

Eastern Illinois University
The Keep

Masters Theses

Student Theses & Publications

2019

Effective Partnerships Between Campus Police and Student Affairs

Michael DiPalma
Eastern Illinois University

Recommended Citation

DiPalma, Michael, "Effective Partnerships Between Campus Police and Student Affairs" (2019). *Masters Theses*. 4416.
<https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/4416>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses & Publications at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.



Thesis Maintenance and Reproduction Certificate

FOR: Graduate Candidates Completing Theses in Partial Fulfillment of the Degree
Graduate Faculty Advisors Directing the Theses

RE: Preservation, Reproduction, and Distribution of Thesis Research

Preserving, reproducing, and distributing thesis research is an important part of Booth Library's responsibility to provide access to scholarship. In order to further this goal, Booth Library makes all graduate theses completed as part of a degree program at Eastern Illinois University available for personal study, research, and other not-for-profit educational purposes. Under 17 U.S.C. § 108, the library may reproduce and distribute a copy without infringing on copyright; however, professional courtesy dictates that permission be requested from the author before doing so.

Your signatures affirm the following:

- The graduate candidate is the author of this thesis.
- The graduate candidate retains the copyright and intellectual property rights associated with the original research, creative activity, and intellectual or artistic content of the thesis.
- The graduate candidate certifies her/his compliance with federal copyright law (Title 17 of the U. S. Code) and her/his right to authorize reproduction and distribution of all copyrighted materials included in this thesis.
- The graduate candidate in consultation with the faculty advisor grants Booth Library the nonexclusive, perpetual right to make copies of the thesis freely and publicly available without restriction, by means of any current or successive technology, including but not limited to photocopying, microfilm, digitization, or internet.
- The graduate candidate acknowledges that by depositing her/his thesis with Booth Library, her/his work is available for viewing by the public and may be borrowed through the library's circulation and interlibrary loan departments, or accessed electronically. The graduate candidate acknowledges this policy by indicating in the following manner:

Yes, I wish to make accessible this thesis for viewing by the public

No, I wish to quarantine the thesis temporarily and have included the **Thesis Withholding Request Form**

• The graduate candidate waives the confidentiality provisions of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) (20 U. S. C. § 1232g; 34 CFR Part 99) with respect to the contents of the thesis and with respect to information concerning authorship of the thesis, including name and status as a student at Eastern Illinois University. I have conferred with my graduate faculty advisor. My signature below indicates that I have read and agree with the above statements, and hereby give my permission to allow Booth Library to reproduce and distribute my thesis. My adviser's signature indicates concurrence to reproduce and distribute the thesis.

Effective Partnerships between Campus Police and Student Affairs

(TITLE)

BY

Michael DiPalma

THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF

Master of Science in College Student Affairs

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

2019

YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THAT THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING
THIS PART OF THE GRADUATE DEGREE CITED ABOVE

THESIS COMMITTEE MEMBER

DATE

THESIS COMMITTEE MEMBER

DATE

Abstract

This study examined partnerships between campus police and student affairs. The study specifically analyzed the essential elements, benefits, and best practices and programs of partnerships between campus police and student affairs. Participants were a Chief of Police and Chief Student Affairs Officer from large public research one institutions in the Northeast and Southwest. Participants were selected by evidence of a strong partnership between campus police and student affairs on their campus. Data was collected from four one-on-one semi-structured phone interviews. Findings suggest partnerships between campus police and student affairs are beneficial to creating a successful educational environment for students.

Keywords: Partnerships, campus police, student affairs, legitimacy

Acknowledgements

I want to thank my advisor, Dr. Coleman, for helping polish this work into what it is today. It was a process, but we made it through and I could not have done it without the time and energy you provided through it. I would like to extend my gratitude to my committee members, Lynette Drake and Dr. Mona Davenport, for their support through this thesis as well.

I would also like to thank my wonderful family. Words cannot describe how much you have always supported me in my goals and this time was no different. Your support has always been important to me and significantly helped me through this process, especially at the end. I would like to also thank my partner, Jordan. You more than anyone know what this process is like and I cannot thank you enough for the love and support you have shown me through this. Lastly, I would like to thank my friend Scottie. You were always there to distract me and talk about other things when it was needed. I wish you the best of luck with your endeavors and I look forward to returning the favor when you need me.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	i
Acknowledgements.....	ii
CHAPTER I.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Purpose of the Study.....	2
Research Questions	2
Significance of the Study	2
Limitations of the Study	3
Definitions of Terms	3
Summary	4
CHAPTER II.....	6
Review of Literature	6
History of Campus Police.....	6
Public Perceptions of Police.....	10
Perceptions of Campus Police.....	18
Influences on Partnerships.....	19
Elements of Successful Partnerships.....	22
Theoretical Framework	27
Summary	31
CHAPTER III	33
Methodology.....	33
Design of the Study	33

