

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Community Oriented Policing Services



National Summit on Campus Public Safety

National Summit on Campus Public Safety

Strategies for Colleges and Universities in a Homeland Security Environment



[WWW.COPS.USDOJ.GOV](http://www.cops.usdoj.gov) [WWW.COPS.USDOJ.GOV](http://www.cops.usdoj.gov) [WWW.COPS.USDOJ.GOV](http://www.cops.usdoj.gov) [WWW.COPS.USDOJ.GOV](http://www.cops.usdoj.gov) [WWW.COPS.USDOJ.GOV](http://www.cops.usdoj.gov) [WWW.COPS.USDOJ.GOV](http://www.cops.usdoj.gov) [WWW.COPS.USDOJ.GOV](http://www.cops.usdoj.gov) [WWW.COPS.USDOJ.GOV](http://www.cops.usdoj.gov) [WWW.COPS.USDOJ.GOV](http://www.cops.usdoj.gov) [WWW.COPS.USDOJ.GOV](http://www.cops.usdoj.gov)

Campus Law Enforcement Summit Report

This project was supported by Cooperative Agreement #20002CKWXK052 by the U.S. Department of Justice Office of Community Oriented Policing Services. Points of view or opinions contained in this document are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Mid-Atlantic Regional Community Policing Institute (MARCPI) acknowledges the time, commitment, and skill of the many professionals whose efforts resulted in the National Summit on Campus Public Safety: Strategies for Colleges and Universities in a Homeland Security Environment. Their dedication and perseverance led to the summit's success and the development of this report. MARCPI recognizes the following people and organizations for their contributions and unwavering support:

- The U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS), for its understanding of issues, guidance, and foresight in supporting the summit. Special recognition is given to Director Carl Peed for his leadership and commitment to this most important subject, and for his guidance and involvement. MARCPI extends special recognition, as well, to Kenneth Howard, COPS project manager, and other participating COPS staff.
- The members of the summit planning committee, whose commitment and drive to make the summit a success went far beyond the call of duty.
- The officers and members of the International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators.
- The members and staff of the International Association of Chiefs of Police.

- Larry Harmel, Director of MARCPI, plus the support team of MARCPI and the Johns Hopkins University Staff.
- Sheldon Greenberg, director of the Division of Public Safety Leadership, Johns Hopkins University, who wrote this report and served as a key advisor to the project and summit.
- The Office of State and Local Government, Coordination and Preparedness, U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS). Special acknowledgment is given to Jeff Allison, DHS special advisor to the FBI, for his dedication to the field, his drive in drawing national attention to the safety and security needs of campuses, and his support in shaping the summit and networking with people and organizations to make it a success.
- The FBI Office of Law Enforcement Coordination.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The aftermath of September 11, 2001 prompted the reexamination of the nation's defenses and vulnerabilities in light of new realities. Every sector of society, particularly those who protect the well being of communities, required change. Safety and security operations on the nation's college and university campuses are no exception.

The nation's academic institutions, through tradition, culture, and expectation, epitomize the open and accessible nature of a free and democratic society. Currently, though, colleges and universities are among society's most vulnerable and exploitable targets for individuals and organizations seeking to cause harm and fear.

In October 2003 the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS Office), supported a project conducted by the Mid-Atlantic Regional Community Policing Institute (MARCPI) to assess and document existing community policing strategies in colleges and universities. Based on input from focus groups held nationwide and findings and needs that emerged during the project, the scope was expanded to include a national summit on campus public safety. The summit would establish direction and recommendations to serve as a basis for the development of a national strategy, programs, information sharing, funding, and other initiatives.

While numerous organizations had sponsored valuable conferences and workshops on matters related to campus safety, a national summit designed to bring together various constituents and target critical issues had not been held. The timing for a national summit was right.

The National Summit on Campus Public Safety was held November 29 to December 1, 2004 in Baltimore, Maryland. The summit afforded an unprecedented opportunity for candor and collaboration in dealing with more than 20 key issues identified in the MARCPI project. The summit planning committee and the COPS Office selected the delegates for their expertise, national stature, and commitment to excellence in campus safety. The delegates provided a diverse perspective and included representatives from campus police and security agencies, major professional associations, college and university administrations, student organizations, and federal agencies.

Three points of focus arose during the summit that drew prolonged discussion and ultimately led to consensus among the delegates. The three points were the following:

1. Overcoming the fragmentation that inhibits innovation, partnerships, and professionalism in the field of campus public safety. At present, there are no organizations or professional associations that represent the majority of campus public safety agencies or foster a collective interagency/interjurisdictional approach to campus safety issues.
2. Creating a national agenda on campus public safety to guide relevant future endeavors of government agencies, nonprofit organizations, business and industry, and professional associations.
3. Establishing a national center for campus safety to support information sharing, policy development, model practices, operations, and research.

The 25 recommendations that resulted from the summit are grouped into three categories:

1. Promote collaboration.
2. Operate a safe campus.
3. Strengthen operations and administrative functions.

Delegates recognized that some of the recommendations require a shift in culture and long-standing thought processes held by college and university administrators, city and county chiefs of police and sheriffs, and others. Implementing these recommendations, therefore, will require building and enhancing partnerships, developing quality educational programs, and conducting research. Many of the recommendations require no funding or additional resources. Several recommendations will be implemented quickly, while for others, implementation will be a lengthy process.

Responsibility for implementing the recommendations cannot and should not be passed to federal agencies or professional associations. While these organizations should share in the effort and serve as catalysts for change, the commitment to foster change must come from and be driven by leaders within the colleges and universities.

All participants saw the summit as an initial rather than a conclusive effort. The collective spirit and candor of the delegates created a foundation for building a national effort to enhance and sustain safety and security on college and university campuses to the benefit of the communities they serve and the nation.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations are grouped into three categories. Details are included later in this report.

1. Create a national collective, establish a national agenda, and promote cooperation and collaboration.
 2. Operate a safe campus: prevention and response.
 3. Strengthen operations and administrative functions.
1. Create a national collective, establish a national agenda, and promote cooperation and collaboration.
 - a. A national agenda on campus safety, setting forth short-term and long-term direction, should be developed and embraced jointly by the Department of Justice, the Department of Homeland Security, and other federal and nonprofit agencies and organizations committed to the safety and well-being of the nation's college and university campuses.
 - b. A national center for campus safety should be established to support the field, foster collaboration and lasting relationships, facilitate information sharing, and provide quality education.
 - c. The Department of Justice and/or Department of Homeland Security should establish and sustain a National Advisory Panel on Campus Safety.
 - d. The National Advisory Panel on Campus Safety should be convened immediately to lead the effort to draft the national agenda on campus safety to present to the Department of Justice and Department of Homeland Security.

- e. Every agency and organization committed to the safety and well-being of the nation's college and university campuses should adopt a goal to overcome fragmentation by elevating professionalism within police and security operations, increasing internal and external awareness, creating a sense of community, and implementing quality programs that foster consistency and collaboration.
- f. Federal and state guidelines for grants and other funding to public safety agencies should be expanded to consider greater eligibility for campus police and security departments.
- g. Campus police and security operations should be a viable part of the nation's intelligence gathering, sharing, analysis, and application processes and should be incorporated into all regional and national efforts to improve the intelligence network.
- h. Allocating increased funding for research on campus public safety should be a priority of college and university administrators, state education and funding agencies, professional associations, private foundations, and the federal government.
- i. All jurisdictions should engage colleges and universities in prevention and response planning and activities. The nation's college and university chiefs of police and security directors should be involved directly in planning and coordinating local, state, and national response to homeland security.
- j. National standards, similar to those of the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies, Inc. (CALEA), should be developed and implemented to guide campus police and security operations and enhance the profession.

