MODULE I. INTRODUCTION TO CAMPUS SECURITY

Module I. Student Guide

Module I. Goal

The goal of Module I is to introduce Campus Security Officers (CSOs) to the field of campus security including its history, the national and Virginia-specific contexts in which campus security has developed, recent Virginia legislative action that has resulted in CSO training and certification requirements and current models of campus policing/security.

Module I. Topics

- A. History of Campus Policing/Security in America Required Reading: Brief History of Campus Policing in America
- B. History of Campus Policing/Security in Virginia Required Reading: History of Campus Policing/Security in Virginia (Timeline)
- C. Current Models of Campus Police and Security Required Reading: Models of Campus Police and Security
- D. Emergence of Federal Legislation on Campus Security Required Reading: Emergence of Federal Legislation on Campus Security
- E. Emergence of State Legislation on Campus Security Required Reading: Virginia Study on Campus Safety: Highlights and Updates



Required Assignment

History and Organization of Security on My Campus CSO will trace the history the campus security department at his institution of higher learning, placing it within broader history of campus police/security and identifying the model(s) of campus security operating on his campus.

Self Test Review of Module I CSO will test himself or herself on information presented in Module I. This will provide preparation and review for the final test, which is required for certification.



A. History of Campus Policing/Security in America

Reading: Brief History of Campus Policing in America



NOTE: Students should find information about the evolution of security/policing in their specific college/ university.

- Campus security is thought to have had its formal beginning in 1894 when the Yale Campus Police was established in response to frequent conflicts between Yale students and townspeople.
- Early in the 20th century, little need was seen for campus police or security forces and most colleges and universities depended entirely upon the local police for criminal violations and handled student misbehavior internally through the dean of students' office.
- From the 1920s until the 1950s, the predominant role was that of watchman-guard concerned mainly with protection of college property.
- As campuses became more complex and enrollments increased in the 1950s, need for a more organized protective force was recognized and retired law enforcement officials began to be hired.
- During the tumultuous 1960s, more professional police/security departments were created.
- In the 1970s campus security became oriented more "people-oriented," shifting somewhat from the focus on protection of property.
- Since the 1990s, the focus has been on a more service-oriented approach, in keeping with the
 national trend toward community-oriented policing by police agencies at all levels.
- Terrorist attacks of 9/11 and more recent attacks by animal rights and environmental radicals have marked a new era of campus public safety.

B. History of Campus Policing/Security in Virginia (Timeline)

Reading: <u>History of Campus Policing/Security in Virginia (Timeline)</u>

- 1977: Virginia Campus Police Act Gave authority to public universities/colleges to create their own campus police departments. Code of VA §23-232.
- 1992: Amendment to the Virginia Campus Police Act Providing similar authority to private universities/colleges. Code of VA §23-232.1.
- Additional applicable Virginia Code:
 - Arrest authority of armed security. Code of VA §9.1-146.
 - Additional jurisdictional authority of Campus Police Officers. Code of VA §23-234.
 - Special Conservators of the Peace. Code of VA §19.2-13

C. Current Models of Campus Police and Security

Reading: Models of Campus Police and Security

National Models

- Campus police and security operations vary considerably.
- Some campuses have police departments; others have security departments; while some rely on local and state law enforcement to provide services on campuses. Still others contract for services from private security firms. Large campuses may rely on a combination of these.

Virginia Models:

- In its Study on Campus Safety, the Virginia State Crime Commission identified four models: one police model and three security models:
 - Police Model:
 - Campus Police Officers have the same minimum standards training as all sworn officers in the Commonwealth. They must also complete additional annual training in areas such as first aid/CPR/AED training, bicycle patrol certification and ASP baton training. Police departments have new officer recruit basic training programs averaging 645 hours and ranging from 480 to 820 hours among the 29 departments.
 - Campus Security Models:
 - Special Conservators of the Peace These officers are appointed by a Circuit Court Judge. They are either armed or unarmed and must be registered with DCJS and meet minimum training standards.
 - Proprietary Campus Security Officers These officers serve in security departments established by colleges and universities. These officers may be armed or unarmed, and may or may not have arrest authority.
 - Contracted Private Security Officers The college or university contracts with a private security organization to provide campus security.



NOTE: Students should refer to their employing college to determine if they have legal arrest authority.

Additional study information:

Virginia

- There is a great deal of variation across colleges and universities.
- Of the 69 colleges that participated in the 2006 Study on Campus Safety, the study found 29 (42%) colleges had campus police departments and 40 (58%) colleges had campus security departments.
- The 29 colleges with campus police departments served approximately 335,000 students, faculty and staff and 71% of all Virginia college students.
- The 40 colleges with campus security departments served approximately 130,000 students, faculty and staff and 29% of all Virginia college students.
- Colleges and universities also outsource to both law enforcement agencies and to private security firms. On large campuses, police and security operations may be provided by a combination of services.



Assignment Worksheet I.1: History and Organization of Security on My Campus

In this assignment, the CSO will trace the history of the campus security department on his campus, placing it within broader history of campus police/security and identifying the model(s) of campus security operating on his campus.