Participants/Sample	33
Research Site	34
Instrument.....	34
Data Collection.....	34
Data Analysis	35
Treatment of Data.....	35
Summary	35
CHAPTER IV	36
Findings.....	36
Essential Elements.....	36
Benefits to the Institution	45
Best Practices and Programs	55
Summary	62
CHAPTER V	64
Discussion, Recommendations, and Conclusion	64
Essential Elements.....	64
Benefits to the Institution	68
Best Practices and Programs	71
Recommendations for Student Affairs Professionals.....	74
Recommendations for Future Research	75
Conclusion	76
References.....	80
Appendix A: Participant Email.....	86

Appendix B: Informed Consent87

Appendix C: Interview Protocol Questions89

CHAPTER I

Introduction

In 1991 the graphic video of the beating of Rodney King, during a traffic stop, by police officers sent ripples through the country (Adams, 2016). In 2014, Eric Garner was killed in New York City after a chokehold, a procedure which was against NYPD policy, was used during an arrest (“14 high-profile,” 2017). Michael Brown was shot in Ferguson, Missouri in 2014 which would thrust the creation of the Black Lives Matter movement forward (“14 high-profile,” 2017). In 2016, Philando Castile was shot and killed during a traffic stop when an officer claimed he was reaching for a firearm, which Castile had informed the officer he had a permit for (“14 high-profile,” 2017). These may only be a few of the more publicized deaths but they all have caused protests, activism, and a call for change. They also potentially could affect a student’s sense of safety on a campus with a campus police present. In 2018, after 17 students were shot in Stoneman Douglas High School, the nation saw students protesting by walking out of school calling for change, (Grinberg & Yan, 2018). While these incidents did not occur on a college campus they are affecting the nation. The students who have grown up with these incidents and participating in these protests are the same ones who will soon be attending college.

Universities may need to adjust their tactics to reach their goals of: Learning, growth, and development (Strange and Banning, 2001). To reach these goals universities need to fulfill three hierarchal purposes: Safety and inclusion, community, and involvement (Strange and Banning, 2001). Utilizing a partnership between campus

police and student affairs can assist a university in fulfilling these purposes to reach these goals.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this qualitative study was to create an understanding of the actions and outcomes of strong, positive partnerships between student affairs and campus police through interviews with professionals participating in the partnerships. These partnerships should assist universities in reaching the overall goals of: Learning, growth, and development (Strange and Banning, 2001). The results provided best practice information for institutions to create a better learning environment for their students through similar partnerships on their campus. Currently, there is a lack of research on partnerships between student affairs and campus police found and this study will add to the research available.

Research Questions

The following research questions (RQ) were used to guide the study:

RQ 1: What are the essential elements necessary for a successful partnership between Student Affairs and Campus Police?

RQ 2: What are the benefits to the institution when Student Affairs and Campus Police have a successful partnership?

RQ 3: What are some best practices and programs that have developed from the partnership between Student Affairs and Campus Police?

Significance of the Study

A university is tasked to find the combination of components that allows them to most effectively establish the three hierarchal purposes of a successful educational

environment: A sense of safety and inclusion, involvement, and community (Strange and Banning, 2001). Meeting those three purposes should put a university in the best position possible to reach the educational goals of learning, growth, and development (Strange and Banning, 2001). There are cutting edge universities utilizing partnerships between campus police and student affairs successfully. Currently, there is a lack of information pertaining to those partnerships and their successes. The significance of this study was to allow professionals to see how other universities are utilizing partnerships between campus police and student affairs to positively impact their campus. The study also helped professionals understand the internal aspects of these partnerships.

Limitations of the Study

There were two potential limitations with this study. First, there was a severe lack of research pertaining to partnerships between campus police and student affairs. This required applying research pertaining to partnerships between student affairs and other departments such as academic affairs and applying that research to the current study.

Second, researcher bias was a concern because bias can impact the trustworthiness of a study (Chenail, 2011). I am a white male raised in the Midwest. I received an undergraduate degree in criminal justice and have a passion for policing. My goal is to eventually become a chief of police on a college campus, so this subject is close to me. To minimize researcher bias I had my thesis advisor review the coded data for verification.

Definitions of Terms

The following terms were defined in the context for this study:

Campus police. “Campus police are sworn police officers employed by a public-school district, college or university to protect the campus and surrounding areas and the people who live on, work on and visit it” (“Campus police,” n.d.).

