

**POLICING ACADEMIA IN ILLINOIS:  
THE EVOLUTION OF AN AMERICAN  
POLICING MODEL**

**David N. Falcone**

*Illinois State University*

**Keith A. Gehrard**

*Illinois State University*

**ABSTRACT**

*As a conceptually distinctive model of policing, the modern campus police department is developed against its historical backdrop, as a unique policing modality separate from the hegemonic, law-enforcement oriented, big-city police department, its progenitor. Much like sheriff's agencies and the military police, campus police suffer a reduced status within the American policing paradigm, largely because of their numerous responsibilities perceived as only peripheral to the dominant law enforcement function of the metropolitan police. Nonetheless, campus police have become important members of the growing number of police organizational models within the mosaic of policing agencies in the United States; they are also important stakeholders in the community-oriented policing movement as a result of the socially complex nature of the modern collegiate campus community.*

## INTRODUCTION

The policing of America's collegiate campuses has been given only scant attention by criminal-justice scholars, despite the fact that campus police have existed, in one form or another, since the late-nineteenth century. Sloan (1992) posits that the little that has been published was produced by campus-police practitioners focusing on practical issues. Perhaps most importantly, these documents represent anecdotal inside perspectives written by non-academics providing descriptive histories that do little more than chronicle the growth of campus policing across the nation. It is the purpose of this article to explain the growth of campus policing from security departments to fully empowered police organizations.

Like all other forms of policing in the United States, campus policing has taken a back seat to its progenitor, the large-urban police department. And the available literature on other forms of policing also reflects this dearth of historical, empirical, and conceptual investigation. A fuller, more robust understanding of the complex mosaic that constitutes the American policing function cannot be gleaned unless we look beyond the structure and operations of the metropolitan police department, which has dominated our thinking about police for the better part of the past century.

This article traces the emergence and evolution of campus policing in the state of Illinois by: (1) examining the larger social history leading to campus policing nationally, and (2) examining the parallel legal and organizational development of two distinct models of campus policing in the State as representative patterns. That is, both public and private institutions of higher learning with full police authority, as opposed to security departments, are developed. Both models have fully-empowered and commissioned police officers by virtue of state statutory provisions. Numerous legislative acts grant the State's police authority to state universities; however, the various acts read nearly identically. The following statute is representative of the various separate acts for the state (public) universities; it states:

Members of the Police Department shall be conservators of the peace and as such have all powers possessed by policemen in cities, and sheriffs, including the power to make arrest on view or warrants of violations of State statutes, University rules and regulations and city or county ordinances, except that they may exercise such powers only within counties wherein [the] . . . University and any of its branches or properties are located when such is required for the protection of University properties and interests, and its students

and personnel, and otherwise, within such counties, when requested by appropriate State or local law enforcement officials. However, such officers shall have no power to serve and execute civil process (ILCS, Ch. 110, § 675/20-45). (ILCS Ch. 110, Art. 805 § 3-42.1 provides virtually the same language for public community colleges).

The statute providing public police authority for the numerous private colleges and universities (ILCS Ch. 110, Art. 1020 § 0.01) reads:

Members of the campus police department shall have the powers of municipal peace officers and county sheriffs, including the power to make arrests under the circumstances prescribed in Section 107-2 of the Code of Criminal Procedure of 1963, as amended [ILCS Ch. 725 Art. 5 § 107-2], for violations of state statutes, municipal or county ordinances, provided, however, that such powers may be exercised only on college or university property, for the protection of students, employees, visitors and their property, and the property of the college or university, unless otherwise authorized by a county or municipality. Campus police shall have no authority to serve civil process.

