

# IACLEA: The First 50 Years



# Higher Education Policing: The New Millennium

By Keith A. Gehrand

Captain (Retired)

Illinois State University Police Department  
Normal, Illinois

England's Prime Minister Benjamin Disraeli (1868-1874-1880) once wrote, "In a progressive country change is inevitable...change is constant." George Santayana, (1863-1952) the noted philosopher, poet, and novelist, once wrote, "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it," from his monograph, *Reason in Common Sense*, the first volume of his *The Life of Reason* (1906). Both quotes are very appropriate for many professions, but especially for campus police and public safety as the years from 2000 to 2007 in the United States have brought many tragic events to our nation, and specifically to institutions of higher education around the nation. During the seven years since the beginning of the new millennium there have been a number of tragic incidents in schools around the nation that have created constant, dramatic, and in some cases very drastic changes to the methods and manner of policing on the college campuses in this nation. Colleges and the police and public safety agencies have undergone increased scrutiny with recent events around the nation, and the world. It does not appear as though there are any signs of the actions of campus police falling off anyone's radar screen.

Students who often feel they have a sense of invulnerability do not worry about campus safety until something has happened to them. However, parents have historically maintained a high level of vigilance towards the actions of the police on the campus their children attend. In addition, because of events around the nation in our schools, many state legislatures and the federal government are increasingly influencing how the business of safety and security is done on our campuses. Federal involvement includes many influences, from the public statement by the Director of the Federal Bureau of

Investigation that college campuses were "soft targets" for terrorist attacks; to the review of the tragic incidents at Virginia Tech in April 2007. This increased scrutiny on how we do our jobs will influence how we look at and respond to the safety of our students and visitors to our campuses. Change is not new in campus police and public safety and our profession has adapted to these changes since the inception of police and security on college campuses.

## University Policing Up to 2000

Historically the development of policing on college and university campuses has been connected with serious and sometimes tragic events on college campuses. These events, regardless of whose campus they occurred on, have influenced how all colleges and universities deal with similar events on their respective campuses. Prior to the establishment of the first university police department in 1894 at Yale University, there were very few colleges in our young nation, and those who attended college were often the privileged class with the considerable financial resources to afford an advanced education. There was a prestige associated with attending a college and those with college degrees were often destined for successful careers, so students did not want to jeopardize their future by being expelled from college.

But this does not mean to imply that college campuses were immune from crime or disorder. Rudolph (1962) reported incidents of student unrest on multiple college campuses prior to 1894, including Miami University, Brown University, the University of South Carolina, Harvard University, Dartmouth College, the City College of New York, Dickens College, and of course, Yale University. Rudolph further reported that South Carolina College, The University of Virginia, University of Georgia, Illinois College, and the University of

Missouri all had incidents where faculty, staff, or students were killed.

For the majority of the 19th Century many colleges utilized a proctor system of controls to maintain student order and discipline on campus. A proctor system utilized faculty members to monitor student behavior outside the classroom and maintain order on campus. Faculty was responsible for enforcement of college rules and regulations both inside and outside of the classroom. When necessary, local police would be called in to investigate criminal acts on the campus. As time progressed they found the proctor system was flawed because the same persons who were supposed to create and encourage free thinking and open communication by the students in the classroom were also obligated to enforce rules and regulations outside of the classroom. Ultimately this created an adversarial role between the students and the faculty and students would naturally become reluctant to an open and free communication in the classroom in fear of retaliation by the faculty if they felt the comments were inappropriate.

Many believed that college campuses in the late 1800s were safe havens where learning was accomplished in a serene and crime-free environment. There were very few college campuses in the United States at that time and many believed the campuses had few problems or high crime rates. In fact, campus unrest and student conflicts were commonplace in the late 1800s and one of the most significant events was at Yale University in 1894 (Gehrand, 2000, 19).

The students at Yale University Medical School were suspected of stealing bodies for their anatomical training from the cemetery in New Haven, Connecticut. The townspeople were openly hostile towards the students at Yale University, and open conflict was common especially after the medical school students were suspected of stealing bodies from the Grove Street

## Higher Education Policing: The New Millennium

Cemetery (Powell, Pander and Nielsen, 1994, 3). Ultimately, in an attempt to quell some of the conflict between the students and the community, two police officers from the New Haven (Connecticut) Police Department volunteered to work on the Yale University campus. After seeing their success with the students, and wanting to prevent campus issues being brought to the town officials, the governing body of the university hired William Wiser and James Donnelly as their first campus police officers. While on the campus, Wiser and Donnelly established themselves as an integral part of the campus community and maintained a theme of service, protection, and establishing a good relationship with the students in all segments of the university community (Powell, Pander and Nielsen, 1994, 4).

Much like the city police departments of this nation in this time period much of their work was modeled after the principles of Sir Robert Peel and his work with the Metropolitan Police Department of London, England in 1829. Walker (1999, 21) provides us with three new strategies in American policing based on Peel's work. These principles include: (1) the mission was crime prevention; (2) preventative patrol; and (3) a defined organizational structure based on a military model.