Community. “A group of people with diverse characteristics who are linked by social ties, share common perspectives, and engage in joint action in geographical locations or settings” (MacQueen, McLellan, Metzger, Kegeles, Strauss, Scotti, Blanchard, and Trotter II, 2001).

Distributive justice. “Distributive justice means fair disbursement of common advantages and common burdens by a community to its members” (“Distributive justice,” n.d.).

Inclusion. “Inclusion is the act of creating environments in which any individual or group can be and feel welcomed, respected, supported, and valued to fully participate. An inclusive and welcoming climate embraces differences and offers respect in words and actions for all people” (“Diversity & inclusion,” n.d.).

Legitimacy. “Legitimacy reflects the belief that the police ought to be allowed to exercise their authority to maintain social order, manage conflicts and solve problems in their communities” (Tyler, 2014, p. 9).

Procedural justice. “Procedural justice refers to the idea of fairness in the processes that resolve disputes and allocate resources...Procedural justice speaks to four principles...Fairness in the processes, transparency in actions, opportunities for voice, and impartiality in decision making” (U.S. Department of Justice, n.d.).

Summary

This chapter gave an introduction to the study. It explored the foundation of the study starting with the purpose of the study. Next, the research questions that were used

to guide this study were stated. The limitations and significance of the study were next explained. Lastly a list of terms deemed important to the study were defined. The next chapter will explore the relevant literature currently available regarding campus police and student affairs partnerships.

CHAPTER II

Review of Literature

This chapter covers the relevant research and literature regarding campus police and student affairs partnerships. The information provided in this chapter allows the reader to understand what is needed from the partnerships to create an improved environment that fulfills the purposes of: Safety and inclusion, community, and involvement (Strange and Banning, 2001). First, the history of campus police programs will be discussed and how these offices have evolved over time. Second, the public perception of police will be explained to allow the reader to better understand what goes into creating positive perception and ways that perception can be affected. Following that, the perceptions of campus police will be explored. Next, a review of the influences on these partnerships, as well as specifically within the community and campus environments will be discussed. The elements of successful partnerships will include best practices that have resulted from successful campus police and student affairs partnerships. Finally, a theoretical framework will be laid out to critically evaluate the data collected during this study.

History of Campus Police

The history of campus police will be explained to allow for understanding of how policing has grown and changed. The chapter begins with the first campus police department at Yale University then the growth from the 1980's to the early 2000s will be shown. Lastly, the current state of campus police will be laid out showing exactly where they stand in more recent years.

Founding to 1980's. The first university police department at an institution of higher education was founded at Yale University in 1894 when two New Haven Police Department officers were assigned strictly to the campus as a result of a rumor that medical students were removing bodies at the local cemetery to study anatomy which had led to a riot resulting in many injuries (Yale University, 2017).

Over the next 50 years campus police would see a steady but slow growth in responsibilities (Sloan, 1992). In the beginning campus police acted mainly in a custodial role protecting university property from damage (Sloan, 1992). With an increase in enrollment in the 1930's and 1940's, universities decided to add the responsibility of enforcing rules and regulations to assist in social control (Sloan, 1992)

Campus policing continued in this general design until in the 1960's when many public security departments began transforming into actual police departments with sworn officers in response to the activism that was occurring on campus and incidents like the shooting at Kent State University (International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators, 2018). It would take much longer before private universities would be able to establish legitimate police departments instead of simply security personnel like their public counterparts. "The laws passed in 1977 only authorized state-owned and controlled colleges and university to maintain a campus police department" (International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators, 2018).

1986 to 2006. Peak, Barthe, and Garcia (2008) collected data on campus policing in the United States and compared it to a similar study done in 1986. From 1986 to 2006 there was a dramatic increase in the use of the title 'Police Department' accompanied by

an equivalent decrease in the title 'Security Office.' This change indicated an increase both in professionalism within the departments as well as the nature of the work the departments were doing (Peak et al, 2008). This change was demonstrated in the increase in full police powers, a change in police activities, and an increase in full-time, sworn officers on campuses from 1986 to 2006.

Peak et al. (2008) found that in the hiring process for campus police there was an 8% increase in the use of background investigations. There have also been large increases in the use of psychological evaluations and physical agility testing for officers. The increase in professionalism of these offices is reflected in the mean number of required annual training hours after becoming an officer. In 1986 the mean number of annual training for campus officers was 14.5 hours, whereas by 2006 this mean had increased dramatically to 47 hours per year. Along with the increase in the number of hours, the percentage of agencies requiring additional training increased from 18% in 1986 to 94% in 2006 (Peak et al., 2008).