D. Emergence of Federal Legislation on Campus Security

Reading: Emergence of Federal Legislation on Campus Security

- Crime on college and university campuses captured media attention in the mid-1980s when several tragic cases were publicized; these reports put to rest the long-cherished notion that colleges and universities are somehow immune from the threat of crime.
- Civil suits filed by victims and surviving family members of homicide victims against universities and administrators threatened the financial resources of colleges and universities and served as the prelude to federal legislation.
- In a climate of new concern about the safety of students on college campuses, three pieces of federal legislation were introduced and passed in the 1990s: the Campus Security Act of 1990; the Campus Sexual Assault Victims Bill of Rights of 1992; and the Higher Education Amendments of 1998 and 2008:
 - The Campus Security Act of 1990 was the first federal legislation to address the issue of crime on college campuses and reflects a national commitment to increase campus safety. In brief, the Act required that institutions publish and distribute an annual report which describes security and law enforcement policies, crime prevention activities, procedures for reporting crimes on campus, and certain campus crime statistics. The first reports covered the 1991 academic year.
 - The Campus Sexual Assault Victims Bill of Rights of 1992 required institutions of higher education to develop and publish policies regarding the prevention and awareness of sex offenses and procedures for responding after a sex offense occurs as part of their campus security report. A key point in the new statute is the responsibility of university officials to inform students of their rights and provide them with clear information about how to report sex offenses and about the assistance (medical, legal, and psychological) available for victims.
 - The Higher Education Amendments of 1998, known as the Clery Act, includes provisions regarding the public reporting of campus crime statistics that specifically address off-campus and adjacent-to-campus student victimization. Regulations require the report of criminal victimization of students in off-campus housing and on public and private property located adjacent to campuses.
 - In 2008, amendments to the Clery Act (*Higher Education Amendments*) require institutions to develop and make public a security plan to respond to emergencies on campus. The plan must provide for:
 - Immediate notification of the campus as soon as an emergency is confirmed.
 - Expanded categories for hate crimes and whistle-blower protections now exist.
 - Requirements for the tracking and reporting of fires in relation to residential housing on campus. (Mandatory policy)
 - New reporting requirements for missing persons under the age of 21.¹ (Mandatory policy)

¹ Virginia law requires immediate report to law enforcement for persons under the age of 21. For additional information see Code of Virginia Sections: §52-32 and §15.2-1718.

- New requirements for a separate database housing confidential contact information to be used in the event of a missing student.
- Victim Advocacy through Campus Violence Civil Litigation:
 - Campus crime civil litigation emerged in the mid-1980s as a legal strategy to address the problem of campus crime.
 - It caught school administrators by surprise and threatened financial resources.
 - One of the more tragic cases involves the torture, rape, and murder of nineteen-year-old Jeanne Ann Clery in her dormitory room at Lehigh University in 1986.
 - Following the conviction and sentencing of Jeanne Clery's murderer, a university student, Clery's parents filed suit against the university for its negligence in failing to take reasonable action to protect their daughter from foreseeable harm.

E. Emergence of State Legislation on Campus Security

Reading: Virginia Study on Campus Safety: Highlights and Updates

- In 2004, the Virginia General Assembly directed the Crime Commission to conduct a study of campus safety in Virginia, examining the following areas:
 - Current Virginia policies, procedures and programs used to promote safety at institutions of higher education;
 - Nature of criminal offenses at Virginia's public and private institutions of higher education;
 - Use of best practices or models for campus safety nationally; and,
 - Need to develop statewide procedures to ensure the dissemination of information pertaining to best practices for campus safety to Virginia's public and private institutions of higher education.
- The full final report, issued in 2006, contains numerous findings and both legislative and best practice recommendations concerning campus safety. The full report is titled "HJR 122 Final Report: Study on Campus Safety".
- *Key Study Findings* About Campus Crime in Virginia:
 - Campus crime in Virginia was found to be consistent with prior research literature:
 - Crime on campus, in general, is lower than that in the surrounding communities.
 - Property crimes -- specifically larceny and vandalism -- account for the majority of reported crimes on both police and security department campuses regardless of region, size, or type of institution.
 - Alcohol violations comprised the vast majority of judicial referrals and of the groups most likely referred include freshmen, males, and those under the age of 20.
 - The presence of student residents on campus was found to increase the amount of campus safety resources.

- Demographics of colleges varied significantly. Some had multiple campuses, large stadiums, research laboratories, hospitals, arts/entertainment centers and historic attractions.
- The study repeatedly made the point that each institution is unique in a variety of areas. This requires the individual college campus police or security department to serve institutions in ways that "fit" with the different resources and environments of the colleges.
- Among weaknesses cited in the study, it was reported that 1) there was no standardized training for campus security officers and that 2) not all police and security departments had written policy and procedure manuals.
- Legislative Action
 - The 2006 Session of the Virginia General Assembly amended the Code to require DCJS to develop training standards for Campus Security Officers.
 - In its 2008 Session, the General Assembly passed laws requiring the boards of visitors or other governing body of each **public** institution of higher education to do three things:
 - Develop, adopt, and keep current a written crisis and emergency management plan, §23-9.2:9. Institutional crisis and emergency management plan; review required.
 - Establish a violence prevention committee and threat assessment team, §23-9.2:10. Violence prevention committee; threat assessment team. and
 - Establish a first warning notification and emergency broadcast system. (§23-9.2:11.
 First warning and emergency notification system required.)