By the early twentieth century, colleges were slowly evolving into a night watchman system of maintaining order. Powell, Pander and Nielson (1994, 5) reported that often these night watchmen were based out of the physical plant or grounds departments and in addition to their duties to enforce the campus rules they were responsible for tending of boilers, opening and closing doors, and other maintenance duties. Because the night watchmen were on campus at night they also slowly began to assume duties of maintaining order on the campus. Any major problems that occurred on the campus were handled by the local police but these interventions by local police often caused poor relationships between the college, the students, and the local police. In some cases private detectives were hired

by the colleges and universities to investigate serious cases of theft or misconduct on the campus (Gelber, 1972, 24).

In time the night watchmen were given additional responsibility, including the enforcement of student conduct and controlling behaviors of students and minor violations of university rules and regulations. Mostly this was because the night watchmen were physically present on the campus at hours when the faculty and college administration were absent. Powell (1994) reported that often these "campus cops" did not or would not report the violations to the university administration.

By the 1930s the demographics on the college campuses were beginning to change. Seven percent of the college age population attended college. The invention of the motor vehicle and the concerns for the moral standards of college students added to the concerns of college/university administration. The onset of political activism also affected behaviors on the college campuses across the nation and demonstrations on campuses became common on many campuses like Harvard, Johns Hopkins, Columbia, Duke, UCLA, and Berkeley (Esposito and Stormer, 1989).

By the early 1950s, many college and university administrators were seeing the increased need for a greater presence of police on their campus. The end of World War II created a dramatic change in the demographics of students on college campuses. The returning military personnel enrolled in colleges and universities because of the formation of the GI Bill, which paid for the returning military educational benefits. Fifty percent of the students on college campuses were veterans and 78% were male. In addition the fact that 50% of the students on colleges and universities had been involved in a war forced the administrators to reconsider how they responded to, and treated this new breed of students.

Many higher education institutions began to hire retired police officers from city and county departments to administer their campus police department (Sloan, 1992, 85). Many times these departments were mirror images of the department the new chief was hired from. Often times the police chief had little, if any, administrative background that could be used to administer the department. In many instances, the campus police were reporting to the building and grounds departments and were relegated to basements of campus buildings with little access to equipment or technology. There was little specific knowledge and training specifically dealing with policing on college campuses and no formal or informal networks existed to exchange information and common practices.

Bess and Horton (1988, 35) reported that the era of "Student Dissent" began in the 1960s and continued into the 1970s. During this time widespread student protests and riots became commonplace on many college campuses. Incidents at places like Kent State (Ohio), Jackson State (Mississippi), New Orleans (Louisiana) demonstrated how inadequate the training and preparation of the campus police were to the changing climate on college campuses. In addition, the actions of Charles Whitman at the University of Texas at Austin gave many administrators of colleges and universities the need to improve their ability to respond to incidents. Local and country police would be called in to respond to campus disturbances but often times were not sympathetic to the concerns of the students or the needs of the institutions. After incidents were over, the local or county police would return to their respective jurisdiction and leave the campus administration to deal with the problems resulting from the response to the campus disruption.

In addition to the changing climate on college campuses, the courts began to get involved in college safety and security concerns. Prior to this time, the doctrine of *In loco parentis* or "in place of the parents" was the

## Higher Education Policing: The New Millennium

dominant philosophy in how students' behavior was controlled. That doctrine was ended when a court ruled in *Dixon v. Alabama* (1961) that public institutions of higher education must provide procedural due process rights before a student can be suspended or expelled. Esposito and Stormer (1989, 28) coined the phrase of "student citizen" to describe this new relationship between the students and university administration. The court was clear in ruling that the institution of higher education can not condition admission to the college on the waiver of due process. Powell, et al suggested that this ruling began the erosion of control over the students which ultimately led to the student unrest in the 1970s.

The 1970s were filled with student unrest in protest to the Vietnam War and the perception by many on college campuses of the illegality of the war. In addition to Vietnam, the 1970s were a period of increased awareness on civil rights and the social changes occurring in the nation. The formation of professional associations and a greater understanding of the unique nature of policing on a college campus became increasingly important to how the campus police operated. In an effort to respond to these changes on college campuses, uniforms became less authoritarian and more in keeping with a "public safety" role rather than a law enforcement role often demonstrated by local police. Campus public safety departments were being brought under the control of the college President or a Vice President and were also accompanied by increased funding and a greater access to technology and equipment.

As the 1970s drew to a close, the Era of Student Dissent was also quickly being replaced with issues of crime on college campuses. Powell (1989) reported that concerns over civil rights issues were quickly replaced with plans for crime reduction and threats to personal safety. The courts began to hold college campuses more accountable for campus safety issues and parents were holding college administrators personally responsible for the safety on campus.