## CAMPUS POLICING: AN HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

### *Nineteenth-Century Developments*

Before Yale University hired its first two New Haven Police Department officers to patrol its campus in 1894, more rudimentary forms of campus policing had been employed to control student conduct and protect the campus community against fire, crime, and disorder (Powell, 1994). The most notable early attempt in the United States was instituted at the University of Virginia and centered on a form of self-policing through student self-government. Thomas Jefferson, the University's founder, had hoped that this approach would take root and be more conducive to learning and research than other more formal methods of social control. Despite Jefferson's best intentions, during the 1830s a wave of student violence led to the death of a professor and the injury of numerous students; armed deputies were brought on campus by the local sheriff to quell the disturbance (Brubacher & Willis, 1976). Following the Virginia incident, and others like it, faculty were heavily

engaged in "policing" the college campus, prior to the Civil War. According to Brubacher and Willis (1976: 50), "this was a period when constant warfare raged between faculty and students, when college government at best was nothing but a paternal despotism. . . ." Historians posit that the reason behind the tension between students and faculty was the unfriendly relations that had been spawned as a result of the clergymen-professors' role as "detectives, sheriffs, and prosecuting attorneys."

Clearly, this tension could not continue if collegiate institutions were to successfully carry out their combined mission of teaching, research and service while attempting to attract capable students and retaining qualified faculty. Thus, the problems of student misconduct became primarily the responsibility of the dean of students, disengaging somewhat the faculty from this odious task. Eventually, college administrators shifted the policing and campus security function (although not the prosecutorial nor judicial function) to either the buildings and grounds department or the physical plant (Proceedings of the Board of Trustees 1897 in *History of the University of Illinois Police Department, n.d.*). At this juncture the "watchman" system of campus security emerged, and the watchman's responsibilities involved both custodial and social control functions (Sloan, 1992). So closely were the custodial and security functions linked, that in 1896, the president of the University of Illinois argued that University janitors should wear uniforms and have arrest authority (Proceedings of the Board of Trustees 1897 in *History of the University of Illinois Police Department, n.d.*).

### *1940s and 1950s*

The "watchman/custodial" approach to policing the college campus became the dominate model for decades in the United States, until the mid- to late-1940s. During the 1950s and beyond, because of the unprecedented growth in student enrollment and the subsequently increased physical size of the campus, the transition to separate security departments from a parent department within the college began in earnest. Much of this sudden growth was a result of the influx of veterans returning from both World War II and the Korean Conflict, under government subsidy.

The first attempts at policing the campuses in Illinois were accomplished through either hiring off-duty sheriff's deputies, municipal police officers or by hiring security personnel with police authority under the aegis of the sheriff's office. This arrangement existed until the middle of the twentieth century. Illinois State University, for example, used this arrangement until the

early 1960s (Gehrand, 2000). Illinois law authorized public universities to create police departments under the authority of the various universities' governing boards in 1963 (Illinois Revised Statutes, Ch. 144, § 28).

Given the enormous growth that was representative of the 1950s, college administrators recognized the need for a more formal police presence on campus. This recognition led to the hiring of "directors" of campus security, most of whom had been former municipal police officers. Directors of campus security in turn began separating their security forces from the physical plant and replicated many of the institutional formalities associated with municipal-level policing (Sloan, 1992 and Bordner and Petersen, 1983).

Before the late-1940s, college campuses were populated by traditional college-age students. That is, they were between the ages of seventeen and twenty-one. However, by the end of World War II and the Korean War, huge numbers of nontraditional students found their way onto America's college campuses. This occurred for two reasons. First, some returning veterans who had intended to attend college before and during the great war, found their plans interrupted by compulsory military service. Second, many who had never hoped to attend college were now able to do so as a result of new federal legislation. The so-called G.I. Bill, officially known as the *Veteran's Readjustment Act of 1944* (Public Law 346, created for veterans of World War II) and later the *G.I. Bill of 1952* (Public Law 550, created for Korean War veterans) dispensed the largest scholarship grant in American history, and involved the federal government tangentially in the business of higher education. Billions of federal dollars were poured into higher education for the nation's returning veterans (Brubacher and Willis, 1976).