- k. Universities and colleges should be considered in local and regional evacuation plans. In evacuation situations and other crises, major colleges and universities should be represented in emergency command centers.
- l. Local, state, and federal enforcement agencies should provide all personnel who work in areas (beats, sectors, zones) in which colleges and universities are located with an orientation to the characteristics, strengths, vulnerabilities, and needs of a campus.
- m. Standardized formats or models for mutual-aid agreements and memoranda of understanding between campus police/security agencies and other public safety organizations should be developed and made available to the field. Samples of quality agreements should be collected.
- n. Representatives of community colleges should be involved in all local, state, and regional activity addressing campus public safety needs, plans, and activities.
- o. In every city and county that serves as home to more than one major college or university, meetings should be held to foster information sharing, common prevention and response strategies, and consistency in working with local and state public safety agencies.
- p. State emergency management agencies should include campus public safety agencies in their efforts to improve interagency coordination, create coalitions, develop partnerships, and build capacity.

q. The major associations, professional organizations, and government agencies serving campus safety should take advantage of the national network of Regional Community Policing Institutes (RCPI) to deliver education and training, promote recommended policies and best practices, and foster consistency and quality regionally and nationally. The Office of Community Oriented Policing Services should require that each RCPI embrace campus safety and security as a priority.

2. Operate a safe campus: prevention and response.

- a. Once development is completed, campus police and security agencies should adopt and implement the International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators (IACLEA) Threat Assessment Instrument.
- b. Support should be given by federal agencies and professional associations to assist colleges and universities in finding new ways (through policies, processes, technology, research, promising practices) to deal with the complex task of balancing traditional open campus environments with the increased security required in the aftermath of September 11.
- c. Colleges and universities should adopt an all-hazards approach to preventing and managing crises and major incidents.

3. Strengthen operations and administrative functions.

- a. Multicampus colleges and universities should adopt common policies, procedures, and incident response strategies for use across units and campuses.
- b. National standards should be established on minimum qualifications for hiring campus police and security personnel.
- c. Colleges and universities should consider establishing parity in salary and benefits with surrounding law enforcement agencies as a means to improve recruitment and retention of campus police and security personnel.
- d. All campus police chiefs and security directors should have access to and meet with college and university presidents and other key decision makers.
- e. Education and training, simulations, tabletop exercises, and related activities should be designed to reflect the diversity in the culture and type of college or university campus.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----|
| Acknowledgements | .1 |
| Executive summary | .3 |
| Summary of recommendations | .7 |
| Table of contents | .13 |
| Background on campus public safety | .17 |
| Background of the national summit | .27 |
| Purpose | .30 |
| Objectives | .30 |
| Anticipated outcomes | .31 |
| Summit format | .31 |
| Selecting the delegates | .32 |
| Four guiding principles | .32 |
| Reporting on the summit | .33 |

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|------------|
| Key issues in campus public safety | .34 |
| Recommendations of the national summit | .46 |
| Three primary considerations | .48 |
| Create a national collective, establish a national agenda, and promote cooperation and collaboration | .48 |
| Operate a safe campus: prevention and response | .62 |
| Strengthen operations and administrative functions | .65 |
| Appendix | .70 |
| Delegates | .71 |
| Facilitators | .78 |

BACKGROUND ON CAMPUS PUBLIC SAFETY



BACKGROUND ON CAMPUS PUBLIC SAFETY

The United States has the world's most extensive higher education system, a complex set of institutions including public and private community colleges, liberal arts colleges, comprehensive universities, and world-renowned research universities.

Susanne C. Monahan
Montana State University-Bozeman

*American University:
National Treasure or Endangered Species?*
(Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1997)

According to the Department of Homeland Security (*Campus Public Safety: Weapons of Mass Destruction Terrorism Protective Measures*, Office for Domestic Preparedness, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, April 2003), approximately 4,000 Title IV (Higher Education Act of 1995) institutions of post-secondary education in the United States serve 15 million students and several million faculty, staff, and visitors. Title IV institutions are those that meet criteria to participate in federal student financial aid programs. Community colleges represent the largest, fastest growing sector of higher education. Currently, 1,173 community colleges serve the nation, of which 997 are public, 145 private, and 31 tribal. According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics, more than 20,000 campus police and security officers protect the nation's largest campuses, those with student populations of 2,500 or more. (*Campus Law Enforcement Agencies, 1995*, U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics, December 1996). Precise figures on the total number of law enforcement and security personnel serving all colleges and universities are not available.

Securing the nation's campuses is a complex task. Heightened debate centers on tightening access to information, facilities, and materials versus maintaining an open campus environment. This debate over the need to address risk and vulnerability creates new problem-solving challenges for public safety personnel.

Many universities function as full-scale towns, with permanent and transient populations that often exceed 25,000 people. For example, the University of California, Los Angeles; University of Maryland, College Park; and many others are self-contained entities with large residential populations, shops, recreational facilities, and full-service police and fire departments. They are located within major metropolitan centers. Cities such as Lawrence, Kansas; and Madison, Wisconsin are dependent on local university campuses for their economic survival. Smaller colleges and universities, including the nation's 2-year institutions (community colleges, technical colleges, junior colleges), serve large transient populations.

Like any thriving community, colleges and universities experience myriad problems and issues related to sustaining a safe, secure campus environment for students, faculty, staff, and others. In addition, new issues related to terrorist threats and the effects of September 11, 2001 have emerged on college and university campuses. In some jurisdictions, threat assessments have cited colleges and universities as potential primary targets of terrorist activity, while in other jurisdictions they have been ignored in homeland security planning and activities.

Many campuses house sensitive materials and information and sponsor activities and events that increase their vulnerability. It is common for major universities to employ people and establish facilities dedicated to research in the following areas:

- Nuclear
- Biochemical
- Medical
- Defense
- Technology
- International affairs
- Engineering
- Communication
- Public safety
- Transportation
- Intelligence
- Aerospace

In addition, many universities house historic and classified documents. They also serve as homes to scholars and researchers who comprise a notable segment of the nation's intellectual talent. Major universities also serve as contractors to government agencies such as the Department of Defense, Department of Justice, National Security Agency, Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, as well as to the nation's largest corporations.

Colleges and universities have extensive international connections. Many have a substantial number of international students on campus who sometimes account for up to half of the full-time student body. They enter the country through student visas to pursue their education.

Many of the nation's major universities maintain campuses overseas and have close ties with countries in Eastern and Western Europe, the Middle East, Far East, and Latin America. Campuses abroad include small enclaves focusing on specific areas of research or academic study to large multipurpose centers serving hundreds or thousands of students.

As with most communities, campuses in the United States are open environments in which students, faculty, and others move about freely with few security restrictions. Freedom of movement is encouraged. Restrictions are seen as contrary to the core mission of most universities, which generally embodies an environment of intellectual and physical openness. On many campuses, libraries, laboratories, and student lounges remain open 24 hours a day.

University campuses are large workplaces. In several major cities, the university is the largest nongovernment employer in the jurisdiction. Most people who live and work on campuses assume that they are safe and give little thought to risk. Their freedom of movement is closely linked to the freedom of expression and the freedom to explore and share ideas fostered in academic environments. For generations, college and university campuses have been hubs of divergent views, which are expressed without interference, fear, or retaliation.

Other issues, too, should be considered in focusing on security, safety, and problem solving on college and university campuses. New students, for example, arrive on campus each semester and few universities have systems in place to routinely check their background.

Further, there is little or no joint or cross-sector training for municipal, county, or state police officers and security personnel who serve on college and university campuses. In some cases, there is little or no cross training among police and security personnel who serve on different campuses of the same university.

Differences in Security and Police Operations

The characteristics of security and police services on the nation's college and university campuses vary considerably. This variance inhibits community policing, collaboration, policy development, training, and other activities, and weakens response capabilities to homeland security. The following four primary types of security and police services are common to the nation's college and university campuses:

1. Campus police department: A full-service agency that functions as part of the university. Officers have full police powers.
2. Security department or operation: A service agency that functions as part of the university. Security personnel do not have full police powers and rely on municipal, county, or state police for support in criminal matters.

3. Contract security: A private firm contracted to provide security services to the university. The firm relies on municipal, county, or state police for support in criminal matters.
4. Local or state police: A municipal, county, or state police agency that provides police operations or services to the university by contract or agreement.

