

Rowan University

## Rowan Digital Works

---

Theses and Dissertations

---

8-9-2011

### Involvement patterns: student involvement in the student community policing program at Rowan University

Stephanie Staple

Follow this and additional works at: <https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd>



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Staple, Stephanie, "Involvement patterns: student involvement in the student community policing program at Rowan University" (2011). *Theses and Dissertations*. 497.

<https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd/497>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Rowan Digital Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Rowan Digital Works. For more information, please contact [graduateresearch@rowan.edu](mailto:graduateresearch@rowan.edu).

INVOLVEMENT PATTERNS: STUDENT INVOLVEMENT IN THE STUDENT  
COMMUNITY POLICING PROGRAM AT ROWAN UNIVERSITY

by  
Stephanie Anne Staple

A Thesis

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the  
Master of Arts in Higher Education Administration  
of  
The Graduate School  
at  
Rowan University  
May 11, 2011

Thesis Chair: Burton R. Sisco, Ed.D.

© Stephanie Anne Staple

## ABSTRACT

Stephanie Anne Staple  
INVOLVEMENT PATTERNS: STUDENT INVOLVEMENT IN THE STUDENT  
COMMUNITY POLICING PROGRAM AT ROWAN UNIVERSITY  
2010/2011

Burton R. Sisco, Ed.D.  
Master of Arts in Higher Education Administration

The use of student development theories such as student involvement and student engagement has become extremely important to administrators and student affairs professionals in higher education; however, few have examined their use in the Department of Public Safety. The purpose of this study was to investigate the involvement patterns of students in the Student Community Policing Program (SCPP). The study also investigated the impact of student involvement in these programs on students' satisfaction with the Rowan University campus. The study was conducted at Rowan University, in Glassboro, New Jersey. The target population for this study was students at Rowan University during the academic year of 2010-2011. The instrument to assess students' levels and patterns of engagement at Rowan University was adapted from a survey of student involvement used by Ohio University.

An overall look at the responses dealing with student involvement levels and patterns of current student employees of SCPP at Rowan University indicated that student employees are generally involved on the Rowan University campus and with the program. A significant correlation was discovered during the analysis of the data involving involvement in specific activities. By a large majority, students at Rowan University were very involved in both academic and social activities. They reported a high level of satisfaction with their social involvement, academic atmosphere, campus atmosphere, and personal goal achievement.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Two and a half years ago, I put my life and Joe's life on hold to enroll in the Higher Education Administration program, and throughout this time I always knew this was a journey we both were taking. My best friend and my biggest fan, he encouraged, supported, and loved me at every moment. Thank you for your love, your understanding, and your flawless grammar editing. Without you, this study would not have been possible, nor would it be grammatically correct. This thesis is dedicated to him.

Many thanks go to my family, who quietly say by and let me complain about all the papers I had due and let it slide when I ignored doing the laundry for weeks on end. There are too many reasons for my gratitude and appreciation.

I would like to thank those closest to me, whose genuine friendship helped make the completion of this work and my graduate studies possible and bearable. To Gavin Farber, thank you for always keeping a positive force and assuring me that everything would be okay and everything would be finished. To Katie Grillo, thank you for letting me have a standing appointment in your office every week where I could come and talk about anything. I am so grateful to have met such a kind and thoughtful person. I am fortunate to call you a friend.

I am also deeply grateful to Dr. Burton R. Sisco for giving me the confidence to explore all of my research and educational interests and the guidance and encouragement to avoid letting my fears get the best of me. You have made more of a difference in my life than you could ever know and for that I am eternally thankful.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |      |
|---|------|
| Acknowledgments   | ii   |
| Appendixes  | v    |
| List of Tables  | vi   |
| CHAPTER   | PAGE |
| I. Introduction   | 1    |
| Statement of the Problem  | 1    |
| Purpose of the Study  | 2    |
| Significance of the Study   | 2    |
| Assumptions and Limitations   | 2    |
| Operational Definitions   | 3    |
| Research Questions  | 4    |
| Overview of the Study   | 5    |
| II. Review of the Literature  | 6    |
| Introduction  | 6    |
| Higher Education and Student Affairs  | 6    |
| Student Involvement Theory  | 9    |
| Student Engagement Theory   | 11   |
| Student Theory Confusion  | 13   |
| Student Involvement and Engagement in Higher Education                      | 14   |
| The Need for Student Involvement and Student Engagement in Higher Education | 16   |

|      |   |    |
|------|---|----|
|      | Utilizing Student Involvement and Engagement through Public Safety Programs | 20 |
|      | Rowan University's Student Public Safety Programs                           | 21 |
|      | Summary of the Literature Review  | 23 |
| III. | Methodology   | 25 |
|      | Context of the Study  | 25 |
|      | Population and Sample Selection   | 26 |
|      | Instrumentation   | 26 |
|      | Data Collection   | 27 |
|      | Data Analysis   | 29 |
| IV.  | Findings  | 30 |
|      | Profile of the Sample   | 30 |
|      | Analysis of the Data  | 32 |
|      | Research Question 1   | 32 |
|      | Research Question 2   | 36 |
|      | Research Question 3   | 41 |
| V.   | Summary, Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations                       | 48 |
|      | Summary of the Study  | 48 |
|      | Discussion of the Findings  | 49 |
|      | Conclusions   | 55 |
|      | Recommendations for Practice  | 58 |
|      | Recommendations for Further Research  | 59 |
|      | REFERENCES  | 61 |

## APPENDIXES

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Appendix A: Institutional Review Board Approval Letter     | 69 |
| Appendix B: Survey Instrument                              | 71 |
| Appendix C: Permission to Survey Student Employees of SCPP | 77 |

## LIST OF TABLES

| TABLE |  | PAGE |
|-------|--|------|
| 4.1   | Racial/Ethnic Backgrounds of Student Employees   | 31   |
| 4.2   | Years of Attendance at Rowan University  | 31   |
| 4.3   | Student Employees' Current Housing Status  | 32   |
| 4.4   | Years of Involvement in the Student Community Policing Program   | 32   |
| 4.5   | Student Involvement in Campus Activities   | 34   |
| 4.6   | Number of Hours Spent in Campus Activities   | 35   |
| 4.7   | Correlation between Involvement in Leaderships Programs and Student Government                                 | 36   |
| 4.8   | Correlation between Hours Spent in Public Safety Programs and Involvement in Hobbies and Social Clubs          | 36   |
| 4.9   | Hours Spent Each Week Studying for Classes   | 38   |
| 4.10  | Correlation between Hours Spent in Public Safety Programs and Amount of Time Spent Communicating with Faculty  | 39   |
| 4.11  | Correlation between Years of Involvement in the Student Community Policing Program and Career Preparation      | 40   |
| 4.12  | Correlation between Hours Spent on Campus on Weekends and Amount of Conversations Shared with Diverse Students | 41   |
| 4.13  | Social Involvement Rank of Satisfaction  | 43   |
| 4.14  | Academic Involvement Rank of Satisfaction  | 44   |
| 4.15  | Campus Atmosphere Rank of Satisfaction   | 45   |
| 4.16  | Personal Goals Rank of Satisfaction  | 46   |
| 4.17  | Correlation between Satisfaction with Attending Rowan University and Getting Involved on Campus                | 47   |

## CHAPTER I

### Introduction

Institutions of higher education are charged with ensuring that students are not only satisfied with the living and learning environment, but feel secure with their academic surroundings. It is through student involvement and student engagement that colleges and universities help to create a meaningful environment for students. These environments can be created through on-campus job opportunities and programming for students. Many campuses have found ways to combine campus safety needs and student involvement to form unique student programs. One such program in place on the campus of Rowan University is the Student Community Policing Program (SCPP).

#### Statement of the Problem

The use of student development theories such as student involvement and student engagement has become extremely important to administrators and student affairs professionals in higher education. These theories have been used throughout campus life, especially in residential learning and student government organizations. One department in higher education that has been overlooked for years is the Department of Public Safety. Public Safety has often been an underutilized area in which institutions can get students involved and engage them in campus life. Little research has been done on the need for student involvement in public safety and its overall impact on students.

## Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the involvement patterns of students in SCPP at Rowan University run through the Department of Public Safety. The study also investigated the impact of student involvement in these programs on students' satisfaction with the Rowan University campus and academic programs.

## Significance of the Study

This study examined variables that may affect student involvement on college and university campuses, such as student involvement, student engagement, and student retention, which impact student satisfaction. This research also investigated the levels and patterns of student involvement of students involved in Public Safety programs at Rowan University. The findings of this study may provide insight for higher education administrators, student affairs professionals, and faculty who are interested in finding new ways to engage students living on and off campus. This study may also provide insights into helping students take an active role in their community. Also, it will look into the impact on retention rates at college and potential graduation rates.

## Assumptions and Limitations

This scope of this survey was limited to full-time, matriculated students at Rowan University during the Spring 2011 semester. These students were all active in SCPP at Rowan University. The sample size of the population was anticipated to be 60 students, whose ages range from 18 to 25. However, due to budget cuts, employee terminations, and unforeseen circumstances, the population of the study was reduced to about 40 students, which ranged in age from 18 to 23, from diverse ethnic backgrounds and social

economic statuses. Data collection took place during the months of January and February of 2011. A survey was distributed to all current employees of SCPP at a mandatory meeting at the beginning of the spring 2011 semester. These students were not offered a monetary gift or compensation for their participation in the study. Only those who returned the survey participated in the study. No student was forced by me or any member of the department of Public Safety to participate in the survey. Completion of the survey took, on average, 15 minutes, and coincided with the meeting agenda. A significant potential bias in the findings was the abrupt and radical changes taking place in the Department of Public Safety. Employee termination, as well as compensation cuts, may negatively affect attitudes reported and data collected. Another potential, yet minimal, bias was my prior involvement in SCPP and its potential to sway participants' results in a positive manner.

#### Operational Definitions

1. Academic Success: A student who successfully completes their program and graduates on-time from Rowan University.
2. Full-time Student: An undergraduate student at Rowan University that carries a minimum of 12 credits or a graduate student enrolled in a minimum of nine credits and residing in on-campus housing.
3. Satisfaction: A student who is almost completely pleased or content with the education and the environment at Rowan University.

4. Students: Traditional-aged, undergraduate and graduate college students attending Rowan University during the spring 2011 semester, who have currently employed by the SCPP.
5. Student Community Policing Program (SCPP): A Public Safety program that employs students residing in on-campus housing.
6. Student Engagement: Actions and programs used to get students involved on campus in an effort to create happy students who stay with an institution through the completion of their degree.
7. Student Involvement: Activities that provide students with opportunities to interact with various aspects of campus life, faculty, and staff.
8. Student Success: A student who is involved on campus, is making a difference, and feels comfortable in the community at Rowan University.

#### Research Questions

This study sought to address the following research questions:

1. What are the involvement patterns of students in the Student Community Policing Program at Rowan University run through the Department of Public Safety?
2. Is there a significant relationship between involvement in leadership programs, such as the Student Community Policing Program (SCPP), and campus activities?
3. What is the impact of student involvement in these programs on students' satisfaction with the Rowan University campus and academic programs?

## Overview of the Study

Chapter II provides a review of literature related to this study. This section includes an explanation of student engagement and student involvement in higher education, and why student engagement and involvement is important to keeping students motivated in college. This chapter discusses how some schools are utilizing the idea of student engagement on their campuses, and details SCPP at Rowan University.

Chapter III describes the study methodology and procedures. This chapter describes the context of the study, population and sample, instrumentation, data collection procedures, and how the data were analyzed.

Chapter IV presents the findings of the study. This chapter addresses the research questions posed in the introduction of this study.

Chapter V summarizes and discusses the major findings of the study, with conclusions and recommendations for practice and further study.

## CHAPTER II

### Review of the Literature

#### Introduction

This thesis focuses on Rowan University's Public Safety Department and the Student Community Policing Program (SCPP). It is because of this focus that it is critical to first understand why this type of programming is important on higher education campuses. There is ample literature on campus safety; however, little is known about public safety programs that involve students. For many years researchers have studied and written about student involvement and student engagement. These theories are important issues in higher education since they help practitioners promote student success and satisfaction. Therefore, this chapter begins with a brief history of higher education and student affairs in the United States. This chapter then focuses on student engagement and student involvement higher education, utilizing student engagement through public safety programs, and Rowan University's student public safety programming.

