

COMMUNITY ORIENTED POLICING AND CAMPUS LAW ENFORCEMENT:

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

A LEARNING CONTRACT SUBMITTED TO

GRADUATE MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE

TEXAS COMMISSION ON LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS STANDARDS AND EDUCATION

BY

S. ERIC JACKSON

DENTON, TEXAS

SEPTEMBER, 1991

#112

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	1
<u>RESEARCH DESIGN</u>	3
<u>THE HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE</u>	5
Traditional Law Enforcement	5
Campus Law Enforcement	6
Community Oriented Policing	8
<u>FINDINGS</u>	10
Community Oriented Policing	10
Campus Policing	15
Traditional Law Enforcement	18
<u>ANALYSIS</u>	20
Community Oriented Policing and Traditional Law Enforcement	20
Traditional Policing and Campus Policing	23
Campus Police and Community Oriented Policing	24
<u>CONCLUSIONS</u>	26
<u>SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY</u>	28
<u>END NOTES</u>	30

INTRODUCTION

Law enforcement in the United States is a dynamic system that changes almost daily. Even during times of relative stability, law enforcement has not been static. Law enforcement is constantly adjusting to the latest court ruling, crime wave, or political dictate. Whether law enforcement is dealing with drugs, rioting or white collar crime, there are constant changes in the laws, in society and in law enforcement itself. Change is the one constant of which police officers can be certain.

Today, the system is again in a state of flux. The "war against crime" is being lost, and law enforcement officials nation wide are looking for ways to turn the tide of battle. The most popular law enforcement strategy today is something called Community Oriented Policing. Perhaps this strategy is the greatest law enforcement strategy to come along; perhaps it is a classic example of the fable of the emperor's new clothes. Advocates of Community Oriented Policing really have something; possibly they are all running around naked.

Only time will tell if Community Oriented Policing is the answer to law enforcement's problems. Right now it is the hot topic, and everyone is trying to find some way to make it work for them; from Chief Reuben Greenberg in South Carolina to Superintendent Chris Braiden in Montreal. Many police executives are investing considerable resources in Community Oriented Policing.

Campus Law Enforcement is jumping on the Community Oriented Policing bandwagon as well. Major universities are now adopting Community Oriented Policing programs. Many of these programs are modeled after those developed in

municipal areas and are reportedly very effective.

This paper is a review of Community Oriented Policing and Campus Policing. It is the opinion of this writer that Campus Policing in many locations has operated from the Community Oriented Policing Strategy. This paper explores that hypothesis. It compares Community Oriented Policing and Campus Policing, against the background or standard of traditional or conventional policing.

RESEARCH DESIGN

This paper is designed to compare Campus Policing and Community Oriented Policing. The primary purpose of the paper is to determine if there are similarities between Campus Policing and Community Oriented Policing. It is this author's belief that the basic model of Campus Policing is very similar to the accepted model of Community Oriented Policing. A secondary purpose of the paper is to examine the question of the direction Campus Law Enforcement is taking. It is also this author's belief that Campus Law Enforcement has attempted to emulate municipal agencies to the detriment of their real purpose and mission. The change many are now making to Community Oriented Policing is actually a reversion to the original campus model.

The actual research for the paper consists primarily of a literature review. Traditional law enforcement, Campus Policing and Community Oriented Policing have been subjects of thousands of articles, hundreds of books and a great deal of research. The challenge is not in finding literature dealing with these topics, the challenge is determining which publications might contain useful data.

In addition to the literature survey, two other information sources were utilized. Interviews with police professionals provided some data, and there was an opportunity to attend some workshops and seminars on both Community Oriented Policing and Campus Policing. This portion of the research proved invaluable.

The findings of this research are presented in the remainder of this paper. The first portion of the paper provides historical perspectives for Traditional

Law Enforcement, Campus Policing and Community Oriented Policing. This review is important to understanding the findings detailed later in the paper. Findings for each area of concern are presented separately, and then in a comparative ed separately, and then in a comparative format that will illustrate the differences and the similarities between traditional law enforcement, Campus Policing and Community Oriented Policing.

THE HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

This section provides a brief historical overview of Campus Policing, traditional law enforcement and Community Oriented Policing. While all of these subjects are related, they each have a specific history.