A. History of Campus Policing/Security in America

Brief History of Campus Policing in America

Campus security is thought to have had its formal beginning in **1894** when the Yale Campus Police was established. Because of frequent conflicts between Yale students and townspeople that often developed into full-scale riots, two New Haven police officers were hired by Yale as campus police officers. These officers retained their sworn authority as city officers, a situation that continues today. One of these first officers, William Weiser, was appointed chief. Chief Weiser wrote a book in 1914 entitled *Yale Memories*, in which he said that his department's most important function was to "protect the students, their property, and the University property." While Yale established a police department in 1894, this was the exception rather than the rule.

During the **1900s**, little need was seen for campus police or security forces and most colleges and universities depended entirely upon the local police to handle any criminal violations and campus disruptions. Most matters involving student misbehavior were handled "internally" through the dean of students' office.

During the **1920s**, the watchman or guard appeared as the predominant approach to campus safety. Historically, these watchmen, who were usually older retired men employed only at night and on weekends, were often attached to the maintenance or physical plant department. Their main concern was with the protection of college property. These watchmen were given no training as law enforcement officers and were not expected to perform as such. Their chief functions were to determine the security of buildings at night and on weekends (e.g., closing windows, locking and unlocking doors, and other duties to protect property) and "patrol" the campus in order to detect fire hazards, check boilers, detect leaky pipes and otherwise perform preventive maintenance duties. With the repeal of Prohibition in the **1930s**, the watchman-guard gradually began to take on other functions dealing with the enforcement of rules and regulations governing student conduct.

During the **1950s**, university administrators began to recognize the need for a more organized protective force on campus. Increases in enrollment, potential increases in behavioral incidents, expansion of the physical plant, increases in motor traffic, and problems related to parking led to an awareness of need for some semblance of police presence on campus. Consequently, at the beginning of the 1950s, retired law enforcement officials were hired as campus "cops" and often patterned campus departments after models used in municipal settings. Usually, the "police" authority was still limited to detection of crime, physical security functions, and notification of local police authorities in the event of necessary arrests or other formal police action.

In **1953**, the Northeastern College and University Security Association was formed by a group of campus security administrators in the Northeast to foster professionalism and the exchange of information. Soon to follow this effort was the formation of the National Association of College and University Traffic and Security Directors in **1958**, which is now the International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators (IACLEA). These associations were clear indications that the once campus watchmen-guards were becoming organized and developed into more professionally oriented safety officers.

It was not until the tumultuous **1960s** when disorder and crime were introduced to the academic community that college administrators realized the inadequacy of their campus "law" and, at the same time, became dissatisfied with the local police attitudes and methods. Subsequently, administrators concerned not only with students' needs and safety, but also with autonomy of law enforcement responsibilities on campus, recognized the time for a change of priorities and the need for a new direction which would create a more professional police/security department on campus. The concept of hiring former municipal and county officers began to be less popular.

During the **1970s**, campus security began to be programmed to meet student problems and needs. It emphasized a low-key but highly professional approach utilizing well-trained young officers who had either enrolled in college degree programs or who had already achieved a degree. These officers were often attired in blazer-slacks outfits bearing the college seal and department name instead of the police-type uniforms of the former watchmen-guards. Professional degree-holding safety and security administrators were very much in demand to head these departments. Security directors, who once answered to the head of the physical plant, were now often reporting to the president and vice-president. The trend would suggest a role changing from one oriented to protecting property to one more "people" oriented.

Through the **1980's** and beyond, drug education, prevention, suppression, interdiction, and arrest became a formal part of the responsibilities of campus police departments. Adding to the numerous problems facing the college police department was the persistent crime problem.

Since the **1990s**, campus police agencies have begun to shift their focus from the traditional crime-fighting role to a *more service-oriented approach*, in keeping with the national trend toward <u>community-oriented policing</u> by police agencies at all levels. Campus police have become important members of the growing number of police organizational models within the myriad of policing agencies in the United States. They are also important stakeholders in the community-oriented policing movement as a result of the socially complex nature of the modern collegiate campus community.

Leaders in campus public safety have noted that the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 marked a **new era** of campus public safety requiring a very different kind of preparation and response to disasters on campus. More recently, attacks by animal rights and environmental radicals have emerged as a new threat to campus safety and security.

B. History of Campus Policing/Security in Virginia

History of Campus Policing/Security in Virginia (Timeline)

1977: Virginia Campus Police Act – Gave authority to public universities/colleges to create their own campus police departments.

Code of VA §23-232. Establishment authorized; employment of officers. A. The governing board of each public institution of higher learning named in §23-14, hereafter sometimes referred to in this chapter as "institution," is authorized to establish a campus police department and to employ campus police officers and auxiliary forces upon appointment as provided in §§23-233 and 23-233.1. Such employment shall be governed by the Virginia Personnel Act, as set forth in Chapter 29 (§2.2-2900 et seq.) of Title 2.2.

1992: Amendment to the Virginia Campus Police Act – Providing similar authority to private universities/colleges.