On large campuses, police and security operations may be provided by a combination of the above services, with some services contracted to private vendors while others are maintained as the responsibility of the campus police or security agency. Some security operations rely heavily on the use of off-duty police officers from local jurisdictions, working secondary employment, to supplement university personnel.

The type of police or security operation may vary within the same university system. Among major state university systems (California, Florida, Pennsylvania, and Texas, for example) the police or security operation may differ from campus to campus. Each segment of the university system may have its own police department, with its own uniforms, insignia, training operations, and policies. There may be little or no support or sharing of resources from one campus to another. Some officials attending the summit stated that this is driven by the autonomy of campuses, the desire to sustain individual identity, the need to maintain flexibility in serving specific constituents, and budget. Other officials cited tradition and unwarranted parochialism as driving the disparity of operations.

Some university police and security operations are responsible for patrolling areas that surround campuses through formal agreement with the local or state law enforcement authority and/or legislation. In one jurisdiction,

for example, the university police department patrols roadways, private businesses, and residential dwellings in an eight-block area of the city in which its buildings are located. The city police department provides no primary patrol in the area.

Campus police and security operations are made more complex by variations in the university or college's oversight authority. The chief of the university police department or director of security often reports to a member of the university's management team, such as the director of facilities and grounds, vice president for academic affairs, or dean of student services, who lack familiarity with public safety operations.

Campus chiefs of police and directors of security are challenged by the competing interests of their chief executive officers. Educating campus leaders about public safety is paramount. However, time constraints and other challenges and priorities imposed on these leaders make it difficult for them to devote time to security and safety matters before problems emerge.

...the greatest perils lie not from dangers without, but from weaknesses within universities ... They require bold, decisive, and visionary leadership ... effective and imaginative management of resources ... a new commitment to clients (students, alumni and society at large) ... a more general willingness to come to terms with new expectations, unacknowledged issues ... [and] the restoration of community.

Frank H.T. Rhodes
President Emeritus
Cornell University

Inconsistency in Responses to Terrorist Threats

Responses to terrorist threat by the nation's campuses are varied, in part, because of the different approaches to security cited above.

Some campuses established work groups, interagency task forces, and permanent offices to analyze potential threat and organize response protocol to those threats. They have pulled together their internal resources to prevent duplication of effort and to ensure that all entities of the university are working together. On many of these campuses, students, faculty, staff, and others have been well informed about these activities and have provided input to them.

Other colleges and universities have handled preparedness loosely or disjointedly. Response and preparedness have been left up to individual schools, departments, and units. The police or security operation responds independently from other entities within the university. As such, there is little consistency or collaboration.

Still other colleges and universities have done almost nothing. They have relinquished responsibility for preparedness to the local or state police, the firm contracted to provide security services, or others.

There is little qualitative research on the response of college and university campuses to the threat of terrorist activity and no single or central entity serves as a clearinghouse for research, policy development, and information exchange.

Clery Act

The Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act (the Clery Act), a 1990 amendment to the Higher Education Act of 1965, requires colleges and universities to disclose information about campus crime and security policies. The Clery Act was named after Lehigh University freshman Jeanne Clery who was raped and murdered in her residence hall room in 1986.

The Clery Act requires colleges and universities to publish an annual report no later than October 1 of every year, containing campus crime statistics for a period of 3 years along with descriptions of certain security policies. Reports must be made available to all students and employees, while prospective students and employees must be notified of its existence and afforded an opportunity to look at copies.

All public and private institutions of postsecondary education participating in federal student aid programs must abide by the law. Until the Clery Act, data on campus crime was collected haphazardly, with individual schools deciding if, how, and when information would be reported.

BACKGROUND OF THE NATIONAL SUMMIT



BACKGROUND OF THE NATIONAL SUMMIT

...9/11 also reminded us that if an event happens which taxes the resources of the municipalities and county, the colleges will be on their own. In both 1989 with the earthquake and 9/11, we had issues on the campuses and there was no way outside law enforcement agencies could help because they were spread too thin. We had chemical spills and structural damage in 1989 and it took a long time for the fire department to respond. Our department went on 12-hour shifts for a week to deal with the safety issues.

Chief of Police Laura Lorman
West Valley-Mission (California) Community College District

The National Summit on Campus Public Safety evolved from the interest of several professional associations and government organizations and the synthesis of a number of endeavors. The Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS Office) of the Department of Justice sponsored a project led by the Mid-Atlantic Regional Community Policing Institute (MARCPI) that involved taking an in-depth look at current activities and future needs in the field of campus safety.

MARCPI representatives sought input from focus groups and officials representing the International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators (IACLEA), International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP)–College and University Policing Section, Major Cities Chiefs Association, U.S. Department of Education, and others. The MARCPI project team contacted representatives of 2- and 4-year, public and private, and large and small colleges and universities. In addition, the project team sought input from municipal, county, and state police officials whose agencies patrol jurisdictions in which campuses are located.

Other activities were occurring nationwide at the same time as the MARCPI project. The U.S. Department of Education, in conjunction with the American Council on Education (ACE), held a series of meetings on campus safety. The Office for Domestic Preparedness sponsored a major national project, led by IACLEA, to provide awareness training on weapons of mass destruction and incident command for campus public safety officers. The National Association of College and University Business Officers and the IACP were among the professional associations addressing the topic, as was the Campus Safety Health and Environmental Management Association of the National Safety Council.

One of the goals of the MARCPI project was to organize a national conference. Shortly after the project began, however, it was apparent that numerous national and regional meetings and conferences on the subject of campus safety were scheduled or had recently concluded. There was no need for another one, a notion reinforced by officials attending the IACLEA conference in Ottawa.

While there was much activity on the subject, it became clear that no group, organization, or agency had established a common set of recommendations or proposed a national agenda to address campus safety. For this purpose, a summit was needed. As one campus chief stated, "It is time to get past talking heads and move to action. There is a short window of opportunity to bring attention to campus safety and its importance in ensuring national security.

The COPS Office and all major stakeholders supported the concept of the summit. A summit brings together a group of subject-area authorities to address a common need or topic of interest by establishing or recommending broad direction, universal practice, or policy. The delegates work as equals toward a common goal. Many summits are void of presentations by individuals, panel discussions, and workshops, to allow delegates the time to focus on outcomes.

MARCPI was designated to take the lead and host the summit because it had gathered extensive information, identified key issues, and interacted with so many organizations. To take full advantage of the work being done by other organizations, the summit was held after the IACLEA annual conference, IACP conference, and the Terrorism Planning Workshop for Campus Executives sponsored by the Office for Domestic Preparedness in conjunction with the ACE.

The summit afforded the campus and university public safety sector with an unprecedented opportunity for collaboration. The 2-day effort is something that has never been done before and it has been a great opportunity to advance our position and promote the importance and significance of campus public safety.

Noel C. March
Director, Department of Public Safety
University of Maine

Purpose

The purpose of the National Summit on Campus Public Safety was presented to the delegates as follows:

Ensure the continued safety and security of the nation's colleges and universities. To this end, the summit brings together a cadre of leaders and subject-area authorities to develop and propose a national agenda on campus safety.

Objectives

Objectives for the summit were set forth as follows:

1. Identify and place in order of priority the concerns, issues, and needs challenging those responsible for safety and security on the nation's colleges and university campuses.

2. Identify notable successes in campus safety and security and how they may be replicated.
3. Suggest courses of action, short-term and long-term, for advancing safety and security on the nation's college and university campuses.

Anticipated Outcomes

Anticipated outcomes of the summit were set forth as follows:

1. Delegates reach consensus on safety and security related issues and concerns facing the nation's colleges and universities and the communities they serve.
2. Delegates identify limitations of the summit and areas of need yet to be addressed.
3. Delegates submit a report to the COPS Office citing recommendations designed to address the identified issues. MARCPI assumes responsibility for compiling the report.

