

Campus Police and Security Programs

CAS Standards Contextual Statement

The issue of crime on American college and university campuses has been around since at least the early 19th century when a series of student disruptions rocked the campuses of a number of colleges (Gregory, 2001). Campus crime has been put in stark relief in recent years due to high-profile incidents on campus, the perceptions that institutions were hiding campus crime (Gregory, 2002), and suggestions that campus officials needed to take more responsibility for the safety of their students (Bickel & Lake, 1999).

Campus Police and Security refers to that agency and those individuals who, either as employees of the institution or through some sort of contracted service, provide for a safer campus environment, protect members of the campus community, and may enforce institutional policy and relevant laws and codes. There are a wide variety of arrangements on college and university campuses in the United States and Canada by which these services are provided. These may include “sworn” police agencies at public institutions that are operated as any municipal, state, or province police agency may be and in which officers are trained similarly. On some independent institution campuses, the agency may operate under state or provincial law as “company police” or “special deputies” who have law enforcement authority but whose authority is limited to the campus itself. Some institutions contract with local law enforcement agencies to provide services within the borders of the campus, hire private security companies to protect the campus, or employ their own security officers who do not have arrest authority. Finally, some campuses use a combination of these methods to provide services on and around campus.

In the United States, all campus police and security programs that operate on campuses that receive federal funds must adhere to the *Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act* (2000). This federal law, originally passed in 1990, requires the reporting of campus crime statistics in certain categories, includes reporting on campus fire safety, requires the provision of certain information about campus policies, and has a number of other requirements with which campus officials must comply. In addition, all U.S. states and Canadian provinces have laws and regulations that control how and under what types of arrangements campus police and security may operate.

The United States Department of Education (DOE) has responsibility for enforcement of the Clery Act (<http://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/safety/campus.html>), may fine institutions for violation of the Act and in extreme cases may remove the authority of institutions to receive federal funds. The DOE also provides a great deal of information to assist campus authorities to make their campuses safer and to comply with the Act.

The family of Jeanne Clery, for whom the Clery Act is named, set up a non-profit advocacy group called Security on Campus, Inc. (2012). This group monitors compliance of institutions with the Act and provides information regarding campus law enforcement and safety issues. This group also advocates for strict enforcement of the law and lobbies Congress for additional law to improve safety on American campuses.

The International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators (IACLEA) “advances public safety for educational institutions by providing educational resources, advocacy, and professional development services. IACLEA is the leading voice for the campus public safety community.

“IACLEA was created by eleven college and university security directors who met in November of 1958 at Arizona State University to discuss job challenges and mutual problems and to create a clearinghouse for information and issues shared by campus public safety directors across the country. Today, IACLEA membership represents more than 1,200 colleges and universities in 20 countries. In addition to the colleges and universities that are institutional members, IACLEA has 2,000 individual memberships held by campus law enforcement staff, criminal justice faculty members, and municipal chiefs of police” (IACLEA, 2012).

According to Fisher and Sloan (2007), “[t]he past 20 or so years ha[ve] seen key development in the context of campus security: the *professionalization* of the individuals and departments charged with the sometimes daunting task of reducing opportunities for on-campus victimization, responding to calls for assistance, and providing services to crime victims. The professionalization has touched almost all aspects of campus security and has resulted in significant changes in, and upgrades to, security policies” (p.14). The authors indicated that the movement from service as a “night watchman” to the current role on many campuses of high-tech police departments, which may also have “information security and infrastructure protection” (p. 14) responsibilities, has been a dramatic role change.

Sloan and Lanier (2007) described the evolution of community policing on college and university campuses and noted other current trends that relate to campus police and security policies. Bromley (2007) explained the evolution of campus police and security services in some detail and laid out his view of the modern campus police and security agency. CAS standards should guide campus police and security programs to best practices in their new roles.

References, Readings, and Resources

- Bickel, R. D., & Lake, P. F. (1999). *The rights and responsibilities of the modern university: Who assumes the risks of college life?* Chapel Hill, NC: Carolina Academic Press.
- Bromley, M. L. (2007). The evolution of campus policing: Different models for different eras. In B. S. Fisher & J. J. Sloan III (Eds.), *Campus crime: Legal, social, and policy issues* (2nd ed., pp. 280-304). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Fisher, B. S., & Sloan III, J. J. (Eds.). (2007). Campus crime policy: Legal, social, and security contexts in *Campus Crime: Legal, Social and Policy Issues* (2nd ed., pp. 3-22). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Fisher, B. S., Hartman, J. L., Cullen, F. T., & Turner, M. G. (2002). Making campuses safer for students: The Clery Act as a symbolic legal reform. *Stetson Law Review*, 32(1), 61-89. Retrieved from <http://www.law.stetson.edu/lawrev/abstracts/PDF/32-1Fisher.pdf>
- Gregory, D. E. (2001). Crime on campus: Compliance, liability and safety. *Campus Law Enforcement Journal*, 31(4), 27-32.
- Gregory, D. E. (2002, November-December). Hiding crime on campus: Current reality or paranoia from the past? *Campus Safety and Student Development*, 4(2), 17, 30-32.

- Gregory, D. E., & Janosik, S. M. (2002). The Clery Act: How effective is it? Perceptions from the field -- The current state of the research and recommendations for improvement. *Stetson Law Review*, 32(1), 7-59. Retrieved from <http://www.law.stetson.edu/lawrev/abstracts/PDF/32-1Gregory.pdf>
- International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators (IACLEA). (2012). *About IACLEA*. Retrieved from <http://www.iaclea.org/visitors/about/>
- Janosik, S. M. (2004). Parents' views of the Clery Act and campus safety. *The Journal of College Student Development*, 45(1), 43-56.
- Janosik, S. M., & Gehring, D. D. (2003). *The impact of the Jeanne Clery Act Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and the Campus Crime Statistics Act on student decision-making*. EPI Policy Paper No. 10. Blacksburg, VA: Virginia Tech.
- Janosik, S. M., & Gregory, D. E. (2003). The Clery Act and its influence on campus law enforcement practices. *NASPA Journal*, 44(1), 182-199. Retrieved from <http://publications.naspa.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1311&context=naspajournal>
- Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act. (2000). 20 U.S.C. § 1092(f).
- Nicoletti, J., Spencer-Thomas, S., & Bollinger, C. (Eds.). (2010). *Violence goes to college: The authoritative guide to prevention and intervention* (2nd ed.). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Security on Campus, Inc. (2012). Jeanne Clery and the SOC story. Retrieved from <http://www.securityoncampus.org/>
- Seng, M. (1995). The Crime Awareness and Campus Security Act: Some observations, critical comments and suggestions. In B. Fisher & J. J. Sloan III (Eds.), *Campus Crime: Legal, social, and policy perspectives* (2nd ed., pp. 38-52). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Seng, M., & Koehler, N. (1993). The Crime Awareness and Campus Security Act: A critical analysis. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 16, 97-110.
- Sloan III, J. J., & Lanier, M. M. (2007). Community policing on university campuses: Tradition, practices, and outlook. In B. S. Fisher & J. J. Sloan III (Eds.). (2007). *Campus crime: Legal, social, and policy issues* (2nd ed., pp.). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Smith, M. C. (1988). *Coping with crime on campus*. New York, NY: American Council on Education, Macmillan
- Smith, M. C. (1989). *Crime and campus police: A handbook for police officers and administrators*. Asheville, NC: College Administration Publications.
- Smith, M. C., & Fossey, R. (1995). *Crime on campus: Legal issues and campus administration*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Contextual Statement Contributor

Dennis E. Gregory, Old Dominion University