Code of VA \$23-232.1. Authorization for campus police departments in private institutions of higher education. The governing board of each private institution of higher education is authorized to establish, in compliance with the provisions of this chapter, a campus police department and to employ campus police officers upon appointment as provided in <u>\$23-233</u>. Except as such provisions apply exclusively to public institutions or employees, the provisions of this chapter shall apply to the appointment and employment of officers, operation, powers, duties and jurisdiction of private campus police departments, and such departments shall be subject to and enjoy the benefits of this chapter. However, to be qualified to use the word "police" to describe the department or its officers, any private college or university which establishes a campus police department shall require that each officer comply with the training or other requirements for law-enforcement officers established by the Department of Criminal Justice Services pursuant to Chapter 1 (<u>\$9.1-100</u> et seq.) of Title 9.1.

Additional applicable Virginia Code:

Arrest authority of armed security:

Code of VA §9.1-146. Limitation on powers of registered armed security officers. Compliance with the provisions of this article shall not itself authorize any person to carry a concealed weapon or exercise any powers of a conservator of the peace. A registered armed security officer of a private security services business while at a location which the business is contracted to protect shall have the power to effect an arrest for an offense occurring (i) in his presence on such premises or (ii) in the presence of a merchant, agent, or employee of the merchant the private security business has contracted to protect, if the merchant, agent, or employee had probable cause to believe that the person arrested had shoplifted or committed willful concealment of goods as contemplated by <u>§18.2-106</u>. For the purposes of <u>§19.2-74</u>, a registered armed security officer of a private security services business shall be considered an arresting officer.

Additional jurisdictional authority of Campus Police Officers:

Code of VA §23-234. Powers and duties; jurisdiction. A campus police officer appointed as provided in §23-233 or appointed and activated pursuant to §23-233.1 may exercise the powers and duties conferred by law upon police officers of cities, towns, or counties, and shall be so deemed, including but not limited to the provisions of Chapters 5 (§19.2-52 et seq.), 7 (§19.2-71 et seq.), and 23 (§19.2-387 et seq.) of Title 19.2, (i) upon any property owned or controlled by the relevant public or private institution of higher education, or, upon request, any property owned or controlled by another public or private institution of higher education and upon the streets, sidewalks, and highways, immediately adjacent thereto, (ii) pursuant to a mutual aid agreement provided for in §15.2-1727 between the governing board of a public or private institution and such other institution of higher education, public or private, in the Commonwealth or adjacent political subdivisions, (iii) in close pursuit of a person as provided in §19.2-77, and (iv) upon approval by the appropriate circuit court of a petition by the local governing body for concurrent jurisdiction in designated areas with the police officers of the county, city, or town in which the institution, its satellite campuses, or other properties are located. The local governing body may petition the circuit court pursuant only to a request by the local law-enforcement agency for concurrent jurisdiction.

Special Conservators of the Peace:

Code of VA §19.2-13. Special conservators of the peace; authority; jurisdiction; registration; bond; liability of employers; penalty; report. The order of appointment may provide that a special conservator of the peace shall have all the powers, functions, duties, responsibilities and authority of any other conservator of the peace within such geographical limitations as the court may deem appropriate within the confines of the county, city or town that makes application or within the county, city or town where the corporate applicant is located, limited, except as provided in subsection E, to the judicial circuit wherein application has been made, whenever such special conservator of the peace is engaged in the performance of his duties as such. The order may also provide that the special conservator of the peace is a "law-enforcement officer" for the purposes of Article 4 (§37.2-808 et seq.) of Chapter 8 of Title 37.2. The order may also provide that the special conservator of the peace may use the title "police" on any badge or uniform worn in the performance of his duties as such. The order may also provide that a special conservator of the peace who has completed the minimum training standards established by the Department of Criminal Justice Services, has the authority to affect arrests, using up to the same amount of force as would be allowed to a law-enforcement officer employed by the Commonwealth or any of its political subdivisions when making a lawful arrest....

C. Current Models of Campus Police and Security

Models of Campus Police and Security

Models Identified Nationally:²

The characteristics of security and police services on the nation's college and university campuses vary considerably.

Some campuses have a campus police department or a security department. Others rely on local or state police to provide services on campus. Still others contract for services from a private security firm such as Wackenhut. On large campuses, police and security operations may be provided by a combination of 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 unreasonable 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.

² Source: National Perspective information is excerpted from *National Summit on Campus Public Safety: Strategies for Colleges and Universities in a Homeland Security Environment* (2005). U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services. Full report available online at

http://www.cops.usdoj.gov/files/ric/Publications/NationalSummitonCampusPublicSafety.pdf

CSO Training Module I Student Readings & Assignments

Virginia Models:³

In its *Study on Campus Safety*, the Virginia State Crime Commission identified campus police departments and three models of campus security.

Campus Police Officers/Departments

The report noted that campus police officers have the same minimum standards training as all sworn officers in the Commonwealth and must complete additional annual training in areas such as first aid/CPR/AED training, bicycle patrol certification and ASP baton training. Police departments have new officer recruit basic training programs averaging 645 hours and ranging from 480 to 820 hours among the 29 departments.

Campus Security Models

- 1. Special Conservators of the Peace These officers are appointed by a circuit court judge. They are either armed or unarmed and must be registered with DCJS and meet minimum training standards.
- 2. Proprietary Campus Security Officers These departments are established by colleges and universities. These officers may be armed or unarmed, and may or may not have arrest authority.
- 3. Contracted Private Security Officers The college or university contracts with a private security organization to provide campus security.