This new level of accountability is most notably seen in 1990 when the U.S. Congress passed the "Crime Awareness and Campus Security Act (Title II of Public Law 101-542), which amended the Higher Education Act of 1965. This act, which was renamed as the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act," in 1998, holds college campuses directly responsible for reporting of crimes and notification of incidents on the campus. Many campuses did not participate in the Uniform Crime Reporting System from the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Clery Act was the means to mandate reporting of certain crimes to the government and to the general public. In addition, the Clery Act requires that the institution also report to the public on security policies and where information can be obtained and tied the reporting of this information with federal funding. In essence the law mandated reporting or the institution took the chance of losing all its federal funding. This placed the institutions in the unique position of being mandated to publish reports and crime statistics that local and county law enforcement agencies are not required to report.

As the twentieth century drew to close campus law enforcement began coming into its own right and gaining more national attention than ever before. In 1995, the U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics released its first ever report of campus law enforcement. In this report the presence of campus police, public safety, and security on our nation's college campuses was analyzed and exposed to public review.

At the conclusion of the twentieth century, campus police, public safety, and security were undergoing drastic changes in their methods of operation. College and university administrators wrestled with multiple issues on campus safety and security, including arming of police on campus, crime control, security processes, and a multitude of other issues. Change was inevitable, and campus police and public safety were about to see a dramatic shift in how they prepared for, and responded to disasters on their campuses.

### September 11, 2001 and Higher Education

Many of us from the Baby Boomer Generation remember the most tragic day in our youth: the assassination of President John F. Kennedy on November 23, 1963. Many of us remember watching the images on the television set of Dealy Plaza in Dallas, Texas, the funeral procession for our fallen President, and the image of a young boy saluting his father's casket as it passed. These images have been played and replayed during our lives countless times. But those images have been replaced with a new tragedy that affected our nation.

On September 11, 2001, at 8:46 a.m. American Airlines Flight 11 crashed into the North Tower of the World Trade Center in New York City, striking floors 94-98. A few minutes later at 9:02 a.m. United Airlines Flight 175 crashed in the 78-84th floors of the South Tower of the World Trade Center. Thirty-five minutes later at 9:37 a.m. another American Airlines flight, number 77, crashed into the Pentagon, the main headquarters for the United States Department of Defense. Finally, approximately 150 miles northwest of Washington, D.C. at 10:03 a.m., United Airlines Flight 93 crashed in a field, the result of the plane's passengers attempting to regain control from the hijackers so this flight could not be used against another target of mass destruction. The images of the planes striking the World Trade Center Towers flashed across every television screen in the nation. Images of first responders attempting heroic deeds and many paying the ultimate price for service to their nation will remain with all of us for decades to come. Occupants of the North Tower who could not escape the flames were seen jumping from the building only to meet their ultimate fate. These are the images that now plague our nation's collective memory.

When word of the first attack reached President George Bush, he was getting ready to visit and read to a class at Emma E. Booker Elementary School. According to "The 9-11 Commission Final Report" (2004, 5), when first told of a plane crashing into the World Trade Center,

## Higher Education Policing: The New Millennium

President Bush, along with many in the nation who were watching the incident unfold live on television, was under the impression it was pilot error and not a threat to the nation. At 9:05 a.m. when the President was notified of the second plane striking the World Trade Center, he and the rest of the world knew it was not pilot error that caused the crash, but that our nation was under attack. The situation required the President to return to Air Force One. He did not return to Washington, D.C. but rather to a secure location selected by the Secret Service and military, according to "The 9-11 Commission Final Report."

There can be little doubt that the effects of 9-11 on this nation are some of the most dramatic in our nation's history, since many never anticipated, nor believed, such an attack on our nation could have occurred. The damage and destruction that occurred as a result of the four planes attacking our nation was extensive and it is not the intent of this article to explain the full impact, nor to minimize the loss suffered by those directly affected by that tragic day. In looking at how America has responded, there can be little doubt that the way emergency service workers, including police and public safety professionals, look at, prepare for, and respond to disaster will be changed forever.

In an attempt to fully investigate the attacks upon the World Trade Center, the President established the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States (The Commission). This commission, via the publishing of the 9-11 Commission Report, identified a number of concerns that can directly apply to the college and university setting.

The Commission (2004, 317) reported that 85% of our nation's critical infrastructure is controlled by the private sector and that these responders are likely to be the first persons on the scene of an incident. Many colleges and

universities utilize private security companies or have their own unarmed campus security. College campuses have a duty to protect their students, faculty, and staff. The appropriate preparation of their campus public safety officers, who are the responders to incidents, must be addressed. This is especially true for the private institutions that have limited, or no staff designated as first responders to incidents. It is imperative that those in higher education realize they are part of this cadre of first responders to crisis.

Another problem identified by The Commission (2004, 318) was the impact of fire safety plans and fire drills on the evacuation of the towers. In higher education, we routinely use fire drills in at least some of our buildings, especially the residence halls. But to what level are the staff members, resident assistants, and residents trained to respond to fires in the campus buildings? How often are fire drills conducted in academic buildings while classes are in session? What, if any, training is provided to the faculty and staff and the all important adjunct faculty? How are the students prepared for drills?

