

University Policing: Its Origins and Development

Keith A. Gehrand, Captain, Illinois State University

In today's climate of concerns about personal safety, gangs, drugs, school violence, workplace violence, and the perceived decline in the moral fiber of America, no one doubts the need for police protection. In 1997 the United States Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, reported there were over 865,000 police officers employed by all levels of government in the United States. This number is up 19.5% from 1982, which had over 714,000 police officers in the United States (*Sourcebook 1997*, 25), and President Clinton has pledged to add 100,000 police officers to the front line against crime. But where did the idea of having police on college campuses come from? Why is it important to have armed, sworn police officers to patrol institutions of higher education where free speech and liberal thinking are encouraged? What has happened on our nation's college campuses that has created an environment where sworn police are necessary to protect the constitutional right of free speech and the liberal thinking so often encouraged on America's college campuses?

Many people assume that colleges and universities are places safe from crime and violence. Rudolph found that college campuses are not the safe environments they are often thought to be. During the period of 1800 to 1875, Rudolph reported student unrest on the campuses of Miami University, Amherst, Brown, the University of South Carolina, Harvard, Yale, Dartmouth, Lafayette, Bowdoin, the City College of New York, Dickenson, and DePauw. In addition to these incidents of

student unrest Rudolph reported on violent incidents in which students and faculty were killed at South Carolina College, the University of Virginia, Oakland College, University of Georgia, Illinois College, and the University of Missouri (Rudolph 1962, 97-98).

Harvard University experienced the first recorded student uprising of the United States in 1766 when the students protested bad food. In 1818 Harvard had another disturbance consisting of a food fight that broke a considerable amount of glass and china. Harvard continued in its problems with additional major student rebellions in 1830 and 1897. In 1823 Harvard University expelled over half of the senior class, and in 1834 the president of Harvard University took the unprecedented action of demanding that city authorities convene a grand jury to indict students involved in student riots. In 1842 there was a confrontation between the students of Harvard and three hundred local workmen, where daggers, pokers and clubs were used (Esposito and Stormer 1989, 26).

The students at the College of New Jersey (Princeton) had their own major riot in 1806 with six additional rebellions recorded from 1800 to 1830. In one of these rebellions, which lasted several days, three students were expelled when pistol fire broke out and bricks were thrown. In another of the six incidents students from the College of New Jersey seized several buildings and defied college authorities to remove them from the premises (Esposito and Stormer 1989, 26).

Campus unrest and student conflicts were commonplace in the late 1800s. Significant turning points in the development of campus policing were the events at Yale University in 1894. Yale, like most universities of the day, encompassed a large segment of the town. The intermingling of the University with the town often led to conflicts between the University and the town's residents. Yale University and New Haven, Connecticut were no different. Frequent confrontations occurred between the citizens of New Haven and the students of Yale University. Often these conflicts escalated into bloody confrontations between the students and the New Haven Police Department. One of the worst confrontations occurred when the citizens of New Haven believed the students at the Yale University Medical School were exhuming bodies from the Grove Street Cemetery. The cemetery was located near the heart of the Yale University and the town's citizens believed the medical students were digging up the bodies to use as cadavers (Powell, Pander and Nielsen 1994, 3).

In the aftermath of this confrontation the University's administration and the New Haven city fathers began looking at ways to improve the relationship between the two. It was decided that two New Haven police officers would be assigned to Yale University to serve as liaisons between the Police Department and the students. Powell (1994) reported that many police officers perceived this request as being equivalent to asking for

Continued on page 20

volunteers to be thrown to the lions. There were few volunteers; however, two police officers were chosen, William Weiser and James Donnelly. Each morning as the two officers walked through the stone gates of Yale University and across its green lawns many officers wondered if the two volunteers would ever be seen again. Much to the surprise of many, the two officers returned each night.

Initially the officers were seen as negative factors by the faculty and students. Campus administrators disliked the two officers leaving the campus each night and being able to relate the daily activities of Yale University to the New Haven Police Department and the city fathers. As time passed the two officers slowly began to win acceptance by the students and the University administrators. Powell (1994) reported that in William Weiser's 1914 book, *Yale Memories*, Weiser stated:

As our acquaintance and friendships with the boys were constantly on the increase, it came to our knowledge that our success had excited envy in many quarters. The position that we made for ourselves by hard work, constant service, civility, kindness and patience, so attracted others that we had trouble of a different nature to fight. Members of the regular force, now that the students did not openly resent our presence, desired to take our places on the campus, and were watching for an opportunity to turn things their way. Pressure had been brought to bear upon the commissioners to transfer Jim and myself, and appoint others in our places.