#### Higher Education and Student Affairs

Education is an extremely important part of society. From a very young age, children are taught that the path to success leads through college and into a prosperous, lucrative, and fulfilling career. Many children grow up never questioning the fact that they will, one day, attend some type of higher education institution; however, this was not always the case. When institutions of higher education were founded, especially during medieval times in Europe, they had a small following. These institutions were

created as small schools with the primary purpose of educating young men for work in the church and furthering careers in medicine and law (Perkins, 2007). Higher education in the United States had an equally diminutive start with only nine colleges (Goodchild, 2007). One of the nine, and perhaps the best known, was Harvard University. It was from that time on that institutions of higher education began to evolve. These colleges and universities faced years and decades of evolution in order to meet the changing needs of their consumers and of changing knowledge. Chute (2008) states that,

Traditionally, higher education -- particularly at bachelor's degree-granting institutions -- was for the best students, with some schools following the philosophy of weeding out students in a make-or-break atmosphere. But, as many middle-class jobs requiring only a high school education have disappeared, post-secondary education has been transformed into a must-have for many who want a middle-class, or better, standard of living.(¶, 15)

It is because of their constant changes that college for most students, today, is not a question, it is an answer. Sandeen (2003) points out that “There are almost 4,000 colleges and universities in the United States and student enrollment exceeds 15 million” (p.6). The emphasis on higher education, and the glory of the American higher education system, is not limited to the United States either. Sandeen (2003) explains that “American colleges and universities have become the envy of the world, and almost a half million students from more than 100 countries each year come to the U.S. to study at our institutions of higher education” (p. 6). Millions and millions of students each year enroll in higher education institutions. It is because of the vast array of different students

entering higher education that the needs of the students are ever changing and the role of the higher education institution itself is also evolving. Trow (2007) believes that “American higher education is the largest and most diverse system of postsecondary education in the world” (p. 582). This diversity among students requires higher education institutions and their student affairs administrators to create new diverse and creative communities within the campus. This is done by implementing programs that both involve and engage their students.

In recent years the expectations of colleges and universities have changed. Multiple expectations and responsibilities have been placed upon these institutions by an array of external groups (Bateson & Taylor, 2004). It is little wonder, then, that higher education has changed and evolved over the years in order to serve the shifting needs of society and the varying economic climates. Families and students are no longer only concerned with just the academic aspect of colleges and universities, but with social aspects as well. Sanford (1964a) explains that, “The social benefits of college seem to be regarded as highly as the economic ones, and to be inseparably interrelated with them” (p. 4). Garland and Grace (1993) explain that “Higher education in the United States is characterized by continuing evolution to meet the changing needs of society” (p. 1). Along with the evolution of the university comes changing expectations of its administrators. Garland and Grace (1993) explain the importance of quickly slipping into new roles and the consequences of not doing so effectively, “Failing to accept the challenge to serve institutions and students effectively could prove costly for student affairs” (p. 7). With the growing amount of competition among colleges and universities

within the United States and, even now, abroad, institutions cannot afford to lose even one student. Pascarella and Terenzini (2005) note “Research suggests that engagement should increase based on an increase in ‘maximized opportunities’ and in this case even more so when coupled with an institutional emphasis on fostering purposeful activities and campus life” (as cited in LaNasa, Olson, & Allemen, 2007, p. 943). The student is the main focus of the higher education institution. Institutions focus much of their time and effort in recruitment, enrollment, and retention.

### Student Involvement Theory

Students are the main focus of the university and explanatory theories are used to enhance the students’ development and experience while on campus pursuing a degree. One such theory that applies to the diverse backgrounds of college students today is the student involvement theory. Kahrig (2005) explains that Alexander Astin (1975) is generally accepted as the first researcher to recognize the importance of student involvement as a critical component in the undergraduate experience. Chute (2008) states that, “The concept of campus involvement is well-known to higher education researchers and practitioners” (p. 29). Astin (1999) explains that student involvement is the amount of time and energy that students devote to their experience at college. Astin (1999) describes the difference between a highly involved and uninvolved student as:

A highly involved student is one who, for example, devotes considerable energy to studying, spends much time on campus, participates actively in student organizations, and interacts frequently with faculty members and other students. Conversely, a typical uninvolved student neglects studies, spends little time on

campus, abstains from extracurricular activities, and has infrequent contact with faculty members or other students. (p. 518)

In student involvement theory, students are responsible for their success and cannot rely on college faculty or staff to solely effect change. The theory forces students to take an active role in their living and learning experiences while at college (Kelley-Hall, 2010). The process of actively committing oneself to the practice allows students to take ownership of their development. It is the responsibility of the individual student to expand a certain amount of effort toward their college experience. The impact of the involvement is based on what the student does, and the quality of those experiences (Kelley-Hall, 2010). Wolf-Wendel, Ward, and Kinzie (2009) state that, “Involvement theory is quite simply a “handy device” for researchers and practitioners” (p. 412).

Involvement theory is also important to other concepts and theories in higher education. Just as student involvement works closely with student engagement, involvement is also an important part of Tinto’s theory of retention. The more involved a student is, the more likely he/she is to create a strong knit community on campus. This strong knit community ties the student to the campus and makes sure he/she stay on campus and successfully graduate (Kelley-Hall, 2010). Astin (1975) explains that “if ways can be found to involve students more in the life and environment of the institution, their chances of staying in college are improved” (p. 148). It is through Astin’s research on student involvement that it becomes obvious that there are any benefits to being involved on campus and almost no negative issues that can arise from it (Kelley-Hall, 2010).

## Student Engagement Theory

Another extremely important theory used in higher education is student engagement. It is because of a school's interest in its students that student engagement and student retention theories have been researched and studied repeatedly. George Kuh is the main theorist known for his work in student engagement. Wolf-Wendel, Ward, and Kinzie (2009) state that,

The project that engendered the concept of engagement is called the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) established by George Kuh (NSSE, 2009) The NSSE was originally developed under the guidance of a design team made up of scholars and practitioners including Alexander Astin, Gary Barnes, Arthur Chickering, Peter Ewell, John Gardner, Richard Light, and Ted Marchese, with input from C. Robert Pace. (p. 413)

Bryson and Hand (2007) state that "Engagement is a frequently used term in the vocabulary of educators and those involved in the scholarship of teaching" (p. 352). Kuh, Schuh, Whitt, & Associates (1991) reference the work of C. R. Pace (1974) who stated:

The attainment of a broad range of personal and social benefits, of liberal viewpoints on important social issues, and of subsequent involvement in the civic and artistic life of the community seems to be related to the extent to which the college experience itself provided a rich opportunity for personal and social relationships, involvement in campus activities, and in associations with the faculty. (p. 129)

Krause and Coates (2008) state that:

Engagement is a broad phenomenon that encompasses academic as well as selected non academic and social aspects of the student experience. At a certain level of analysis, engagement is taken to provide a singularly sufficient means of determining whether students are engaging with their study and university learning community in ways likely to promote high-quality learning. (p. 493)

Student engagement is a significant issue in colleges and universities because an engaged student is more successful student. A growing issue in higher education is that students do not seem to be very engaged. Hu and Kuh (2002) explain that “Some recent studies suggest that large numbers of college students appear to be either academically or socially disengaged, or both” (p. 556). It is the goal of higher education institutions to engage students and get them involved in their community. In order to do this, institutions must create programming and activities that give students the opportunity to take initiative and lead. Krause and Coates (2008) explain that:

The concept of engagement embraces a specific understanding of the relationship between students and institutions. Institutions are responsible for creating environments that make learning possible, and that afford opportunities to learn.

The final responsibility for learning, however, rests with students. (p. 494)

Students can be given numerous diverse and creative opportunities to get involved and engaged with their academic surroundings, however they cannot be forced. Each student is the controller of his/her personal destiny. Students are the only ones who can determine the experiences they have while at college and how much those experiences shape and

affect them (Kelly-Hall, 2010). Each student is unique and the level in which each student is involved on their college campus differs.

### Student Theory Confusion

One problem with these theories is that they are so closely related and work hand in hand with one another. Often theories such as these morph together and become indistinguishable. Wolf-Wendel, Ward, and Kinzie (2009) state that:

As faculty who teach about the impact of college on students, we repeatedly come across graduate students who do not understand the nuanced differences between involvement, integration, and engagement. Students often treat these important concepts as interchangeable. In the field, practitioners have a difficult time delineating where one concept ends and the next begin. Even researchers seem to have muddled the concepts, claiming to be studying one while adopting the traditional measurement and definition of another. As a result, these concepts get cloudy and are often interpreted as different in name only. (p. 408)

The terms student involvement and student engagement are used interchangeably in many areas of higher education. Wolf-Wendel, Ward, and Kinzie (2009) agree with others who find that these terms are used so interchangeably that they often lose their importance and uniqueness. Each term is deeply rooted in its own historic past that connecting these terms together is detrimental to its influence. The problem arises when theorists, researchers, and staff pick and choose portions of these theories to explain them in the context of institutions of higher education. Wolf-Wendel, Ward, and Kinzie (2009) state that, “These concepts each add something unique and important to understanding

student development and success that can be lost among those who cite them without fully understanding their definition and use. Such haphazard citations and usage can lead to further confusion about the concepts” (p. 408). The concept of student engagement does share many similarities with student involvement, but have different key concepts. Wolf-Wendel, Ward, and Kinzie (2009) state that, “Engagement differs from involvement in that it links more directly to desired educational processes and outcomes and emphasizes action that the institution can take to increase student engagement” (p.414).

### Student Involvement and Engagement in Higher Education

Institutions of higher education strive to produce knowledge and then disseminate that information. While doing so they also place a high level of importance on attempts to nurture the needs and talents of students while teaching them the vital skills that will allow them to enter the world and be a fully functioning member of society (Bateson & Taylor, 2004). Institutions of higher education are often concerned for the well being of their students academically, emotionally, and socially. In short, the more satisfied a student is at college, the more likely the student will remain enrolled and successfully fulfill all the requirements and graduate with a degree in a reasonable amount of time. Kuh, Schuh, Whitt, and Associates (1991) state that “the impact on college students is increased when they are more actively engaged in various aspects of college life” (p. 5). Students need to experience various situations and events on campus in order to not only feel like part of a community, but feel comfortable in that community.

Student development theories are quite possibly the most important knowledge a student affairs professional can possess when working in an institution of higher education with several different types of students in an array of different environments.

Wolf-Wendel, Ward, and Kinzie (2009) state that:

Established theories and constructs long associated with student success, including involvement, engagement, and integration, provide common language and a body of knowledge to inform understanding of the challenges currently facing higher education in this era of increased scrutiny of student achievement. These theories have rich histories in research and have effectively guided educational practice for decades. (p. 407)

Over many decades the student population has changed and become more diverse. Bateson and Taylor (2004) explain that, “Many of the students who enter the doors of our universities today are exceedingly savvy with information technology, used to fast-speed communications and to customer-oriented services in their day-to-day life outside of the university. Increasingly, they expect the same level of service and commitment inside the academic institution” (p. 476). The increasing need for institutions to change their ways of engaging students directly parallels the changes that are occurring in society and the effects it has on new and incoming college bound students (Bateson & Taylor, 2004). Just as each theory is unique and different in its own way, the students with whom we use these theories need to be treated as individuals. Each student is different with a unique set of ideas, values, and feelings. They come from their own distinctive background and environment. Simply understanding a student’s demographic information and regional

backgrounds is not enough to effectively involve and engage those entering an institution (Bateson & Taylor, 2004). Students cannot be placed in categories, such as New Jersey, upper-middle class, or Caucasian. These terms do not adequately explain their complexities nor do they in any way provide an insight to what their individual needs are. Each student enters an institution of higher education with different needs and wants and each has very unique issues and goals. Each individual student requires an individual approach to meeting their college needs. Bateson and Taylor (2004) caution that, “A ‘one-size-fits-all’ approach becomes incompatible and ineffective in handling student demands” (p. 479).

