York and on several campuses across Ontario have moved the University to reduce factors that contribute to *unsafety* and [to] deal with safety risks. York University is committed to improving safety policies and practices and increasing transparency and accountability to its diverse stakeholders. (York University 2010: 5, emphasis added)

Both of these statements expose administrative tendencies to construct institutional checks on the safety of campus as necessary in an increasingly hostile environment. More to the point, they represent safety audits and related recommendations as acts of benevolent institutional responsibility.

Close scrutiny of these and related documents brings into question these routine interpretations, however. To be sure, university administrators work in institutional climates in which they must do more than ensure safe campuses. Indeed, as my emphasis on the word “perception” in the citation of the Carleton document above indicates, university administrators must validate people’s experiences and fears of campus violence, and circumvent accusations that the university administration is in any way responsible for such acts. This institutional reality may explain why these documents discursively transfer the responsibility for increasingly securitized universities onto students. In the 2007–08 Personal Safety Audit cited above, for example, correlations are drawn between a lack of awareness of the “wide range of programs and services [Carleton offers] to enhance safety on campus” and people’s perceptions of personal safety (Carleton University 2008: 7). In particular, in this document high levels of fear vis-à-vis violence on campus are linked with findings that “[I]ittle over half of female student respondents [to Carleton’s university-wide survey] said they knew who to contact on campus if they felt unsafe, whereas 84 per cent of female employees knew who to contact” (8). Fear of so-called “unsafety,” in other words, is not framed with reference to personal or mediated experiences of assaults; rather, it is rationalized in terms of people’s—particularly young women’s—lack of interest, responsibility and/or resourcefulness.

Here, attention is directed away from any potential shortfalls associated with the “wide range of safety-related services, programs and physical enhancements” Carleton already offers (Carleton University 2008: 13). Rather, the assumption is that these services are sufficient for addressing, if nothing else, people’s fears of “unsafety.” Indeed, the authors of Carleton’s safety-audit report recommend increasing visibility and awareness of the university’s existing safety initiatives so as to “[create] a welcoming environment and [send] a *distinct message* to people individually and collectively that Carleton is an institution that cares” (13, emphasis added). While they concede that “[p]ersonal safety...[is] a shared responsibility,” Carleton’s administration is represented as having already fulfilled its duties in this regard (13). If we accept this reading, any impending augmentations to Carleton’s techno-security apparatus are rendered superfluous through the report’s discursive strategies.

Of the new initiatives that are recommended in this report, two stand out as especially interesting: the development of a comprehensive, up-to-date “Safety on Campus” website (13) and a “Neighbourhood Watch” program on campus (14). What is most interesting about these suggestions is that they confirm administrative beliefs about the importance of using social media to make their safety-related efforts widely known and easily accessible. At the same time, insofar as their efficacy relies on voluntary and participatory forms of watching and reporting, these recommendations point to administrative efforts to make individuals the ultimate agents of their own safety and the safety of their peers. The recommendations confirm, in other words, the tendency to conflate safety with surveillance (Lewis 2003: 335).

Moreover, insofar as such recommendations are extrapolated from a representative sample, students are situated not merely as *supportive* of an increasingly technosecuritized campus, but as its main architects.<sup>5</sup>

As I have already noted, this is not the only way in which securitization of Carleton's campus is discussed. Rather, analysis across a range of texts reveals another discursive shift: over time, links drawn by administrators between acts of violence on campus and institutional security-related investments are superseded by depictions of security investments as exemplary of the extent to which Carleton is an exceptionally safe institution. In other words, longitudinal analysis reveals the transformation of safety audits and related acts of securitization into central tools in university branding efforts. University securitization and branding thus emerge as overlapping processes.

One change to Carleton's techno-security infrastructure is especially interesting in this regard: the installation of an emergency notification system (ENS). In the case of an emergency, this system is designed to send alerts via flashing messages on campus computers, e-mails to university accounts, and text messages to cellular phones (Carleton University 2009a: para 4). In relation to tendencies for campus administrators to transfer responsibility for personal safety onto students, this system is notable for at least two reasons: first, it is represented within news releases posted on Carleton's website as a direct response to the needs and desires of the very people it is meant to protect; second, and at the same time, the technology's efficiency is depicted as reliant on that same group's participation. In particular, the ENS is described as useless unless members of Carleton's community "help keep Carleton safe by providing [administrators with their] cellphone number[s]" (Carleton University 2009a: para 5). To entice people to comply with this system requirement, potential users are offered a "chance to win one of six \$500 cash prizes" in exchange for their personal information (para 6).<sup>6</sup>

Again, this gimmick is indicative of administrative efforts to make people accountable for their personal safety and the safety of their peers. At the same time, it reveals more fundamental equations drawn between responsibility—often used as a substitute for adulthood—and consumerism (Schudson 2006). When read through this lens, such incentives do more than reveal administrative efforts to redistribute the burden of responsibility for a safe campus environment; they also point to a socio-legal context wherein understandings of administrators as surrogate parents are supplanted by those that position students as consumers. Following this latter logic, universities become the providers of a range of commodities, including but not limited to "a safe campus environment" (Carroll 2004: 1).<sup>7</sup>