Summit Format

The format for the summit was determined by the summit planning committee, members of the MARCPI project team, and representatives of the major associations serving campus safety and college and university administration. To allow delegates to spend most of their time working on issues, the planning committee was determined to avoid the traditional approach to summits. There would be no formal presentations or lengthy plenary

sessions; rather, delegates would begin working in groups immediately to meet the objectives. The opening session consisted of greetings and the charge to the delegates, and time was allotted at the end of the sessions to pull together and present the findings.

Selecting the Delegates

Members of the MARCPI project team, summit planning committee, and the COPS Office selected the delegates. The diverse group consisted of representatives from campus police and security agencies, the major professional associations, campus administration, students, the Department of Homeland Security, MARCPI, and others. The full list of delegates is in the Appendix of this report.

Four Guiding Principles

The summit planning committee divided the delegates into work groups based on the four guiding principles or core themes that the committee established following a review of the key issues:

1. Promote cooperation and collaboration.
2. Create and sustain leadership.
3. Elevate the profession.
4. Operate a safe campus.

The key issues identified in the MARCPI project (described in the next section of this report) were grouped according to these guiding principles and presented to the summit delegates for discussion and debate.

While each group of delegates was tasked with discussing specific issues, its members had the opportunity to comment on all issues before the summit. Facilitators and note takers supported each group, protocols were established, and time was managed so that each delegate had ample opportunity to participate. Following group sessions, all delegates participated in an open forum. The goal of the forum was to achieve consensus on the findings and recommendations.

Reporting on the Summit

The four guiding principles were designed to foster dialogue during the summit and were not intended to restrict discussion or inhibit the identification of other issues. Further, they were not intended to serve as an outline for the summit outcomes or the report.

In fact, delegates to the summit identified other key issues and presented their findings in order of priority and importance to the field. The summit recommendations reflect the delegates' discussion and debate.

KEY ISSUES IN CAMPUS PUBLIC SAFETY



KEY ISSUES IN CAMPUS PUBLIC SAFETY

We know that culture and education are the most threatened arenas in this war on terror.

Carolyn Parker Mayes
Homeland Security Cultural Bureau
Department of Homeland Security
March 28, 2004

A review of the literature on campus safety showed that there was no concise summary of the key issues facing the field of campus public safety. With support from International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators and the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, the Mid-Atlantic Regional Community Policing Institute project team deviated from some of its original tasks and undertook compiling such a summary. The summary of key issues served as the basis for discussion at the national summit.

Twenty key issues were identified from a review of literature and interviews with campus police and security officials, supervisors and executives in police and sheriffs departments, college and university administrators, fire officials, students (including student groups representing minority and special populations), and others.

They are the issues that emerged most frequently or were deemed most important. Priorities varied according to factors such as the type of college or university, size of the student population, proximity to urban and metropolitan centers, frequency of special events, relationship to local or state police, relationship to other government agencies, and reporting hierarchy within the college or university. The 20 key issues with discussion points follow.

1. Since September 11, 2001, coordination between senior executives (president, provost, vice presidents, deans, directors, chairs) within colleges and universities and those charged with implementation of safety and security practices (police and security officials) remains weak.

Discussion about efforts to prevent terrorist acts, harden targets, respond to crises, and share intelligence has resulted in minimal change on the frontline. Supervisors, in particular, cite that activities are the same or nearly the same as they were before the events of September 11, with the exception of accessibility to new equipment. Some colleges and universities have done a great deal to effect significant change, but they remain in the minority.

For some officials, the lack of change in response to terrorist threat is not a concern because they do not perceive their campuses as vulnerable. They are more concerned about campus administrators creating expectations that security and police operations are unable to meet. The lack of change in activity since September 11 is particularly apparent in small 4-year and community college campuses.

2. Attrition among front-line personnel in campus police and security agencies creates instability and a loss of institutional knowledge essential to effective prevention, problem solving, and crisis intervention.

While supportive national data are not readily available, campus police and security officials identify attrition as one of their primary concerns. Frequent turnover among campus police and security personnel results in continuous recruiting, hiring, and orientation of new employees. Loss of experienced employees diminishes knowledge of and ability to respond to calls for service, crises, and special events. Vulnerability increases when attrition is excessive.

3. Allocation of resources by municipal and state police agencies rarely consider college and university campuses, particularly in urban areas.

Few local and state police agencies consider campus environments and populations in their resource allocation plans. Yet in some environments, students and employees on campuses are a large part of a jurisdiction's population. In many urban police agencies, the presence of a college campus has little influence on the number of officers allocated to a district, area, or beat.

4. There is a need for model mutual aid agreements, memoranda of understanding (MOU), and related policies and procedures.

There is no central database or collection of model mutual aid agreements or MOUs detailing relationships between campus police and security and local and state law enforcement agencies. A few memoranda of

agreement are available that specifically address prevention and response to terrorist threats. A central clearinghouse is needed to improve consistency and quality and encourage more agencies to engage in structured agreements.

5. There is inconsistency in prevention and response strategies when more than one college or university exists in a jurisdiction.

It is not uncommon for four, five, or more universities and colleges— public, nonprofit, and profit—to be located in a large city or county. The number of campuses may be far greater. Each college or university negotiates and works individually with local and state enforcement agencies. There are few collective efforts and, as such, threat assessment, prevention, and response strategies may differ significantly.

6. There is a wide variance in the number, role, structure, and professionalism of security and police operations occurring on college and university campuses. One-size-fits-all programs, policies, laws, and grants do not work.

Colleges and universities are large, small, urban, rural, residential, transient, 2-year, 4-year, public, and private. The variance in purpose, structure, authority, and operations among campus police and security agencies makes one-size-fits-all programs and policies impractical. Grants, policies, and laws need to consider the unique characteristics of various types of colleges and universities and their security and police operations.

7. Universities and colleges are not considered in many local and regional evacuation plans and are excluded from other homeland security efforts.

College and university campuses too often are forgotten or cited minimally in the evacuation plans of local jurisdictions. Campuses present a unique set of protection and transportation dilemmas in a crisis. This is a significant concern for campuses that house a large percentage of residential and, particularly, international students. Many campuses house large populations of students and employees who, if not considered in evacuation plans, may have an adverse effect on ingress and egress in a crisis. Campuses, too, are well positioned to serve as centers to house people evacuated from other locales.

Generally, colleges and universities, particularly those with small campuses and student populations, are not involved sufficiently in local and regional homeland security planning.

8. Local, county, and state police officers lack knowledge and understanding of the potential risks, threats, and needs associated with campuses.

State and municipal police administrators often are not oriented to the needs of university and college campuses and do little to orient their front-line personnel. There is little or no training or briefing for officers, deputies, and troopers whose beats include a campus. Few, if any, police academies instruct patrol officers on the unique policing and security needs of college and university campuses. A survey of police academy curricula from 28 large jurisdictions, each with one or more colleges and universities within its borders, revealed that none of the agencies provided instruction to officers or deputies on how to patrol on or near a campus.

9. Local, county, and state police agencies do not give adequate attention to community colleges when developing prevention, problem solving, and response strategies.

Community colleges are a significant part of the nation's system of higher education. Yet community and junior colleges (both terms refer to comprehensive 2-year institutions of higher education) are included less frequently than 4-year and graduate institutions in research, planning, and operational activities related to preventing crime, minimizing threat, and responding to crises. By the nature of the programming they provide, community colleges often maintain a closer working relationship with police, fire, and emergency medical agencies than do their 4-year and graduate counterparts.

10. Off-campus sites lack security and local police attention.

Many colleges and universities are decentralized, with small, remote centers and facilities. Off-campus sites often house important research, experimentation, and data and off-campus residences house thousands of students. In some universities, juniors and seniors are required to live off campus. Generally, these sites do not fall within the college or university's policing or security jurisdiction. This creates legal, jurisdictional, and operational dilemmas in preventing and responding to crime, solving problems, and managing crises. MOUs cannot cover all jurisdictional issues posed by off-campus sites.

11. Colleges and universities maintain an open environment to support ongoing research, movement of people, and transport of goods and materials.

Colleges and universities are expansive centers of activity that maintain and foster open, unrestricted environments. They are designed for the free movement of people and materials. Target hardening of campuses, therefore, is difficult. Many faculty members, administrators, and students oppose a restricted environment and criticize security restrictions as an imposition on personal freedom.