Finally in September 1894, the Yale University administration decided it would be prudent to hire the two officers as employees of Yale University. With that action Yale University created a police department that is widely accepted as the first University Police Department in the United States. Weiser was appointed Chief of Police and their power of arrest was granted through the New Haven Police Department (Powell, Pander and Nielsen 1994, 4).

Weiser and Donnelly maintained a theme of service, protection, and estab-

lishing a good relationship with students and all segments of the campus community (Powell, Pander and Nielsen 1994, 4). Their theory of and approach to policing was unique for the time. Those departments that did exist were little more than a version of the watch system already in existence. Many police departments in large cities were not formally created until the late 1800s. The police positions were based on political appointment rather than qualifications, and patrol areas were very expansive, if they existed at all (Walker 1999, 23-25).

Police departments of the late 1800s followed the work of Sir Robert Peel, who created the first modern police force in London, England in 1829. Three new strategies were introduced by Sir Robert Peel into American policing. They were: (1) the mission of the new police was crime prevention; (2) preventative patrol; and (3) a defined organizational structure based on the military model (Walker 1999, 21). According to Powell, Weiser posited the proper role for a campus police department, which still holds true for today's campus police. The following passages are examples of Weiser's expectations.

Our duties [are] to protect the students, their property, and all college property from injury.

We were in constant communication with the Dean as well as with the police (New Haven) so it was hard for the boys to believe that anyone but us reported them. No argument prevailed against this opinion, and it gave us a reputation among the undergraduate body which it had taken years of constant, honest endeavor to overcome.

As we were constantly on the lookout for opportunities to show the student our good will, we began to be tolerated.

Gradually things began to change. We were often called upon for advice in times of trouble, and many a homesick boy, or one with the problem of ways and means staring him in the face, has left our office with a lighter heart and a new grip on life.

These are some of the ways in which we have gained the confidence of the boys. Gradually the cloud of suspicion lifted and finally we basked in the sunshine of the University; we belong on the campus; we are friendly with the students; and we stand ready at all times to render to everybody such favors or assistance as may be in our powers.

Weiser and Donnelly practiced more than preventative patrol, they expanded upon the model established by the Metropolitan Police in London. They sought out and established positive contacts within their entire community, Yale University, and provided service to the students and all those who came on the campus. Weiser's definition of "render to everybody such favors or assistance as may be in our power" may be dramatically different from our definition today, but there can be little doubt that Weiser and Donnelly established an early form of community policing. They were not merely enforcers of the law, they were one with their community and enhanced communication with all persons on the campus to the mutual benefit of the University, students, faculty, staff, and the community that surrounds Yale.

As the twentieth century dawned many universities began to have night watchmen patrolling their campus. These watchmen were often part of the university's physical plant or the building and grounds department. The primary concern of the night watchmen was to act as a fire-watch, lock and unlock doors, tend boilers, and other duties associated with maintenance of the university physical structures. Any problems that occurred on the campus were handled by the local police department (Powell, Pander and Nielsen 1994, 5). Gelber reported that these interventions by local police were the cause of ill feelings and in some situations the colleges and universities hired private detectives to investigate serious cases of theft or misconduct (Gelber 1972, 24). As time passed the night watchmen were given additional responsibilities in-

Continued on page 21

cluding the enforcement of student conduct codes and controlling behaviors of the students for minor violations of university rules. Because these night watchmen were on the grounds during nights and weekends (when faculty were absent) the responsibility for student code enforcement was transferred to the night watchmen. Powell (1994) reported that many times these "campus cops," as they were called, did not or would not report the violations to the dean of students.

By 1930, over a million students were attending colleges and universities in the United States, representing 7% of the college age population. College administrators were becoming increasingly concerned with the decline in the moral standards of society. The introduction of the automobile was also beginning to affect college campuses (Gelber 1972, 25). In addition to the obvious concerns of traffic and parking problems, students were taking their courting rituals from the front porch to the back seat of automobiles (Esposito and Stormer 1989, 27).