Police and Security Departments

Of the 69 colleges that participated, the 2006 *Study on Campus Safety* found 29 colleges had campus police departments and 40 colleges had campus security departments.

- The 29 colleges with campus police departments served approximately 335,000 students, faculty and staff and 71 percent of all Virginia college students.
- The 40 colleges with campus security departments served approximately 130,000 students, faculty and staff and 29 percent of all Virginia college students.

Table 1. Type of Institution by Type of Department		
Type of Institution	Police Departments	Security Departments
Public 4-year and above	15	0^4
Private 4-year and above	8	22
Public 2-year	6	18
TOTAL	29	40

 ³ Source: Information on Virginia Operations is based on *Study on Campus Safety*, House Document No. 36 (2006). Report of the Virginia State Crime Commission. The full study is available at http://leg1.state.va.us/lis.htm, under Reports to the General Assembly, 2006.
 ⁴ Several public 4-year institutions have *security officers* under the direction of their *police department*.

Organizational Status of Departments

- 86 percent of police chiefs report to a vice-president level administrator; 14 percent report to a student-affairs administrator.
- 59 percent of security directors report to a vice-president level administrator; 19 percent report to a student-affairs administrator.
- Practitioners indicated that if police or security functions were too far down the organizational structure, they were likely to experience difficulty in receiving adequate resources and administrative support.

Outsourcing

To law enforcement:

- In FY 2004, 17 percent (5 of 29) of police departments and 24 percent (8 of 33) security departments outsourced some police or security services to other state or local law enforcement.
- Since 1999, there was a 60 percent increase in the number of security departments outsourcing to state or local law enforcement; the number of police departments outsourcing remained the same.

To private security:

- In FY 2005, 14 percent (4 of 29) police departments and 44 percent (15 of 34) security departments outsourced some security services to a private firm.
- Since 1999, there was a 33 percent increase in the number of police departments and a 25 percent increase in the number of security departments outsourcing some security services to an outside firm.

On large campuses, police and security operations may be provided by a combination of services.

D. Emergence of Federal Legislation on Campus Security

Emergence of Federal Legislation on Campus Security⁵

Background

Crime on college and university campuses first captured media attention in the mid-1980s and brought the issue into public view. Civil suits filed by victims and surviving family members of homicide victims against universities and administrators served as the prelude to successful advocacy for federal legislation that requires colleges to compile and publish annual campus security reports. Such federal laws, and the programs, policies, and procedures that have since developed; have served to enhance safety, security, and crime victim assistance on many campuses.

Few issues affecting colleges and universities captured media attention more dramatically in the last decade than violent crime. Awareness of the incidence of violent crime on college campuses burst into the public's consciousness with the reporting of several tragic cases in the 1980s. Headlines of major newspaper across the country have described violent incidents on campuses. These reports put to rest the long-cherished notion that colleges and universities are somehow far removed from the threat of crime.

Federal Laws

In the 1990s, three pieces of federal legislation were introduced and passed in a climate of new concern about the safety of students on college campuses: the Campus Security Act of 1990; the Campus Sexual Assault Victims Bill of Rights of 1992: and the Higher Education Amendments of 1998.

• The Student Right to Know and Campus Security Act of 1990:

The Campus Security Act was the first federal legislation to address the issue of crime on college campuses and reflects a national commitment to increase campus safety. In brief, the Act requires that institutions publish and distribute an annual report which describes security and law enforcement policies, crime prevention activities, procedures for reporting crimes on campus, and certain campus crime statistics. The first reports covered the 1991 academic year.

The Campus Sexual Assault Victims Bill of Rights of 1992:

The Campus Sexual Assault Victims Bill of Rights (1992) requires institutions of higher education to develop and publish policies regarding the prevention and awareness of sex offenses and procedures for responding after a sex offense occurs as part of their campus security report. A key point in the new statute is the responsibility of university officials to inform students of their rights and provide them with clear information about how to report sex offenses and about the assistance (medical, legal, and psychological) available for victims.

⁵ Source: Information in the reading is based on materials from the U.S. Department of Justice, Office for Victims of Crime, National Victim Assistance Academy Textbook, June 2002, Chapter 22 Special Topics: Campus Crime and Victimization. All textbook materials can be accessed online at <u>http://www.ojp.gov/ovc/assist/nvaa2002/chapter22_4.html#1</u>

Higher Education Amendments of 1998: The Jeanne Clery Act:

Signed into law in October 1998, H.R. 6, *Higher Education Amendments of 1998* includes provisions regarding the public reporting of campus crime statistics that specifically address off-campus and adjacent-to-campus student victimization. Regulations require the report of criminal victimization of students in off-campus housing that has a school affiliation, and on public and private property located off-campus but adjacent thereto. Schools are also expected to make a "good faith" effort to obtain crime report information from local police. The Clery amendments also expanded requirements for the reporting of hate crimes.