It is at this analytic juncture that convergences between Carleton's ENS and processes of branding become especially significant. Following the first university-wide testing of the system, Carleton's ENS is publicized as "state of the art" (Carleton University 2009a: para 2), "the most effective and flexible of any such system on

a Canadian university campus” (para 3), “the most comprehensive of its kind on a Canadian university campus” (Carleton University 2009b: para 1), “innovative, unique” (para 3) and able to “revolutionize how emergency situations are communicated in post-secondary institutions” (para 8). Within internally generated documents, Carleton’s ENS is advertised as demonstrating excellence on the parts of its developers and Carleton’s administration; it is represented as a corporate and educational success to be emulated. Rather than making their ways into the architectural landscapes or curricula of schools through insidious methods (Gidney and Gidney 2008), military-corporate education alliances are now manifestly touted as evidence of institutional responsibility. As further confirmation of this tendency, consider that readers of an article posted in the university’s virtual newsroom are explicitly informed that “Carleton partnered with [locally-based high-tech firms] Mitel and Benbira to configure the system” (2009b: para 4) and that “Mitel and Carleton have enjoyed a longstanding partnership when it comes to delivering communications solutions” (para 7). Consider also that in this same piece Carleton’s ENS is praised by none other than the chief of the Ottawa Police Services as “an impressive use of technology that meets today’s critical challenge of mass notification...[and that, thus, should be deployed by] all large employers and other public institutions” (Carleton University 2009b: para 6).<sup>8</sup>

At the same time as these appraisals became prominent, any remaining discursive links between a need to augment techno-security apparatuses and sexualized campus violence were gradually denied by institutional representatives. This is illustrated in a newscast embedded in a story posted on the university’s website (Carleton University 2010). Here, a CTV anchor asks Len Boudreault, Carleton’s director of the department of university safety, if installation of the \$350,000 ENS on Carleton’s campus is “in response to incidents like the brutal sexual assault that took place on campus a couple of years ago.” To this question, Boudreault responds: “No. Not really. This is a method of notifying our community of an emergency situation, something that may be happening, like a fire or a need to evacuate a building, or an armed intruder. There is no real relationship between the incident in September and this one.” (CTV 2009b)

This assertion clearly contradicts earlier claims made by institutional representatives and cited within key documents. While perhaps not directly causal, there are links between these occurrences. In particular, I maintain that Boudreault’s comments cannot be adequately analyzed in isolation from the legal case brought against Carleton University in response to the attack and sexual assault mentioned above. In the statement of claim filed on behalf of Jane Doe on December 23, 2008, Carleton is charged with numerous counts of negligence. These charges culminate in the final contention that Carleton failed in its “duty to ensure that the plaintiff was reasonably safe while she worked on the defendant’s premises” (Statement of Claim 2008: 9). In the statement of defence submitted on February 11, 2009, Carleton refutes all charges of legal responsibility. This is not to say that Carleton’s representatives

deny the plaintiff's injuries. Rather, they formally retort that these "were caused or contributed to by the Plaintiff" (Statement of Defence: 2). Jane Doe is, herself, accused of negligence: Carleton claims that the plaintiff "knew or ought to have known," for example, "the steps she could take to notify the Safety Department of her intention to work [late on campus] on her own" (2).

This contention on the part of the university reflects an abandonment of the *in loco parentis* philosophy of university governance.<sup>9</sup> In particular, it points to a context in which post-secondary students have won their struggles to be considered adults, with the same constitutional freedoms thereof (Axelrod 2002).<sup>10</sup> As Kerry B. Meler notes, under the pretences of "less paternalism and more [administrative] accountability," the student-university dyad is now generally understood to be governed by a "mutually obligatory relationship" between consumer and provider (2003: 125). As the Ontario court documents indicate, however, in practice this contractual rationale often means that onus is placed on student claimants to prove institutional non-compliance (134) and consumer protection laws are rarely reviewed or applied in such cases (136). From a strictly legal standpoint, then, administrative denials of liability for unsafe campuses and their concomitant shifts of blame are not mere rhetorical ploys; rather, they are common—indeed, necessary—professional practices.<sup>11</sup>

To recognize this is not to deny that inconsistencies do arise in judicial decisions à propos charges of institutional liability for acts of violence on campus properties. On one hand, as Georgi-Ann Oshagan notes, some judges fear that to find post-secondary institutions liable for such acts is to set precedence for the resurrection of paternalistic policies that allow administrators "to regulate the activities and conduct of...students" (1993: 1348). On the other hand, refusals to uphold such charges are sometimes read by judiciaries as failures to move beyond an *in loco parentis* logic to consider specific mitigating factors that inform administrators' duties to protect students. Following this latter rationale, a loss of legal rights to police students' morals and privacy does not negate administrators' obligations to provide safety and protection (1358). Again, an important point to emerge from this analysis is that the letter of the law is open to interpretive differences and inconsistent applications. As Oshagan confirms, in these situations the law is read as "a series of strategies [that] constitute...the identities of legal subjects and their social relations with each other" and their surroundings (Comack and Balfour 2004: 34).