The onset of political activism in the 1930s by the students also began to affect college campuses. Thousands of students began to demonstrate against war, and large rallies were held on college campuses across the nation. Esposito and Stormer (1989) reported that demonstrations directly or indirectly related to this new political activism occurred at Harvard, Johns Hopkins, Columbia, Hunter College, Syracuse, Oklahoma, Duke, UCLA and Berkeley.

As the 1950s emerged, many college administrations began to feel some form of police presence was needed on the various campuses. The end of World War II created a drastic change on college campuses, with many veterans taking advantage of the GI Bill, which made the population of college campuses soar. In 1946 the enrollment at colleges and universities in the United States was up 57% over the enrollment in 1939. Fifty percent of the students were veterans and 78% were male, with public institutions absorbing 75% of these students. "Not only were there many of them, they were different. They were seasoned veterans, adults who challenged collegiate social traditions and

who required administration to relate differently to them." (Esposito and Stormer 1989, 27). Gelber suggests that the post-World War II days saw a divestment of the watchman-janitor style of policing to a formal organizational police structure (Gelber 1972, 28).

Many colleges and universities began to hire retired police officers to be responsible for the police functions on campus (Sloan 1992, 85). Unfortunately many of these retired or former police officers had no administrative training or experience and often the campus police departments were merely a reflection of the departments the officers had left. In their fledgling state, these new campus police departments remained under the supervision of the physical plant or grounds department, with little or no specific budget for police operations. "Although the 1950s saw changes in both the administration and organization of campus police departments, on the whole, the characteristics and duties of the officers remained relatively stable. For the most part, officers were men who had either retired from other occupations or were former police officers. Their duties remained primarily custodial . . . , campus security was limited to detection, apprehension, and reporting, rather than to making an arrest" (Sloan 1992, 86-7).

The "era of student dissent" (Bess and Horton 1988, 35) began in the 1960s and continued into the 1970s with widespread student protests, building takeovers, sit-ins, and riots on the nation's college campuses. Many campuses had inadequate and poorly prepared security departments that could not control the student uprisings. When local police were called in to assist with the disturbances they responded with mass arrests and the use of force. Many times these tactics by local police created tremendous problems for campus administrators. The local police, state police, and national guard were not receptive to the needs and desires of the administrations of the college or university. The response by the police tended to escalate the violence and perpetuated the cause of the rioters (Powell, Pander and Nielsen 1994, 6). Society as a whole questioned America's action in the Viet-

nam War, and many in society agreed with the protesters, sympathizing with their cause. When police responded violently to these demonstrations, public opinion began to sway toward the students and against the police. When the disturbances were over the local police and National Guard returned to their own communities and abandoned the campus, leaving college administrators to pick up the pieces. College and university administrators across the nation began to see a real need for their own experienced, qualified, and trained police departments to handle problems on the campus (Bess and Horton 1988, 35). The need for a police department that was familiar with the campus environment and receptive to the needs and desires of the university community was becoming essential to maintaining the quality of life on campus.

The courts also became involved in the changing role of campus police on America's college campuses. Prior to the 1960s, American colleges and universities were operating under the principle of *in loco parentis*, or "in place of a parent" (*Black's Law Dictionary* 1979). Prior to 1961, colleges and universities relied on *Gott v. Beras College*, decided by the court in 1913. The court ruled in *Gott* that it was within the power of college officials to enact rules governing students to the same extent as parents could (Young and Gehring 1988, 1-18). The *Gott* decision said that just like parents, college administrators could dictate to their students conditions in which physical and moral welfare and mental training were concerned. Although the *Gott* decision dealt with a private institution, the court stated that a more critical view would be taken of rules in a public institution (Young and Gehring 1988, 1-18).