Traditional Law Enforcement

In the early 19th century, police departments, as they are known today did not exist. Many of the activists associated with police officers today were conducted by citizens themselves or the military. As times changed and the problems of the urban environment became more complex, the need for a civilian police authority grew. In 1829, Sir Robert Peel established the first modern police department in London. This police force was the model for the first police forces in the United States.¹

These early police agencies were based on fundamental principles that were easily recognized by the community. In effect, the police simply worked full time doing things a good citizen did when he had time.² Specifically, the early police departments performed many of the following functions:³

1. controlling alcoholics, inebriates, vagrants, the disorderly and the homeless.
2. controlling gambling, prostitution, and other forms of vice.
3. controlling riots, disturbances and crowds.
4. watching for fires.
5. maintaining basic public health standards in the streets and other common areas.
6. inspecting businesses, taverns and lodging houses.

7. licensing peddlers, transportation for hire and other forms of commerce. For the next hundred years or so, the police role in society changed very little. It was not until the 1950s or 1960s that the police became known as crime fighters.⁴ However, when the image changed it changed drastically.

Today, police officers do not see themselves as public servants. They see themselves as law enforcement professionals, with limited responsibility, if any,

in several of the areas Peel identified as their function. Officers will still report a fire, but very few officers worry about health standards or commercial licensing.

Campus Law Enforcement

In most areas, Campus Law Enforcement did not exist until the late 1960s or early 1970s. Campus Law Enforcement came about due to the problems experienced on college and university campuses during the Vietnam War. In many ways the evolution of campus police agencies paralleled the development of the original police forces. Problems on campus were caused by the rapid growth of the campuses during the Vietnam War period, and the existing systems were not capable of coping with these problems. However, for the purposes of this paper, the pre-Vietnam history of Campus Law Enforcement is more important than the period of the 1960s.

Historically, the first campus police department was formed at Yale in 1894.⁵ However, the need for police on campus was almost non-existent until the 1960s. The Yale department was formed to deal with some specific "town vs. gown"

problems.⁶ At other institutions, functions performed by today's campus police departments were either not a problem or were handled by an existing entity.

The origin of Campus Law Enforcement is a little unclear. It appears campus police departments can trace their roots to several different areas of a campus, depending on the way the needs of the campus evolved. Some departments evolved from night watchmen programs. Others came from physical plant/maintenance programs. Still others are directly descended from the university president's office. Regardless of their roots, the primary concerns of campus police departments were physical security, emergency services, student conduct and other non-law enforcement functions. As time progressed and campus populations grew, these departments evolved into security departments that included physical security and other duties. Law enforcement needs were minimal, and were normally performed by the local police authority.⁷

The unrest of the Vietnam era radically changed the perceived security needs on campus. The ability to make arrests, carry weapons, and other considerations caused many institutions to establish "police departments." The difference between these departments and previous organizations was the addition of police powers. Many other duties were the same. Physical security was still a major concern and the collegial atmosphere was a very important consideration.⁸

Today, most campus police departments are very similar to municipal police departments. They may have different priorities and levels of activity, but they provide the same services to the campus that municipal agencies provide to their cities.⁹

Community Oriented Policing

Community Oriented Policing is the hot topic in law enforcement today. Recognized leaders in the field such as Lee Brown, Commissioner of Police in New York City, and Chris Braiden, Superintendent of Police in Edmonton, Alberta, feel it is the answer to many problems faced by law enforcement today. Other experts such as Dr. Gary Sykes, Director of the Southwestern Law Enforcement Association,

and Dr. Larry Hoover, Sam Houston State University, advise caution in embracing Community Oriented Policing. The reasons for this disparity in feelings are not simply a matter of viewpoint. The concept of Community Oriented Policing is a difficult one to grasp in some ways, and this is apparent in its history and definition.

One major problem is deciding where it came from. Some practitioners feel it is little more than the reemergence of team policing. While it has some similarities to team policing, there are differences. The one major difference seems to be the idea that Community Oriented Policing is an orientation or philosophy, and not just another strategy or program.¹⁰ It seems to be a different way of looking at law enforcement, at least if you can believe people like Superintendent Braiden and Reuben Greenberg. It is a problem oriented approach to solving community problems that result in criminal activity. If this definition or hypothesis is correct, Community Oriented Policing seems to have its roots in Herman Goldstein's philosophy of problem oriented policing.¹¹ Of course there are also elements of order maintenance practices and similar programs or philosophies.