#### The Need for Student Involvement and Student Engagement in Higher Education

The baffling issue is that while many theories state the importance of connecting students’ activities inside and outside the classroom, few schools have mastered how to do so. While interest and admission in institutions of higher education has grown over time, the amount of students actually earning a degree has not (Chute, 2008). Time after time, traditional-aged students excitedly begin their freshman year of college and progressively grow unhappy with the college they are attending. By the time the first year of college has concluded, many have either dropped out of school all together or have transferred to another institution. In short, students and families are throwing down thousands of dollars on college tuition to simply watch them fail, and no one wants to see that (Chute, 2008). Kuh, Cruce, Shoup, Kinzie, and Gonyea (2008) believe that many students end up leaving a college or university before they even begin to earn a degree or declare a major. This may be due to the inevitable hurdles that students face at the

beginning of their freshman year in college that frequently either slows or halts their development process (Chute, 2008). These obstacles can throw students off course and ruin their outlook on the college experience. Chute (2008) explains that, “The obstacles can be so daunting that, if the current pattern continues, 1 in 3 of today's freshmen won't have earned a bachelor's degree from any four-year school 8<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> years from now, according to federal data” (¶, 5). Kuh et al. (2008) reference statistics from Berkner, He, and Cataldi (2002) who state “Only half (51%) of students who enrolled at four year institutions in 1995–96 completed bachelor’s degrees within six years at the institutions at which they started. Another 7% obtained baccalaureate degrees within six years after attending two or more institutions” (2008, p. 1). According to Chute (2008), “Many students who leave one school transfer to another, but graduation rates don't track their progress at their old school or new one. About 90 percent of traditional-age students return to school somewhere -- not necessarily their first school -- during their second calendar academic year, according to federal data” (¶, 43). This information is not only important for recruitment numbers, but for financial reasons. Dennis (1998) notes:

Students who drop out after one year represent a loss of the next three years’ tuition. If your school’s annual tuition is \$10,000 and one freshman stays for all four years, the fiscal return on that student could be as much as \$40,000. Even if the student receives institutional funds of \$10,000 over the course of four years, the return on the investment is still \$30,000. For every student who transfers or drops out after the first year, the net income loss could be as much as \$30,000.

Multiply that figure by the number of first-year students who withdraw, and the

net revenue loss can be substantial. (p. 79)

These statistics are important because, as Hu and Kuh (2002) explain, “In order for institutions to enhance the overall quality of undergraduate education for all students, we must identify and better understand how student and institutional characteristics interact to encourage or discourage student engagement in educational purposeful activities in college” (p. 556). Clearly then, institutions must build better connections with their students. Kuh et al. (1991) reference Astin (1985) when they talk about the need for institutions to actively get involved in students’ lives. It is not only that connections should be built with students, it is important to build those connections early on. To effectively involve and engage students, there needs to be an immediate connection made with them when they enter the university for the first time. This connection should be made early on with the introduction of services, activities, and programs that offer students an outlet to organize themselves and take initiative (Bateson & Taylor, 2004). The importance of socializing outside of the classroom and taking part in non-academic activities is critical. Taking part in these activities is central to student development, especially early on in their academic careers in college (Sanford, 1964b). An effective institution will strive to build these connections as soon as the students set foot on campus and continue to strengthen those relationships throughout their time at the school. This is not only a goal, but a responsibility for an institution of higher education.

Institutions are responsible for creating environments that make learning possible, and that afford opportunities to learn, however, the final responsibility for learning rests with students (Krause & Coates, 2008). Most students are willing to put forth the time

and energy to involve themselves in their academic courses and extracurricular activities; however, they still expect some effort on the part of the academic institution to work with them (Bateson & Taylor, 2004). Students can be given numerous diverse and creative opportunities to get involved and engage with their academic surroundings, however they cannot be forced. Students should want to be involved at their institutions and that involvement can not only help them in the classroom, but also outside of it. Astin (1985) is quoted as saying “True excellence lies in the institution’s ability to affect its students and faculty favorably, to enhance their intellectual and scholarly development, and to make a positive difference in their lives” (p. 60).

There is much information about student involvement and engagement theories, as well as student retention theories that are available to higher education student affairs professionals. However, few studies have examined how to form programs that foster growth in the area of public safety. The main environment for fostering student involvement is often in residential life and campus housing. This is understandable because more often students form lasting friendship bonds with students they meet outside of the classroom than of people they study with in the classroom (Newcomb, 1964). These relationships can be forged through dorms, activities, clubs, or even work. Most institutions utilize theories through student programming geared toward students living on campus and in dormitories. LaNasa, Olson, and Alleman (2007) explain that,

During the past two decades institutions of all types have sought to expand and enhance residential facilities. Institutional focus on scale, configuration, amenities, and academic integration has sought to leverage prior research

documenting the multiple and often positive impacts of on-campus residence.  
(p.941)

Many schools fail to utilize programs outside of the dormitories. Bryson and Hand (2007) state that “Engagement is enriched to a significant degree by establishing a sense of community in the educational setting” (p. 354). These communities have been established within the traditional departments and units at institutions of higher education; however, schools need to branch out to new departments and new programming.

#### Utilizing Student Involvement and Engagement through Public Safety Programs

There is limited information available about utilizing student run public safety programs on college campuses. Most of the information is limited to a select number of institutions. Few universities have implemented programs on their campuses that involve students by taking an active role in the safety of their academic community, with the exception of residential life programs. While residential life programs do offer new students with similar backgrounds a place to meet and engage in activities, there are many other opportunities and programs that institutions fail to attempt. One such university that has implemented a program involving students in campus safety is Rutgers University. Rutgers University has a program in place called the Community Service Officer Program (CSOP) (Community Service Officer Program, 2008). At Rutgers, students get hands on training with the Rutgers Police Department while serving the community in various ways. The University of Hartford also has a type of public safety division that uses students. Hartford has a Traffic Appeals Board (TAB), which is a

student run board that hears traffic and motor vehicle violation appeals from students (Student Involvement and Leadership Opportunities, p. 76). The University of Hartford is one of the very few to even implement this type of program. Lochner (2008) speaks about the need for student involvement on and around the Syracuse University campus in a Neighborhood Watch program. The need for this program came about because of a string of thefts occurring on and near the campus community in the beginning of the fall semester (Lochner, ¶ 1). Lochner (2008) quotes Lieutenant Joe Cecile of the Syracuse Police Department in saying "I think that's the reason why they should make the time to create a Neighborhood Watch" (¶, 3). Very little research has been done on the effects of including students in public safety decisions and involving students in student public safety organizations. There is a severe gap between public safety departments on college campuses and other academic and student affairs units. The ability to link the Student Affairs office and the Department of Public Safety could be extremely beneficial, as a whole, to the entire academic community. A connection should be attempted to create a loosely coupled system between these two departments. Weick (2000) is quick to point out that loose coupling "intends to convey the image that coupled events are responsive, but that each event also preserves its own identity and some evidence of its physical or logical separateness" (p. 38).

#### Rowan University's Student Public Safety Programs

For many years people have researched the needs of a campus community and precautions that need to be taken to ensure a safe and secure community not only for students, but for the community surrounding the institution. Through this research,

programs have been implemented at Rowan University that gives students the chance to get involved on campus. These programs focus on community service and safety. They often promote values such as responsibility, awareness, and taking an active role in one's own community. These programs are also important because they promote and foster leadership opportunities outside of the traditional openings available on campus. Not only do these programs provide a fair amount of leadership training and a place to foster student growth and development, but they also serve as a way for students to interact and meet with other individuals. These groups of students have a tremendous influence on the development, more so than any other attribute. Newcomb (1964) explains that, "Membership in a peer group is more likely to influence directly students' attitudes than their general skills, specific capacities, or basic personality traits" (p. 141).

Programs such as SCPP, Student Patrol, Safe Walk & Ride, and Rape Aggression Defense (R.A.D.) have recently been implemented on the Rowan University campus. The main focus of this thesis is on SCPP, a program that takes full-time students residing in on-campus housing and puts them to work, nightly, in areas all around campus. These students, whose majors vary, work in the Rowan Communication Center assisting in dispatch calls, perform walking escorts, work in the residence halls, and in the library. These students also take part in many Rowan University events supporting the Rowan University Police, and actively take on charitable work. The purpose of this program is to instill a sense of responsibility and a good sense of community within the students. Generally, students involved in the program have the chance to network with various administrators on campus, gain leadership experiences, and form a bond with other

students involved in the program. Public safety administrators feel that getting involved with programs geared toward public safety can only benefit the school and the student body. The Rowan Department of Public Safety's motto is "It's In Your Interest" (Rowan University Public Safety, ¶ 4).

#### Summary of the Literature Review

The goals of an institution of higher education are constantly changing and evolving to meet the needs of students. One need that is constant is to involve and engage students in ways that create a pleasant and satisfying environment for them, to grow academically and socially. Researchers have studied the art of student involvement, but now more than ever this research needs to be put into action. Student growth and development cannot occur in a static state. Students must actively participate in their academic campus community in order to enjoy the benefits of growth (Kelley-Hall, 2010). The established methods of using student involvement and student engagement need to evolve and change in order to include all students in all aspects of college and campus life. Student affairs need to step up and change in order to engage students. Garland and Grace (1993) referenced Allen and Garb (1993) when they explained that "Changes in students' and institutions' natures and needs consistently promoted an evolution in the role of student affairs as colleges struggled to redefine their relationship with students" (p. 93). With the creation of programs like SCPP on other campuses, administrators can both engage students and get them involved on campus while serving the community, which is the ultimate goal. Programs like these could perform many functions that promote an inviting environment for students on a campus.

Student affairs professionals need to make many more strides in the advancement of leadership programs. In the current state of the world, safety is an important issue for everyone to undertake. With the creation of SCPP on the Rowan University campus, administrators can both engage students and get them involved on campus while protecting the community. This program performs so many functions that promote an inviting environment for students on campus. It is the responsibility of student affairs professionals to create programming and opportunities for students to become engaged and involved in their academic community. Since student affairs professionals seem to have such a good opportunity to create strong and lasting relationships between the student body, other administrators, and academic departments, they seem the best fitted to take on the situations of leading the campus and its students toward progress and success (Garland & Grace, 1993). Institutions of higher education need to properly utilize under-developed and under-appreciated programs such as the Student Community Policing Program, which is one example of a program that promotes beneficial patterns and levels of student involvement.

## CHAPTER III

### Methodology

#### Context of the Study

The study was conducted at Rowan University, in Glassboro, New Jersey. The university is a public institution that is part of the New Jersey State University system. Opened in 1923, Rowan University is comprised of a diverse student body. Students come mainly from areas all over New Jersey and, in recent years, students have come from Connecticut, Virginia, Rhode Island, New York, and Pennsylvania. Rowan University President Donald J. Farish serves as chief executive and oversees the operations of the university. Currently Dr. Farish is in his 12<sup>th</sup> year of service to the Rowan University Community (Rowan University-About Rowan, 2010).

At Rowan University, there are a number of ways for students to get involved on campus. One such program is the Student Community Policing Program (SCPP) which is a division of Public Safety. The program typically consists of two professional coordinators, three to four student Senior Practitioners, and about 60 student employees (Rowan University Student Community Policing Program, 2010). However, the recent change in political climate, budgetary concerns, and reassignment of resources has forced the program to change drastically. Currently the program consists of two professional coordinators, whom hold full-time positions as Rowan University Officers, four student Senior Practitioners, and a maximum of 40 students. The program no longer compensates student employees through tuition reimbursement, but rather compensates the students

with an hourly rate between eight dollars and eight dollars and fifty cents (Rowan University Student Community Policing Program, 2010).

#### Population and Sample Selection

The target population for this study was students at Rowan University during the academic years of 2010-2011. The available population was 40 students from Rowan University in Glassboro, New Jersey that participate in SCPP during the academic years of 2010-2011. A convenience sample consisted of selected student employee members who currently were members of SCPP at Rowan who were present at the mandatory meeting and are were to participate in the survey administered.

#### Instrumentation

The instrument to assess students' levels and patterns of engagement at Rowan University was adapted from a survey of student involvement used by Ohio University. The Ohio University Student Involvement Study has been used in a variety of situations by the university since 1979, which establishes content validity (Kahrig, 2005). The questionnaire is an adapted version of an instrument that was first used as part of the University of Michigan Project CHOICE (Center for Helping Organizations Improve Choice in Education) study (Kahrig, 2005). The Office of Institutional Research (2010) explains that, "The Ohio University Involvement Study is a survey administered to all entering first-year students at the end of winter quarter" (p. 2). It is designed to assess social and academic involvement behaviors and attitudes of students.

The majority of questions and the format of the survey being administered were taken from the Ohio University Involvement Study questionnaire. Some questions that

currently appear on the original survey were edited or removed to better suite the current research taking place.