The confrontations between students and the political climate of the 1960s forced the court to review the *Gott* decision. With the movement toward individual rights by the courts in the 1960s, the Supreme Court was asked to review the legal foundation allowing colleges and universities to limit constitutionally protected rights of due process. The court

Continued on page 22

University Policing: Its Origins and Development

Continued from page 21

was specifically asked to review in *Dixon vs. Alabama* if a public institution of higher education could violate the constitutional protection of due process in disciplinary matters within the university. Young and Gehring stated, "[t]he confrontations during the '60s, however, primarily concerned matters of institutional discipline and began with *Dixon vs. Alabama*. This decision confirmed that students at tax-supported institutions must be provided with procedural due process rights before they can be expelled or suspended from the institutions. Many of us in higher education were caught short during the late '60s having little knowledge of the constitutional rights of students in higher education" (Young and Gehring 1988, iii). In the *Dixon* case several students at Alabama State College participated in a sit-in at a lunch grill. Disciplinary action was taken against the students; some were expelled and some suspended. The actions against the students were taken

without consideration to their due process rights. Specifically they were not given notice of the nature of the charges against them and no hearing was conducted prior to disciplinary action being taken. The students turned to the United States District Court and appealed the decision of the school to expel them. The District Court upheld the dismissals and the students appealed the lower court's decision to the United States Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit. The Court of Appeals found that the students had a right to due process in tax-supported institutions. The court stated:

In the disciplining of college students there are no considerations of immediate danger to the public, or of peril to the national security, which should prevent the Board from exercising at least the fundamental principles of fairness by giving the accused students notice of the charges and an opportunity to

be heard in their own defense . . . The State cannot condition a privilege upon the renunciation of the constitutional right of procedural due process. (Young and Gehring 1988, 13-6)

The ruling by the Court of Appeals was appealed to the United States Supreme Court; however, the high court refused to hear the case and let the ruling of the Appellate Court stand. This landmark decision established that all students at public institutions have a right to due process procedures in disciplinary actions. "The students who had been 'wards' of the university became 'student citizens'" (Esposito and Stormer 1989, 28). Gelber stated that the "[e]rosion of the absolute right of entry began with the landmark (1961) *Dixon* case, which stated that the right to attend school may not be conditioned on a waiver of due process" (Gelber 1972, 4 1). This ruling, along with

Continued on page 23

Partner With The Leader



- Real Time Dispatching
- Case Management
- Accident Reporting
- Gang Association and Tracking
- Investigations and Follow Up
- MO Tracking and Case Routing
- Warrants and Restraining Orders
- Master Name File with Digital Photos
- "CLERY Act" Reporting
- Mobile Report Writing
- Arrest Log
- Property and Evidence Tracking
- Parking
- Vehicle Maintenance
- Personnel File
- Training File
- Bicycle Registration
- Report Library and Graphing
- Community Event Calendar
- Custom Report Generator

End2End, Inc.

43 Riverside Avenue, #402, Medford, MA, 02155 • (800) 365-9962 www.e2e.org

University Policing: Its Origins and Development

Continued from page 22

the "legalistic 60's" (Young and Gehring 1988, 111) essentially eliminated the doctrine of *in loco parentis* from America's colleges and universities. Powell also suggests this ruling removed the school-parent role of the college or university and eroded the control of the university on the students, which ultimately led to the student unrest and protests of the 1970s (Powell, Pander and Nielsen 1994, 10).

With the end of the 1960s many college students were using their constitutionally protected right of free speech and assembly to demonstrate and speak their minds on the social issues of the day. This often created an open, and sometimes violent, confrontation between students and members of the controlling establishment. "It became clear that campus law enforcement, geared to the needs of the institution was preferable to external law enforcement, geared to the societal and political needs of the area" (Esposito and Stormer 1989, 27). Disturbances at South Carolina (1968), Kent State and Jackson State (1970) and in New Orleans 1971) where students were killed by police and National Guard troops clearly demonstrated that outside agencies were unsympathetic to the students (Esposito and Stormer 1989, 29).

These incidents were not the only examples of situations where local police were inadequately prepared to deal with campus situations. Local police were also unfamiliar with the campus physical environment, also a disadvantage in times of crisis or emergency. One example of this problematic situation is demonstrated by the events at the University of Texas in Austin.

On August 1, 1966, Charles Whitman entered the University of Texas at Austin's Main Building Tower and, perched from that vantage point, opened fire on the campus with a high-powered rifle. Whitman appeared to have been a model young person growing up—an Eagle Scout, altar boy at his church and a good pianist. Whitman joined the Marine Corps after graduating from a Catholic high school in 1959. He received a college scholarship from the Navy, but it was withdrawn after Whitman's poor academic performance at the University of Texas. It

was in the Marine Corps that he became proficient with an M-14 rifle. Whitman is reported to have begun physically assaulting his wife Kathy during this time. In July 1966, Whitman was well thought of and active in his community. That perception changed on August 1, 1966, when Whitman entered the Main Building of the University of Texas posing as a delivery man. He then took the elevator to the 27th floor and killed a receptionist and some visitors who were in the open-air tower (August 1, 1966 Web site, 1996). During the devastation that followed, seventeen people were killed and thirty-five others injured. Later his wife and mother were found dead in their apartments. A note from Whitman was found explaining that he wanted to spare them the embarrassment of what he was going to do.