For the purposes of this paper, it should be sufficient to say Community

Oriented Policing is any form of policing in which police response or activity is placed on community perceptions or desires, and has a problem oriented approach to law enforcement.

"based on" (?)

FINDINGS

As mentioned previously, the literature on law enforcement, Campus Law Enforcement and Community Oriented Policing is extensive. Unfortunately, much of it is of little direct use. Bordner and Peterson, during their research on Campus Law Enforcement found that much of the literature was opinion or simple reporting on specific situations and programs. A similar charge can be leveled at researchers dealing with traditional law enforcement. Experimental research in the area of law enforcement has been relatively limited. Only a few field studies have taken place, and in many cases the results either cannot be or have not been replicated. Statistical studies are common, but broad scale experiments with different strategies and programs are scarce. This made the task of researching this paper more difficult, but not impossible. The timeliness of at least two workshops on the topic of Community Oriented Policing helped clarify the issue. This section contains a review of the findings made during this study.

Community Oriented Policing

Community Oriented Policing on and off campus is alive and well in the United States and Canada. The diversity of the programs or operations called Community Oriented Policing makes a model difficult to develop, but a very

general model can be postulated. One such model was proposed during the seminar titled "Contemporary Issues in Police Administration - the Pros and Cons of Community Oriented Policing: A National Debate."¹² The model was developed by the Ministry of the Solicitor General in Canada in 1986, and it seems to agree with the findings of this researcher. Part of this model is presented in the Appendix of this paper. Specific excerpts will be used for comparative purposes later in this paper.

In summary, the model identifies Community Oriented Policing as having the goal of community order, peace and security. Police authority within the Community Oriented Policing philosophy is derived from society and the community. The role of the police is socially defined, and officers are "peacekeeping professionals." There are numerous other elements, but repeating all of them now would make other sections of the report redundant. Suffice it to say that Community Oriented Policing departments are involved, proactive, innovative and more political than police under the traditional model. Police organizations are more open, less bureaucratic and decentralized under the Community Oriented Policing philosophies. Specialization is kept to a minimum and participative management is the rule of the day.

Individual examples of Community Oriented Policing are numerous, and well reported. Cities as large as Houston and New York have programs that can be classified as Community Oriented Policing. Cities as small as Denton, Texas have programs that are called Community Oriented Policing. Campuses such as Michigan State University¹³ and Virginia Commonwealth University¹⁴ claim to be involved in Community Oriented Policing. The diversity of these operations, philosophies or strategies illustrate one of the problems when dealing with the Community

Oriented Policing concept.

For comparative purposes, this paper will briefly review three programs. The purpose of the review will be to illustrate the diversity possible in Community Oriented Policing. The programs summarized will be Denton, Texas' operation, Charleston, South Carolina's drug dealer intervention program and Michigan State University's satellite office operation.

Denton, Texas

The Community Oriented Policing program in Denton is the work of Chief Mike Jez. Faced with a no growth budget and escalating problems in a predominantly black neighborhood, Chief Jez chose to implement a Community Oriented Policing program to deal with the problem. The program started by soliciting citizen input via community meetings. After meeting with the citizens for some time and identifying the perceived needs of the community, a supervisor and several officers were assigned to the area. The program included a satellite office in a neighborhood community center. Working with the citizens and the rest of city government, some crime was suppressed in the area.

Crime was suppressed by following tips provided by the community, aggressive action against crimes that the community identified concerns for the department and a change in some existing ordinances. The result was the displacement of some of the criminal element to other areas of the city. The center of the program area is an area of apartment buildings, occupied by low income families, minorities, college students and foreign nationals (legal and illegal residents). This program progressed in a fashion similar to the first one, but this program included extensive foot patrol and bicycle patrol. This

program is still new enough that its degree of success or failure cannot be assessed. Preliminary response from the community, however, is good.

Charleston, S.C.

The Charleston Community Oriented Policing program was discussed by Chief Reuben Greenberg during the contemporary issues forum mentioned earlier. Chief Greenberg, his department and the community were dealing with a serious drug problem. Street corner pushers were taking over different areas of the city. Arresting them was an exercise in futility, so Charleston looked for an innovative approach to the problem.