The survey (Appendix B) consists of four parts: Demographic information and Levels and Patterns of Student Involvement. The first sections asked six questions in order to collect demographic information about the subjects. The second section asked about activities done on a weekly, monthly, and yearly basis. The third section asked students to choose a certain response that best suits them. The last section asked subjects to rank 34 Likert-style items by evaluating their attitudes, opinions, and satisfaction of student involvement in multiple ways. A Cronbach Alpha was also calculated for this survey and returned coefficients at the following rate for each of the two survey sections: Student opinions on the importance of specific activities (.97), and student satisfaction levels with specific activities (.98). Alpha coefficients with a value of .70 and above typically indicate internal consistency or a reliable instrument which is true of the items in the student opinions of importance of specific activities and student satisfaction levels with specific activities sections. Approval to proceed with the study of the Student Community Policing Program from the Institutional Review Board of Rowan University was received on December 15, 2010 in the form of an official Rowan University letter (Appendix A).

#### Data Collection

Permission was granted by Officer Frank Agosta, Program Coordinator of SCPP at Rowan University, to survey the students (Appendix C). Approval was received in the form of an official Rowan University Public Safety letter on December 22, 2010. The

students selected to receive the survey were all staff that participated, in some capacity, in SCPP. The survey was then administered on January 15, 2011 at a mandatory meeting for all student employees of the program. Completed surveys were submitted and saved. No identifying information was collected on the survey itself. The paper surveys were distributed by hand at a mandatory meeting for SCPP student employees at the beginning of the spring 2011 semester in mid January. All participants were given until February 14, 2011 to return and submit all materials to one of their Senior Practitioners, who then submitted all of the completed surveys to me. No incentive was given in order to ensure a higher return rate of the material by the deadline. The decision not to include a momentary or otherwise incentive was reached due to the small and controllable population of the subject pool.

Data retrieved from the questionnaire was stored in a locked desk drawer with the key kept with the researcher in a secret location. At the end of the three year completion for record keeping of the study, paper-based data, such as the questionnaire, will be shredded. The remaining shredded material will then be divided up into different trash receptacles and discarded in various locations. This will be done to ensure that no information will be useable if found. CDs that contain any data, such as charts, or statistics, will be physically destroyed and data stored on USB devices will be electronically removed by deletion software. Once unusable, the physical remains of these devices will be destroyed and discarded in various locations.

## Data Analysis

The independent variables in this study included gender, ethnic background, age, years in school, where the student resides, and years of involvement in SCPP.

Information for these variables was collected in the first component of the questionnaire.

The dependent variables were the levels and patterns of student involvement that employees SCPP present towards Rowan University and the campus community.

Variations in student employees' attitudes were explored based on each of the independent variables using PASW computer software. Data was analyzed using frequency tables. The impact of the independent variables on the dependent variables will be studied using analysis obtained through PASW. Correlations and descriptive statistics, including mean, standard deviation, and Pearson  $r$  coefficient correlations were used to examine the data and answer the research questions posed in previous chapters. This was done by utilizing frequency tables, cross tabulations, and correlations in PASW.

## CHAPTER IV

### Findings

#### Profile of the Sample

The subjects for this study were selected from the Rowan University undergraduate student body who participated in the Rowan University Student Community Policing Program (SCPP) during the spring 2011 semester. Of the 40 surveys distributed, 35 completed surveys were returned, yielding a return rate of 88%. There were 16 males (45.7%) and 19 females (54.3%). The subjects were between the ages of 18 and 23. Table 4.1 contains demographic data on the Racial/Ethnic groups that respondents in SCPP self-identified. Subjects reported many different answers when asked for their Racial/Ethnic group; however, more than half of the subjects (62.9%) reported to be of a Caucasian, White background. Of the 35 surveys completed, 6 (17.1%) of the respondents self-identified as African American, Black. Table 4.2 contains demographic data concerning the duration of time subjects have attended Rowan University. A little over half of the subjects had attended Rowan University for four years (50.1%), while 11 students responded as having only attended two or less years at the time (31.4%). Four of the subjects responded that they had attended Rowan University for more than four years (11.4%)

Table 4.1

*Racial/Ethnic Backgrounds of Student Employees (N=35)*

| Race                   | <i>F</i> | %    |
|------------------------|----------|------|
| African American/Black | 6        | 17.1 |
| Asian American         | 1        | 2.9  |
| Caucasian/White        | 22       | 62.9 |
| Hispanic/Latino        | 4        | 11.4 |
| Multi-racial           | 2        | 5.7  |

Table 4.2

*Years of Attendance at Rowan University (N=35)*

| Years | <i>f</i> | %    |
|-------|----------|------|
| 1     | 6        | 17.1 |
| 2     | 5        | 14.3 |
| 3     | 2        | 5.7  |
| 4     | 18       | 51.4 |
| 5     | 4        | 11.4 |
| 5+    | 0        | 0    |

Table 4.3 contains information about the current housing status of students involved in the program. More than half of the subjects surveyed reported living in on-campus housing (60.0%), while 1 (2.9%) reported living off-campus with a parent or guardian. The remaining subjects, 13 (37.1%), reported to reside in off-campus housing arrangements. Table 4.4 contains demographic data on the years of involvement with

SCPP, as measured at the beginning of the spring academic year. Almost half of the subjects had been involved with the program for at least one year (42.9%).

Table 4.3

*Student Employees' Current Housing Status (N=35)*

| Housing                             | <i>f</i> | %    |
|-------------------------------------|----------|------|
| On-campus housing                   | 21       | 60   |
| Off-campus housing                  | 13       | 37.1 |
| Off-campus, with parent or guardian | 1        | 2.9  |

Table 4.4

*Years of Involvement in the Student Community Policing Program (N=35)*

| Years of Involvement | <i>f</i> | %    |
|----------------------|----------|------|
| 1                    | 6        | 17.1 |
| 2                    | 5        | 14.3 |
| 3                    | 2        | 5.7  |
| 4                    | 18       | 51.4 |
| 5                    | 4        | 11.4 |
| 5+                   | 0        | 0    |

### Analysis of the Data

Research Question 1: What are the involvement patterns of students in the Student Community Policing Program (SCPP) at Rowan University run through the Department of Public Safety?

An overall look at the responses dealing with student involvement levels and patterns of current student employees of SCPP at Rowan University indicates that student

employees are generally involved on the Rowan University campus and with the program (see Table 4.5). Thirty-five (100%) of the student respondents reported to take part in some type of Public Safety program, which included their involvement and employment with the Student Community Policing Program. According to Table 4.6, while public safety programs were the most popular pursuits for students, with more than half 24 (69.3%) of the students reporting to spend at least seven hours participating in this activity during any given week, other areas of involvement on campus emerged.

Of the students who took part in SCPP, 14 (40%) reported to engage in campus recreation frequently, with 8(22.8%) of students participating in one to three hours of the activity weekly. Twelve (34.3%) of the students were involved in some type of hobby or social club on the Rowan University campus, where 7 (20.1%) of the students participated for a minimum of one hour a week and 3 (8.7%) participated for a minimum of four hours. Student involvement in professional or department clubs tied with volunteer services and programs on campus with 8 (22.95%) of the students reporting to take part in those specific activities. Although they were tied for involvement the amount of time students spent in each activity differed. Students involved in professional and departmental clubs, 2 (5.7%), spent a minimum of 4 hours participating, while students involved in volunteer services, 4 (11.5%), spent on average a minimum of four hours a week. Five (14.3%) reported to be involved in fraternities and sororities on campus, where they equally spent a minimum of one-to-three hours a week participating. Four (11.4%) students in each category reported to attend and participate in intercollegiate

athletics, residence hall activities, student government, and leadership programming. Three (8.6%) each took part in religious activities and international-related activities.

Table 4.5

*Student Involvement in Campus Activities (N=35)*

|                           | <i>f</i> | <i>%</i> |
|---------------------------|----------|----------|
| Public Safety Programs    | 35       | 100.0    |
| Campus Recreation         | 14       | 40.0     |
| Hobbies or Social clubs   | 12       | 34.3     |
| Professional Clubs        | 8        | 22.9     |
| Volunteer Services        | 8        | 22.9     |
| Fraternities, Sororities  | 5        | 14.3     |
| Residence Hall activities | 4        | 11.4     |
| Intercollegiate Athletics | 4        | 11.4     |
| Student Government        | 4        | 11.4     |
| Leaderships Programs      | 4        | 11.4     |
| International Activities  | 3        | 8.6      |
| Religious Organizations   | 3        | 8.6      |
| College Publications      | 2        | 5.7      |
| College Productions       | 0        | 0        |

Table 4.6

*Number of Hours Spent in Campus Activities (N=35)*

|                           | 1-3      |      | 4-6      |      | 7-9      |      | 10-12    |      | 12+      |      |
|---------------------------|----------|------|----------|------|----------|------|----------|------|----------|------|
|                           | <i>f</i> | %    |
| Intercollegiate athletics | 3        | 8.6  | 1        | 2.9  | 0        | 0    | 0        | 0    | 0        | 0    |
| Campus recreation         | 8        | 22.8 | 4        | 11.5 | 1        | 2.9  | 1        | 2.9  | 0        | 0    |
| College publications      | 1        | 2.9  | 0        | 0    | 1        | 2.9  | 0        | 0    | 0        | 0    |
| College productions       | 0        | 0    | 0        | 0    | 0        | 0    | 0        | 0    | 0        | 0    |
| Fraternities, sororities  | 1        | 2.9  | 1        | 2.9  | 1        | 2.9  | 1        | 2.9  | 1        | 2.9  |
| Professional clubs        | 5        | 14.4 | 2        | 5.7  | 0        | 0    | 0        | 0    | 1        | 2.9  |
| Hobbies or social clubs   | 7        | 20.1 | 3        | 8.7  | 0        | 0    | 2        | 5.7  | 0        | 0    |
| Religious organizations   | 2        | 5.7  | 0        | 0    | 1        | 2.9  | 0        | 0    | 0        | 0    |
| Residence hall activities | 3        | 8.6  | 0        | 0    | 0        | 0    | 0        | 0    | 1        | 2.9  |
| Public safety programs    | 8        | 22.8 | 3        | 8.6  | 14       | 40.0 | 4        | 11.4 | 6        | 17.9 |
| Student government        | 3        | 8.6  | 0        | 0    | 0        | 0    | 0        | 0    | 1        | 2.9  |
| International activities  | 3        | 8.7  | 0        | 0    | 0        | 0    | 0        | 0    | 0        | 0    |
| Leaderships programs      | 2        | 5.8  | 0        | 0    | 1        | 2.9  | 1        | 2.9  | 0        | 0    |
| Volunteer services        | 2        | 5.8  | 4        | 11.5 | 1        | 2.9  | 0        | 0    | 1        | 2.9  |

Research Question 2: Is there a significant relationship between involvement in leadership programs, such as the Student Community Policing Program (SCPP), and campus activities?

A significant correlation was discovered during the analysis of the data involving involvement in specific activities. The relationship between students involved in leadership programs and students involved in student government was determined to be direct and significant ( $r = .435, p = .009$ ). All the variables listed in Table 4.7, according to the Pearson  $r$  correlation coefficient, have a moderate and positive level of strength of association in relation to one another. Additionally, another relationship was discovered between the amount of hours spent in SCPP and involvement in hobby and social clubs on campus. This relationship was determined to be significant at the .05 level (2-tailed) ( $r = .354, p = .037$ ).

Table 4.7

*Correlation between Involvement in Leaderships Programs and Student Government (N=35)*

|                      |                     | Student Government |
|----------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| Leaderships Programs | Pearson Correlation | .435**             |
|                      | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .009               |
|                      | N                   | 35                 |

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 4.8

*Correlation between Hours Spent in Public Safety Programs and Involvement in Hobbies and Social Clubs (N=35)*

|                                       |                     | Involvement in Hobbies and Social Clubs |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------|---|
| Hours Spent in Public Safety Programs | Pearson Correlation | .354*                                   |
|                                       | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .037                                    |
|                                       | N                   | 35                                      |

\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Student employees took part in many different clubs, activities, and events on campus, but they also engaged in a variety of different academic acts while involved in SCPP. While students were taking part in campus recreation, hobbies, and professional clubs, they were also engaging in multiple conversations with faculty, preparing for their courses, and spending time on campus on the weekends. According to Table 4.9, the amount of time spent studying for courses each week ranged from zero hours all the way to 50 hours. Responses were mixed, 13 (37.2%) students reported to spend four-to-five hours studying for classes each week during the academic year and 6 (17.1%) reported to spend 10 hours. The number of times students frequented the library during the academic year was, on average, three. Students' library usage differed greatly with the amount of leisure reading they did on their own during the year. Twenty (57.1%) students reported to read at least one book for their own pleasure or information.