The impact of this exponential growth of nontraditional students on the nation's college campuses led to numerous problems previously unanticipated and wholly unaddressed by college/university administrators. Clearly, these were not children to be watched over by a paternalistic college administration. They were mostly young men who had witnessed real life, and in explicitly graphic ways, prior to attending college. Unlike traditional college students, many returning veterans came from families where a college education had not even been a dream, and most had no family tradition for appreciating or acclimating to a college environment with its more refined traditions and customs. Rather, they represented the "great unwashed" to those steeped in the ways of the academy and posed special problems in terms of controlling student behavior.

As a result, the ancient doctrine of *in loco parentis*, that had guided college administrators for scores of decades, no longer represented the *bright-line rule* in disciplinary cases, and college administrators had to readjust their

thinking regarding what behaviors were acceptable for adults on campus (Dixon v. Alabama, 1961, Del Carmen, 1991 and Conrath, 1976).

### *1960 and 1970s*

Further compounding the rapidly changing face of campus life was the student unrest of the 1960s. Student sit-ins, peace demonstrations, nonviolent confrontations, the unlawful restraint of administrators, rioting, anti-war demonstrations, and assaultive behaviors became nearly everyday events that begged for some sort of police intervention (Holmes, 1969). What became the galvanizing event that captured national attention regarding the policing of on-campus disturbances by off-campus police and the military, occurred at Kent State University on May 4, 1970 (Kelner and Munves, 1980). Eventually, four students were shot down and killed by Ohio National Guardsmen (Eszterhas, 1970). Pointing to the bad fit between the military and student activism was the United States Attorney General's report which called the shootings "... unnecessary, unwarranted, and inexcusable" (Davies, 1973: 9).

College administrators were faced with two options: (1) calling in off-campus police agencies and or the military/militia which had already proven untenable at Ohio's Kent State, or (2) creating a more formal police presence within the academic community, i.e., a campus police department with full police (state) authority to address these problems. A major movement toward the internal development of a separate police department within the college or university bureaucracy began. Administrators felt that this approach was the better approach since they would have college employees, i.e., campus police officers, who would be more sensitive (and hopefully more discreet) when dealing with faculty, staff, and students.

Noting the shortcomings of municipal police nationwide to adequately quell disturbances off campus, many college administrators opted to "professionalize" their departments of campus security by creating full-fledged police departments, sanctioned by state law. As mentioned earlier, by 1963, the Illinois General Assembly passed legislation giving public universities in the State full police authority as state officers. According to the statute, police officers in the employ of state universities held all the authority of city policemen and deputy sheriffs, save the authority to serve civil process (Illinois Revised Statutes, 1963).

Events involving local police nationwide added fuel to the campus police movement. A telling indictment of the nation's urban police in dealing with the escalating social disorder of the 1960s is found in Chapter 11 of the *Report*

of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (1968). It succinctly describes the wholesale failure of urban-American policing by depicting the police officer as a symbol of a repressive system of social control in which minority citizens had no voice, and where violent means were employed by police to gain compliance without legal authority or community approval.

### *1980s and Beyond*

Alcohol has long been recognized as a special problem for college-age students and has been a constant and endemic problem associated with college life. Campus policing authorities have dealt with, and continue to deal with, this chronic problem on campuses across the nation. However, during the 1960s, drugs became a *de facto* part of campus life for a large and growing number of students. This condition certainly did not abate during the decades that followed. Drugs had become such an endemic problem on the American college campus, that it effected even the campus police departments. In fact, by the mid-1990s, 46 percent of campus police agencies nationwide had instituted mandatory employee drug testing programs for their officers (Reaves and Goldberg, 1995).

Drug education, prevention, suppression, interdiction, and arrest became a formal part of the responsibilities of campus police departments over a nearly forty-year period (Reaves & Goldberg, 1995). Adding to the numerous problems facing the college police department was the persistent crime problem, which had not excluded the seemingly protected sanctuary of the college campus. While campus crime rates are highest for larceny offenses, violent crimes occur only too frequently. Violent crime data suggest that the greater danger lies off campus and that campus crime rates are affected by the crime rates of the immediately surrounding community -- not the inverse (Fox & Hellman, 1985).