In August 1966, the campus was protected by only a handful of unarmed and untrained security officers. As police from the City of Austin Police Department attempted to approach Whitman they were pushed back by his rifle fire. It was not until a campus security officer, familiar with the campus system of tunnels and underground access routes, led Austin police to the tower rooftop, and the carnage was ended with a barrage of gunfire from the police (30th Anniversary speech [August 1998]).

There is little doubt that this incident, combined with other incidents in the University of Texas system, led the 60th Texas Legislature to enact Senate Bill 162, which authorized institutions to employ and commission peace officers for their member institutions. Roy Baldridge, Director of the University of Texas System Police, was with the Austin Police Department on that memorable day in 1966. In his 30th Anniversary of the University of Texas Police system speech, he commented on the impact of this incident, combined with knowledge of the tremendous growth of the University of Texas system, that led the legislature to create a university police system. In the following years the University of Texas system took advantage of this new legislation and created peace officers for their institutions, and on February 1, 1968, the first class of peace officers graduated from the Uni-

versity of Texas Police Academy. Today there are 372 officers within the University of Texas system, covering their fifteen member institutions and 235,000 students, faculty, and staff (30th Anniversary Speech [August 1998]).

Although the events stemming from Charles Whitman's reign of terror were devastating, another incident on May 4, 1970, at Kent State University in Ohio will forever mark the incredible violence between the students of the time and the government establishment. Kent State, like many other colleges and universities, was victim to student demonstrations on campus. The Vietnam War, racial issues, and civil rights issues along with a myriad of social concerns led many students on college campuses to protests, sit-ins, takeovers of campus administration buildings, or protests marches. On May 4, 1970, students gathered on the Kent State University campus to demonstrate against America's involvement in the Vietnam War. The campus police along with local police had been unable to contain an April 30 demonstration, and the mayor of Kent requested that the governor of Ohio mobilize the National Guard, and the Guard was dispatched to Kent State. On Saturday May 1, 1970, the Guard arrived at Kent State and in the next 36 hours several small conflicts took place. On Monday May 4, the Ohio National Guard opened fire on the students. When the shooting was over four students were dead and nine wounded (Bills 1988, 16-17). This incident will forever live as a pivotal point in the history of the United States and of university policing.

Powell described the effects on university policing that followed the incidents at Kent State:

Suddenly an urgent cry arose from presidents and other top college and university administrators for professional security departments able to relate to the campus environment and prevent and control student problems. The overall philosophy, learned from sometimes bitter experience, was that the institution must control these situations on campus with its own per-

Continued on page 24

sonnel rather than call in outside police agencies . . . Campus security during the late 1960s and early 1970s had to evolve to meet students problems. Therefore, it emphasized a low-key but highly professional approach, using well-trained officers who were either enrolled in college degree programs or who had already achieved degrees.

By the 1970s, heads of university security departments, with proven skills in this unique style of policing, were in high demand. Colleges and universities often competed for these proven, degree-holding security directors. The directors, who previously reported to the heads of the physical plant or grounds department were now being placed under the supervision of the president or a vice president of the university. Salaries and fringe benefits were brought more in line with faculty and administrators' salaries and benefits. The working environment of the security forces improved during this period as their offices were brought out of the basements and placed in new facilities with modern equipment (Powell, Pander and Nielsen 1994, 7).

The security departments, being responsive to the needs and desires of the university and its students, dressed their officers in a softer style of clothing, blazers and slacks, used unmarked squad cars, and changed their title from police officer to public safety officer. All of these improvements portrayed a softer image to the students and were intended to enhance communications with the university community (Powell, Pander and Nielsen 1994, 7-8).