Communications was identified by The Commission (2004, 318) as a problem especially in regards to the NYPD's 911 operators not being fully integrated into the response effort. After the evacuation was ordered the information was not conveyed to the 911 operators, who continued to advise callers not to evacuate the building. Several other examples of a communications gap were identified, but the lesson to learn for all emergency responders is to be sure your plans and responses are inclusive of all agencies that have a role in the response. Not just your agency and all members in your agency, but also the first responders from the neighboring jurisdictions, county, and state agencies.

The use of the Incident Command System for coordinating the response was identified by The Commission as another area of concern. The use of Incident Command was mandated by New York City Mayor Rudolph Giuliani in July 2001, but during the response all concepts of the Incident Command System were not implemented. The Commission (2004, 319) advised there are many incidents where the Incident Command System were used, but they still lacked the integrated communications, command and control of responding agencies, and unified command structure intended by the mayor in his directive a few months before the attack on the World Trade Center. This philosophy is replicated in a recommendation made by The Commission (2004, 397) which states that the Incident Command System should be adopted, and when multiple agencies or jurisdictions are involved a Unified Command System should be utilized, and the Commission recommended tying this requirement to federal funding.

The Commission (2004, 323) provided the following insight into the future: "The first responders of today live in a world transformed by the attacks on 9-11. Because no one believes that every conceivable form of attack can be prevented, civilians and first responders will again find themselves on the front lines." This statement by the Commission is especially true for college and university campuses that may be prime targets of terrorist attacks or victim to natural disasters.

The attacks on the World Trade Center, the Pentagon, and the downed plane in Pennsylvania have served to illuminate the needs our nation has in emergency response capability and collaborative response efforts. But in campus policing we must also balance the need for response capabilities to international terrorist attack with our other responsibilities in responding to threats that may strike our campuses.

## Higher Education Policing: The New Millennium

### **The New Threat on College Campuses: Campus Violence and New Trends**

The phrase “soft targets” has been associated with many locations and businesses including college and university campuses for several years. But why has this title been bestowed upon our nation’s institutions of higher education?

College campuses are symbols of a free and open society, but this same symbolism is what makes them vulnerable to attack. College campuses have to accept that they have certain vulnerabilities that must be recognized if they are to be truly effective in their new role in campus safety. Factors common to many college campuses that make them attractive targets are: (1) Open access to people; (2) Access by vehicles; (3) Security for hazardous materials; (4) Security for sensitive information; (5) Large gatherings of people; (6) Perpetrators are easily concealed in crowds; (7) Lack of security awareness or precaution; and (8) Poor or inadequate security safeguards for critical infrastructure.

Historically the focus of campus law enforcement has been crime, public disorder, regulatory functions, and physical security of their campus, while maintaining the open and nonthreatening environment of the campus. On many campuses the functions of police, fire response, safety, security, and parking are combined into the overarching umbrella of campus law enforcement. In other locations, the police are solely responsible for detection and deterrence of crime by enforcement of statutory laws and university rules and regulation; while many other functions are controlled by other university departments in a collective approach.

Since the attack on the World Trade Center in September 2001, the primary focus of law enforcement in general has shifted away from their traditional roles of crime suppression, public order, and regulatory functions.

In 2003, Secretary of Homeland Security Tom Ridge reiterated the direction of President Bush in his remarks to the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP), where he stated, “That is why the President has asked law enforcement to shift its focus to prevention of terrorist acts – to be ‘first preventers’ as well as first responders.” (Secretary Tom Ridge in remarks to the IACP on October 23, 2003). It is this role of “first preventer” that is new to law enforcement as they are now asked to be more than a response agency to crime and threats to the campus.

Colleges and universities have a unique history where they are held responsible for prevention of foreseeable crime on their campuses by the students, the parents, and the courts. This has been part of the development of campus police and public safety agencies since 1894 when Yale University first established a campus police department. There have been many court cases holding colleges and universities liable for recognizing foreseeable dangers, and the Clery Act holds institutions of higher education responsible for notifying the campus community of crime prevention efforts as well as crimes reported.

In today’s environment of potential terrorist threats, many college campuses must anticipate the potential for both the domestic terrorist and those who would attack the United States from other parts of the world. The American Association of State Colleges and Universities (2007) stated it in this way:

“College and university campuses are essentially open environments; to many they are compelling symbols of democracy. This lack of environmental restraints and American symbolism make institutions of higher education valued targets. Campuses are easily accessible and convenient places for terrorists to hide because they can blend in with students in residence halls, student unions and libraries .... Structures are

another prime target for terrorists. Campuses feature large-capacity arenas and stadiums that are vulnerable to outside threats, performance concerts and other venues that attract large crowds who are not easily scrutinized, high rise buildings like residence halls and office buildings that may have parking garages under them. Some institutions house chemical and biological, medical, and animal research laboratories that accommodate toxic and hazardous agents. All campuses have tempting targets such as power plants and heating and cooling terminals, and elaborate information technology systems that are easily accessible and vulnerable.”

But on our nation’s campuses we must also concern ourselves with the more plausible, but often less dramatic incidents of crime on our campuses and suppression of those incidents. The factors that make college campuses vulnerable to terrorists also make them vulnerable to other criminal threats.