When applied to the present case study, this socio-critical perspective resonates with criticisms launched against Carleton's administrative that their dismissals of liability are instances of victim blaming that discourage people from reporting sexual assaults (see CTV 2009c).<sup>12</sup> Indeed, it substantiates findings that such discourses are among the factors that hinder the formal documentation of acts of sexualized violence on campuses and elsewhere (see, for example, Karjane, Fisher and Cullen 2002). In this sense, the legal shifts of blame noted above dovetail with

Boudreault's discursive erasure of links between techno-securitization of Carleton's campus and instances of sexualized violence. They represent systematic safeguards that help to ensure a reduction in the formal criminalization of acts of sexual violence. In the context of these processes of rendering sexual violence invisible, readers of Carleton's independent weekly are informed that "no arrests have been made" in the sexual-assault case and that details of *Jane Doe v. Carleton University* are not publically available because the case was settled through out-of-court mediation (*Charlatan*, 2009).

Notwithstanding the absence of legal mandates, which require publicly funded educational institutions in the United States to disclose their crime statistics and security policies, university branding via securitization is an institutional reality in Canada.<sup>13</sup> Indeed, Canadian administrators must find ways to circumvent the bad press and general decrease in public confidence that accompanies the construction of campus violence as a problem. I have suggested that rather than being legally obliged to report and publicize campus crimes, Canadian administrators are expected to subsume safety audits and related securitizing acts into their university's brand. Techno-securitization of campuses, in other words, is a prominent marketing strategy employed by Canadian administrators to fulfill the ostensibly growing need to convince people that their institutions are safe and reputable.

In light of this, as Monahan notes, it becomes necessary to ask more frequent and explicit, "questions about how emerging relationships among... schools, private technology companies and the police connect with the larger political [and international] economy" (2006: 122). To be sure, the securitization of campuses cannot be adequately analyzed without reference to a generalized "fear of violence as well as [a more specified] fear of legal liability that convinces school district administrators that security technology is worth the expenditure" (Casella 2003a: 83). An example of the production of fear can be found in an online article in the *Toronto Star*, in which Louise Brown asserts that the implementation of a mass alert system on the University of Toronto's campus "was fuelled by the 2006 shootings at Virginia Tech, where a gunman killed 33 people over 2 ½ hrs, a toll some say might have been lower had students been warned" (Brown 2009). This article underscores the ways in which security-related modifications made to campuses are endemic to, and reproductive of, a sociopolitical and historical moment in which military-corporate-education alliances are considered appropriate responses to people's personal and mediated experiences with and fears of violence.

To further underscore the importance of this analysis in the Canadian context, consider the following claim taken from the *Report on University Campus Policing and Security in Canada*:

Recent global incidents, national events and trends have heightened community expectations for safe and secure environments. The World Trade Centre attacks, the war in Iraq, SARS [Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome] and major power blackouts all underscore the important role that professional campus security providers play during significant crises. (Carroll 2004: 1)

Notwithstanding the glaring omission of shooting deaths and rampant sexualized and racialized violence from the list of factors that point to a need for safer schools (Faulkner, Mackinnon and Edwards 2008), this report is unusual in that it acknowledges the links between mediated events, fears of violence and university “applicants...placing greater relevance on a safe campus environment” (Carroll 2004: 4).<sup>14</sup> Stated simply, this report further substantiates the fact that, in an era consistently described as governed by fear (Altheide 2002; Furedi 2006), branding via securitization is considered by many people to be a necessary and desirable practice across a range of institutional and national contexts.

Another response to Monahan’s (2006) call for more pointed questions about the links between schools, the military, police and wider political-economic concerns is to examine the ways in which security is subsumed by capital. The case study provided here certainly confirms the ongoing existence of military-corporate-education alliances. Moreover, it suggests that, like their American counterparts, public universities in Canada are governed by a definition of security that is fundamentally adversarial, punitive and entrepreneurial. Recalling Rentschler (2003) and Lewis (2003) and following Liz Elliott, this is a form of “security without care” (2011: 194): an antisocial definition of security that undermines the importance of developing and sustaining compassionate, equitable relationships. It is, more poignantly, a neoliberal understanding that conflates security with commodification, democracy with advertising, and citizenship with consumption.

Below, I suggest that it is not only essential that we question and theorize these developments; we must also imagine, articulate and work toward producing and sustaining counter-rationalizations to this dominant security logic under which many of us study, work and live (Hallsworth and Lea 2011). It is also necessary that we acknowledge the connections between our own experiences and the systems of power within which they take place. It is with this aim in mind that I offer these suggestions for future research.

## Future Directions

In an article published in *Times Higher Education*, John Morgan notes that “[i]n an increasingly competitive higher education marketplace, branding has become big business for universities” (2011: para 4). Underscoring the present discussion, Morgan continues,

[t]he notion of a university brand is one that many in higher education are comfortable with. It induces a wave of nausea in others, who warn that [by] focusing on branding, universities promote a view of higher education as a commodity rather than a good in itself. (para 4)

I began this article with the assertion that while administrators of post-secondary institutions “are investing considerable sums [of money] in [the] development and management of their brand” (Chapleo 2005: 54), rarely is any explicit and critical consideration given to the intersections between university branding and the securitization of campuses. In this paper, I have attempted to illustrate and analyze the significance of these intersections.