### *Special Legal Issues and Concerns*

While crime has plagued campuses for as long as higher education has existed, it has virtually transformed the relationship of the institution to the student in recent times. During the 1960s to date, burgeoning student populations have more than tripled the number of individuals pursuing higher education in the United States from about four million to over fourteen million (Fisher & Sloan, 1995). This increase in numbers and changing social attitudes, concerns, and values have worked synergistically to create

expectations regarding the higher educational institution's responsibility concerning student exposure to the ravages of crime. Until 1979, American case law was completely devoid of any appellate court ruling holding a college or university liable for damages incurred by a student who had been injured as a result of on-campus crime (Fisher & Sloan, 1995). Since 1979, in *Duarte v. State* (1979) and *Peterson v. San Francisco Community College District* (1984) state appellate courts have increasingly held institutions liable when they fail to give students timely warnings regarding known risks of criminal victimization.

The concerns of students and their parents regarding the presence of crime on campuses began with a movement toward the disclosure of crime statistics by institutions of higher learning. In a 1989 editorial that appeared in *USA TODAY*, colleges were asked to literally "open their books" on campus crime statistics. By 1990 eight states had passed legislation requiring colleges to make crime statistics public information, and in November of that year, Congress superseded state legislation by passing the *Student Right-to-Know and Campus Security Act* (1990). This act further increased the workload of campus police agencies, as data collection required by the Act became largely their responsibility. This federal law not only requires the collection and dissemination of campus crime statistics (the duty to warn), it also requires the provision of adequate security protection for students (Fisher and Sloan, 1995). Public institutions are largely immunized, however, against liability from those who are wrongfully injured as a result of a "failure to protect" by their police under the *Public Duty Doctrine*. This court-generated doctrine dates from 1896, and posits that, unless a "special relationship" can be established, there is no duty to protect (*South v. Maryland*, 1896 and Del Carmen, 1991, see also *Deshaney v. Winnebago County Dept. of Social Services*, 1989 and *Klobuchar v. Purdue University*, 1990). (This doctrine has no impact on private colleges with security departments). The public duty doctrine is controlling for state institutions and private schools with police departments that operate under the authority of the state. This doctrine, like its progenitor doctrine of *sovereign immunity* is likely to be nibbled away at in the years that lie ahead, making post-secondary public institutions increasingly liable in civil adjudications.

Student-victim suits can be placed in four general categories of claimed duties: (1) a duty to warn about known risks, (2) a duty to provide adequate protection, (3) a duty to screen for the purpose of protecting students and employees from dangers, and (4) a duty to control student conduct. There appears to be a discernable pattern of courts being more receptive to plaintiff's arguments under the above claimed duties than ever before (Del Carmen,

1991). The implications for campus policing are self-evident.

Compounding the problems regarding campus crime and the responsibility of the post-secondary educational institution to protect its students is the definition of what legally constitutes the campus. This is of special concern for urban campuses. According to the International Campus Law Enforcement Association (IACLEA, 1992) the issue is not a well settled area of law. Although, the U.S. Department of Education does interpret the *Crime Awareness and Campus Security Act* as excluding streets from the definition of "on campus" (Fernandez and Lizotte, 1995). Future case law will no doubt give clarity to this issue. Thus, during the late 1960s and early 1970s America's college campuses witnessed the birth of what Sloan (1992) refers to as the "modern campus police department." Campus administrators, during this period, attempted to upgrade the image of the campus officer, who had been castigated as old, overweight, and primarily interested in issuing parking tickets (Webb, 1975 and Sloan, 1992). The 1980s witnessed campus police agencies: (1) becoming increasingly autonomous, (2) developing a notable similarity to urban police departments in terms of their administration, structure, and operations, (3) elevating educational and training standards for personnel, (4) developing a dedicated career path for employees, and (5) becoming an indispensable part of the fabric of American post-secondary education (Sloan, 1992 and Peak, 1993).