Crime on campus can be measured in a number of ways, including those of the faculty perspective and the student perspective. One study completed by Duhart for the Bureau of Justice Statistics, in their report *Violence in the Workplace*, 1993-1999, found that, “College or university teachers were victimized the least among occupations examined (2 per 1,000 college teachers). In the same study they found that of the professions examined, police officers had the highest rate of victimizations at 261 per 1,000 officers.

While good news for college faculty and staff, and not so good news for police officers on the college campus, student victimization is a concern for campus law enforcement as well. The Bureau of Justice Statistics report on college student victimization from 1995-2002 stated that “college students ages 18 to 24 experienced violence at average annual rates lower than those for non-students in the same age group.... Except for

## Higher Education Policing: The New Millennium

rape/sexual assault, average annual rates were lower for students than for non-students for each type of violence crime measures.... Rate of rape/sexual assault for the two groups did not differ statistically." (Baum and Klaus, 2005, 1). Additionally, they reported that 58% of offenses were committed by strangers; 41% of offenders were perceived to be using alcohol or drugs; 93% of crimes occurred off campus; and 72% of incidents occurred at night. Two-thirds of the victimized college students reported they did not perceive the offender as having a weapon.

In September 2004, 488 sworn police departments were reported as serving four-year colleges and universities, and an additional 254 sworn police agencies nationwide protecting two-year college campuses (Reaves, 2007, 7). For the roughly 12,600 sworn police officers on these campuses, and the scores of other non-sworn public safety and campus security officers, their lives are evolving into a new direction, away from traditional policing strategies. The federal government is now going towards an all-hazard approach to preparation for critical incidents, and a national framework for disaster response. In addition, the guidance from the Department of Homeland Security is that this all-hazard approach along with collaborative community partnerships is the wave of the future. As leaders in the law enforcement and public safety field for higher education it is imperative that we embrace and follow the same requirements placed upon our sister agencies at the local, county, and state level. Doing any less would jeopardize the ability of our campuses to respond to threats on our campuses.

### NIMS and Higher Education IACLEA's Response

On September 11, 2001, our nation suffered an attack that was unprecedented in our nation's history. The World Trade Center in New York City was the target of terrorists who were intent on striking a blow to America and the American way of life. In addition to the extensive property damage and interruption of the lives of millions of people, there were 343 firefighters and paramedics killed, 60 police officers killed, and *The New York Magazine* reported that 115 nations were affected by the attack on the World Trade Center. After the tragic events of September 11, 2001, the federal government examined the response of New York City and the capability of the nation to respond to an incident of such magnitude. Many believed that if any jurisdiction had enough resources to respond to such an attack it would be a large city like New York City. What was found was that no city, regardless of size or location, had the ability to respond to such an incident. The government had to respond and emergency responders were going to change how they did business in major incidents.

In February 2003, President Bush announced the release of Homeland Security Presidential Directive Number 5 (HSPD-5). The policy set forth by the President is that the United States Government shall ensure that all levels of government across the nation shall have the ability to work efficiently and effectively together using a national approach to domestic incident management. In addition, HSPD-5 recognized the importance of the private and nongovernmental organizations in preventing, preparing for, responding to, and recovering from terrorist attacks, major disasters, and other emergencies. To support this objective, the President established the National Incident Management System (NIMS) and the National Response Plan (NRP) to support the role of both local and federal government agencies in an "all hazard" approach to domestic emergency response.

The emerging threats and challenges that face campus public safety departments underscore the need for trained, professional police agencies that meet rigorous standards. The International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators (IACLEA) has recognized for many years the need for standards that apply to campus public safety agencies. In 1999, IACLEA conducted a member needs assessment study, which identified the development of a campus public safety agency/departamental Accreditation process as a priority. The Association created an Accreditation Committee in 2001 and charged it with the task of developing an Accreditation process. In 2003, IACLEA received a federal grant from the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS Office) to support the start-up costs associated with creating and implementing a campus public safety Accreditation program. IACLEA secured a second federal grant in 2005 and in 2006 it began accepting applications for IACLEA Accreditation. As of the end of 2007, IACLEA had awarded Accreditation to six campus public safety agencies with more than 15 applications pending.

The President followed up HSPD-5 with a companion directive in Homeland Security Presidential Directive Number 8 (HSPD-8), which tied federal emergency preparedness funding to the adoption of this all-hazard approach to disaster management and compliance with the other requirements under the National Incident Management System. In this way the federal government, by way of emergency preparedness funding, requires that local and state governments conform to the standards set forth in the NIMS and NRP documents or lose federal funding.

In keeping with the philosophy of standardized training and cooperative interagency working arrangements, IACLEA submitted a grant application to the Department of Homeland Security, and subsequently received federal funding to support these philosophies

## Higher Education Policing: The New Millennium

for institutions of higher education across the nation. In doing so, IACLEA provided a number of resources available to the membership and campus public safety agencies throughout the United States.