Admittedly, the analysis presented here stresses corporate and state-driven economic interests as the most important factors driving these reconfigured campus geographies. This possibility notwithstanding, my analysis of Carleton’s emergency-notification system supports arguments that it is time to move beyond overly repressive conceptualizations of social control to also consider how “consumer desire and choice” figure centrally and productively in processes of institutional fortification (Casella 2003b). Recall, for example, that Carleton’s ENS is framed not only with reference to supposedly innovative military-corporate-education alliances, but also to “community demand.”

By the same token, when read in relation to legal cases brought against universities by students who hope to hold administrators liable for acts of campus violence, techno-securitized campuses suggest that it is not just university administrators who rely on and reproduce a negative definition of security. As revealed above, shifts away from an *in loco parentis* philosophy of university governance are often accompanied by socio-legal readings of administrators’ rights and responsibilities as correlated negatively with the rights and responsibilities of students. Following this analysis, students are positioned not just as consumers, but also as producers of safe-campus discourses. In other words, while it is true that there has been a shift toward positioning students as consumers, this by no means obviates their roles in reproducing paternalistic and/or adversarial rationalities. Students, too, are securitizing agents.

Indeed, Carleton’s administrators were not the only ones to conduct a safety audit following the 2007 sexual assault. Nor were they the only ones to offer suggestions about how best to respond to the highly publicized problem of sexualized violence on campuses. Rather, as has happened on other Canadian university campuses, some Carleton students took up the task of working toward a different solution to sexualized and gender-related violence on campuses by forming “a student-run, university-funded, sustainable and accessible Sexual Assault [Support] Centre” (Coalition for a Carleton Sexual Assault Centre 2011: para 1).

The logic informing this effort is outlined as follows:

The Coalition for a Carleton Sexual Assault Centre was created in the fall of 2007 by two graduate students in the wake of a high profile sexual assault on Carleton's campus.... [These] graduate students...were both experienced in sexual assault support and knew that gender-based violence was a harsh reality on all university campuses. Having come from the University of Alberta which has a student-run sexual assault centre, [one of these students] suggested an audit of existing services on campus. This informal audit and meetings with Carleton students uncovered that Carleton's support services are inaccessible and patchy at best. Wait times are unrealistic and the overwhelming majority of services are run by Carleton University administrators, which is highly problematic. (para 2)

Following these findings, two referendums were held to determine if other students were in favour of the development of such a centre. The response was overwhelming: 80 per cent of voters agreed that Carleton University would benefit from such an initiative (para 4).

While the extent of these "results...[ostensibly] continue[s] to be ignored by Carleton University administration" (para 4), the coalition's efforts have not been futile. Indeed, petitions and editorials have been written and distributed, alliances have been formed between students, faculty and institutions and rallies have been organized (para 5–6). Compromises have also been made; Carleton's administration has added "a coordinator of Sexual Assault Services" to their payroll, for example (*Charlatan* 2009). More recently, they also agreed to open a sexual-assault centre, run by the administration, which "will include student-led education and support initiatives" (Carleton University 2012: para 4).

These successes are significant for at least two reasons. First, they suggest that university administrators are not the only ones to engage in campus securitization. Indeed, if we understand security to be a discursive practice (Valverde 2011), then we must problematize all efforts to delineate what does and does not constitute safety and what is and is not to be considered a responsible means of achieving that goal. This type of analysis compels acknowledgment that at the same time as the Coalition for a Carleton Sexual Assault Centre seeks to address the various and overlapping injustices associated with "gender, sex, sexual orientation, race, religion, ethnicity, citizenship, age, Mother tongue or student status" (Coalition for a Carleton Sexual Assault Centre 2011: para 1), it also works within the very framework it seeks to challenge. Insofar as the centre is a form of campus securitization, the coalition's activities can be read as a form of masculinist protection: a discursive logic associated more with chivalry and active consent than with overt domination (Young 2003: 4).

Second, analysis of the activities of the Coalition for a Carleton Sexual Assault Centre reveals that university administrations are responsive to students' demands. More specifically, this group's various if partial successes confirm that fear (of violence and/or liability) and hope (for peace and collaboration) are interdependent discourses prompting university branding via securitization. Following from this, we must admit that processes of university governance are more complex, nuanced and accommodating to students than is often assumed. In addition, we should re-examine the institutional parameters of university administrators' work, within which they must simultaneously acknowledge people's experiences and fears of campus violence while also convincing them that "Carleton *is* an institution that cares" (Carleton University 2008: 13, emphasis added).

While we must continue to raise awareness about the general entrenchment of military-corporate logics (Saltman 2007), I am confident that it is only by analyzing diffusions, cross-articulations and shifts in these rationalities that critical scholars can avoid romanticizing relatively non-official forms of praxis while also encouraging people inside and outside academe to continue to act toward the undoing of dominant models of security. Future analyses must include explicit criticisms of the ways in which various groups accept, through activities that are overt or covert, militarization-corporatization as necessary for ensuring student, faculty and staff safety. Such analyses will remind us that social change is an ongoing process. More to the point, they will make clear, as has York University's Graduate Women's Studies Students Association, that while "[r]ape is a public relations nightmare... denying its rootedness in the [university] community [and beyond] will not protect us" (*Rabble*, January 24, 2008).