## CAMPUS POLICE TODAY

Campus police agencies across the nation have begun to shift their focus from the traditional crime-fighting role to a more service-oriented approach. Although, it can be argued that this service-oriented approach was an inseparable part of early, albeit informal campus policing techniques at Yale University (1894) and contained the seeds of community-oriented policing (COP) (Gehrand, 2000), COP was not yet recognized as a formal mode of policing. In fact, what was experienced at Yale eventually gave way to the more formal professional-style model of policing, which was in its nascent stages of development during the years that followed the turn of the nineteenth century.

Nonetheless, the present shift is in keeping with the national trend toward COP by police agencies at virtually all levels (Lanier, 1994). This shift of philosophy and concomitant strategies will involve a greater accountability to the members of the campus community. It will also demand better educated and less bureaucratically-oriented executives. Lastly, it will necessarily

require a softening of the paramilitaristic structure so long associated with the municipal/professional model of policing upon which campus policing has historically rested (Peak, 1993). While the campus community appears to be a fertile environment in which to find COP, it is not without its peculiar problems.

The source of legitimate police authority is mutually exclusive under the traditional/professional and the community-oriented policing models. Therefore, in theory, COP is better suited to provide policing in a campus environment. Conversely, under the traditional/professional model, policing is a formal extension of the criminal-justice system, and in theory is formally and legally accountable to the system. By way of contrast, community-oriented campus policing is an extension of the campus community with its normative value system and attendant organizational structure. Nonetheless, one thorny theoretical problem with COP has been and continues to be the difficulty with which we operationalize and define what constitutes a community (Mansour and Sloan, 1992 and Meenahan, 1972). Further compounding the COP issue are the problems encountered when attempting to measure its efficacy. Alpert and Moore (1993: 109) have noted that: "community policing remains a concept and philosophy in search of a process, without proper ways to document or evaluate its efforts."

### CAMPUS POLICE AS A MODEL

This brief historical overview of policing the nation's (and more specifically Illinois') institutions of higher learning points out that campus policing has been based almost exclusively on the municipal-policing model.

Early appointees to the position of director of campus security themselves came mostly from the ranks of municipal police departments, and had attempted to replicate what they were familiar with at the local-government level. It was natural for these directors to follow the professionalization movement already afoot in public policing since the turn of the nineteenth century. Inherent in the professionalization movement was the removal of the police department from any direct supervision of a parent municipal department (department of public safety or the like) and the direct interference by local politicians. Not surprisingly, directors of campus security departments pushed for the removal of their security departments from the organizational attachments associated with the departments of buildings and grounds, the physical plant, or the dean of students as well as the influences

of high-level administrators of the educational institution. This was a pale reflection of the trend that had been underway in policing in non-collegiate contexts across the nation for decades.

### *Other Police Models of Importance*

Despite the heavy influences of municipal-level/professional-model policing on campus police, many of the requisite responsibilities inherent in policing a collegiate campus are not in keeping with the value system and defining mission of the traditional municipal-level policing, i.e., law enforcement. First, the inescapable security function of campus policing stands in opposition to the law enforcement orientation and "professionalism" of urban municipal-level policing. This has the same effect on the image of campus police, within the greater policing community, as one finds with the Army Military Police, who also serve an active security function within the armed forces (Falcone and Smith, 2001). According to Falcone and Wells (1995) sheriffs' deputies also suffer a lower prestige within the policing community because of their multifaceted duties, including the security of the court, witness, and defendants. That is, within the mosaic of American policing, security functions are seen as antithetical to both the law enforcement focus and professionalization efforts of American policing.

Second, campus policing's emphasis on discrete COP-style policing necessarily de-emphasizes the law enforcement orientation found in urban policing, with its professional-model approach to social control. Although, paradoxically, campus policing's environment and orientation are more inclined to embrace both the values and efficacy of COP than their urban counterparts.

### CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

Campus policing has evolved through a number of iterations since its early and humble beginnings. Each evolutionary development was precipitated by social events, issues, and trends external to the university but which had enormous impact on the collegiate campus. Campus security and later police departments, in response to those societal conundrums, adapted and adjusted accordingly. Not surprisingly, what has emerged is a policing model that has adapted to its new tasks and responsibilities by shedding much of its former security-based image and developing into a modern full-fledged

police department. Although it has become a full-fledged newcomer to the police community, it has distinguished itself as a separate form of police organization intended to serve the complex needs of the collegiate community.

Although it conducts law enforcement activities, it is more community based than its progenitor, the urban police department. In fact, it was the inability of urban police (as well as the military/militia) to adequately police campus turmoil ultimately that led to the development of full-police authority for campus police departments. Thus, although campus policing can trace its lineage to urban policing, it has evolved to become a separate and discernable model of policing that is more service oriented than its municipal counterpart.

Because campus police are charged with a number of activities and responsibilities not necessarily associated with the law enforcement focus of urban police, they are accorded less status within the paradigm of American policing. This is similar to the reduced status found among other non-metropolitan police agencies like the sheriff and the military police, who also have security functions inherent in their organizational missions. Nonetheless, campus police are an important element in the larger mosaic of policing in the United States, and must be studied in order to more fully appreciate the complex apparatus that comprises the American policing function.

The implications for the future of campus policing are enormous as a greater and greater portion of the American public attends institutions of higher learning. With the expansion of knowledge in our ever burgeoning technocratic culture and the need to pursue higher levels of education escalates, the college campus will continue to require increasingly sophisticated forms of policing. This has daunting implications not only for the increases in the physical size of campus and expanding student enrollments but for the policing of the "university without walls" of the future.

## REFERENCES

- Alpert, G. and H. Moore (1993). "Measuring Police Performance in the New Paradigm of Policing." In *Performance Measures for the Criminal Justice System*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, 109-141.
- Bordner D. and P. Petersen (1983). *Campus Policing: The Nature of University Police Work*. New York: University Press of America.
- Brubacher, J. S. and R. Willis (1976). *Higher Education in Transition*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Conrath, R. C. (1976). "In Loco Parentis: Recent Developments in this Legal Doctrine as Applied to the University-Student Relationship in the United States of America 1965-1975." EDRS Microfiche.
- Cordner, G. (1987). "Police Responsiveness to Community Norms: Guidance and Autonomy." *American Journal of Police* 5:83-107.
- Crime Awareness and Campus Security Act (P.L. 101-542 [Stat. 2381]) November 8, 1990.
- Davies, P. (1973). *The Truth About Kent State: A Challenge to the American Conscience*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux Publishing.
- Del Carmen, R.V. (1991). *Civil Liabilities in American Policing*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- DeShaney v. Winnebago County Dept. of Social Services*, 489 U.S. 189, 109 S.Ct. 998, 1989.
- Dixon v. Alabama*, 294 F. 2d 150 U.S. Court of App. (5th Dist.) 1961.
- Donnell. California Western School of Law*, 200 Cal. App. 3d 715, 246 Cal. Repr. 199 (4 Dist. 1988).
- Duarte v. State*, 88 Cal. App. 3d 473, 151 Cal. Repr. 727 (Cal. App. 1979).
- Eszterhas, J. (1970). *Thirteen Seconds: Confrontation at Kent State*. New York: Dodd, Mead Publishing.
- Falcone, D.N. and B.A. Smith (2001). "The Army Military Police: A Neglected Policing Model." *Police Quarterly* 3(4):247-261.
- Falcone, D.N. and L.E. Wells (1995). "The County Sheriff as a Distinctive Policing Modality." *American Journal of Police* 14(3/4): 123-149.
- Fernandez, A. and A.J. Lizotte (1995). "An Analysis of the Relationship Between Campus Crime and Community Crime: Reciprocal Effects?" In B.S. Fisher and J.J. Sloan III (eds.) *Campus Crime: Legal, Social and Policy Perspectives*. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas.

Fisher, B. S. and J.J. Sloan III (1995). *Campus Crime: Legal, Social, and Policy Perspectives*. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher.