2008 Higher Education Amendments (Clery Act):

In 2008, amendments to the Clery Act require institutions to develop and make public a security plan to respond to emergencies on campus. The plan must provide for immediate notification of the campus as soon as an emergency is confirmed. Expanded categories of hate crimes and whistle-blower protections now exist. Additionally, the U.S. Department of Education (ED) is authorized under the Jeanne Clery Act to disseminate best practices information and is required to report annually to Congress on the implementation of the Jeanne Clery Act. [Campus Safety Connection, 2008: Vol. 14, Issue 2, Security on Campus, Inc.].

The 2008 Amendments also include new provisions that require the tracking and reporting of fires that occur in relation to residential facilities controlled by the college/university, and the requirement for the creation and maintenance of a confidential contact-person database to be utilized in the event that a student under the age of 21 is missing. This contact person, to be designated by the student, would receive the report of a student under the age of 21 who is reported missing.

Victim Advocacy through Campus Violence Civil Litigation

Campus crime civil litigation emerged in the mid-1980s as a relatively new and formidable legal strategy to address the problem of campus crime. It caught school administrators by surprise and threatened the financial resources of colleges and universities, many of which have suffered in recent years from declining enrollment and escalating costs.

Civil cases have been filed, primarily by students or their surviving family members, against universities, their administrators and trustees. In such cases, plaintiffs seek compensatory damages for financial losses and pain and suffering as well as punitive damages that are awarded to punish perpetrators and deter others from engaging in similar behavior. Cases have alleged negligence and gross negligence, and in recent years, civil lawsuits have resulted in large judgments or out-of-court settlements. Generally, lawsuits have alleged unsafe campus conditions. Awards ranging from \$50,000 to \$2 million for plaintiffs who were victims of assault and rape have shaken several universities, attracted Congressional and media attention, and led to an examination of security on campuses and institutions' response after a crime occurs.

One of the more tragic cases involves the torture, rape, and murder of nineteen-year-old Jeanne Ann Clery in her dormitory room at Lehigh University on April 5, 1986. Following the conviction and sentencing of Jeanne Clery's murderer, who was also a university student, Howard and Connie Clery filed suit against the university for its negligence in failing to take

reasonable action to protect their daughter from foreseeable harm. The amount of the settlement was not made public, but pursuant to its terms, the university agreed to improve security throughout the campus, particularly in dormitories. Howard and Connie Clery went on to form Security on Campus, Inc., an organization dedicated to bringing the problem of violent crime on college campuses to the attention of those who most need to know: applicants, students, faculty, and staff. Their crusade has had widespread results. Since their initial success in securing passage of campus crime legislation in Pennsylvania in 1988, similar legislation has been passed in many states. The Clerys are also recognized as the driving force behind the first federal campus crime law.

E. Emergence of State Legislation on Campus Security

Virginia Study on Campus Safety: Highlights and Updates⁶

Background

House Joint Resolution (HJR 122), introduced during the 2004 Session of the Virginia General Assembly, directed the Crime Commission to examine the following areas: (i) current Virginia policies, procedures and programs used to promote safety at institutions of higher education; (ii) nature of criminal offenses at Virginia's public and private institutions of higher education; (iii) use of best practices or models for campus safety nationally; and, (iv) need to develop statewide procedures to ensure the dissemination of information pertaining to best practices for campus safety to Virginia's public and private institutions.

The full final report contains numerous findings and both legislative and best practice recommendations concerning campus safety. Summarized briefly below are selected study findings and legislative recommendations.

Summary of Study Findings

Campus crime in Virginia is consistent with prior research literature.

- Crime, in general, is lower than that in the surrounding communities.
- Property crimes, specifically larceny and vandalism, account for the majority of reported crimes on both police and security department campuses regardless of region, size, or type of institution.

The type, degree of usage, and operating procedures of judicial referral systems at colleges varied significantly among different institutions.

- Some colleges did not have a system at all, relying solely on local law enforcement; whereas, others had multiple judicial boards to handle incidents occurring on campus that could be considered criminal in a court of law.
- Alcohol violations comprised the vast majority of judicial referrals and of the groups most likely referred include freshmen, males, and those under the age of 20.

The survey of findings from the campus police and security departments further illustrated the uniqueness of each department and the type and amount of resources available.

- Demographics of colleges varied significantly. Some had multiple campuses, large stadiums, research laboratories, hospitals, arts/entertainment centers and historic attractions.
- The presence of student residents on campus was found to increase the amount of campus safety resources.

All public 4-year and above colleges had campus police departments.

⁶ *Study on Campus Safety.* House Document No. 36 (2006). Report of the Virginia State Crime Commission. Full report available at <u>http://leg1.state.va.us/lis.htm</u>, under Reports to the General Assembly, 2006

- Campus police officers are required to meet the same minimum standards as all other police officers in the Commonwealth; however, there is no standardized training for campus security officers.
- Not all police and security departments had written policy and procedure manuals.

Each higher education institution in the Commonwealth is unique in a variety of areas. This requires the individual college campus police or security department to serve that institution in a way that accounts for the different resources and environment of that college.

Recommendations

A lengthy list of both legislative and best practice recommendations were set forth in the *Study*. Legislative recommendations were initially presented to the Virginia General Assembly in 2006. Many recommendations have since been acted upon; some recommendations have not been acted upon and others have been addressed in different ways. The April 2007 Virginia Tech shootings subsequently generated a great deal of study and action along with more recent sets of recommendations.