Table 4.9

*Hours Spent Each Week Studying for Classes (N=35)*

|       | <i>f</i> | <i>%</i> |
|-------|----------|----------|
| .00   | 2        | 5.7      |
| 1.0   | 1        | 2.9      |
| 3.00  | 2        | 5.7      |
| 4.00  | 8        | 22.9     |
| 5.00  | 5        | 14.3     |
| 6.00  | 1        | 2.9      |
| 7.00  | 1        | 2.9      |
| 8.00  | 2        | 5.7      |
| 10.00 | 6        | 17.1     |
| 15.00 | 1        | 2.9      |
| 19.00 | 1        | 2.9      |
| 20.00 | 2        | 5.7      |
| 25.00 | 1        | 2.9      |
| 30.00 | 1        | 2.9      |
| 50.00 | 1        | 2.9      |

In addition to their studying habits, the levels of their communication, in person and through e-mail, with faculty during the academic year was wide-ranging. The students self-reported responses were scattered between three to 800 times a year with 5 (14.3%) reporting to communicate ten times, 4 (11.4%) 20 times, and 5 (14.3%) 50 times an academic year. These students also engaged in a number of conversations with faculty members about research and scholarships during the academic year. Sixteen (45.8%)

reported to have at least one conversation during the academic year with faculty about research or scholarship opportunities. Additionally, these conversations extended to educational plans, problems, and progress, not only with faculty, but with higher education staff. A little more than half of the students 19 (54.3%) reported to have no less than one and no more than three conversations about their academic situation in an academic year. Moreover, students also engaged in multiple conversations with career advisors concerning their potential careers. Twelve (34.3%) students reported to have at least two conversations during the year.

This is a notable portion of data since a significant relationship was found between the number of years of employment in the Student Community Policing Program and the amount of time spent communication with faculty. According to Table 4.10, the relationship between the two was found to be moderate ( $r = .340, p = .046$ ). Another correlation found related to the time spent participating in the Student Community Policing Program related to career preparation. This relationship is moderate ( $r = .415, p = .013$ ).

Table 4.10

*Correlation between Hours Spent in Public Safety Programs and Amount of Time Spent Communicating with Faculty (N=35)*

|                                       |                     | Amount of time spent, during the academic year, communicating with faculty? |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------|---|
| Hours Spent in Public Safety Programs | Pearson Correlation | .340*   |
|                                       | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .046  |
|                                       | N                   | 35  |

\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 4.11

*Correlation Between Years of Involvement in the Student Community Policing Program and Career Preparation (N=35)*

|   |   | How many times have you talked with a career advisor or attended a program concerning your career during this academic year? |
|---|---|--|
| How many years have you been in the Student Community Policing Program? | Pearson Correlation<br>Sig. (2-tailed)<br>N | .415*<br>.013<br>35  |

\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Students who participated in campus activities and engaged in conversations with faculty and staff did so while spending time on the Rowan University campus. Almost half of the students 17 (48.6%) of students involved in SCPP spent three weekends on campus during the academic year. Their recreational time spent on campus included hanging out with friends and attending on-campus parties. In any given month during the academic year, 5 (14.3%) students hung out with friends at least five times, while 8 (22.9%) socialized with friends ten times. Besides socializing with friends, students also attended on-campus parties; attendance reached its peak at 8 (22.9%) students attending two parties a month. These students also engaged in several conversations with diverse peers whose backgrounds were different from their own. A moderate relationship ( $r = .349, p = .040$ ) was discovered between the amount of time spent on campus on the weekends and the amount of conversations shared with diverse students.

Table 4.12

*Correlation between Hours Spent on Campus on Weekends and Amount of Conversations Shared with Diverse Students (N=35)*

|  |                     | How many conversations do you have with diverse students, in a month? |
|--|---------------------|---|
| How many weekends each month do you spend on campus? | Pearson Correlation | .349*   |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .040  |
|  | N                   | 35  |

\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Research Question 3: What is the impact of student involvement in these programs on students' satisfaction with the Rowan University campus and academic programs?

Twenty seven (77%) of the students surveyed responded that it is "extremely important" they graduate from Rowan University. The overall positive response to the university is a respectable indicator of student's attitudes and satisfaction with Rowan University and its academic and social community. According to Table 4.13, more than half, 18 (51.4%) of students surveyed were "very satisfied" when asked about having a job while in enrolled. Fifteen (42.9%) students were "very satisfied" with their ability to make and have friends at Rowan University. Twelve (34.3%) of students were "very satisfied" with being able to establish personal relationships with peers while at Rowan. Fourteen (40.0%) students reported to feel "somewhat satisfied" with attending campus events. Again, students exhibited a great deal of interest and satisfaction with diversity in their community when they reported to be "very satisfied" with interacting with international students. Although students enjoyed taking part in conversations with diverse students, they had little opinion on religious pursuits in their personal lives. Just

under one-third of the students reported having a “neutral” opinion when asked about their satisfaction with getting involved with religious activities and organizations (10, 28.6%).

Generally, students were also pleased with academic involvement at Rowan University, reporting that 13 (37.1%) were “very satisfied” with the academic advising they received and 12 (34.3%) were “very satisfied” with their instruction in major courses. Eleven (31.4%) reported to have a “somewhat satisfied” opinion when asked about instruction in their non-major courses. Eight (22.9%) students reported to be “very satisfied” with the availability of faculty outside of the classroom (see Table 4.14). Students were satisfied with the availability with faculty and staff when they were needed, but 13 (37.1%) reported only a “neutral” opinion of social contact with faculty.

Table 4.13

*Social Involvement Rank of Satisfaction (N=35)*

|  | Very Satisfied |      | Somewhat Satisfied |      | Neutral  |      | Somewhat Dissatisfied |      | Not at all Important |      |
|--|----------------|------|--------------------|------|----------|------|-----------------------|------|----------------------|------|
|  | <i>f</i>       | %    | <i>f</i>           | %    | <i>f</i> | %    | <i>f</i>              | %    | <i>f</i>             | %    |
| Having a job while enrolled  | 18             | 51.4 | 6                  | 17.1 | 0        | 0.0  | 2                     | 5.7  | 9                    | 25.7 |
| Having close friends at Rowan University                           | 15             | 42.9 | 5                  | 14.3 | 4        | 11.4 | 1                     | 2.9  | 10                   | 28.6 |
| Establishing personal relationships with peers at Rowan University | 12             | 34.3 | 5                  | 14.3 | 5        | 14.3 | 4                     | 11.4 | 9                    | 25.7 |
| Interacting with international students                            | 11             | 31.4 | 5                  | 14.3 | 10       | 28.6 | 4                     | 11.4 | 5                    | 14.3 |
| Getting involved in religious activities                           | 11             | 31.4 | 6                  | 17.1 | 10       | 28.6 | 1                     | 2.9  | 7                    | 20.0 |
| Interacting with people of different races and backgrounds         | 9              | 25.7 | 4                  | 11.4 | 10       | 28.6 | 6                     | 17.1 | 6                    | 17.1 |
| Getting involved in student organizations                          | 6              | 17.1 | 7                  | 20.0 | 11       | 31.4 | 5                     | 14.3 | 6                    | 17.1 |
| Getting involved in campus activities                              | 6              | 17.1 | 11                 | 31.4 | 8        | 22.9 | 3                     | 8.6  | 7                    | 20.0 |
| Attending events on campus   | 4              | 11.4 | 14                 | 40.0 | 8        | 22.9 | 5                     | 14.3 | 4                    | 11.4 |

Table 4.14

*Academic Involvement Rank of Satisfaction (N=35)*

|                                     | Very Satisfied |      | Somewhat Satisfied |      | Neutral  |      | Somewhat Dissatisfied |      | Not at all Important |      |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|------|--------------------|------|----------|------|-----------------------|------|----------------------|------|
|                                     | <i>f</i>       | %    | <i>f</i>           | %    | <i>f</i> | %    | <i>f</i>              | %    | <i>f</i>             | %    |
| Academic advising                   | 13             | 37.1 | 8                  | 22.9 | 6        | 17.1 | 6                     | 17.1 | 2                    | 5.7  |
| Instruction in my major courses     | 12             | 34.3 | 7                  | 20.0 | 7        | 20.0 | 3                     | 8.6  | 6                    | 17.1 |
| Faculty availability outside class  | 8              | 22.9 | 11                 | 31.4 | 6        | 17.1 | 3                     | 8.6  | 7                    | 20.0 |
| Instruction in my non-major courses | 6              | 17.1 | 11                 | 31.4 | 10       | 28.6 | 5                     | 14.3 | 3                    | 8.6  |
| Social contacts with faculty        | 5              | 14.3 | 8                  | 22.9 | 13       | 37.1 | 3                     | 8.6  | 6                    | 17.1 |

Students commonly were pleased with their campus atmosphere as well (see Table 4.15). Thirteen (37.1%) students reported to be “very satisfied” with fitting into the campus community. Additionally, 11 (31.4%) indicated there was adequate security on campus and they felt safe. Ten (28.6%) also reported to be “very satisfied” with the academic and intellectual atmosphere on campus. Many students (13 (37.1%)) also reported to be “very satisfied” when asked how they adjusted socially and emotionally to college (see Table 4.16). Additionally, 13 students (37.1%) were “very satisfied” with their adjustment academically to college. Twelve (34.3%) agreed that they, too, were “very satisfied” with their progress towards personal and academic goals, and the development of personal self-esteem and confidence. Eleven (31.4%) students were also “very satisfied” with their personal achievement of academic success. However, 11 (31.4%) students reported to be only “somewhat satisfied” with the development of their life philosophy while in school. By a large majority, students at Rowan University were

very involved in both academic and social activities. They reported a high level of satisfaction with their social involvement, academic atmosphere, campus atmosphere, and personal goal achievement.

Table 4.15

*Campus Atmosphere Rank of Satisfaction (N=35)*

|   | Very Satisfied |      | Somewhat Satisfied |      | Neutral  |      | Somewhat Dissatisfied |      | Not at all Important |      |
|---|----------------|------|--------------------|------|----------|------|-----------------------|------|----------------------|------|
|   | <i>f</i>       | %    | <i>f</i>           | %    | <i>f</i> | %    | <i>f</i>              | %    | <i>f</i>             | %    |
| Fitting into the campus community         | 13             | 37.1 | 5                  | 14.3 | 8        | 22.9 | 4                     | 11.4 | 5                    | 14.3 |
| Adequate personal security                | 11             | 31.4 | 7                  | 20.0 | 7        | 20.0 | 3                     | 8.6  | 7                    | 20.0 |
| Adequate academic/intellectual atmosphere | 10             | 28.6 | 11                 | 31.4 | 3        | 8.6  | 6                     | 17.1 | 5                    | 14.3 |
| Adequate physical environment on campus   | 9              | 25.7 | 9                  | 25.7 | 6        | 17.1 | 5                     | 14.3 | 3                    | 8.6  |
| Adequate social atmosphere                | 9              | 25.7 | 9                  | 25.7 | 6        | 17.1 | 4                     | 11.4 | 6                    | 17.1 |
| Adequate physical environment on campus   | 8              | 22.9 | 11                 | 31.4 | 8        | 22.9 | 5                     | 14.3 | 3                    | 8.6  |

Table 4.16

*Personal Goals Rank of Satisfaction (N=35)*

|   | Very Satisfied |      | Somewhat Satisfied |      | Neutral  |      | Somewhat Dissatisfied |      | Not at all Important |      |
|---|----------------|------|--------------------|------|----------|------|-----------------------|------|----------------------|------|
|   | <i>f</i>       | %    | <i>f</i>           | %    | <i>f</i> | %    | <i>f</i>              | %    | <i>f</i>             | %    |
| Adjusting academically to college           | 13             | 37.1 | 7                  | 20.0 | 5        | 14.3 | 5                     | 14.3 | 5                    | 14.3 |
| Making progress toward personal goals       | 12             | 34.3 | 9                  | 25.7 | 2        | 5.7  | 3                     | 8.6  | 9                    | 25.7 |
| Making progress toward academic goals       | 12             | 34.3 | 9                  | 25.7 | 2        | 5.7  | 5                     | 14.3 | 7                    | 20.0 |
| Developing my Self-esteem & confidence      | 12             | 34.3 | 6                  | 17.1 | 4        | 11.4 | 5                     | 14.3 | 8                    | 22.9 |
| Making progress toward career goals         | 11             | 31.4 | 7                  | 20.0 | 6        | 17.1 | 5                     | 14.3 | 6                    | 17.1 |
| My personal motivation for academic success | 11             | 31.4 | 5                  | 14.3 | 7        | 20.0 | 6                     | 17.1 | 6                    | 17.1 |
| My personal achievement of academic success | 11             | 31.4 | 10                 | 28.6 | 4        | 11.4 | 4                     | 11.4 | 6                    | 17.1 |
| Being interested in my studies              | 10             | 28.6 | 11                 | 31.4 | 2        | 5.7  | 5                     | 14.3 | 7                    | 20.0 |
| Developing personal values & beliefs        | 8              | 22.9 | 11                 | 31.4 | 5        | 14.3 | 4                     | 11.4 | 7                    | 20.0 |
| Developing spiritually                      | 6              | 17.1 | 10                 | 28.6 | 8        | 22.9 | 4                     | 11.4 | 7                    | 20.0 |
| Developing a philosophy of life             | 5              | 14.3 | 11                 | 31.4 | 8        | 22.9 | 4                     | 11.4 | 7                    | 20.0 |

A positive correlation emerged during data analysis that dealt with involvement in campus activities and satisfaction with campus environment. The relationship between getting involved on campus and the satisfaction levels of students with attending Rowan University is direct and moderate ( $r = .449, p = .007$ ).