### Acknowledgments

Thank you to SSHRC for its generous financial support of the doctoral research on which this article is based. Thank you also to Alison Hearn, Samah Sabra, Vincent Sacco and two anonymous reviewers for their comments on earlier drafts of this paper. As always, any and all omissions and errors are results of my interpretations of these suggestions.

### Notes

1. As compared with tendencies to conceptualize institutional brands as having objective indicators, the argument made throughout this article is that these are largely subjective assessments, contingent on claim-making activities.
2. The word security is put in quotation marks here to emphasize my understanding that, as a socially constructed concept, security is not an objective phenomenon that exists separate from power relations or related claim-making activities. In keeping with this logic, in this article I describe security as a verb (securitize) and as a process (securitization).
3. The understanding of policing that informs these relatively critical assessments is a broad one that defines it as "any activity which is expressly designed and intended to

establish and maintain (or enforce) a defined order” (Kempa, Stenning and Wood 2004: 564n3).

4. Following John Devine, I take techno-security measures to be those that promote surveillance and militarism via a “network of security guards and technolog[ical devices]” (1996: 86).

5. Importantly, such representations go beyond university-supported documents. For example, in a newscast produced by CTV (2009a) students are asked about the various safety initiatives undertaken by Carleton following the previously mentioned sexual assault. Despite inclusion of one dissenting voice, this report reproduces commonplace assumptions that students are happy with these techno-security modifications and that Carleton is now a safer institution.

6. Please refer to Janice Tibbets’s (2008) news story, which reveals that similar tactics are used by administrators at the University of British Columbia, the University of Calgary and Concordia University to encourage people to comply with the requirements of the text-messaging alert systems implemented there.

7. Thank you to my anonymous reviewers for these insights, which are developed below in the context of charges of third-party liability for violent campus crimes.

8. And deploy they have; tracing this military-corporate education alliance beyond texts published on Carleton’s website to how it is represented by Mitel reveals that use of this technology spans beyond Carleton’s campus to include collaborations between Mitel and numerous other post-secondary institutions (Mitel Networks Corporation 2008).

9. As Georgi-Ann Oshagan notes, “[i]n *loco parentis*, meaning ‘in the place of a parent,’ refers to the concept that the university or college may impose any rules it deems fit to regulate the activities and conduct of its students” (1993: 1348). In the American and Canadian contexts, this rationale meant that, prior to the 1960s, university administrators were expected to regulate students’ moral and social conduct by, for example, imposing curfews on students who lived in residence and punishing students who consumed alcohol while they were under the legal age to do so (see also Neatby and McEown 2002).

10. In their book on the history of Carleton University, Blair Neatby and Don McEown refer to this shift as one “from *in statu pupillari* [or under guardianship as a pupil] to a more contractual relationship” between student and university (2002: 205). More importantly, following this discussion, while initial efforts to induce this change were framed with reference to students’ “aspirations to change the world,” since the 1970s these aspirations have been displaced by more individualized concerns about job security or a lack thereof (201–2).

11. In this context, it is interesting to note the response given by Carleton’s president to allegations that Carleton’s Statement of Defence (2008) reproduces victim-blaming discourses and, thus, that Jane Doe deserves a formal apology: “I do not refuse to apologize.... There is nothing I would rather do. But I have been told by the lawyer of Jane Doe that we cannot say anything more about the case” (Doneahy 2009).

12. Thank you to my two anonymous reviewers for asking me to draw this point out in this and the following paragraph.

13. See Kenneth J. Peak, Emmanuel P. Barthe and Adam Garcia (2008: 250–2) for a discussion of the origins of the *Crime Awareness and Campus Security Act* and some influences it has had on campus policing protocols and reputations in the United States. See Fisher et al. (2002) for a longer and more critical discussion of this law’s largely symbolic function.

14. Indeed, Edward J. Carroll notes that based on the findings from the 2002 *University Applicant Survey* conducted by the Council of Ontario Universities, “safe environment [is] the second of top-five factors in applicant selection” (2004: 4n7).