12. Securing chemical, biological, and radiological materials in an accessible environment, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, creates a unique set of security concerns and compounds risk.

Research, experimentation, and need to access information dictate that some laboratories and other facilities that house potentially dangerous materials must be accessible 24 hours a day. While technology such as card access and digital keypads provides some degree of control, protecting these sites, particularly with limited resources, creates a unique set of challenges.

13. Police and security operations in some of the nation's largest college and university systems are highly fragmented.

A large university system may have multiple, independent police and security operations, each with its own chief of police or director, staffing patterns, training, policies and procedures, and contractual services. One state university system, for example, has three campuses located within a 45-minute radius. It maintains three police departments, each reporting to a separate chief of police who, in turn, reports to a separate academic administrator.

This fragmentation leads to competition for personnel, inconsistencies in policy, wasteful procurement, and other inefficiencies. Parochialism among campus administrators often inhibits coordination, cooperation, and consolidation.

- 14. Reassuring and guiding students, parents, faculty, administrators, and staff regarding safety and security, gaining their cooperation, and managing their fear requires planning, analysis, education, and marketing. Changing the campus culture to embrace prevention and response strategies cannot be accomplished with brochures, fliers, and a web site.**

Education to facilitate prevention, response, and fear management is limited to brochures, posters, and web-based bulletins. While important, these things alone do not necessarily effect change. Few campus police and security agencies focus on managing change; few have marketing plans or are provided with professional marketing support; and few maintain interactive electronic communities. As such, outreach is limited. There is no national clearinghouse providing information, guidance, or model practices on marketing and outreach.

- 15. Special events (sports, lectures, graduation) occur frequently, draw thousands of people to campuses, and create vulnerability.**

Special events management is all consuming for many campus police and security officials. One major university, for example, sponsors more than 1,200 special events annually. Planning, threat and vulnerability assessment, resource management, and interjurisdictional response strategies are part of the special events management process.

Resources to manage special events are rarely sufficient. In the past, campuses have relied heavily on the assistance of off-duty police officers from other jurisdictions. Today, the number of officers willing to work secondary employment on college campuses has declined dramatically and the cost of paying officers to work off-duty assignments, which in some jurisdictions on the East Coast exceeds \$40 per hour, is prohibitive for many colleges and universities.

- 16. Few college and university leaders are adept at defining and demonstrating the value and success of safety and security functions. Rather, safety and security are measured by statistical reports (incidents increase or decrease) and the absence of problems.**

The value of campus safety and security programs and activities can be shown in many ways, far beyond traditional reporting of statistical change. In a homeland security environment, students, parents, faculty, and others need more than statistical reports to reduce their fears and provide a sense of safety and well being on campus. Credibility, stature, recognition, and funding will improve if new approaches are taken to demonstrate value and showcase success.

- 17. Campus police and security personnel lack access to high-quality, affordable education and training.**

Generally, training budgets for campus police and security personnel are small. High-quality, affordable education and training that focuses on the unique needs of campus safety and security personnel is lacking, as is training for supervisors serving campus police and security agencies.

Accessibility to training for personnel is particularly difficult for campuses in remote regions. Few campuses have travel budgets to support training for front-line personnel and few state training providers (police officer standards and training boards and training commissions) develop and implement programs unique to the needs of campus police and security personnel.

Furthermore, few campus police and security personnel are cross-trained in fire and public health; yet, these two components of the public safety network have particular relevance to campus police and security operations.

18. Colleges and universities have been slow to accept and incorporate the cost of homeland security.

Developing homeland security plans, projecting needs, preparing personnel, and budgeting appropriately for increased security have been slow to evolve on the nation's college and university campuses. Beyond basic target hardening and providing essential protective equipment, colleges and universities have not budgeted adequately for homeland security. This is particularly evident among smaller universities and community colleges.

19. There are no national standards, similar to those of the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies, Inc. (CALEA), to guide campus police and security operations.

While campus police departments may pursue CALEA accreditation, certain characteristics and functions unique to campus operations are not addressed in the broader police standards. Well-crafted standards would provide a foundation for campus police or security agencies to enhance services and demonstrate accomplishments and value to administrators, students, parents, and other stakeholders.

20. There is no national center or institute dedicated to serving campus police and security agencies or the continuous education of college and university police and security executives, supervisors, and officers.

Campus police and security operations functions do not have the following resources to serve and help them: a national policy center, information clearinghouse, or center for model practices; a research center dedicated to campus safety and security; an educational institution committed to campus safety and security as its primary mission; an ongoing, long-term school (comparable to the FBI National Academy, Senior Management Institute for Police, Southern Police Institute, or Police Executive Leadership Program) designed to serve campus police and security leaders; or an educational center or institute dedicated to developing online courses for campus police and security executives, supervisors, and front-line personnel. As a result, college and university officials participate in programs designed for municipal, county, and state law enforcement personnel. While somewhat effective, these programs do not address the unique issues and problem-solving needs of large and small campuses.

**RECOMMENDATIONS
OF THE
NATIONAL SUMMIT**



RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE NATIONAL SUMMIT

There is a concern on the part of universities to balance on this tightrope in the post-September 11 world. On the one hand, no one wants to do anything that is not entirely supportive of national security. On the other hand, universities are open places that want to encourage dialogue and diversity.

A. John Bramley
Provost
University of Vermont

This section provides an overview of the recommendations and action steps produced by the summit. Because of the complexity and diversity of issues related to campus safety and security, many recommendations emerged. To provide perspective, the recommendations have been grouped into five categories. As stated earlier, these groupings are not the same as the guiding principles presented to the summit delegates. Instead, they are based on points of consensus that arose during the summit.

Three Primary Considerations

The recommendations are grouped within the following three categories:

1. Create a national collective, establish a national agenda, and promote cooperation and collaboration.
2. Operate a safe campus through prevention and response.
3. Strengthen operations and administrative functions.

1. Create a national collective, establish a national agenda, and promote cooperation and collaboration

- a. **A national agenda on campus safety, setting forth short-term and long-term direction, should be developed and embraced jointly by the Department of Justice, the Department of Homeland Security, and other federal and nonprofit agencies and organizations committed to the safety and well-being of the nation's college and university campuses.**

There is no national agenda on campus safety and security. In spite of numerous attempts to bring attention to campus safety and security issues, none has resulted in a national call for action and none of the leading professional associations has established such an agenda or call for action.

Without a national agenda, approaches to strengthening campus safety and security will remain fragmented. Priorities that the field deems important will be relegated to a lesser concern or ignored as the nation moves to embrace homeland security. Associations, professional organizations, foundations, and government agencies will continue to function independently, at times duplicating their efforts or working in conflict with each other.

Establishing a national agenda to which agencies and associations may commit is a complex and deliberate task beyond the scope or projected outcomes of this summit. The task of establishing a national agenda, however, is reasonable and warrants action.

A national agenda on campus safety would affirm the common principles embraced by the various agencies and associations serving the field. It should be a succinct document, suggesting strategic targets, points of intervention, and responsibilities for key constituents. It should provide a road map for enhancing and improving campus safety.

Once established, the national agenda could be used by political leaders, the Department of Justice, the Department of Homeland Security, Department of Education, state and local agencies, college and university administrators, professional associations, and others to guide discussion, develop plans, and initiate programs and activities. The white paper setting forth the national agenda should briefly reference this report, the summit, and other recent significant activities related to campus public safety. (An advisory panel to draft the national agenda is recommended in the following section of this report.)

- b. A national center for campus safety should be established to support the field, foster collaboration and lasting relationships, facilitate information sharing, and provide quality education.**

Another point of discussion that recurred throughout the summit was the need for a national center committed to the safety and security needs and challenges faced by colleges and universities.

There is no fusion point for the myriad campus public safety initiatives being undertaken nationwide or for the fulfillment of critical information needs. There was discussion throughout the summit about the increasingly complex environment in which campus public safety services are being provided. With the challenges imposed by terrorist threat, the need to embed homeland security into the campus culture, more students living off campus, and greater competition for qualified personnel, the complexity of the environment has never been greater. Yet few new resources are available to assist campus public safety leaders in navigating this environment.