Table 4.17

*Correlation between Satisfaction with Attending Rowan University and Getting Involved on Campus (N=35)*

|  | How sure are you that you made the right choice in attending Rowan University? | Getting involved in campus activities. |
|--|--|--|
| How sure are you that you made the right choice in attending Rowan University? | Pearson Correlation  | .449*                                  |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed)  | .007                                   |
|  | N  | 35                                     |

\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

## CHAPTER V

### Summary, Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

#### Summary of the Study

This study investigated the student involvement patterns of selected students in the Student Community Policing Program (SCPP) run by the Department of Public Safety at Rowan University, Glassboro, New Jersey, in January 2011. The study was also designed to investigate and assess the impact of student involvement in these types of programs on students' satisfaction with the Rowan University campus and academic programs. The subjects in the study were students who were currently involved in SCPP at Rowan University.

A four-part questionnaire, consisting of a paper survey form, was distributed individually to 40 students during a mandatory meeting at the beginning of the spring 2011 semester on January 15, 2011. Although attendance at the meeting was mandatory, for all staff participation in the survey was still optional and left up to the discretion of each member of the organization. The first part of the questionnaire collected demographic data, including how long a student had attend Rowan University, had been involved in SCPP, and their current housing status. The second section of the questionnaire asked respondents to report activities they took part in on a weekly, monthly, and yearly basis. The third section asked respondents to choose certain responses that best suited them about their levels of satisfaction at Rowan University. The fourth section consisted of 34 Likert-type items split into two sections. The first part

asked respondents to rank the importance of certain items pertaining to student involvement and the second part asked respondents to rank their satisfaction with the same items. The entire fourth section was used to evaluate the attitudes, opinions, and satisfaction of student involvement on the Rowan University campus in multiple ways. Thirty-five completed surveys were anonymously collected during the mandatory January meeting, yielding a return rate of 88%.

Descriptive statistics and correlations were used to analyze the data from the completed surveys. Variations in student involvement patterns and students' attitudes and levels of satisfaction were explored using Predictive Analytic Software (PASW) Version 18.0. PASW was used to calculate Pearson product-moment correlations and descriptive statistics including frequencies, means, percentages, and standard deviations. Some significant statistical differences were determined.

#### Discussion of the Findings

Research Question 1: What are the involvement patterns of students in the Student Community Policing Program (SCPP) at Rowan University run through the Department of Public Safety?

A portion of this study examined the impact on involvement levels and patterns of students who were involved in the Student Community Policing Program. These students worked as student employees during the academic year and participated in a wide variety of programs through the Department of Public Safety at Rowan University. The majority of the subjects had an overall positive attitude towards being involved on campus and with the program. These students were observed to be highly involved and engaged in the

campus community. The majority of subjects self-reported high levels of involvement in a variety of campus activities. The highest levels of involvement were present in campus recreation, 14 (40.0%), hobbies and social clubs, 12 (34.4%), professional and departmental clubs, 8 (22.95%), and volunteer services, 8 (22.95%). In addition, these students also had significant contact between themselves, faculty, and the administration of Rowan University. The level of personal communication, in person and through e-mail, with faculty during the academic year was wide-ranging. The students self-reported responses were scattered between three to 800 times a year with 5 (14.3%) reporting to communicate 10 times, 4 (11.4%) 20 times, and 5 (14.3%) 50 times an academic year. These students also engaged in a number of conversations with faculty about research and scholarships during the academic year. Sixteen (45.8%) reported to have at least one conversation during the academic year with faculty about research or scholarship opportunities. Additionally, these conversations extended to educational plans, problems, and progress, not only with faculty, but with higher education staff. A little more than half of the students 19 (54.3%) reported to have no less than one and no more than three conversations about their academic situation in an academic year. Moreover, students also engaged in multiple conversations with career advisors concerning their potential careers. Twelve (34.3%) students reported to have at least two conversations during the year.

Student employees of SCPP were constantly engaged in the Rowan University community through campus activities and steady conversations with faculty and administrators. While enrolled at Rowan University and employed by SCPP, students

spent a great deal of time on campus during the week and on the weekends, with almost half, 17 (48.6%), reporting to spend at least 3 weekends a month residing on the Rowan University campus. This is, to some extent, due to their employment obligations that require them to work frequent weekend hours. This requirement has been beneficial to students who choose to stay on campus during the weekends since they are exposed to more of the campus community and have the opportunity to take part in more events offered through the university. Additionally, students were engaged in conversations with diverse students from varying backgrounds on a frequent basis. These students also kept in contact with a number of their peers and shared many conversations with people different from their own background. A moderate relationship (Pearson  $r = .349$ ) was discovered between the amount of time spent on campus during the weekend and the amount of conversations shared with diverse students. The more time spent on campus the more likely students were to engage in conversation on campus with other diverse students and faculty.

Data were analyzed looking at the relationship between working on and off-campus and student involvement. Consistent with previous findings (Astin, 1975, 1993, 1996, 1999), this study found that having a job on-campus, through SCPP for the purpose of this study, was positively correlated with student involvement. Although these students tended to be more involved on campus and engaged with their academic faculty, they shared little interest in college productions or performances and involvement in campus religious organizations. The lack of interest in the arts could be due to the nature of students who involve themselves in student public safety programs. Another factor could

include the lack of time they have to be involved in such productions with their work schedules and other personal commitments.

Research Question 2: Is there a significant relationship between involvement in leadership programs, such as the Student Community Policing Program (SCPP), and campus activities?

A significant correlation was discovered during the analysis of the data involving student involvement in leadership programs. Most students were involved in some type of leadership program on campus, which included participation in the Student Community Policing Program (SCPP) and the supplemental programs and events offered through the organization. The relationship between students involved in leadership programs and students involved in student government was determined to be direct and significant. Students involved in leadership programs were generally more involved on campus and took a more active role in the campus community. These students also tended to be involved in other programs on campus, with a particular concentration of students being involved in student government activities and events. Student involvement in both leadership programs and student government activities help to foster the development of student identity. These programs not only promote community involvement, but also personal growth. Involvement in programs that aid in the development of leadership skills, create a sense of community, and promote service can positively affect student outcomes during their higher education career. Rhoads (1997) believes, "Participation in community service is an educational activity that lends itself to identity clarification and exploration of the self" (p. 2). Taub (1990) believes that

encouraging these types of programs in higher education is critical to student development. Flowers (2004) agrees with Taub (1990) who believes that this type of involvement outside of the traditional college classroom is important to students. Additionally, another relationship was discovered between the amount of hours spent in SCPP and involvement in hobby and social clubs on campus.

Research Question 3: What is the impact of student involvement in these programs on students' satisfaction with the Rowan University campus and academic programs?

There was an overall positive response to the university which was an acceptable indicator of student's attitudes and satisfaction with Rowan University and its academic and social community. Twenty seven (77%) of the students surveyed reported that it is "extremely important" that they graduate from Rowan University. Also, students were quite happy with their current employment status on campus and through SCPP, reporting that more than half, 18 (51.4%) were "very satisfied" when asked about having a job while enrolled. Fifteen (42.9%) students were "very satisfied" with their ability to make and have friends at Rowan University. Twelve (34.3%) of the students were "very satisfied" with being able to establish personal relationships with peers while at Rowan. Again, students exhibited a great deal of interest and satisfaction with diversity in their community when they reported to be "very satisfied" with interacting with international students.

Students' satisfaction with Rowan University carried over into their contentment with faculty, instruction, and campus atmosphere. They reported to be very happy with

the instruction they received in their major courses. Twelve (34.3%) reported to be “very satisfied” with their instruction. Seven (20.0%) reported to be “somewhat satisfied.” Eleven (31.4%) were also “somewhat satisfied” with their instruction in non-major courses. Eleven (31.4%) students reported to be “somewhat satisfied” with the availability of their faculty outside of the classroom, while 13 (37.1%) were “very satisfied” with the academic advising that they had received during the academic year. Students were also quite satisfied with their campus community and environment. Eleven (31.4%) students reported to be “very satisfied” when asked about the adequate personal security on the Rowan University campus. Eleven (31.4%) were also “very satisfied” with the adequate physical environment on campus.

Students also felt as though they were making satisfactory progress toward their academic, personal, and emotional goals while enrolled at Rowan University. Twelve (34.3%) of the students surveyed reported to be “very satisfied” with both their progress towards achieving personal and academic goals. Eleven (31.4%) of the students surveyed reported to be “very satisfied” with the progress they were making toward achieving their career goals. These data confirmed the work of Tinto (1997) who argues that student involvement greatly matters in the life of a developing student and leads to greater attainment of knowledge, development of skills, and achievement of goals. Pepper (2009) references Astin (1993), Dugan (2006), Dugan and Komives (2007), Kezar and Moriarty (2000), and Pascarella & Terenzini (2005) when he discusses the fact that previous research has determined that student involvement in campus activities and events increases skills and development in college students. These increased skills and

accelerated development could lend itself to the elevated levels of contact with faculty and staff at the university and their satisfaction with the ongoing personal and professional development. It was also found that the total amount of time spent on working was positively correlated with the involvement levels of students and the satisfactions with the Rowan University campus and environment.

### Conclusions

Students who participated in the survey displayed a number of involvement levels and patterns. These students, for the most part, were heavily involved in on-campus activities such as student organizations, professional, and department clubs. Additionally, they spent a good deal of time preparing for courses and interacting with faculty. These students were satisfied with the education they had received from Rowan University and valued the opportunity to graduate from the university. Overall, they enjoyed their time spent at the university and were pleased with their academic pursuits and achievement of personal and social goals.

The results of this study generally confirmed the findings of other studies done on student involvement and student engagement on higher education campuses. This study specifically confirmed Astin's (1984) theory of student involvement. Astin (1984) believed that the amount of time involved and put forth in a specific activity while enrolled at an institution of higher education had significant benefit and impact on the student's experience. This was an extremely important discovery since changes are occurring on campuses of higher education institutions all over the world.

As Crosling, Heagney, and Thomas (2009) state:

An issue of concern in higher education institutions across the world is the retention and success of students in their studies. This is a particularly pressing issue in the context of widening participation for under-represented student groups, increasing student diversity and educational quality assurance and accountability processes. As well as the personal impact and loss of life chances for students, non-completion has financial implications for students (and their families), and for society and the economy through the loss of potential skills and knowledge. There are also financial and reputational implications for higher education institutions. (p. 9)

There is generous evidence to support the claim that student involvement in campus programs, activities, and events has a positive impact on the social and personal development of students in college (Dugan & Komives, 2007; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). Pepper (2009) states that, “Scholars generally have agreed that students experience numerous benefits from being involved in co curricular programming” (p. 16). This study confirmed these findings by analyzing the involvement levels and patterns of students involved in SCPP and its effects on their satisfaction at Rowan University. This study also generally confirmed the research of Schlies (1992) and found that the longer students are in school, the more they are involved.