Legislative Actions

The Virginia General Assembly in its 2006 Session amended § 9.1-102.48, *Code of Virginia*, to require the Department of Criminal Justice Services to develop training standards for campus security officers and to provide technical support and assistance to campus police departments and campus security departments. The amendment was effective July 1, 2007.

The Virginia General Assembly, in its 2008 Session, amended § 23-9.2:9, § 23-9.2:10, and § 23-9.2:11, *Code of Virginia*, to require the boards of visitors or other governing body of each public institution of higher education to develop, adopt, and keep current a <u>written crisis and emergency</u> <u>management plan</u>. Such plan must be reviewed and revised every four years. The Department of Emergency Management must assist institutions, as needed, in their development of the plan. The bill also requires each board of visitors to establish a <u>threat assessment team</u> to develop a campus-wide threat assessment policy, and to establish a <u>first warning notification and emergency</u> broadcast system.

- Written Crisis and Emergency Management Plans:
 - *§ 23-9.2:9. Institutional crisis and emergency management plan; review required.*
 - Requires the board of visitors or other governing body of each public institution of higher education to develop, adopt, and keep current a written crisis and emergency management plan. Plans must be reviewed and revised every four years.
 - The Department of Emergency Management must assist institutions, as needed, in their development of the plan.
- Threat Assessment Teams:
 - § <u>23-9.2:10</u>. *Violence prevention committee; threat assessment team.*

- Requires each college or university to have in place policies and procedures for the prevention of violence on campus, including assessment and intervention with individuals whose behavior poses a threat to the safety of the campus community.
- Requires each board of visitors to establish a threat assessment team to develop a campus-wide threat assessment policy.
- First Warning Notification and Emergency Broadcast System:
 - § <u>23-9.2:11</u>. First warning and emergency notification system required.
 - Requires that each board of visitors shall establish by January 1, 2009 a comprehensive, prompt, and reliable first warning notification and emergency broadcast system for their students, faculty, and staff, both on and off campus.

Assignment 1. History and Organization of Security on My Campus

Name of Institution
History
1. When was the police/security department at my institution established?
2. Based on what you have learned about your department's history, in what ways does the history reflect the stages described in the reading "A Brief History of Campus Security in America?"
Organization
3a. What model(s) of campus security operate on your campus? (Refer to the reading "Models of Campus Police and Security")
3b. What is your legal authority in your position? (E.g. Do you have authority to arrest/detain individuals? Do you have authorization to physically intervene in potentially violent confrontations?)
4. Are some security functions contracted out to private security companies? If yes, list function(s) and to whom the function(s) is/are contracted.
5. To whom in the college/university does the police/security department report? Give the title rather than the name of the person.

MODULE I: INTRODUCTION TO CAMPUS SECURITY

Self Test for Module I.

- 1. A more service-oriented approach to campus policing/security is associated with the trend toward:
 - a. a more organized, protective force
 - b. community-oriented policing
 - c. campus watchmen/guards
 - d. use of retired law enforcement

2. Federal legislation on campus safety emerged after:

- a. civil litigation
- b. student protests
- c. media attention to incidents
- d. a and c above

3. The Student Right to Know and Campus Security Act of 1990:

- a. was the first federal legislation to address the issue of crime on college campuses, requiring colleges/ universities to publish annual reports on security policies, crime prevention activities, procedures for reporting crimes on campus, and certain campus crime statistics
- b. required colleges/universities to implement a comprehensive crisis response plan
- c. required colleges/universities to develop agreements with local law enforcement agencies
- d. required colleges/universities to immediately notify students and parents about criminal incidents on campus

4. The Campus Sexual Assault Victims Bill of Rights:

- a. requires colleges/universities to develop and publish policies about the prevention and awareness of sex offenses and procedures for responding after a sex offense occurs
- b. requires colleges/universities to inform students of their rights and provide clear information on how to report sex offenses and about medical, legal, and psychological assistance available
- c. reduced lawsuits against colleges/universities
- d. a and b above

5. The Jeanne Clery Act:

- a. requires students to report crimes to campus police/security
- b. requires public reporting of campus crime statistics, including off-campus and adjacent-tocampus student victimization
- c. requires security departments to implement crime prevention and fire safety programs
- d. requires keeping a log of requests for services

6. The 1977 Virginia Campus Police Act did which of the following?

- a. Required background checks on all campus employees
- b. Gave private universities/colleges the authority to create their own police departments
- c. Allowed campus police to arrest
- d. Gave authority to public universities/colleges to create their own campus police departments

CSO Self Test

7. The 1992 amendment to the 1977 Virginia Campus Police Act did which of the following?

- a. Required background checks on all campus employees
- b. Gave private universities/colleges the authority to create their own police departments
- c. Allowed campus police to arrest
- d. Gave authority to public universities/colleges to create their own campus police departments

8. Virginia's *Study on Campus Safety* demonstrated:

- a. campus crime patterns in Virginia are consistent with prior research with property crimes such as larceny and vandalism reported most frequently
- b. each campus is unique in a variety of ways; therefore, each police/security department must serve their institution in ways that account for the unique environment
- c. crime on campuses is, in general, lower than crime in surrounding communities
- d. all of the above
- 9. Virginia's *Study on Campus Safety* showed that each campus in Virginia is quite unique. Consequently, each security department:
 - a. should have the same policies and procedures
 - b. should serve their particular institution in the way that best fits the needs on their campus
 - c. should only employ students as security officers
 - d. all of the above
- 10. The requirement for establishing training standards for campus security officers in Virginia is based on:
 - a. federal and state regulations
 - b. best practice standards
 - c. state law
 - d. Governor's Executive Order