Working with the community, the courts, the American Civil Liberties Union and anyone else that would help address the issue, Chief Greenberg's department developed a plan to make drug dealing less profitable for the street level dealer. They assigned a number of officers to foot patrol in high crime areas, specifically the areas occupied by dealers. The officers simply stationed themselves in the proximity of the dealer, and observed. The dealers customers went to other locations and eventually the dealer moved. Few, if any arrests were made, but Charleston was able to eliminate this sort of crime and the crimes associated with drugs from several areas of the city. Dealing drugs was simply no longer profitable.

Michigan State University

Michigan State University's police department developed a Community Oriented Policing program that is derivative of a municipal program model used

in several areas. Dr. Bruce Benson, Director of Public Safety at MSU instituted the program with him when he assumed the post of director. Dr. Benson discussed his program at the 1991 International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators Conference in July, 1991.

The MSU program consists of six satellite offices situated within six campus districts. An officer is assigned to each office, and is in effect a one officer police department. The officer has the authority to deal with anything the students, faculty or staff want dealt with in that area. They operate on a first name basis with their clients, and are charged with finding innovative ways to deal with problems discovered or brought to them. The officers may handle routine calls, but the rest of the department's officers normally handle regular calls. The Community officers concentrate on non-routine matters.

As an example, Dr. Benson cited one program developed by an officer whose client group includes housing for the families of international students. During the Gulf War the children in this area were afraid of retaliation or harassment from other children. The officer assigned to this area set up self defense training for the children, working with them and making them safe and secure.

All of the programs mentioned previously are considered Community Oriented Policing programs by their originators. As far as this writer can tell, the programs meet the most widely accepted criteria for Community Oriented Policing programs. However, each is different in some ways. Denton's program relies heavily on aggressive enforcement of the laws that are a concern of the community. As an observer of this program, this writer feels any problem solving that has been done by the police department has been through law enforcement. Increased police presence, community relations, one on one informal contacts with the community and a tailored response to crime are the tactics used by

Denton. There has been little, if any, problem solving in a more non-traditional sense. A group of Denton police officers did set up an athletic league as a diversionary juvenile delinquency program, but there have not been many non-law enforcement responses to the problems in Denton.

Charleston took a non-traditional approach, in that arrests are not the object of the program. Low-key intimidation of the dealer's customers is the tactic being used here. While it is a departure from traditional police activities, it is not very new. Vice units have used similar tactics to address prostitution problems in a number of cities. This approach simply did not involve arresting the john.

MSU's approach is different as well. Without trying to be critical, this writer received the distinct impression the MSU program is an example of what some call "feel good policing." The public feels good about the program and the department. They perceive the situation as being better, so they are more satisfied with the department. No dramatic decreases in criminal activity were reported by Dr. Benson, in fact he indicated there had been some increase. The purpose of reviewing these programs was to illustrate the diversity of what we are calling Community Oriented Policing. There does not seem to be a clear cut definition of Community Oriented Policing. Even the model mentioned previously contains broad statements that are open to diverse interpretations. However, it is possible to discuss this topic and compare Community Oriented Policing to other systems, in spite of the lack of concise definition.

Campus Policing

The literature on Campus Policing is abundant. However, as mentioned

previously it is not very informative in some ways. Most of the literature on Campus Policing consists of essays, opinion, reports on "what we've done" and "how to" articles. One problem is the diversity of Campus Law Enforcement agencies. The diversity makes meaningful research difficult. An unpublished survey conducted by this author in 1987 illustrated this diversity. While most of the agencies contacted called themselves police departments, the structure, range of services and responsibilities reported in the survey varied in significant ways.¹⁵

For example, the chief of police, director of public safety or assistant vice president heading a police/security agency might report to anyone of several different types of administrator. One might report to the Vice President for Student Affairs, another to the Dean of Students, another to the Physical Plant Director and another to the Director of Business Services. In each of these cases the orientation of the department will be a little different. Another factor is the structure of the department itself. Some departments are strictly police. Some departments are strictly security. Other departments are both police and security. Some have parking responsibilities, and some do not. All of these factors affect the mission, operation and effectiveness of a campus police department.