## References

- Addington, Lynn A. 2009. Cops and Cameras: Public School Security as a Policy Response to Columbine. *American Behavioral Scientist* 52(10): 1426–46.
- Ali-Choudhury, Rehnuma, Roger Bennett and Sharmila Savani. 2009. University Marketing Directors’ Views on the Components of a University Brand. *International Review on Public and Nonprofit Marketing* 6(1): 11–33.
- Altheide, David L. 2002. *Creating Fear: News and the Construction of Crisis*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Axelrod, Paul. 2002. *Values in Conflict: The University, the Marketplace, and the Trials of Liberal Education*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press.
- Bélanger, Charles H., Saadi Syed and Joan Mount. 2007. The Make Up of Institutional Branding: Who, What, How? *Tertiary Education and Management* 13(3): 169–85.
- Benigni, Mark D. 2004. The Need for School Resource Officers. *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin* 73(5): 22–5.
- Bennett, Roger and Rehnuma Ali-Choudhury. 2009. Prospective Students’ Perceptions of University Brands: An Empirical Study. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education* 19(1): 85–107.
- Berger, Randall R. 2002. Expansion of Police Power in Public Schools and the Vanishing Rights of Students. *Social Justice: A Journal of Crime, Conflict & World Order* 29(1-2): 119–30.
- . 2003. The “Worst of Both Worlds”: School Security and the Disappearing Fourth Amendment Rights of Students. *Criminal Justice Review* 28: 336–54.
- Best, Joel. 2006. *Flavor of the Month: Why Smart People Fall for Fads*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Bliss, Melanie J., James Emshoff, Chad A. Buck and Sarah L. Cook. 2006. Parents’ Perceptions of Causes and Solutions for School Violence: Implications for Policy. *Journal of Primary Prevention* 27(3): 265–80.
- Brown, Louise. 2009. U of T Now Using Cellphone Alerts, *Toronto Star*, 18 March. <http://www.thestar.com/article/603996>.
- Bunzel, David L. 2007. Universities Sell Their Brands. *Journal of Product & Brand Management* 16(2): 152–53.
- Carleton University. 2008. *Towards a Culture of Safety: 2007–08 Personal Safety Audit Report*. Ottawa.
- . 2009a. Carleton Launches Emergency Notification System. Messages and Speeches. 27 August. <http://www2.carleton.ca/about/university-executive/the-president-and-vice-chancellor/messages-and-speeches/carleton-launches-new-emergency-notification-system/>.
- . 2009b. Carleton Launches Emergency Notification System: New System Will

Enhance Campus Safety. Carleton University Newsroom. 27 August. <http://www2.carleton.ca/newsroom/news-articles/carleton-launches-emergency-notification-system-new-system-will-enhance-campus-safety/>.

———. 2010. The Emergency Notification System. Crisis Communications. 5 October. [http://www3.carleton.ca/duc/crisis\\_communications/](http://www3.carleton.ca/duc/crisis_communications/).

———. 2012. Enhancing Sexual Assault Support Services at Carleton. Current Students. 14. January. <http://www1.carleton.ca/about/university-executive/the-president-and-vice-chancellor/messages-and-speeches/enhancing-sexual-assault-support-services-at-carleton/>.

Carroll, Edward J. 2004. *A Report on University Campus Policing and Security in Canada*, prepared for Law Commission of Canada. [http://www.oacusa.ca/documents/University\\_Campus\\_Policing\\_and\\_Security\\_In\\_Canada.pdf](http://www.oacusa.ca/documents/University_Campus_Policing_and_Security_In_Canada.pdf).

Casella, Ronnie. 2003a. The False Allure of Security Technologies. *Social Justice* 30(3): 82–93.

———. 2003b. Security, Schooling and the Consumer's Choice to Segregate. *Urban Review* 35(2): 129–48.

———. 2006. *Selling Us the Fortress: The Promotion of Techno-Security Equipment for Schools*. London: Routledge.

———. 2010. Safety or Social Control? The Security Fortification of Schools in a Capitalist Society. In *Schools Under Surveillance: Cultures of Control in Public Education*, edited by Torin Monahan and Rodolfo D. Torres, 73–86. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.

Chapleo, Chris. 2005. Do Universities Have “Successful” Brands? *International Journal of Educational Advancement* 6(1): 54–64.

———. 2010. What Defines “Successful” University Brands. *International Journal of Public Sector Management* 23(2): 169–83.

Charlatan. 2009. Sexual Assault Lawsuit Settled, 28 August. <http://www.charlatan.ca/2009/08/sexual-assault-lawsuit-settled/>.

———. 2009. Students Still Demanding Sexual Assault Centre After Lawsuit Resolved, 18 August. <http://www.charlatan.ca/2009/08/students-still-demanding-sexual-assault-centre-after-lawsuit-resolved/>.

Coalition for a Carleton Sexual Assault Centre. 2011. Organizing, Mobilizing and Acting Against Carleton University's Statements and Policies about Sexual Violence. <http://coalitionforcarleton.blogspot.com/>.

Comack, Elizabeth and Gillian Balfour. 2004. *The Power to Criminalize: Violence, Inequality and the Law*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.

CTV. 2008. Universities Developing Emergency Alert Systems. Montreal. [http://montreal.ctv.ca/servlet/an/plocal/CTVNews/20080415/univ\\_alert\\_080415/20080415/?hub=MontrealHome](http://montreal.ctv.ca/servlet/an/plocal/CTVNews/20080415/univ_alert_080415/20080415/?hub=MontrealHome).

———. 2009a. Carleton Students Speak about Campus Safety. Ottawa. [http://ottawa.ctv.ca/servlet/an/local/CTVNews/20090807/OTT\\_Carleton\\_Lawsuit\\_090807/20090807/?hub=OttawaHome](http://ottawa.ctv.ca/servlet/an/local/CTVNews/20090807/OTT_Carleton_Lawsuit_090807/20090807/?hub=OttawaHome).

———. 2009b. Enhancing Security. Ottawa. [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fJHInxE3AiFw&feature=player\\_embedded](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fJHInxE3AiFw&feature=player_embedded).