One such program funded was to develop and provide a best practices model for higher education. IACLEA's Board of Directors formed a Domestic Preparedness Committee to oversee the DHS grant program. The DPC convened subcommittees to focus on creating guides to best practices, communications with first responders, and a strategic vision for WMD training. The terminal product of the best practices subcommittee was the development of a model Emergency Operations Plan that could be utilized by campuses, both large and small, private and public, to help develop their own plans in their respective campuses. In addition, a set of support documents on a variety of topics related to domestic preparedness was developed. The Campus Emergency Operations Guide was posted on the IACLEA Web site in 2006, and includes a basic plan, Emergency Support Functions, Incident Action Plans, and support documents.

A second such initiative was to develop a self-assessment tool for threat and risk assessment that colleges and universities could utilize locally to help assess vulnerabilities on their campus. This tool was adapted for campus use from a state and local government threat and risk instrument in a cooperative project between IACLEA and the National Emergency Response and Rescue Training Center (NRRTC), Texas Engineering Extension Service (TEEX), at Texas A&M University. TEEX was one of the five National Domestic Training Consortium partners created by the federal government to train for domestic preparedness. In accordance with the all-hazard approach to disaster management this tool is equally applicable to both natural and man-made incidents; and it encourages the involvement of local agencies in addition to campus departments. This

*Campus Preparedness Assessment Manual* was completed in 2005 and placed on the IACLEA Web site as well as being promoted at various conferences and seminars. Since its posting in 2005, nearly 3,000 Web site visitors have accessed the manual and its accompanying forms.

Another project undertaken by IACLEA was to provide awareness level training for Weapons of Mass Destruction. IACLEA partnered with another member of the National Domestic Training Consortium, Louisiana State University's National Center for Biomedical Research & Training, Academy for Counter-Terrorist Education, to train WMD instructors and coordinate course deliveries. In this training program, campus public safety agencies were able to obtain the same level of training in WMD incidents equal to that of local and state responders. By ensuring that college and university security and public safety officers have the same level of awareness regarding WMD techniques they are able to respond as their counterparts in the institutions that have sworn police. IACLEA facilitated the training of 264 instructors and trained over 4,800 students in 191 courses delivered around the nation.

An equally important training opportunity provided by IACLEA to their members was the Incident Command training program, developed for IACLEA by BowMac Educational Services. This training program, while not the Incident Command Training required for NIMS compliance, is an outstanding command post operations training program that can be delivered locally. Sixty instructors were selected from member agencies and have delivered training throughout the United States to more than 1,700 campus public safety and local emergency responders in more than 20 states, as of February 2008. Currently, there are four regional sites established, as well as the availability to have the training delivered locally through the mobile courses established early in 2007.

IACLEA has also facilitated a number of other resources available to its member agencies. These include a Guide to Strengthened Communications workshop; Strategic Vision for WMD Training focus group; a campus preparedness video; and a "Lessons Learned" white paper on selected catastrophic events that have happened on our nation's college campuses, based on the experiences of Gulf Coast campus public safety departments following Hurricanes Katrina and Rita in 2005.

The training and materials developed or delivered by IACLEA have been a critical investment in time and resources in order to make campus law enforcement, whether sworn or not, more responsive to the needs of their communities. All of this training was offered to campus public safety agencies and their respective community response partners at little or no charge and provided under the grants awarded by the Department of Homeland Security.

From November 29-December 1, 2004 in Baltimore, Maryland, a historic gathering took place. More than 40 campus public safety leaders attended a meeting called the National Summit on Campus Public Safety: Strategies for Colleges and Universities in a Homeland Security Environment. The event was sponsored as part of a research project conducted by the Mid-Atlantic Regional Community Policing Institute (MARCPPI) and the Johns Hopkins University Division of Public Safety Leadership under a federal grant from the COPS Office. The summit produced 25 recommendations designed to strengthen protection of U.S. colleges and universities. A consensus recommendation to emerge from the Summit was the need to create a National Center for Campus Public Safety to support the profession, foster collaboration and lasting relationships, facilitate information sharing, and provide quality education for campus public safety professionals.



## Higher Education Policing: The New Millennium

Momentum for a National Center for Campus Public Safety took a significant step forward when the COPS Office awarded a grant to IACLEA to develop a strategic plan and a business prospectus to create a National Center. As of early 2008, the U.S. Congress was considering proposed legislation to fund a National Center for Campus Public Safety.

The National Center is viewed as a "catalyst that brings together professional associations, advocacy organizations, community leaders, and others to improve and expand services to those who use and depend on the nation's colleges and universities," according to the report, *National Summit on Campus Public Safety: Strategies for Colleges and Universities in a Homeland Security Environment* (U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, 2005, 50).

Among the priorities identified in the COPS Office report for the National Center are:

- Improve and sustain the quality of services provided by police, security, and public safety personnel to students, faculty, administrators, staff, parents, business professionals, and others who use and depend on the nation's colleges and universities;
- Increase cooperation, collaboration, and consistency in prevention, response, and problem-solving methods among agencies and jurisdictions serving the nation's colleges and universities;
- Provide a centralized clearinghouse for information on public safety related to the nation's colleges and universities and the communities in which they are located;
- Provide educational leadership and opportunities to those responsible for or who have a vested interest in campus safety and security; and

- Provide a forum for discussion, debate, and strategic planning among the various public safety, security, service, and advocacy organizations responsible for the safety of the nation's colleges and universities.