Particular research did show significant correlations and confirmed previous research and findings. Rust, Dhanatya, Furuto, and Kheiltash (2008) explain that, “Much research has been done in the past on the effects of student involvement and the college

experience” (p. 2). However, these findings could not be confirmed with previous studies done on student involvement and student engagement with public safety, since no studies could be found during the time of this study. Although no studies on student involvement and engagement in public safety programs could be found, many other comparable studies were evaluated. Research by Terenzini, Pascarella, and Blimling (1996) regarding the influence of students’ out-of class experiences on their developmental learning outcomes was evaluated. Flowers (2004) explained that “Based on their research synthesis, it can be concluded that a variety of college experiences positively impact college student development” (p. 634). Additionally, the study generally confirmed the findings of Moore, Lovell, McGann, and Wyrick (1998), who found that student involvement research overwhelmingly supports the belief that student involvement positively influences moral development, cognitive development, and career aspirations for college students. This was evident by student employees’ increased and prolonged interactions with faculty and academic advisors, as well as students self-reported satisfaction levels with the progress they were making toward their personal and professional goals. The results of this study also generally confirmed the finding of Terenzini, Pascarella, and Blimling (1996). Recent research conducted by Hernandez, Hogan, Hathaway, and Lovell (1999) on the effects of student involvement on college students’ educational outcomes recorded similar findings to those found in the present study.

SCPP promotes both leadership skills and community involvement at the same time keeping students actively engaged in their academic and social campus community.

Although institutions of higher education are primarily responsible for ensuring the success of their students, student attitudes must be taken into account to help ensure a successful student body, as well as growth and development of programs that Student Affairs professionals and administrators once deemed unnecessary or just overlooked. This study researched the impact of student involvement in SCPP and many beneficial results were found. As Chang (2002) noted, “The works of several researchers has asserted and shown the importance of student involvement in the college settings” (p. 3).

#### Recommendations for Practice

Based upon the findings and conclusions of the study, the following suggestions are presented:

1. At a very exact level, Rowan University should create a more supportive environment for the Department of Public Safety to efficiently and successfully run SCPP.
2. Rowan University and its administrators should better fund the SCPP program, which would mean higher hourly pay for student employees, new uniforms, enhanced training, and up-to-date security equipment.
3. SCPP administrators and coordinators should work more closely with Rowan University administrators to negotiate better benefits to compensate their student employees.
4. Administrators and Student Affairs professionals should involve themselves in building up programs such as SCPP and bringing the Department of Public Safety to the academic community.

5. Administrators involved in higher education should consider appropriating a larger budget allotment to programs such as SCPP, with the intention of enticing additional students to the program.
6. Institutions of higher education should consider the creation of a student police academy on campus similar to the one created on the Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey campus.
7. Departments of Public Safety at institutions of higher education should encourage students to take an active role in their academic campus community, through various internships, job opportunities, workshops, and events.
8. Institutions of higher education should better educate the academic community about the role and responsibilities of the Department of Public Safety and build relations between students and Public Safety Officials.

#### Recommendations for Further Research

Based upon the findings and conclusions of the study, the following suggestions are presented:

1. Further studies should be conducted with larger populations to confirm the findings in this study.
2. A follow-up analysis should be done using the same subjects to compare the findings of the different studies.
3. A study should be conducted to compare attitudes and the amount of time student employees actually spend involved in the program.

4. An additional study should be conducted to replicate this study, but expand the scope to include information including other programs involved with on and off-campus, GPA of students involved (before and after), and amount and type of involvement.
5. Future research should be conducted to explore the impact of student involvement on student development that incorporates larger sample sizes and data from nontraditional students involved in the Student Community Policing Program.
6. A longitudinal study should be conducted with Senior Practitioners from the Student Community Policing Program tracking personal progress after graduation and their success in their chosen career field.
7. A longitudinal study should be conducted with a larger group of past student employees of the Student Community Policing Program that tracks their career success after graduation.

## REFERENCES

- Allen, K. E., & Garb, E. L. (1993). Reinventing student affairs: Something old and something new. *NASPA Journal*, 30, 93-100.
- Astin, A.W. (1975). *Preventing students from dropping out*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Astin, A. W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 25(4), 297-308.
- Astin, A. W. (1985). *Achieving educational excellence: A critical assessment of priorities and practices in higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college? Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Astin, A. W. (1996). Involvement in learning revisited: Lessons we have learned. *Journal of College Student Development*, 37, 123-134.
- Astin, A. W. (1999) Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Development*, 40(5). Retrieved March 21, 2009, from the Blackboard-CE@ Rowan University web site.
- Bateson, R., & Taylor, J. (2004). Student involvement in university life- beyond political activism and university governance: A view from central and eastern Europe. *European Journal of Education*. 39(4), 471-483.

- Berkner, L., He, S., & Cataldi, E.F. (2002). Descriptive summary of 1995– Postsecondary Students: Six years later (NCES 2003–151). Washington, Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved February 22, 2009, from National Center for Education Statistics Web site:  
<http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2003/2003151.pdf>
- Bryson, C., & Hand, L. (2007). The role of engagement in inspiring teaching and learning. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 44(4), 349-362. Retrieved June 14, 2010, from EBSCOhost Educational Administration Abstracts.
- Chang, J. (2002). Student involvement in the community college: A look at the diversity and value of student activities and programs. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Chute, E. (2008). Students face a long list of obstacles on the way to college degree. Available online (<http://www.post-gazette.com/pg/08244/908437-298.stm>).
- Crosling, G., Heagney, M., & Thomas, L. (2009). Improving Student Retention in Higher Education: Improving Teaching and Learning. *Australian Universities' Review*, 51(2), 9-18. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Dennis, M. J. (1998). *A practical guide to enrollment and retention management in higher education*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Dugan, J. P. (2006) Involvement and leadership: A descriptive analysis of socially responsible leadership. *Journal of College Student Development*, 47(3), 335-343.

- Dugan, J. P., & Komives, S. R. (2007). *Developing leadership capacity in college students: Findings from a national study*. Report from the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership. College Park, MD: National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs.
- Flowers, L. A. (2004). Examining the effects of student involvement on African American college student development. *Journal of College Student Development* 45(6): 633-654.
- Garland, P. H., & Grace, T. W. (1993). *New perspectives for student affairs professionals: Evolving realities, responsibilities and roles*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No.7. Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.
- Goodchild, L. F. (2007). History of higher education in the United States. In Wechsler, H. S., Goodchild, L. F., & Eisenmann, L. (Eds.), *The history of higher education* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.) (pp. 36- 48). Boston, MA: Pearson Custom Publishing.
- Hernandez, K., Hogan, S., Hathaway, C., & Lovell, C. D. (1999). Analysis of the literature on the impact of student involvement on student development and learning: More questions than answers? *NASPA Journal*, 36, 184-197.
- Hu, S., & Kuh, G. D. (2002). Being (dis)engaged in educationally purposeful activities: The influences of student and institutional characteristics. *Research in Higher Education*, 43(5), 555- 575. Retrieved June 15, 2010, from the EBSCOhost Educational Administration Abstracts.

- Kahrig, T., (2005). An evaluation of the Residential Learning Communities program at Ohio University: An analysis of student involvement, satisfaction, academic success, and retention. Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio University, United States -- Ohio. Retrieved November 29, 2010, from Dissertations & Theses: A&I. (Publication No. AAT 3197298).
- Kelley-Hall, C. (2010). The role of student support services in encouraging student involvement and its impact on student perceptions and academic experiences. Ed.D. dissertation, Clemson University, United States, South Carolina. Retrieved November 2, 2010, from Dissertations & Theses: A&I. (Publication No. AAT 3402531).
- Kezar, A., & Moriarty, D. (2000). Expanding our understanding of student leadership development: A study exploring gender and ethnic identity. *Journal of College Student Development*, 41, 55-68.
- Krause, K. & Coates, H. (2008). Students' engagement in first-year university. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, (33)5, 493- 505. Retrieved June 15, 2010, from the EBSCOhost Educational Administration Abstracts.
- Kuh, G. D., Cruce, T. M., Shoup, R., Kinzie, J., & Gonyea, R. M. (2008). Unmasking the effects of student engagement on first-year college grades and persistence. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 79(5). Retrieved May 29, 2010 from the EBSCOhost ERIC database.

- Kuh, G. D., Schuh, J. H., Whitt, E. J., & Associates. (1991). *Involving colleges: Successful approaches to fostering student learning and personal development outside the classroom*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- LaNasa, S., Olson, E., & Allemen, N. (2007). The impact of on- campus student growth on first year student engagement and success. *Research in higher education*, 48(4). Retrieved June 3, 2010 from EBSCOhost Academic Search Premier Database.
- Lochner, S. (2008, October, 29). Neighborhood watch program lacks student involvement. *The Daily Orange*. Retrieved May 29 2010, from <http://media.www.dailyorange.com/media/storage/paper522/news/2008/10/29/News/Neighborhood.Watch.Program.Lacks.Student.Involvement-3512617.shtml>
- Moore, J., Lovell, C. D., McGann, T., & Wyrick, J. (1998). Why involvement matters: A review of research on student involvement in the collegiate setting. *College Student Affairs Journal*, 17(2), 4-17.
- Newcomb, T. M. (1964). Student peer-group influence. In Sanford, N. (Eds.), *College and character* (pp. 141-152). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Pace, C. R. (1974). *Demise of diversity: A comparative profile of eight types of institutions*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Pascarella, E., & Terenzini, P. (2005). *How college affects students: Vol. 2, A third decade of research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Pepper, R. C. (2009). In Longbotham G. (Ed.), *The impact of motivation to lead on college students' cocurricular involvement*. United States -- Virginia: Regent University. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/305136600?accountid=13605>
- Perkins, H. (2007). History of universities. In Wechsler, H. S., Goodchild, L. F., & Eisenmann, L. (Eds.), *The history of higher education* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.) (pp. 6- 35). Boston, MA: Pearson Custom Publishing.
- Rhoads, R. A. (1997). *Explorations of the Caring Self: Rethinking Student Development and Liberal Learning*. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Rowan University-About Rowan. (2010). Retrieved March 20, 2011, from Rowan University Web site: <http://www.rowan.edu/open/subpages/about/history/>
- Rowan University Public Safety. (2008). Retrieved February 20, 2009, from Rowan University, Rowan Public Safety Web site: <http://www.rowan.edu/safety/>
- Rowan University Student Community Policing Program. (2010). Retrieved March 21, 2010, from Rowan University, Public Safety Web site: <http://www.rowan.edu/safety/scpp/>
- Rutgers University Community Service Officer Program. (2008). Retrieved May 29, 2010, from Rutgers University, New Brunswick Campus, Employment Web site: <http://publicsafety.rutgers.edu/rupd/CSO%20Recruitment%20Brochure.pdf>
- Rust, V., Dhanatya, C., Furuto, L. L., & Kheiltash, O. (2008). Student Involvement as Predictive of College Freshmen Plans to Study Abroad. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 151-16. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

- Sandeen, A. (2003). *Enhancing student engagement on campus*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Sanford N. (1964a). Freshman personality: A Stage in human development. In Sanford, N. Eds.), *College and character* (pp. 86-90). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Sanford, N. (1964b). Higher education as a social problem. In Sanford, N. (Eds.), *College and character* (pp. 3-13). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Schlies, M. J. (1992). A comparison of Hispanic and Caucasian undergraduate students' quality of effort of involvement, level of satisfaction, and perception of the college environment (Doctoral dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 1992). *Proquest Dissertations and Abstracts International-A*, 53 (08), 2708.
- Student Involvement and Leadership Opportunities. (2008). Retrieved June 1, 2010, from University of Hartford, Campus Life Web site:  
<http://www.hartford.edu/theforce/leadership.pdf>
- Taub, D. J. (1990). Community service: Increased interest on campuses. *The Commuter*, 16(2), 1.
- Terenzini, P. T., Pascarella, E. T., & Blimling, G. S. (1996). Students' out-of-class experiences and their influence on learning and cognitive development: A literature review. *Journal of College Student Development*, 37, 149-162.
- Tinto, V. (1997). Classroom as communities: Exploring the educational character of student persistence. *Journal of Higher Education*, 68, 599-623.