———. 2009c. Students Outraged at Carleton's Response to Lawsuit. Ottawa. [http://ottawa.ctv.ca/servlet/an/local/CTVNews/20090807/OTT\\_Carleton\\_Lawsuit\\_090807/20090807/?hub=OttawaHome](http://ottawa.ctv.ca/servlet/an/local/CTVNews/20090807/OTT_Carleton_Lawsuit_090807/20090807/?hub=OttawaHome).

Devine, John. 1996. *Maximum Security: The Culture of Violence in Inner-City Schools*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Doneathy, Elizabeth. 2009. Students Speak Out against Victim Blaming: Community Denounces Carleton University's Response to Sexual Assault Case, *The Fulcrum*, 3 September. <http://fulcrum.hotink.net/articles/19762>.

Elliott, Liz. 2007. Security, Without Care: Challenges for Restorative Values in Prisons. *Contemporary Justice Review* 10(2): 193–208.

Entin, Joseph. 2005. Contingent Teaching, Corporate Universities, and the Academic Labor Movement. *Radical Teacher* 73: 26–32.

Faulkner, Julian N., Linda Mackinnon and Peggy Edwards. 2008. *The Road to Health: A Final Report on School Safety*. Toronto: School Community Safety Advisory Panel. <http://www.falconschoolsafetyreport.com/finalReport.html>.

Fisher, Bonnie S., Jennifer L. Hartman, Francis T. Cullen and Michael G. Turner. 2002. Making Campuses Safer for Students: The Clery Acts as a Symbolic Legal Reform. *Stetson Law Review* 32(1): 61–89.

Fox, James Allan and Jenna Savage. 2009. Mass Murder Goes to College: An Examination of Changes on College Campuses Following Virginia Tech. *American Behavioral Scientist* 52(10): 1465–85.

Furedi, Frank. 2006. *Culture of Fear Revisited*. New York: Continuum.

Garland, David. 2001. *The Culture of Control: Crimes and Social Order in Contemporary Society*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Gidney, Catherine and R. D. Gidney. 2008. Branding the Classroom: Commercialism in Canadian Schools, 1920–1960. *Histoire Social/Social History* 41(82): 345–79.

Giroux, Henry A. 2002. Neoliberalism, Corporate Culture, and the Promise of Higher Education: The University as a Democratic Public Sphere. *Harvard Educational Review* 72(4): 425–82.

———. 2008. The Militarization of US Higher Education after 9/11. *Theory, Culture & Society* 25(5): 56–82.

Gray, Brendon J., Kim Shyan Fam and Violeta A. Llanes. 2003. Branding Universities in Asian Markets. *Journal of Product & Brand Management* 12(2): 108–20.

Hallsworth, Simon and John Lea. 2011. Reconstructing the Leviathan: Emerging Contours of the Security State. *Theoretical Criminology* 15(2): 142–57.

Hirschfeld, Paul J. 2008. Preparing for Prison? The Criminalization of School Discipline in the USA. *Theoretical Criminology* 12(1): 79–101.

Jevons, Colin. 2006. Universities: A Prime Example of Branding Going Wrong. *Journal of Product & Brand Management* 15(7): 466–67.

Karjane, Heather M., Bonnie S. Fisher and Francis T. Cullen. 2002. *Campus Sexual Assault: How America's Institutions of Higher Education Respond*. Final Report, NIJ Grant # 1999-WA-VX-0008. Newton, MA: Education Development Center, Inc. [www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/196676.pdf](http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/196676.pdf).

Kellner, Douglas. 2007. Media Spectacle and the “Massacre at Virginia Tech.” *Fast Capitalism* 3(1). [http://www.uta.edu/huma/agger/fastcapitalism/3\\_1/kellner.html](http://www.uta.edu/huma/agger/fastcapitalism/3_1/kellner.html).

Kempa, Michael, Peter Stenning and Jennifer Wood. 2004. Policing Communal Spaces: A Reconfiguration of the “Mass Private Property” Hypothesis. *British Journal of Criminology* 44(4): 562–81.

Kupchik, Aaron and Nicole Bracy. 2010. To Protect, Serve, and Mentor? Police Officers in Public Schools. In *Schools Under Surveillance: Cultures of Control in Public Education*, edited by Torin Monahan and Rodolfo D. Torres, 21–37. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.

Kupchik, Aaron and Nicolas Ellis. 2008. School Discipline and Security: Fair for All Students? *Youth & Society* 39(4): 549–74.

Kupchik, Aaron and Torin Monahan. 2006. The New American School: Preparation for Post Industrial Discipline. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 27(5): 617–31.

Lewis, Tyson. 2003. The Surveillance Economy of Post-Columbine Schools. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies* 25(4): 335–55.

Lianos, Michalis. 2003. Social Control after Foucault. *Surveillance & Society* 1(3): 412–30.

Lutz, Catherine. 2002. Making War at Home in the United States: Militarization and the Current Crisis. *American Anthropologist* 104(3): 723–35.

Melear, Kerry B. 2003. From *In Loco Parentis* to Consumerism: A Legal Analysis of the Contractual Relationship between Institution and Student. *Journal of Student Affairs and Research* 40(4): 124–48.