11. In 1977, this Virginia Legislation allowed public colleges and universities to create their own campus police departments:

- a. Jeanne Clery Act
- b. Virginia Campus Police Act
- c. Virginia Campus Security Act
- d. Virginia Community Policing Act
- 12. During what decade did increased crime and disorder cause college and university administrators to see a growing need for their own police and security departments?
 - a. 1920's
 - b. 1940's
 - c. 1980's
 - d. 1960's

13. What events brought about a new era of campus public safety?

- a. 9/11
- b. Attacks by animal rights and environmental radicals
- c. The social networking boom
- d. Both a and b

CSO Self Test

- 14. Based on the findings of the 2006 Study on Campus Safety, what violations comprised the vast majority of judicial referrals?
 - a. Sexual harassment/assault
 - b. Illicit drug use
 - c. Theft
 - d. Alcohol
- 15. In 2008, the Virginia General Assembly passed laws requiring public institutions of higher learning to do which of the following?
 - a. Develop, adopt, and keep a current written emergency management plan
 - b. Establish a violence prevention committee
 - c. Establish a first warning notification and emergency broadcast system
 - d. All of the above

Score /15





Campus Security Officer Program

Overview of Module I

- History of Campus Policing/Security in America
- History of Campus Policing/ Security in Virginia
- Current Models of Campus Police and Security
- Federal Legislation on Campus Security
- State Legislation on Campus Security

Campus Security Officer Program Overview of Module I

The goal of Module I is to introduce the CSO to the field of campus security including its history, the national and Virginia-specific contexts in which campus security has developed, recent Virginia legislative action that has resulted in CSO training and certification requirements, and current models of campus policing/security.

€IS

CSO MODULE I





Campus Security Officer Program

History of Campus Policing/Security in America

1970s-Campus security becomes more "people oriented" instead of focusing mainly on property crime

1990s-In keeping with national trends, campus police shift toward "communityoriented" policing-a service-oriented approach

2000s-9/11 terrorist attacks and recent animal rights and environmental radical attacks have marked a new era of campus security

(VA§ 23-232) (VA§ 23-232.1)

Campus Security Officer Program

History of Campus Policing/Security in Virginia

1977-Virginia Campus Police Act: Gave authority to public universities/colleges to create their own campus police departments

1992–Amendment to Virginia Campus Police Act: allows private universities/ colleges to create campus police departments

VA§ 9.1-146–Arrest authority of armed security VA§ 23-234–Additional jurisdictional authority VA§ 19.2-13–Special conservators of the peace





Campus Security Officer Program Current Models of

Campus Police and Security

The Virginia Police Model:

- Campus Police Officers must have the same minimum training standards as all sworn officers in the Commonwealth
- they must complete annual training in areas such as first aid/CPR, bicycle patrol certification, and baton training
- police departments have new officer basic training programs averaging 645 hours and ranging from 480 to 820 hours among the 29 departments







Campus Security Officer Program Module I Assignment

and Discussion

History & Organization of Security on my Campus:

- When and why was your campus's police/security department developed? Is it consistent with national trends?
- What model of campus security is in operation on your campus? Is it a combination of two or more?
- What is your legal authority in your position? Are you armed? Do you have arrest authority?
- Who does your police/security department report to? Are there any issues with this?

Campus Security Officer Program

Emergence of Federal Legislation on Campus Security

- Crime on campuses captured media attention in the mid-1980s when several cases were publicized—putting to rest notions that campuses were void of crime.
- Civil suits began to be filed by victims and surviving family members against universities and administrators and served as a prelude to federal legislation.

CSO MODULE I





Campus Security Officer Program
Emergence of Federal

Legislation on Campus Security

The Campus Sexual Assault Victims Bill of Rights of 1992:

- required institutions to develop and publish policies regarding the prevention and awareness of sex offenses and procedures for responding after a sex offense occurs
- required university officials to inform students of their rights and provide them with clear information about how to report sex offenses
- also required officials to inform students about the assistance available to victims of sexual offenses

Campus Security Officer Program
Emergence of Federal
Legislation on Campus Security
• The Higher Education Amendments of 1998
(The Cleary Act):
• required the report of criminal victimization of
students in off-campus housing and on public
and private property adjacent to campuses
• required institutions to develop and make public
a security plan to respond to emergencies on
campus
• required immediate notification when an

- required immediate notification when an emergency is confirmed, which included hate crimes
- required the tracking and reporting of fires of housing on campus and missing persons





Campus Security Officer Program

Emergence of State
Legislation on Campus Security

Crime Commission's Study on Campus
Safety:

In 2006, the crime commission released the
report, key findings were:

Campus crime in Virginia was consistent
with prior research literature

Crime on campus, was lower than crime in
surrounding communities

property crimes (larceny, vandalism)
accounted for the majority of reported
crimes—regardless of region, size, or type
of institution







CSO MODULE I