As the 1970s drew to a close so did the era of student dissent. The focus of the new public safety departments shifted from campus unrest and demonstrations to the issue of crime on campus. *Time* magazine published an article in 1973 that highlighted this change in focus from student demonstrations to assaults, armed robberies and rapes. A fifty percent increase in crime over a two-year period was reported by the executive secretary of the International Association of College and University Security Directors (Walker,

1976, 37). Powell (1994) also noted that campus policing had a new focus: escalating crime, threats to personal safety, and terrorism.

The courts began to hold institutions of higher education increasingly responsible for protective services as students and their parents began demanding adequate security for the campus. Lawsuits were on the rise, and as one university president put it, "I feel responsible for the safety and well-being of my university city, and the people who study, work, and reside here" (Powell, Pander and Nielsen, 1994, 8). "Campus law enforcement will be called upon in the future for greater accountability. Parents are demanding safer campuses and want to know about the campus law enforcement program. The public will expect each campus administration to provide well-trained officers, professional management, and effective service. Law enforcement administrators will be called upon to assist their department and make the adjustment necessary to accommodate public expectation" (McAuliffe 1990, 12).

The courts agreed, a university is responsible for the safety and security of its campus. Courts have repeatedly held that there are legal duties upon a college or university to provide a reasonably safe and secure environment. If the university fails to perform an action that a prudent person would have performed, the university is liable. The negligent act may be intentional, unintentional but with the university at fault, or with fault on the university's part (Bickel 1988, 8-1). As colleges and universities are held to a higher standard of care, it is only reasonable to depend upon qualified professionals in key areas to protect the students, faculty, staff, and guests from harm. It only followed that prudent university administrators shielded the university from civil litigation by having qualified, trained professionals in its police departments.

The courts were not the only ones holding colleges and universities to a higher standard of care. In 1990 the U.S. Congress passed the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act. The legislation was a direct result of the percep-

tions that colleges and universities were not properly reporting crimes occurring on campus, and parents wanted to know security measures on campus. Prior to this time, barring any court action, there were no consequences for colleges and universities not correctly reporting crimes and security measures on their campuses.

Many colleges and universities in the United States did not participate in the Uniform Crime Reporting system operated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. If crime statistics were available there were no standardized reporting procedures. The Congress tied federal financial aid money to its legislation requiring the recording and dissemination of information. Therefore, if a college or university violated the provision of the act it could lose all federal financial aid.

Section 485(f) of the Higher Education Act specifically states: "Each eligible institution participating in any program under this title shall on August 1, 1991, begin to collect the following information with respect to campus crime statistics and campus security policies of that institution, and beginning September 1, 1992, and each year thereafter, prepare, publish, and distribute, through appropriate publication or mailings, to all current students and employees, and to any applicant for enrollment or employment upon request, an annual security report containing at least the following information with respect to the campus security policies and campus crime statistics of that institution" (Campus Security Act, 20 U.S.C. Sec. 1092(f)).

The legislation went on to identify the areas of campus policies for reporting criminal acts or other emergencies, statements of policies on security and access to campus facilities, a statement of current policies concerning the law enforcement agency of the institution, informational programs, and statistics on certain offenses.

This legislation is undoubtedly one of the most influential factors in university policing in the last decade of the twentieth century. The legislation shows Congress' concern for crime and safety on America's college campuses. U.S. Repre-

Continued on page 25

University Policing: Its Origins and Development

Continued from page 24

sentative Augustus Hawkins of California, a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, stated his concerns this way:

There was a time when a college campus was considered to be a sanctuary, a place where teaching, learning, and social exchange took place in an environment that posed minimal danger to the personal safety of the campus community. However, as with society in general, crime on campus has escalated from an infrequent occurrence to a subject of major concern for the higher education community.

This places college and university campuses in a unique situation. If they fail to comply with the provisions of the Clery legislation, the institution stands to lose millions of dollars in federal funding. In addition, as previously stated, universities and colleges are held to a higher standard of care in being reasonably prudent in preventing criminal acts. Therefore, colleges and universities face a double-edged sword—if they fail to perform certain duties directed toward the protection of the public, and from the courts in civil action. Many states, such as Illinois, have specific legislation that protects cities and counties from litigation for not enforcing certain laws unless the action is willful and wanton (745 ILCS 2-202 and 725 ILCS 2-205). In addition, as city and county police agencies are not landlords for the city or county, they do not have a specific established duty in the protection of persons in the city or county, as the duty placed upon a college or university.