*(National Summit on Campus Public Safety: Strategies for Colleges and Universities in a Homeland Security Environment* (Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, 2005, 50-51.)

### What the Future Holds for Campus Policing

Campus law enforcement is now experiencing some of the most intensive scrutiny they have ever experienced since campus policing began. Campus law enforcement underwent major changes since 2001 in how they thought about, and responded to major incidents on their campus. The concepts utilized by William Wiser and James Donnelly at Yale University in 1894, and those of community policing and being facilitators for change in their respective communities, have evolved into working collaboratively with local agencies and the private sector in their planning and response to all forms of disaster.

The emphasis on campus public safety agencies planning and working collaboratively with their community partners was tested on April 16, 2007. On that date, on the campus of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (Virginia Tech), a lone gunman began shooting two students in the Ambler Johnston Residence Hall, and then approximately two hours and twenty minutes later continued his rampage in the Norris Hall. Ultimately 32 students/faculty, plus the gunman, were dead and another seventeen were wounded. The gunman, Virginia Tech senior Seung Hui Cho, began his shooting spree by killing two students in the Ambler Johnston Residence Hall and over two hours later continued his killing in Norris Hall. This incident, the worst shooting on a college campus in our nation's

history, has dramatically impacted the way institutions of higher education and their students and parents look at disaster preparation. Since this devastating incident everyone is beginning to review the safety and security procedures on the campuses. No longer are they looking at just disasters caused by severe weather or other acts of God, but also intruders and gunmen on campuses. The events of September 11, 2001 broke the innocence of our nation, but the events of April 16, 2007, brought those concerns to the college campus.

In the aftermath of the massacre at Virginia Tech, the first review came under the direction of President Bush when he directed the Secretaries of Health and Human Services, and Education, along with the U.S. Attorney General to conduct a series of meetings across the nation to find out what problems existed on our nation's college campuses. The report was not intended to investigate the incidents at Virginia Tech, but rather to provide a summary of recurring themes regarding the balance between the safety and security on our nation's campuses with the overall mission of our institutions of higher education and the individual liberties we all honor and cherish. In the report released in June 2007, the committee provided the following key findings and recommendations:

- Information-sharing between various agencies — when information they possess indicate someone poses a threat to themselves or others — is often mistakenly not shared because of confusion over existing laws.
- Improvements are needed in state laws and practices to ensure the states' ability to uniformly ensure that information on persons restricted from possessing firearms is captured and shared as needed.
- The need for improved awareness of warning signs of mental illness and that they are encouraged to seek out assistance.

## Higher Education Policing: The New Millennium

- Improving the coordination of community resources and providing those services to citizens with mental health issues who need that assistance.
- The need for communities to adopt programs to address school and community violence and integrate plans including emergency preparedness and violence prevention.

The federal government is not the only governmental body that is examining how major disasters are handled on the campuses of our higher education institutions. Many states have already developed special reports to their governors or legislative bodies. Governor's task forces have delivered reports in Illinois, New Jersey, Missouri, Ohio, Kentucky, and Florida. Several other states have established special panels to review the campus security measures within their respective states and additional reports will be available in the future.

The most intensive review of the Virginia Tech incident was ordered by the Virginia Gov. Timothy Kaine. In its report, the Virginia Governor's Review Panel reviewed the development of the incident, response and reaction to the shootings, and lessons learned for future preparation of campuses against violent attack or other major disasters. While the recommendations from the Review Panel established by the governor of Virginia is not a mandate for the higher education community nationally, the recommendations from this panel can provide us with some insight into what our students, their parents, and the general public will expect in the future from institutions of higher education. The Review Panel Report of August 2007 has many recommendations on a broad spectrum of topics but some of the more law enforcement specific recommendations are:

- Universities should conduct a risk analysis (threat assessment) and then choose a level of security appropriate for their campus.
- Students, faculty, and staff should be trained annually about responding to various emergencies and about the notification system that will be used.
- The head of the campus police should be a member of a threat assessment team as well as the emergency response team for the university.
- Campus police must train for active shooters.
- The mission statement of campus police should give primacy to their law enforcement and crime prevention role.
- Universities should have multiple communication systems, including some not dependent on high technology.
- Campus police everywhere should train with local police departments on response to active shooters and other emergencies.
- Communications and coordinated response to emergencies is imperative to an effective and efficient response. Use of Unified Command and Incident Command System should be institutionalized.
- Regional disaster drills should be held on an annual basis.
- Nearly all public campuses (93 percent) used sworn officers, compared to less than half (42 percent) of private campuses.
- Two-thirds (67 percent) of campus law enforcement agencies surveyed used armed patrol officers during the 2004-05 school year. Armed patrol officers were used at nearly 9 out of 10 agencies that employed sworn officers and at nearly one in 10 agencies that relied on non-sworn officers only.
- On campuses with 5,000 or more students, private campuses had a higher ratio of law enforcement employees to students than public campuses. Between the 1994-95 and 2004-05 surveys, comparable agencies increased their collective staffing levels from 2.8 full-time employees per 1,000 students to 3 per 1,000.
- More than 9 out of 10 agencies had a written emergency preparedness plan. During the 2004-05 school year, 58 percent of agencies participated in emergency preparedness exercises.
- During the 2004-05 calendar year, campus law enforcement agencies received on average 62 reports of serious violent crime per 1,000 students and 1,625 reports of serious property crime. Violent crime rates for private campuses were about twice that of public campuses; property crime rates were 48 percent higher. Between 1994 and 2004, campus crime rates decreased by 9 percent for violent crime and by 30 percent for property crime.
- Nearly three-quarters (74 percent) of the 750 law enforcement agencies serving four-year universities and colleges with 2,500 or more students employed sworn law enforcement officers. Those officers had full arrest powers granted by a state or local government. The remainder employed non-sworn officers.

In February 2008, the U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, released an update to its 1995 Study on Campus Law Enforcement. The BJS Campus Law Enforcement, 2004-05 Study included campus public safety agencies serving four-year U.S. universities and colleges with a fall 2004 enrollment of 2,500 or more and those serving two-year public colleges with a fall 2004 enrollment of 10,000 or more. Among the major findings of the study were:

(Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report, Campus Law Enforcement 2004-05, February 2008, page 1. Brian Reaves, Ph.D., BJS Statistician)

## Higher Education Policing: The New Millennium

### Final Thoughts

Policing in higher education has evolved since the first campus police department was established in 1894 at Yale University. We have evolved from the basements and isolated corners of the campus, where campus police maintained order in their dormitories and tended to boilers and locking doors. Through this evolution campus police have become professional voices for law enforcement, while still remaining an active and vital member of the campus community. It is sad that the natural evolution of the response capabilities of the campus police have been motivated by such tragedies as those occurring on September 11, 2001, and April 16, 2007. But despite these tragic events, campus law enforcement has maintained its credibility and has risen to the challenges faced in the new millennium. Not all campus leadership teams have risen to the challenges faced by campus police and public safety across this nation. Many campus police and public safety agencies have adapted to the changing campus environment as we have during the development of our profession throughout the years. With the assistance of the federal and state governments, and professional associations such as the International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators, assistance and tools to meet this challenge are available. No single campus or organization must meet these new demands by themselves. If there is one thing the National Incident Management System has told us, it is that we must all work together to meet the challenges faced by the new era of campus public safety. We can not, and should not, ignore the teachings of the past, nor ignore the lessons learned from history. Our profession is one that has consistently adapted to the changing environment of our campuses. No two campuses are the same, nor should they strive to be. Rather, it is the application of the lessons we have learned from the past, and applying them to our individual campuses and communities that will

allow us to be properly prepared for the future. No campus is immune from disaster, whether natural or by the hand of man. To ignore the lessons of the past, and not take advantage of the resources we have available is the way we will fail our constituents and ultimately cost the lives of those we are sworn to protect.

### References

- American Association of State Colleges and Universities, "Addressing the Challenge of Campus Security," 2007, available at [http://www.aascu.org/policy/special\\_report/security.htm](http://www.aascu.org/policy/special_report/security.htm).
- Baum, Katrina and Patsy Klaus. "Violent Victimization of College Students, 1995-2002," *Bureau of Justice Statistics*, Washington, D.C., 2005.
- Bess, William R. and G.R. Horton. "The Role of Campus Law Enforcement," *Campus Law Enforcement Journal*, July-August 1988, 35-36.
- Duhart, Denis T., "Violence in the Workplace, 1993-99," *Bureau of Justice Statistics*, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C., 2001.
- Esposito, D., and D. Stermer. "The Multiple Roles of Campus Law Enforcement," *Campus Law Enforcement Journal*, May-June 1989, 26-28.
- Gehrand, Keith. "University Policing: Its Origins and Development," *Campus Law Enforcement Journal*, 30(4): 19-25.
- New York, available at <http://nymag.com/news/articles/wtc/1year/numbers.htm>
- Powell, John, Michael S. Pander, and Robert Nielsen. *Campus Security and Law Enforcement*. Newton, Massachusetts: Butterworth-Heinemann, 1994.
- Reaves, Brian A., "Census of State and Local Law Enforcement Agencies, 2004," *Bureau of Justice Statistics*, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C., 2007.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report, Campus Law Enforcement 2004-05, February 2008, page 1.
- Rudolph, Frederick. *The American College and University*. New York: Vintage, 1962.
- Sloan, John J. "The Modern Campus Police: An Analysis of Their Evolution, Structure, and Function," *American Journal of Police*, Vol 11, No. 2, 1992.
- Walker, Samuel. *The Police in America: an Introduction*. Boston, McGraw-Hill, 1999.