Bordner and Peterson's research referenced earlier found diversity to be a problem as well. But, conclusions can be reached and a broad theoretical model of Campus Policing can be defined. As with Community Oriented Policing, a summary of the model is offered below. A more detailed model can be found in the Appendix.

Campus Policing as it exists today in most areas appears to be oriented toward crime suppression. The goal of Campus Policing is to maintain an orderly

campus. This is accomplished by the enforcement of rules, regulations and applicable laws. Campus Policing is service oriented policing. Almost all campus departments of any size offer a number of non-police services to the community. These include escorts, motorist assistance, special security services and similar services that a "traditional" police agency does not perform. Many campus police agencies also operate other activities such as shuttle bus and parking programs. However, these programs are normally separated in some fashion from the enforcement function.

Campus police departments are very political. Campus police departments are expected in many instances to often mediate or solve non-law enforcement problems on campus. This is not demonstrated in the literature as much as in the type of training offered through organizations such as the International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators and in comparing problems with other administrators. Campus police departments and administrators are called upon to handle many problems that cannot be decided by opening up a penal code or book of regulations. Negotiation and diplomacy are regular weapons in a campus department's arsenal.

For example, consider building security. A municipal police agency and a campus police agency have some responsibility for building security. However, actually being responsible for locking and unlocking buildings would probably not be an expectation of many municipal agencies. On the other hand a campus department is one of several logical places to look for this sort of service. It is not, in the opinion of many Campus Law Enforcement practitioners, the right place to provide this service, but it is a logical choice. Negotiating a reasonable way to deal with this sort of request can be very delicate and political. It can also be very serious. The courts have held that a campus

police chief or director of security has direct responsibility for security on campus. A municipal chief is not directly responsible for individual criminal acts, but a campus chief has a special relationship to the university community. A campus chief can be held responsible for crimes committed on campus, under certain circumstances.

Traditional Law Enforcement

The traditional law enforcement model is fairly well defined. In summary, the traditional law enforcement model is an agency that is reactive, receives its authority from the law, is non-political and is somewhat isolated from the community. The chart below illustrates some of the major characteristics of the traditional model, and compares them to characteristics of Community Oriented Policing and Campus Law Enforcement. Portions of this chart will be referred to in the remainder of this paper.

A Comparative Analysis of Contemporary Police Models:¹⁶

<u>PHILOSOPHY</u>	<u>TRADITIONAL L.E.</u>	<u>COMMUNITY POLICING</u>	<u>CAMPUS POLICING</u>
1. <u>POLICE MANDATE</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Control of crime - response, deterrence, apprehension - Law Enforcement - Crisis Response 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Community order, peace and security - crime control as a means - Preventive as well as reactive policing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Campus order, peace and security - law enforcement and disciplinary actions as means of control - Preventive as well as reactive policing
2. <u>POLICE AUTHORITY</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Authority from law - Agency of the Criminal Justice System 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Authority from society, community granted through law - Agency of municipal government and community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Authority primarily from faculty and staff granted through regulations and law¹⁷ - Agency of the university administration and community
3. <u>POLICE ROLE</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Legally defined/limited by law - Distinct and separate - Professional-crime fighting - Law enforcement officers - Crime alone 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Socially defined, expanded role - Legal and social agencies - Crime and social problems that impact on crime - One of a number of agencies of order 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Environmentally defined - Legal, educational and social agencies - Peacekeeping/educational professionals - Crime and environmental problems that impact on crime

4. COMMUNITY-POLICE RELATIONSHIP

- | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|
| - Passive role | - Active role - policy | - Active role, involved in policy making |
| - Supportive and adjunct to police | - Shared responsibility for crime and social order | - Shared responsibility for crime and social order |
| | - Community as a client | - Community member, community as client |

5 POLITICS

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| - Police must be a-political | - Police as political, mediate interests | - Police as political, mediate interests and take advocacy role |
| - Police alone manage mandate | - Responsible to community and political representatives | - Responsible to community and governing board |
| - Separation of police and political issues | - Policy and operational accounting | - Totally accountable |
| - Fiscal accountability only | | |

There is some disagreement over the traditional model. When someone speaks of traditional law enforcement we automatically think of modern municipal agencies. Police officers riding around in police cars, answering calls, and catching crooks. The previous discussion on the history of traditional law enforcement contained some information to the contrary. What is considered traditional law enforcement today is actually the latest evolution of law enforcement. It is the model developed in response to a perceived need for police reform. It is the model formalized by teaching and writing in the 1960s when texts like Municipal Police Administration were published. It is not the same law enforcement practiced in the 19th and early 20th centuries.