College campuses are no longer cloistered communities where free speech and intellectual thought are encouraged by everyone on the campus. Campuses are now open, thriving communities within themselves. Most college campuses encourage involvement from the surrounding community, with few walls separating the campus from the town. "College and university campuses became prime targets from criminals who realized that a campus population was made up of mostly young people who have little concern for security or crime and administrators whose main interest was education,

not protection or enforcement of the law. Therefore, many undesirables invaded college campuses to steal, rob, deal in drugs, and commit sexual assaults" (Powell, Pander and Nielsen, 1994, 9).

University policing has evolved from proctors in dormitories, to night watchmen opening and closing doors along with student code enforcement, to sworn police officers patrolling the campuses of America. "Powell defines the proper role and function of a campus security department as 'difficult because the operation must be programmed to meet the needs and general attitudes of the campus it will serve.' However, the campus department must direct its efforts primarily at prevention and service to be successful" (Bess and Horton 1988, 35). Much like their counterparts in the municipal setting, university police departments must meet the needs of their communities. In the context of the historical development of university policing, the very beginning of policing on college campuses was a primitive form of community policing, while municipal police agencies are just now embracing the concept of being one with the community and facilitators of change.

About the Author

Keith Gebrand is currently a Captain with the Illinois State University Police Department supervising the Patrol Division. He has been with the Illinois State University Police since 1980 and has served in both the patrol and investigative units of the department. He holds a B.S. degree from Illinois State University and is currently working toward a Master of Science Degree in Criminal Justice. He is a graduate of the School of Police Staff and Command from Northwestern University Traffic Institute.

Bibliography

- August 1, 1966 [website]. Available at <http://www.cwri.litexas.edu/~eberly/330e/memorial/documents/august.html>
- Bess, William R. and Horton, G.R. "The Role of Campus Law Enforcement," *Campus Law Enforcement Journal*. July-August 1988, 35-36.
- Bickel, Robert D. *The College Administrator and the Courts*. Asheville, NC: College Administration Publications, 1988.

- Bills, Scott L. *Kent State/May: Echoes Through a Decade*. Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1988.
- Campus Security Act, 20 U.S.C. Sec. 1092 (f).
- Clingon, Johnny D. "The Process of Professionalization and the Implication for Policing." Master's thesis, Illinois State University, 1998.
- Commission of Accreditation of Law Enforcement Agencies. *Standards for Law Enforcement Agencies: The Standards Manual of the Law Enforcement Agency Accreditation Program*. Fairfax, Virginia: Commission of Accreditation of Law Enforcement Agencies, 1999.
- Dixon vs. Alabama State Board of Education, 294 F2 150 (1961).
- Dowls, R. Dan. Interview by Keith A. Gebrand, 18 May 1999.
- Esposito, D., and D. Stormer. "The Multiple Roles of Campus Law Enforcement," *Campus Law Enforcement Journal*. May-June 1989: 26-28.
- International Association of Chiefs of Police [website]. Available at <http://www.theiacp.org/about/history.html>
- McAuliffe, John C. "Campus Law Enforcement and IACLEA: Report of the 1989-1990 Advisory Committee," *Campus Law Enforcement Journal*, November - December 1990, 11-13.
- Pavalko, Ronald M., *Sociology of Occupations and Professions*. Itasca, IL: F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1988.
- Powell, John, Michael S. Pander, and Robert Nielsen. *Campus Security and Law Enforcement*. Newton, MA: Butterworth-Heinemann, 1994.
- 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.
- United States Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Campus Law Enforcement Agencies*, 1995. [Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, 1996].
- U.S. Department of Justice. *The Role of Campus Security in the College Setting* (December 1972), by Seymour Gelber, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Sourcebook 1997. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Justice, 1998.
- Walker, Samuel. *The Police in America, an Introduction*. Boston: McGraw-Hill. 1999.
- Walker, Sharon. "A Profile of Campus Police and Security Departments at Four-year Institutions of Higher Education in Illinois, Indiana, Michigan and Ohio." Ph.D. diss., Ohio State University, 1976.
- Whitman Shootings [website]. Available at <http://cwrl.utexas.edu/~eberly/330e/memorial/documents/intor.html>
- Young D. Parker, and Donald D. Gehring. *The College Student and the Courts*. Asheville, N.C.: College Administration Publications, 1988.