The center could be the catalyst that brings together professional associations, advocacy organizations, community leaders, and others to improve and expand services to those who use and depend on the nation's colleges and universities. The following are suggested priorities for the center:

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

4. Provide educational leadership and opportunities to those responsible for or who have a vested interest in campus safety and security.
 5. Provide a forum for discussion, debate, and strategic planning among the various public safety, security, service, and advocacy organizations responsible for the safety of the nation's colleges and universities.
- c. The Department of Justice and/or Department of Homeland Security should establish and sustain a National Advisory Panel on Campus Public Safety.**

The National Advisory Panel on Campus Public Safety should be used as consultants to assist in defining issues and needs, setting goals, providing input from the field, and maintaining standards of excellence in matters related to campus safety. The panel may be called on to conduct reviews and prepare reports on matters of importance to agency leaders.

The National Advisory Panel on Campus Public Safety should reflect the diversity of organizations that have a vested interest in campus safety. The panel should play a lead role in advising representatives of the national clearinghouse on needs, information collection, information exchange, and outreach.

- d. The National Advisory Panel on Campus Public Safety should be convened immediately to lead the effort to draft the national agenda on campus safety to present to the Department of Justice and Department of Homeland Security.**

A panel of representatives from a broad constituency should convene to draft a national agenda on campus

safety. The draft national agenda should identify challenges and suggest direction for both the near and distant future. The panel should present the draft national agenda to appropriate federal and professional agencies and organizations for consideration. If these agencies and organizations agree with the agenda, they could provide feedback to the panel for consideration in refining the statement.

- e. **Every agency and organization committed to the safety and well-being of the nation's college and university campuses should adopt a goal to overcome fragmentation by elevating professionalism within police and security operations, increasing internal and external awareness, creating a sense of community, and implementing quality programs that foster consistency and collaboration.**

Individual colleges and universities and entire university systems, as well as a number of government agencies, professional organizations, and associations, are working to improve campus safety. These efforts are admirable, well intentioned, and many have resulted in positive change; however, there is little coordination among these organizations and their efforts. As such, there is unnecessary duplication and competition for funding in an already fragmented system.

If issues related to campus safety and security are to receive appropriate attention, coordination among the nation's leaders in the field is paramount. There is a need to bring together government agencies, public safety agencies, professional organizations and associations, community leaders, and others to improve coordination and communication, share efforts and expertise, develop a national agenda, and provide continued leadership to the field. The Office of Community Oriented Policing Services has the credibility and is well positioned to meet this need.

For example, the national network of Regional Community Policing Institutes (RCPI), established by the COPS Office, brings together key officials, supports innovation, provides education and training, and facilitates collaboration. Since most of the RCPIs have long-standing partnerships with public safety agencies, college and universities, and community organizations, they offer a needed foundation on which to build a cohesive national approach to campus safety. In addition to taking advantage of this existing network, the COPS Office can bring needed attention to campus public safety by mandating that it be considered in future sponsored projects and grants. In addition, the COPS Office can elevate the visibility of campus public safety by incorporating it into conferences and seminars designed to improve service, solve problems, explore best and promising practices, and sustain communities.

f. Federal and state guidelines for grants and other funding to public safety agencies should be expanded to consider greater eligibility for campus police and security departments.

Funding sources, such as the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Justice, and state criminal justice and emergency management agencies, do not always recognize and, therefore, do not allow college and university police and security operations to compete for funds. Campus police departments serving public colleges and universities have a greater opportunity to obtain funds than do their counterparts in private institutions, but they, too, do not have the same level of eligibility as municipal, county, and state law enforcement agencies. Greater consideration, therefore, needs to be given to the role, responsibilities, and value of campus police and security operations when determining eligibility for federal and state funding.

- g. Campus police and security operations should be a viable part of the nation's intelligence gathering, sharing, analysis, and application processes and should be incorporated into all regional and national efforts to improve the intelligence network.**

Campus police and security agencies must have access to intelligence information, including Law Enforcement Online and the Homeland Security Information Network. They also should be included more extensively in intelligence coordination activities such as those of the Regional Joint Terrorism Task Forces. Campus police and security officials should play a greater role in planning and implementing new and enhanced systems for improving the collection, analysis, and dissemination of information.

- h. Allocating increased funding for research on campus public safety should be a priority of college and university administrators, state education and funding agencies, professional associations, private foundations, and the federal government.**

There is a need for increased research on campus safety and security. An extensive literature review conducted by the Mid-Atlantic Regional Community Policing Institute showed that research on campus safety and security issues was either lacking or dated.

Major professional associations and agencies such as the Department of Justice and the Department of Homeland Security should designate research on campus safety and security as a priority. This is essential for establishing a foundation of meaningful information on which to build plans and make decisions concerning the future of the field of campus public safety.

A primary agency within the federal government, in conjunction with the national center, should guide decisions about the research that should be conducted. The intent of the partnership is to prevent unnecessary duplication, take full advantage of existing resources, and maximize funding.

- i. **All jurisdictions should engage colleges and universities in prevention and response planning and activities. The nation's college and university chiefs of police and security directors should be involved directly in planning and coordinating local, state, and national response to homeland security.**

Generally, colleges and universities, particularly those with small campuses and student populations, are involved peripherally in local and regional homeland security planning.

Campus police and security directors, and the professional associations that represent them, should engage routinely in discussions, work groups, and task forces addressing local, state, and regional planning, programming, and funding.

- j. **National standards, similar to those of the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies, Inc. (CALEA), should be developed and implemented to guide campus police and security operations and enhance the profession.**

Some campus police departments are accredited by CALEA, while others meet a variety of certifications by organizations such as ASIS International (formerly the American Society for Industrial Security).

To date, however, there is no nationally recognized set of standards that applies to the unique needs and functions of campus safety and security. At the time of this summit report, the International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators (IACLEA) had begun to develop such standards, with grant support from the COPS Office. IACLEA worked with CALEA and participates in the commission's Alliance Program.

Developing accreditation standards for campus safety and security agencies, including those functioning as police and security departments, should proceed as a priority.

Universities have truly helped America keep its republic—not just by imparting knowledge—but by fighting for the basic freedoms that have helped us perfect our democratic experiment, freedoms that simultaneously give hope to oppressed people everywhere. Our contemporary challenge is even broader. We must secure our free republic from those who seek to destroy it, who threaten not just our liberties, but also our lives. And universities can help.

Former Department of Homeland Security Secretary Tom Ridge
to the Association of American Universities, April 14, 2003

k. Universities and colleges should be considered in local and regional evacuation plans. In evacuation situations and other crises, major colleges and universities should be represented in emergency command centers.

College and university campuses too often are forgotten or cited minimally in the evacuation plans of local jurisdictions. Campuses present a unique set of protection and transportation dilemmas in a crisis. This is a significant point of concern for campuses that house a large percentage of students (particularly international students) and employees who, if not considered in evacuation plans, may have an adverse effect on ingress and egress in a crisis. Campuses, too, are well positioned to serve as centers to house people evacuated from other locales. State and local officials should consider colleges and universities as contributors to and signatories of mutual aid compacts related to emergency management.

l. Local, state, and federal enforcement agencies should provide all personnel who work in areas (beats, sectors, zones) in which colleges and universities are located with an orientation to the characteristics, strengths, vulnerabilities, and needs of a campus.

Every major police and fire academy should provide an orientation on campus public safety. Officers, supervisors, and executives should be well versed in the characteristics of the campuses in their jurisdictions: demographics, type of security and police operations, response tactics, evacuation plans, location of off-campus facilities, and critical infrastructure.

Public safety certifying agencies, such as state police officer standards and training boards and commissions, should mandate minimum standards for training all law enforcement personnel in serving and interacting with college and universities.