ANALYSIS

This part of the paper will analyze some of the specific findings made during the research. It will include a comparison between traditional law enforcement, Community Oriented Policing and Campus Law Enforcement.

Community Oriented Policing and Traditional Law Enforcement

Superintendent Chris Braiden presented a paper entitled "Nothing New Under the Sun" during the contemporary issues seminar referenced earlier. In this paper he argues Community Oriented Policing is simply a return to the principles first established by Sir Robert Peel. He argues his case strongly, and it makes a good deal of sense. Departments practicing Community Oriented Policing are performing many functions similar to those performed in the early days of modern law enforcement. They are solving non-police problems with the goal of impacting police problems.

An example of this was discussed by Bruce Benson during his presentation of MSU's Community Oriented Policing program. One of the community officers in his previous department was trying to address juvenile delinquency related problems in a different and innovative fashion. He used the strategy of taking a large group of kids at a time to the movie. He promoted a bus and a special deal with the theatre so this could happen. After the movie, and before the juveniles got off the bus, he would spend time with them discussing juvenile problems and other

topics of interest to them and the community. The idea was to interact and divert the juveniles, before they became a problem. This sort of program would not happen in most departments, it is simply not "police work!"

This story also illustrates another point of difference between Community Oriented Policing and traditional policing. The officer's plan worked marvelously until the theatre changed hands. One day the officer took the juveniles to the show, allowed them to enter and then found the theatre's policy had changed. Instead of Pinocchio, he took them to see The Erotic Adventures of Pinocchio. The reaction of the parents and the community were understandable, and in many agencies the officer would have been severely reprimanded. In this case he wasn't. The agency empowered him to make mistakes, and this is an essential part of the Community Oriented Policing philosophy. It is also one of the bigger stumbling blocks for this sort of program. Agency heads and city governments are understandably reluctant to allow this sort of freedom. In the example cited previously, the city might be held civilly accountable for the actions of the officer.

A department following this philosophy must support the officers charged with the task of developing the programs. Ownership is important to Community Oriented Policing, and ownership cannot be achieved if every decision has to be approved by the boss. The officer accepted the responsibility for his actions and learned from his mistake, at least according to Dr. Benson. Another example from this program is the officer that set up the self defense courses. His purpose was to make the children feel more secure. He taught them to defend themselves, and he taught them how to avoid needing to defend themselves. If one of them later used the martial arts to beat up another child, the department could find itself in a difficult position. Traditional wisdom might say, "Don't

teach these kids to fight."

What these examples and this discussion illustrates is some basic differences in Community Oriented Policing and what is viewed as traditional law enforcement. The excerpts from Appendix A below help illustrate this point.

According to the model, the police role for traditional law enforcement and Community Oriented Police Departments include:

Traditional

- Legally defined/limited by law
- Distinct and separate
- Professional-crime fighting
- Law enforcement officers
- Crime alone

Community

- Socially defined, expanded role
- Legal and social agencies
- Peacekeeping professionals
- Crime and social problems that impact on crime
- One of a number of agencies of order

Community-Police Relationships were described as follows:

Traditional

- Passive role
- Supportive and adjunct to police

Community

- Active role-Policy
- Shared responsibility for crime and social order
- Community as client

Traditional Policing and Campus Policing

Walk into many campus police departments today and you would be hard pressed to tell you weren't in Municipal P.D., U.S.A.. The one exception would be the lack of a jail. Of course, many smaller municipal agencies don't have jails either. You would find uniformed police officers, marked police cars, criminal investigation units, crime prevention units and all the other trappings of a modern police department. Many campus departments handle the city's crimes. There are departments that are simply security departments, and some that are hybrids. However, this paper will concentrate on the "police" departments.

There are differences between campus and traditional police departments. The easiest to identify is the security component of the department. Physical security is a major concern for campus police departments. There are other differences as well. One is political activity. Traditional agencies are non-political, for the most part. On the other hand campus departments are political animals. In this writer's opinion, and the opinions of some other Campus Law Enforcement administrators, the relative short history of campus "law enforcement" is partially to blame. City administrators have learned to keep police departments as neutral as possible. Campus administrators on the other hand often consider the campus police as little more than another department of the university. This can lead to extremely delicate and politically sensitive situations. A university president would not hesitate to direct a campus police officer or department to obey his interpretation of a law. A city manager would know better.