- Trow, M. A. (2007). American higher education: Past, present, and future. In Wechsler, H. S., Goodchild, L. F., & Eisenmann, L. (Eds.), *The history of higher education* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.) (pp. 582-596). Boston, MA: Pearson Custom Publishing.
- Weick, K. E. (2000). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. In M.C. Brown III. (Ed.), *Organization & governance in higher education* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.) (pp. 36-49). Boston, MA: Pearson Custom Publishing.
- Wolf-Wendel, L., Ward, K., & Kinzie, J. (2009). A tangled web of terms: The overlap and unique contribution of involvement, engagement, and integration to understanding college student success. *Journal of College Student Development*, 50(4), 407-428.

## APPENDIX A

### Institutional Review Board Approval Letter



December 15, 2010

Stephanie Anne Staple  
16 Talia Road  
Flemington, NJ 08822

Dear Stephanie Anne Staple:

In accordance with the University's IRB policies and 45 CFR 46, the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects, I am pleased to inform you that the Rowan University Institutional Review Board (IRB) has approved your project:

IRB application number: 2011-063

Project Title: Involvement Patterns: Student Involvement in the Student Community Policing Program at Rowan University

In accordance with federal law, this approval is effective for **one calendar year** from the date of this letter. If your research project extends beyond that date or if you need to make significant modifications to your study, you must notify the IRB immediately. Please reference the above-cited IRB application number in any future communications with our office regarding this research.

Please retain copies of consent forms for this research for three years after completion of the research.

If, during your research, you encounter any unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects, you must report this immediately to Dr. Harriet Hartman ([hartman@rowan.edu](mailto:hartman@rowan.edu) or call 856-256-4500, ext. 3787) or contact Dr. Gautam Pillay, Associate Provost for Research ([pillay@rowan.edu](mailto:pillay@rowan.edu) or call 856-256-5150).

If you have any administrative questions, please contact Karen Heiser ([heiser@rowan.edu](mailto:heiser@rowan.edu) or 856-256-5150).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Harriet Hartman".

Harriet Hartman, Ph.D.  
Chair, Rowan University IRB

c: Burton Sisco, Educational Leadership, Education Hall

Office of Research  
Bole Hall Annex  
201 Mullica Hill Road  
Glassboro, NJ 08028-1701

856-256-5150  
856-256-4425 fax

## APPENDIX B

### Survey Instrument

## Rowan University Student Involvement Study

*While participation in this survey is voluntary and you are not required to answer any of the questions herein, your cooperation and participation are important to the success of the project and are greatly appreciated. If you choose to participate, please understand that all responses are strictly confidential and no personally identifiable information is being requested. Your completion of this survey constitutes informed consent and your willingness to participate. If you are under the age of 18 when this survey is administered, please disregard and do not participate. If you have any questions about this survey or the study it is being conducted for, please contact Stephanie Anne Staple at Staple12@students.rowan.edu or (732)713-0253 or Dr. Burton R. Sisco at Sisco@rowan.edu or (856)256-4500 ext. 3717.*

### Demographic Information

**1. Gender**

- Male
- Female

**2. Race/Ethnic Group**

- American Indian/Native American
- African American/Black
- Asian American
- Caucasian/White
- Hispanic/Latino
- Multiracial

**3. Age**

- 18 to 20
- 21 to 23
- 24 to 26

**4. How many years have you been at Rowan?**

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 5+

**5. Where do you reside, while in college?**

- On-campus housing
- Off-campus housing
- Off-campus, with parent or guardian.

**6. How many years have you been in the Student Community Policing Program?**

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 5+

Directions: The following questions ask about how often you do certain activities—weekly, monthly, and yearly. Please answer each question honestly, placing your response in the blank beside each question. When completed, return this form to your Senior Practitioner by February 14, 2011.

**WEEKLY:** The first two questions ask about how much time you spend per week doing certain activities.

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. How many hours did you spend each week studying for classes during this academic year?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. How many of the following activities did you participate in? (For the following list of activities, place an (X) on the first line for those you participated in. For those you mark with an (X), please indicate the number of hours you participated each week during this academic year in the space to the right.)

| (X)   | (#)   |                                     |
|-------|-------|-------------------------------------|
| _____ | _____ | Intercollegiate Athletics           |
| _____ | _____ | Campus Recreation                   |
| _____ | _____ | College Publications                |
| _____ | _____ | College Productions or Performances |
| _____ | _____ | Fraternities, Sororities            |
| _____ | _____ | Professional or Departmental Clubs  |
| _____ | _____ | Hobbies or Social Clubs             |
| _____ | _____ | Religious Organizations             |
| _____ | _____ | Residence Hall Activities           |
| _____ | _____ | Public Safety Programs              |
| _____ | _____ | Student Government                  |
| _____ | _____ | International-Related Activities    |
| _____ | _____ | Leadership Programs                 |
| _____ | _____ | Volunteer Services                  |

**MONTHLY:** Questions 3 through 6 ask you about how much time you spend per month doing certain activities.

- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. How many weekends each month do you spend on campus?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. How many times do you go out with friends (for pizza, soft drinks, movies, etc.) each month?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. How many on-campus parties did you attend each month during this academic year?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. How many conversations, with diverse students from backgrounds different from your own, have you had in an average month?

**YEARLY:** Questions 7 through 13 ask you about how much time you spent per year doing certain activities.

- \_\_\_\_\_ 7. How many books other than those assigned for class did you read for your own pleasure or information this academic year?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 8. How many events did you attend during this academic year? (e.g., performance, concert, lecture, play, fair, etc.)?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 9. How many conversations about educational plans, problems, or progress did you have with staff during this academic year?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 10. How many conversations about faculty research and scholarship have you had with faculty during this academic year?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 11. During this academic year, how many times did you communicate, in person or through e-mail, with faculty?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 12. How many times have you talked with a career advisor or attended a program concerning your career during this academic year?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 13. How many times have you been to the library this academic year?

Questions 14 through 18 ask you to respond by placing the letter corresponding to the response that best describes your feelings in the blank provided.

14. How sure are you that you made the right choice in attending Rowan University?
- A. Definitely Right Choice                      B. Probably Right Choice  
C. Definitely Wrong Choice                      D. Probably Wrong Choice  
E. Not Sure
15. How important is it that you graduate from Rowan University?
- A. Extremely Important                      B. Very Important  
C. Somewhat Important                      D. Not At All Important
16. How important is it to you that you graduate from any university?
- A. Extremely Important                      B. Very Important  
C. Somewhat Important                      D. Not At All Important
17. Will you return to Rowan University next fall?
- A. Definitely Will Return                      B. Probably Will Return  
C. Definitely Will Not Return                      D. Probably Will Not Return  
E. Not Sure
18. How would you rate the quality of instruction at Rowan University?
- A. Very Satisfactory                      B. Somewhat Satisfactory  
C. Very Unsatisfactory                      D. Somewhat Unsatisfactory  
E. Neutral

Questions 19 through 52 have two parts. First, please rate how important each item is to you here at Rowan University by circling the best response. Second, rate how satisfied you are with each item here at Rowan University by circling the best response. Use the following scales:

*Very Important= 1, Somewhat Important= 2, Neutral= 3, Somewhat Unimportant= 4, Not at all Important= 5*

*Very Satisfied= 1, Somewhat Satisfied= 2, Neutral= 3, Somewhat Dissatisfied= 4, Not at all Satisfied= 5*

|  | <u>Importance</u> | <u>Satisfaction</u> |
|--|-------------------|---------------------|
| <b><u>Social Involvement</u></b>                                       |                   |                     |
| 19. Establishing Personal Relationships with Peers at Rowan University | 1 2 3 4 5         | 1 2 3 4 5           |
| 20. Having close friends at Rowan University                           | 1 2 3 4 5         | 1 2 3 4 5           |
| 21. Getting Involved in Student Organizations                          | 1 2 3 4 5         | 1 2 3 4 5           |
| 22. Getting involved in campus activities                              | 1 2 3 4 5         | 1 2 3 4 5           |
| 23. Attending events on campus   | 1 2 3 4 5         | 1 2 3 4 5           |
| 24. Interacting with international students                            | 1 2 3 4 5         | 1 2 3 4 5           |
| 25. Interacting with people of different races and backgrounds         | 1 2 3 4 5         | 1 2 3 4 5           |
| 26. Getting involved in religious activities                           | 1 2 3 4 5         | 1 2 3 4 5           |
| 27. Having a job while enrolled  | 1 2 3 4 5         | 1 2 3 4 5           |
| <b><u>Academic Involvement</u></b>                                     |                   |                     |
| 28. Instruction in my major courses                                    | 1 2 3 4 5         | 1 2 3 4 5           |
| 29. Instruction in my non-major courses                                | 1 2 3 4 5         | 1 2 3 4 5           |
| 30. Faculty availability outside class                                 | 1 2 3 4 5         | 1 2 3 4 5           |
| 31. Social contacts with faculty                                       | 1 2 3 4 5         | 1 2 3 4 5           |
| 32. Academic advising  | 1 2 3 4 5         | 1 2 3 4 5           |
| <b><u>Campus Atmosphere</u></b>  |                   |                     |
| 33. Adequate personal security   | 1 2 3 4 5         | 1 2 3 4 5           |
| 34. Adequate physical environment on campus                            | 1 2 3 4 5         | 1 2 3 4 5           |
| 35. Adequate physical environment on campus                            | 1 2 3 4 5         | 1 2 3 4 5           |
| 36. Adequate social atmosphere   | 1 2 3 4 5         | 1 2 3 4 5           |
| 37. Adequate academic/intellectual atmosphere                          | 1 2 3 4 5         | 1 2 3 4 5           |
| 38. Fitting into the campus community                                  | 1 2 3 4 5         | 1 2 3 4 5           |
| <b><u>Personal Goals</u></b>   |                   |                     |
| 39. Making progress toward personal goals                              | 1 2 3 4 5         | 1 2 3 4 5           |
| 40. Making progress toward academic goals                              | 1 2 3 4 5         | 1 2 3 4 5           |
| 41. Making progress toward career goals                                | 1 2 3 4 5         | 1 2 3 4 5           |
| 42. Adjusting academically to college                                  | 1 2 3 4 5         | 1 2 3 4 5           |
| 43. Adjusting socially to college                                      | 1 2 3 4 5         | 1 2 3 4 5           |
| 44. Adjusting emotionally to college                                   | 1 2 3 4 5         | 1 2 3 4 5           |
| 45. Managing personal stress   | 1 2 3 4 5         | 1 2 3 4 5           |
| 46. Developing my Self-esteem & confidence                             | 1 2 3 4 5         | 1 2 3 4 5           |
| 47. Developing personal values & beliefs                               | 1 2 3 4 5         | 1 2 3 4 5           |

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 48. Developing a philosophy of life             | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 49. Developing spiritually                      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 50. My personal motivation for academic success | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 51. My personal achievement of academic success | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 52. Being interested in my studies              | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

**Please return this form to your Senior Practitioner by February 14, 2011.**

Thank you for your participation in this survey. The time you have given to complete this survey is very much appreciated. No identifiable information will be attached to the survey you have just taken. If you have any other questions or concerns about this survey or the research study being conducted you can contact Stephanie Anne Staple at her email address Staple12@students.rowan.edu or on her phone at (732) 713-0253.

THANK YOU!

## APPENDIX C

### Permission to Survey Student Employees of SCPP



Ptl. F. Agosta  
Rowan Police  
201 Mullica Hill Rd.  
Glassboro, NJ 08028  
December 1, 2010

Stephanie Anne Staple  
16 Tailia Rd  
Flemington, NJ 08822

Dear Stephanie Staple,

I spoke with Lt. Flail regarding this and you have the department's permission to conduct the survey with the Student Community Policing Program's Practitioners. We will be having a meeting in January to set up the schedule and you are more than welcome to attend in order to conduct the survey. Let me know if there is anything else you need. I will email to you the information as soon as we have the exact time decided for the meeting.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Ptl. F. Agosta".

Ptl. Frank Agosta

Public Safety  
Bole Hall Annex  
201 Mullica Hill Road  
Glassboro, NJ 08028-1701

856-256-4568  
856-256-5606 fax