- m. Standardized formats or models for mutual aid agreements and memoranda of understanding between campus police/security agencies and other public safety organizations should be developed and made available to the field. Samples of quality agreements should be collected.**

To facilitate improved collaboration among agencies, standardized or model mutual aid agreements and memoranda of understanding should be identified and/or developed by the National Center for Campus Public Safety. Campus, municipal, and state officials will be more receptive to enter into formal agreements if they know that the documents are standardized and widely accepted within the field of public safety.

A series of regional conferences or seminars should be held to bring together executives from federal, state, and local public safety agencies and their counterparts from campus police and security agencies for the purpose of making a commitment to and improving cooperation and collaboration. The National Center for Campus Public Safety should develop and sponsor the series.

The sessions should involve officials from police, fire, emergency medicine, public health, transportation, and private security. The regional meetings should serve as a catalyst to follow-up activities focusing on ongoing local cooperation. Topics discussed at the regional sessions may include mutual aid, emergency management, opportunities for joint programs and funding proposals, necessary legislation, shared resources, and education and training.

n. Representatives of community colleges should be involved in all local, state, and regional activity addressing campus public safety needs, plans, and activities.

Community colleges serve a large segment of the nation's youth and adult population. In many areas, they function as central facilitators and conveners for the communities they serve in matters such as neighborhood development, entrepreneurship, improving public education, and public safety. Their faculty and staff offer considerable expertise in business, government, health care, elder care, nonprofit management, and more. Local and regional planners, community and agency executives, and political leaders should avail themselves of this knowledge. Greater involvement of community college officials in local and regional public safety and emergency management efforts is necessary and will prove beneficial.

o. In every city and county that serves as home to more than one major college or university, meetings should be held to foster information sharing, common prevention and response strategies, and consistency in working with local and state public safety agencies.

Regional partnerships are often more powerful and have far greater value than a series of individual partnerships. Police chiefs, security directors, fire chiefs, health officers, and transportation directors benefit from working with a group of agencies that share a common need or interest. A college or university; local police, fire, or public health department; or regional emergency management agency should take the lead in initiating the sessions.

College and university officials serving a common jurisdiction or region should join together to coordinate and collaborate on policies, needs, and resources so that they may collectively influence local and state agencies.

- p. **State emergency management agencies should include campus public safety agencies in their efforts to improve interagency coordination, create coalitions, develop partnerships, and build capacity.**

Campus police and security agencies have much to offer to and learn from emergency management agencies. They represent and have responsibility for a major segment of the population and community and have access to and a need for information. Critical incident response, evacuation, and recovery are as important to a college or university as they are to any community. State, regional, and local emergency management planning groups should include representatives from campus police and security agencies.

- q. **The major associations, professional organizations, and government agencies serving campus safety should take advantage of the national network of Regional Community Policing Institutes (RCPI) to deliver education and training, promote recommended policies and best practices, and foster consistency and quality regionally and nationally. The COPS Office should require that each RCPI embrace campus safety and security as a priority.**

Regional Community Policing Institutes

In 1997, the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services funded the creation of a national network of Regional Community Policing Institutes (RCPI) to provide comprehensive and innovative community policing education and technical assistance to communities throughout the nation. The RCPIs focus on issues of importance to public safety agencies and the communities they serve and have the capability to move quickly to develop and deliver relevant training and technical assistance. Every RCPI is a partnership of public safety agencies, community organizations, and academic institutions.

RCPIs develop innovative, cutting-edge curricula on emerging law enforcement issues. Topics addressed by RCPIs include but are not limited to community problem solving, school violence, cultural diversity, domestic violence, building and sustaining partnerships, resource allocation, and prevention of and response to terror. Training is provided to criminal justice practitioners, local and state government officials, business leaders, and community leaders, including young people, volunteers, government employees, clergy, elected officials, and social service agencies. RCPIs provide a forum in which law enforcement and community members can discuss important and sensitive issues, working together to achieve a common end. Each year the national network of RCPIs provides training to more than 70,000 officers, community members, and government leaders.

The network of RCPIs is ideally suited to support education, discussion, debate, innovation, and research on campus safety. Most of the nation's RCPIs have a college or university partner because they are in locales in which most of the nation's college and universities are based. RCPIs are experienced in developing and delivering educational programming and each has a close working relationship with local, state, and regional public safety agencies.

Through meetings of RCPI directors or by other means, all of the nation's RCPIs should be encouraged to become involved in supporting campus safety. For example, the RCPIs should work closely with the proposed National Center for Campus Public Safety to develop and deliver curricula on problem solving, managing fear, and sustaining quality partnerships that reflect campus environments. As education and training, research programs, and other tools to enhance campus safety and security are developed, they should be delivered through the RCPI network.

Our investigations suggest that al-Qaeda has developed a support infrastructure inside the U.S. that would allow the network to mount another terrorist attack on U.S. soil. Multiple small-scale attacks against soft targets—such as banks, shopping malls, supermarkets, apartment buildings, schools and universities, churches, and places of recreation and entertainment—would be easier to execute.

FBI Director Robert Mueller, February 11, 2003
Testimony before the Select Committee on Intelligence
of the United States Senate

2. Operate a safe campus through prevention and response

- a. **Once development is completed, campus police and security agencies should adopt and implement the IACLEA Threat Assessment Instrument.**

IACLEA developed and is field-testing a campus risk assessment instrument with the National Emergency Response and Rescue Training Center and the Department of Homeland Security. When completed, the

instrument will have relevance to a wide spectrum of colleges and universities. The instrument is designed so that officials can conduct a self-assessment rather than rely on external resources. As it evolves and is refined, the instrument should target internal and external threats, strengths and weaknesses in readiness and responses, and gap analysis.

- b. Support should be given by federal agencies and professional associations to assist colleges and universities in finding new ways (through policies, processes, technology, research, promising practices) to deal with the complex task of balancing traditional open campus environments with the increased security required in the aftermath of September 11.**

There is significant debate over the degree to which colleges and university campuses should sustain environments allowing unrestricted movement of people and material. For some, this issue cuts to the heart of the freedoms—movement, research and experimentation, thoughts and ideas, debate—inextricably linked to the system of higher education. For others, it is a practical matter of providing for the security of the institutions of higher learning so that they may continue to enjoy these freedoms.

There is a need for more research on and study of recent practices to determine if increased security, in any way, has inhibited the freedoms associated with excellence in higher education.

An agency, organization, or center has to take the lead in continuing dialogue and learning among the key players—faculty, students, campus police and security officials, administrators, funders of research, and

others—who are leading the debate. A series of national and regional forums resulting in a series of guidelines published in a national consensus paper or report would be of considerable value.

c. Colleges and universities should adopt an all-hazards approach to preventing and managing crises and major incidents.

An all-hazards approach considers more than terrorist threat and attack when developing prevention, mitigation, response, and recovery strategies.

An all-hazards approach considers crises such as weather (hurricanes, ice storms, tornadoes), blackouts, natural gas leaks, protests, riots, and much more. An all-hazards approach to crisis prevention, response, and management enhances the overall coordination of activities among responding organizations, improves early warning and notification, allows for improved and continued assessment of potential consequences, and fosters continuity of operations during and after a crisis.

The prevention and control of major hazards has subsequently become a pressing issue in virtually all parts of the world. The rapid progress in modern technology and in the national and international regulatory framework, the fierce competitiveness of nations and within industries, allows less opportunity for learning by trial and error, making it increasingly necessary to get design and management's operating procedures right the first time.

Clifford B. Purcell
American Society of Safety Engineers
International Conference on Campus Safety
June 14, 1992

3. Strengthen operations and administrative functions

a. **Multicampus colleges and universities should adopt common policies, procedures, and incident response strategies for use across units and campuses.**

In some colleges and universities, various schools and units, such as research centers, institutes, libraries, and student centers, have not adopted or embraced a common policy for responding to crises. Deans, directors, department chairs, and other officials in these institutions cling to their independence and disavow following the lead of their campus police chief, security director, or other authority establishing prevention and response policy and practice. In times of crisis, such independence can be harmful. During the MARCPI project, police chiefs and sheriffs expressed frustration over decentralized decision making and discrepancies within college and universities that inhibit implementing quality, consistent critical incident response strategies.