The police mandate is different on campus as well. The model developed by the Ministry of the Solicitor General lists the following elements of the police

mandate:

- Control of crime - response, deterrence, apprehension
- Law enforcement
- Crisis Response

Based on this review and this writer's experience, the campus police mandate is:

- Promoting education by maintaining order and security on campus
- Reactive and proactive responses to criminal activity
- Providing public services to the university community

No matter how hard campus police try to cultivate the "real cop" image, the special requirements of the job make the roles different.

Campus Police and Community Oriented Policing

Campus Policing has some of the elements of traditional policing. It also has some elements in common with Community Oriented Policing. As indicated previously, it is politically active. The politics of the campus are extremely important to getting the job done. It is also a socially defined agency, whether Campus Law Enforcement administrators or line personnel want to admit it. In the real world of Campus Law Enforcement, a police department must be responsive to the university community. The law may define its authority and jurisdiction, but the faculty, staff and students have a great deal of say in the operation and orientation of the department. For example, physical security is a major concern for all campus police agencies. One element of physical security is normally foot patrol and identification of people using buildings after hours, even controlling access after hours. As many campus police officers know, this will only be possible if the faculty is supportive and cooperative. Officers or departments

that aggressively pursue strict security policies are totally ineffective if faculty leaders oppose the efforts.

In a very real sense, campus police departments consciously or unconsciously provide exactly the services the community wants. This is another element of Community Oriented Policing, and can be seen in any program that approaches the Community Oriented Policing model. A department that fails to be sensitive to community concerns will find itself with new administrator in a very short time.

CONCLUSIONS

As a result of this study, several conclusions can be reached. The easiest is the need for further scientific research in the area of Campus Law Enforcement. Objective research into the differences between Campus Law Enforcement and traditional law enforcement would be appropriate. Research into the specific role of campus police in different environments might be another area of interest. There are only three or four studies of Campus Law Enforcement and their utility is questionable.¹⁸ The other conclusions are less clear and open to argument.

It is the conclusion of this writer that Campus Policing is a form of Community Oriented Policing. It is also the conclusion of this writer that this is happenstance and not design. It may be the composition and power of the client group served by Campus Law Enforcement, or the result of the relatively brief history of Campus Law Enforcement. Modern Campus Law Enforcement is less than thirty years old. It has not had enough time to evolve away from its origins. The security, night watch, physical plant ties are still very strong. This makes Campus Law Enforcement more amenable to non-law enforcement solutions to problems. The campus environment helps by keeping problem solving as a viable strategy for dealing with crimes.

Another conclusion that can be drawn from this study is that Campus Law Enforcement has tried to emulate the traditional policing model. In many cases individual departments have been successful, to the detriment of the university

community and the department. This writer contributed to this situation with a 1984 article entitled "Campus Cops or Real Police." The purpose of the article was to illustrate how closely campus departments approximated traditional police agencies. This and similar articles by other writers were well intentioned attempts to improve the image of campus police operations. It is ironic that this was probably the wrong approach to take. Campus Policing should probably be a community service agency with law enforcement powers. Law enforcement is probably not the primary role of campus departments, just like it is probably not the primary role of future police agencies. Problem solving by non-law enforcement methods appears to be the future of law enforcement.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bell, John, and Barbara Burke. "Cruising Cooper Street". The Police Chief 56) Jan. 1986): 26.
- Brown, Lee P. "A Police Department and Its Values." The Police Chief 52 (June 1985): 21-24.
- Brown, Lee P. "A Direction for Police Operations." The Police Chief 52 (June 1985): 21-24.
- Cahn, Michael, and James M. Tein. An Alternative Approach in Police Response: Wilmington Management of Demand Study. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1981.
- Carlson, Wayne R. "Community Policing at Virginia Commonwealth University: Designing Strategies For a Campus Environment." Campus Law Enforcement Journal 21 July/August (1991): 22-25.
- Cordner, Gary. "A Problem Oriented Approach to Community Oriented Policing." in Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality?, eds. Jack R. Greene and Stephen D. Mastrofski. New York: Praeger, 1988.
- Davis, Kenneth Culp. "An Approach to Legal Control of the Police." Texas Law Review 52(1974): 703-725.
- Davis, Kenneth Culp. Police Discretion. St. Paul, Minn.: West Publishing Co. 1974.
- Federal, R. Keegan, and Jennifer Fogleman, eds. Avoiding Liability in Premises Security. Atlanta, Stafford Publications, Inc. 1989.
- Eck, John E., and William Spelman. "Who Ya Gonna Call? The Police as Problem Busters." Crime and Delinquency 33 (1987): 31-52.
- Goldstein, Herman. "Police Discretion: The Ideal versus the real." Public Administration Review 23 (1963): 140-148.
- Goldstein, Herman. Problem Oriented Policing. New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing Company, 1990.
- Goldstein, Herman. Policing a Free Society. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger. 1977.
- Goldstein, Herman. "Improving Policing: A Problem-Oriented Approach." Crime and Delinquency 25 (1979): 236-258.
- Greene, Jack R., and Stephen Mastrofski, eds. Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality. New York: Praeger. 1988.