Mitel Networks Corporation. 2008. Meeting the Communication Needs of a New Generation. [http://www.mitel.com/resources/528\\_1542\\_Higher\\_Ed\\_Overview\\_Canadian.pdf](http://www.mitel.com/resources/528_1542_Higher_Ed_Overview_Canadian.pdf).

Monahan, Torin. 2006. The Surveillance Curriculum: Risk Management and Social Control in the Neoliberal School. In *Surveillance and Security: Technological Politics and Power in Everyday Life*, edited by Torin Monahan, 109–24. New York: Routledge.

Morgan, John. 2011. Times Higher Education World Reputation Rankings, *Times Higher Education*, 10 March. <http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/story.asp?storycode=415429>.

Neatby, Blair and Don McEown. 2002. *Creating Carleton: The Shaping of a University*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press.

Neocleous, Mark. 2008. *Critique of Security*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press.

Newman, Katherine, Cybelle Fox, David Harding, Jal Mehta and Wendy Roth. 2004. *Rampage: The Social Roots of School Shootings*. New York: Basic Books.

Oshagan, Georgi-Ann. 1993. Obscuring the Issue: The Inappropriate Application of *In Loco Parentis* to the Campus Crime Victim Duty Question. *Wayne Law Review* 39(3): 1335–59.

Peak, Kenneth J., Emmanuel P. Barthe and Adam Garcia. 2008. Campus Policing in America: A Twenty-Year Perspective. *Police Quarterly* 11(2): 239–60.

Pearson, Matthew. 2012. Carleton University to Open Centre to Support Sex Assault Victims, *Ottawa Citizen*, 4 January. <http://www.ottawacitizen.com/news/Carleton+University+open+centre+support+assault+victims/5942481/story.html#ixzz1m0tDhBb9>.

Rabble. 2008. Re: Sexual Assaults at Ontario Universities, 24 January. <http://rabble.ca/comment/893219>.

Rentschler, Carrie A. 2003. Designing Fear: How Environmental Security Protects Property at the Expense of People. In *Foucault, Cultural Studies and Governmentality*, edited by Jack Bratich, Jeremy Packer and Cameron McCarthy, 243–71. New York: State University of New York Press.

Saltman, Kenneth J. 2007. Education as Enforcement: Militarization and Corporatization of Schools. *Educating for Equality* 18(2): 28–30. <http://urbanhabitat.org/node/1177>.

Saltman, Kenneth J. and David A. Gabbard, eds. 2003. *Education as Enforcement: The Militarization and Corporatization of Schools*. New York: Routledge.

Schudson, Michael. 2006. The Troubling Equivalence of Citizen and Consumer. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*. 608(1): 193–204.

Seymour, Andrew. 2009. Sex-assault Victim Sues Carleton: Woman Claims Security Was Inadequate; University Says She Didn't Do Enough to Protect Herself, *Ottawa Citizen*, August 7, A1.

Shore, Cris and Susan Wright. 2000. Coercive Accountability: The Rise of Audit Culture in Higher Education. In *Audit Cultures: Anthropological Studies in Accountability, Ethics and the Academy (EASE Series)*, edited by Marilyn Strathern, 57–89. London: Routledge.

———. 2004. Whose Accountability? Governmentality and the Auditing of Universities. *Parallax* 10(2): 100–16.

Simon, Jonathan. 2007. *Governing through Crime: How the War on Crime Transformed American Democracy and Created a Culture of Fear*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Snell, Clete, Charles Bailey, Anthony Carona and Dalila Mebane. 2002. School Crime Policy Changes: The Impact of Recent Highly-Publicized School Crimes. *American Journal of Criminal Justice* 26(2): 269–85.

Statement of Claim. 2008. Jane Doe v Carleton University, 08-CV-43617.

Statement of Defence. 2009. Jane Doe v Carleton University, 08-CV-43617.

Stein, David B. 2005. School Shootings and School Terrorist Attacks: Identification, Intervention, and Tactical Response. In *Public Policing in the 21st Century: Issues and Dilemmas in the U.S. and Canada*, edited by James F. Hodgson and Catherine Orban, 155–83. Monsey: Criminal Justice Press.

Tibbets, Janice. 2008. Universities Using Text Message Alerts in Crises, *Canwest News Service*, 24 February. <http://www.canada.com/theprovince/news/story.html?id=0e07ac50-9fc4-4c36-b8a5-f98c8607e67e&k=6904>.

Tuchman, Gaye. 2009. *Wannabe U: Inside the Corporate University*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Valverde, Mariana. 2011. Questions of Security: A Framework for Research. *Theoretical Criminology* 15(1): 3–22.

Wæraas, Arlid and Marianne N. Solbakk. 2009. Defining the Essence of a University: Lessons from Higher Education Branding. *Higher Education* 57(4): 449–62.

York University. 2010. *York University Safety Audit: Leading the Way to Personal and Community Safety*. <http://www.yorku.ca/safety/audit/report/report.pdf>.

Young, Iris Marion. 2003. The Logic of Masculinist Protection: Reflections on the Current Security State. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 29(1): 1–25.