College and university officials should support a common policy and prevent or limit independent units from going their own way. Professional associations representing those who lead the nation's academic institutions should foster this effort.

b. **National standards should be established on minimum qualifications for hiring campus police and security personnel.**

Before a reasonable dialogue can ensue on important issues such as salary and benefits, parity, and retention for campus police and security personnel, guidelines must be established on standards or qualifications for hiring. Professional associations such as IACLEA and the IACP can initiate such dialogue and take the lead in

exploring qualifications. Once established, the National Center for Campus Public Safety can play a lead role or support the efforts of the associations.

A commitment to a common set of standards or qualifications is essential to raising the level of professionalism in the field of campus safety. For campus public safety officers, the standards should address those traits and characteristics central to their role, going beyond the minimum qualifications mandated by most states for sworn officer status.

Once established, such standards will do much to enhance the field. They may lead to the following:

1. Increased recognition by administrators, students, faculty, grant funders, and others of the capabilities of campus police and security personnel.
2. Greater consistency and latitude in hiring practices across campuses and universities in the same system.
3. Justification for reasonable salary and benefits.
4. Parity with other police and security agencies serving the region.
5. Added foundation for robust discussion on ways to increase the professionalism of campus safety.
6. Increased number of applicants and qualified candidates for employment.

7. Better retention of personnel.
8. Increased confidence and pride in the profession.
9. Improved performance.

Establishing such standards is a daunting process. The diversity in campus safety operations may require several categories of standards. Input from a cross-section of officials representing these varied operations is essential, along with research on the state of selection in the field.

c. Colleges and universities should consider establishing parity in salary and benefits with surrounding law enforcement agencies as a means to improve recruitment and retention of campus police and security personnel.

Parity in salary and benefits with law enforcement agencies serving within a region is a goal only a few campus police and security operations have achieved.

While it is a reasonable goal, parity for the sake of parity is difficult to justify. Parity in salary and benefits has merit only if there is parity in standards, workload, accountability, and other criteria.

d. All campus police chiefs and security directors should have access to and meet with college and university presidents and other key decision makers.

Unlike municipal, county, and state chiefs of police and sheriffs who have regular contact with mayors and governors, campus police and security administrators may have minimal contact with their institution's chief executive officer (CEO). Safety and security cannot be managed as an add-on task or unit or function removed from key decision makers. Interaction at the highest level between the CEO and police and security professionals is imperative as new prevention and response issues emerge.

This does not imply that there must be a direct reporting relationship. Rather, ongoing, face-to-face contact between presidents, vice presidents, provosts, and their police and security professionals should occur routinely. Meetings of this type are essential to understanding the culture and nuances of safety-related matters and their effect on the institution. Criticality, confidentiality, and liability are among what makes it difficult to convey and address safety-related matters through third-party administrators.

e. Education and training, simulations, tabletop exercises, and related activities should be designed to reflect the diversity in the culture and type of college or university campus.

Federal and state agencies and private vendors are providing myriad products to enhance campus safety, with some mandated as a grant requirement. This is problematic when only one product is available and it lacks the flexibility to conform to different environments.

One-size-fits-all training packages and programs are of little value to the field of campus public safety. Diversity in the type of agency providing police and security services is one inhibitor to applying single-model systems. The differences in large and small schools, single-campus versus multicampus environments, and urban versus rural environments significantly affect the relevance of these programs.

Researchers, developers, and vendors engaged in providing training and support systems to colleges and universities need to be cognizant of and more responsive to the varied nature of colleges and universities.

APPENDIX



APPENDIX DELEGATES

Allison, Jeff

DHS Special Advisor to the FBI
Office of Laws Enforcement Coordination
U.S. Department of Homeland Security

Briggs, Mark

Campus Risk Manager
University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign
1110 West Springfield Avenue
Urbana, IL 61801

Clark, Oliver J.

Chief
University of Illinois Police Department
University of Illinois
1110 West Springfield Avenue
Urbana, IL 61801

Dillard, Robert C.

Chief
University of Richmond Police Department
University of Richmond
29 Westhampton Way
Richmond, VA 23173

DELEGATES

Eisenburger, Sam

Emergency Management
Emergency Management Institute
16825 South Seton Avenue
Emmitsburg, MD 21727

Goodwin, Ken

Director of Public Safety
Portland Community College
12000 SW 49th Avenue
Portland, OR 97219-7132

Flynn, Bill

Acting Director
Protective Security Division
Information Analysis & Infrastructure Protection,
U.S. Department of Homeland Security
3801 Nebraska Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20528

Healy, Steven

Director of Public Safety
Princeton University
Stanhope Hall
Princeton, NJ 08544

DELEGATES

Judge, Patrick

International Association of Directors of
Law Enforcement & Training
2521 Country Club Way
Albion, MI 49224

Karchmer, Clifford

Police Executive Leadership Forum
1120 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036

Keller, Rosi

Associate Vice President
The University of Montana-Missoula
32 Campus Drive
Missoula, MT 59812

Krouse, Kenneth W.

Chief of Police
University of Maryland Department of Public Safety
Route 1, Building 003
College Park, MD 20742

DELEGATES

Kurz, David

Chief
Durham Police Department
86 Dover Road
Durham, NC 27705

Langford, Linda

Associate Director
Higher Education Center for Alcohol & Other Drugs
c/o Education Development Center
55 Chapel Street
Newton, MA 02458

March, Noel

Director of Public Safety
University of Maine
Department of Public Safety
5794 Public Safety Way
Orono, Maine 04469-5794

McBride, Bruce

Associate Professor & Director of Criminal Justice
Utica College/International Association of Campus Law
Enforcement Administrators (IACLEA)
Faculty Center Room 209
Utica, NY 13502

DELEGATES

Perrotti, James

Chief
Yale University Police
Yale University
New Haven, CT 06520

Polk, Simone

Director of Public Safety
Wright State University Police Department
3640 Colonel Glen Highway
Dayton, OH 45435-0001

Riseling, Sue

Associate Vice President/Chancellor of Public Safety
University of Wisconsin Public Safety
Madison, WI 53711

Robinson, Robert

Vice President for Public Safety & EM
University of the District of Columbia
4200 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20008

DELEGATES

Seaman, Tom

Consultant, International Association of Chiefs of Police
1250 Kenas Road
North Whales, PA 19454-1213

Stafford, Dolores

Chief, University Police Department
George Washington University
2033 G Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20052

Steinbach, Sheldon

General Counsel/Vice President
American Council on Education
1 Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036

Thomas, Dave

Director,
Johns Hopkins University
Domestic Violence Program
6716 Alexander Bell Drive, Suite 200
Columbia, MD 21046

DELEGATES

Willett, Kenneth

President, IACLEA
Director, Office of Public Safety
University of Montana-Missoula
Missoula, MT 59812

Zdziarski, Eugene

Dean of Students
University of Florida
P202 Peabody Hall
P.O. Box 114275
Gainesville, FL 32611

Worden, Dave

Chief of Police
San Diego Community College District
IACLEA (Junior Colleges)
1536 Frazee Road
San Diego, CA 92108-4345

FACILITATORS

Firman, John, Director of Research, International Association of Chiefs of Police, Research Center, Master Facilitator

Dentico, John P., Special Consultant for the Division of Public Safety Leadership Program, Johns Hopkins University

De Simone, Joan, School of Professional Studies in Business and Education, Division of Public Safety Leadership, Johns Hopkins University

Dreisbach, Chris, School of Professional Studies in Business and Education, Division of Public Safety Leadership, Johns Hopkins University

McDonald, Phyllis, Director of Research/Faculty, Division of Public Safety Leadership, Johns Hopkins University

Smith, Patti, Peoples Counsel for the State of Maryland

COPS

FOR MORE INFORMATION:

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Community Oriented Policing Services
1100 Vermont Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20530

To obtain details on COPS programs, call the
COPS Office Response Center at 800.421.6770

Created Date: July 2005
ISBN: 1-932582-56-8