Fox, J.A. and D.A. Hellman (1985). "Location and Other Correlates of Campus Crime." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 13(2): 429-444.

Gehrand, Keith A. (2000). "University Policing: Its Origins and Development." *Campus Law Enforcement Journal* 30(4): 19-25.

Gelber, S. (1972). *The Role of Campus Security in the College Setting*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

*History of the University of Illinois Police Department*. Unpublished (n.d.) Urbana/Champaign.

Holmes, G. (ed.) (1969). *Student Protest and the Law*. Benton Harbor, Michigan: Patterson Press.

International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators (1992). *News Letter*, July 23, pp 1-4.

*Illinois Revised Statutes 1963*. Chapter 144, § 28.

*Illinois Revised Statutes 1963*. Chapter 38, Art.107 § 2.

*Illinois Compiled Statutes 1993*. Chapter 110, Art.725 § 5-107-2.

*Illinois Compiled Statutes 1993*. Community College Security Departments, Chapter 110, Art.805 § 3-42.1

*Illinois Compiled Statutes 2000*. Higher Education, Board of Regents Universities, Chapter 110 ILCS, Art. 120, § 675/20-45.

*Illinois Compiled Statutes 2000*. Higher Education, Private College Campus Police Act, Chapter 110, § 1020.

Kelner, J. and J. Munves (1980). *The Kent State Coverup*. New York: Harper & Row.

*Klobuchar v. Purdue University*, 553 N.E. 2d 169, 1991 (Ind. App. 4Dist.).

Lanier, M.M. (1994). "Community Policing on University Campuses: Tradition,

Practice, and Outlook." In B.S. Fisher and J.J. Sloan III (eds.) *Campus Crime: Legal, Social and Policy Perspectives*. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas.

Mansour, N. and J.J. Sloan (1992). "Campus Crime and Campus Communities: Theoretical and Empirical Linkages." Unpublished paper presented at the annual meetings of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences.(November)

Meenahan, T.W. (1972). "What Means 'Community'?" *Social Work* 19(1): 6-94.

*Miller v. State of New York*, 62 N.Y. 2d 506, 478 N.T.S. 2d 829, 467 NeE. 2d 493 (1984).

"Open the Books on Campus Crime." (1989) *USA TODAY*, November 13, p. 10A.

Peak, K.J. (1993). *Policing America: Methods, Issues, Challenges*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Regents/Prentice-Hall.

*Peterson v. San Francisco Community College District*, 685 p. 2d 1193 (Cal. 1984).

*Proceedings of the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois*, for the year ending August 31, 1897. pp. 20-21.

Reaves, B. and A.L. Goldberg (1995). U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. *Campus Law Enforcement Agencies, 1995*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

*Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders*. (1968) (New York Times Ed.) New York: E.P. Dutton & Co.

Powell, J. (1994). "The Beginning -- Yale Campus Police Department, 1894." *Campus Law Enforcement Journal*, 24(4): 205.

*Savannah College of Art and Design, Inc. v. Roe*, 409 E.E. 2d 848 (Ga. 1990).

"Security Office Departmental History." (unpublished) Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University (n.d.)

Shoemaker, E. (1995). "Non-Traditional Strategies for Implementing Community-Oriented Policing." *Community Policing on Campus*. IACLEA.

Sloan J.J. (1992). "The Modern Campus Police: An Analysis of Their Evolution,



Structure, and Function." *American Journal of Police* 11(2): 85-104.

*South v. Maryland*, 59 US (18 How.) 396 (1896).

*Student Right-to-Know and Campus Security Act (P.L. 101-542 [S.580])* November 8, 1990.

Veterans' Readjustment Act of 1944 (P.L. 346, 78th Cong.) June 22, 1944.

Veterans' Readjustment Act of 1952 (P.L. 550, 82 Cong. July 16, 1952.

Webb, J. (1975). "The Well-Trained, Professional University Police Officer: Fact or Fiction?" *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin* 44(1): 26-31.