- Higdon, Richard, and Phillip G. Huber. How to Fight Fear: the Citizen Oriented Police Enforcement Program Package. Washington, D.C.: Police Executive Research Executive Forum. 1987.
- Hutchins, Terry. "The Role of Law Enforcement on Campus - Student Courts? Jail? Both?" Campus Law Enforcement Journal 21 March-april (1991): 16-19.
- Jackson, S. Eric. "Campus Police or Real Cops." Campus Law Enforcement Journal 14. November-December (1984): 5-7.
- Kelling, George L.. "Order Maintenance, the Quality of Urban Life, and Police: A Different Line of Argument." in Police Leadership in America: Crisis and Opportunity, ed. William A. Geller. Chicago: American Bar Foundation and Praeger Publishers, 1985.
- Klockars, Carl B. "Street Justice: Some Micro-Moral Reservations: Comment on Sykes." Justice Quarterly 3 (1986): 45-81.
- Shaffer, Dale. Public Safety Organization and Management Guide for the Campus. Glenview, IL., Public Safety Management 1987.
- Stern, Gary. "Community Policing Six Years Later: What have we learned?" Law and Order 39. May (1991): 52-54.
- Vaughan, Jerald. "Community Oriented Policing...You can make it happen." Law and Order 39 June (1991): 35-39.

END NOTES

1. Robert Sheehan and Gary W. Cordner, Introduction to Police Administration (Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing Co. 1989), 48.
2. Superintendent Chris Braiden, Edmonton Police Department, in a paper presented at the Southwestern Law Enforcement Institute, March 21, 1991.
3. Sheehan, 48.
4. Ibid, 49.
5. Diane C. Bordner and David M. Petersen, Campus Policing (New York: University Press of America), ix.
6. Michael Clay Smith, Crime and Campus Police (College Administration Publications, Inc.), 1989.
7. Bordner, ix.
8. Ibid., xi.
9. S. Eric Jackson, "Campus Cops or REal Police," Campus Law Enforcement Journal 14, November-December 1984, 5-7.
10. This point was made by several writers, in both campus and traditional law enforcement. Braiden and Benson made it during their presentations.
11. Herman Goldstien, A Problem Oriented Approach to Policing (New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing Company, 1990).
12. Southwestern Law Enforcement Institute, March 20-22, 1991.
13. Dr. Bruce Benson, address to the International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators, Halifax, July, 1991.
14. Wayne R. Carlson, "Virginia Commonwealth University: Designing Strategies for A Campus Environment," Campus Law Enforcement Journal 21, July-August, 1991, 22-25.
15. Seventy one universities in forty three states were surveyed. Each reported over 10,000 students and reported criminal activity via the Uniform Crime Report.
16. This is a partial model comparison, based on Contemporary Models of Urban Policing: A Comparative Analysis developed by the Ministry of the Solicitor General for Canada, and a theoretical model developed by the author.

17. Students play a role in this factor, but the transient nature of their involvement with the campus community minimizes their influence. Essentially each new class raises the same issues raised by previous classes, requiring the permanent population to decide what is important.

18. Bordner, 3.