In 1986 parking was the top time-consuming activity ranked by campus police departments, whereas in 2006 investigations had become the top ranked time consuming activity (Peak et al., 2008). However, the 1986 survey did not include one major activity that was present on the 2006 survey which was crime reporting. In 1990 Congress enacted the Campus Security Act, later renamed the Jeanne Clery Act, which would change campus policing forever (Peak et al., 2008). The period from 1986 to 2006 also showed a major change to one type of patrol; the percentage of agencies utilizing bicycle/foot patrols increased from 24% to almost 80% of reporting campus police agencies. The increased use of these patrols shows an understanding of the effect they

have on community building on campus (Peak et al., 2008). Increased visibility is crucial to increased perceptions of police effectiveness (Hawdon and Ryan, 2003).

Current State of Campus Police. Brian Reaves, a statistician for the Bureau of Justice Statistics, presented the data from a survey of campus law enforcement agencies from 2011-12 (Reaves, 2015). In 2012, the percentage of agencies using sworn police officers was 77% and the percentage of agencies using armed officers was 75%. At campuses employing sworn personnel, nine out of ten were armed (Reaves, 2015). In 2012, one in six sworn officers were women and 31.5% of sworn officers identified as members of a minority, with 21% of the total number of officers identifying as African-American (Reaves, 2015). Of the 905 universities contacted for the survey, 95% operated their own campus police department (Reaves, 2015).

Of the police departments serving 5,000 or more students, 97% indicated they participated in active shooter training and by 2012, 84% of university police departments had designed or revised a preparedness plan for a school shooting (Reeves, 2015). For entry-level sworn officers the amount of training required averaged 1,027 hours (Reeves, 2015). Two-thirds of those hours were conducted in the classroom during the police academy, while the remaining one-third was in practical applications in the field (Reaves, 2015). The average total required training for sworn campus police officers was four times the amount required for non-sworn campus police officers; non-sworn officers also split their training equally between classroom and field training (Reaves, 2015).

In 2012, 51% of public universities' police departments serving 5,000 or more students partnered with citizen groups and used their feedback to develop community policing strategies (Reaves, 2015). Reaves (2015) found that University police

departments serving 2,500 or more students were meeting with different administration and student groups on campus to discuss crime-related problems on 4-year campuses.

The percentages of police departments meeting with the different groups were: Campus administrators (97%), student organizations (81%), sexual violence prevention groups (69%), domestic violence prevention groups (60%), and advocacy groups (55%) (Reaves, 2015).

Of the university police departments serving 5,000 or more students, 88% offered safety escort services. In 2012, 92% of all university police departments that responded to the survey had blue light phone systems in place to allow for direct contact with the police dispatch for students in emergency situations (Reaves, 2015). Of the university police departments serving 5,000 or more students, most reported having, “Personnel specially designated to provide prevention, education, and assistance programs and services to the campus community” (Reaves, 2005, p. 13).

Public Perceptions of Police

Sunshine and Tyler (2003) stated, “A polarized public is problematic on numerous levels. It inhibits the police from fulfilling their regulatory role in society and produces polarization and discontent through the recognition that certain groups feel disproportionately mistreated by the police” (p. 515). Sunshine and Tyler (2003) conducted two studies; the first was conducted by mailed surveys in New York City in 2001 before September 11th. The final sample ended up with 483 valid participants with 55% identifying their ethnicity as white, 19% identifying as black, and 26% as Hispanic. Sunshine and Tyler (2003) found in the first study that legitimacy and risk estimates are significant factors in citizen compliance with the police. “Legitimacy reflects the belief

that the police ought to be allowed to exercise their authority to maintain social order, manage conflicts and solve problems in their communities” (Tyler, 2014, p. 9).

Legitimacy and evaluations of police performance were significant in a person’s consideration of their level of cooperation with police. Legitimacy and distributive justice also had significant effect on empowerment of police. Distributive justice is defined as the level of fairness citizens feel the police use when making decisions (Sunshine and Tyler, 2003). Sunshine and Tyler (2003) also looked into what goes into Legitimacy and found that constituent views of legitimacy were significantly based on procedural justice, performance evaluations, and distributive justice judgments.

The second study conducted by Sunshine and Tyler (2003) collected their sample through phone interviews in the summer of 2002. Limiting the responses to those participants identifying as white, black, and Hispanic, the adjusted sample size for the second study was 1,422 participants. This study confirmed their earlier findings that legitimacy was a significant factor in the empowerment of, cooperation with, and compliance with police by members of the community. It also confirmed that procedural justice, distributive justice, and police performance are significant factors in establishing legitimacy (Sunshine and Tyler, 2003).

The second study conducted by Sunshine and Tyler (2003) sought to find the differences among community members based on racial demographics and compared white, African American, and Hispanic community members. Table 1 shows that legitimacy was the largest significant determinant of cooperation with the police among all three ethnic groups. Risk and age were also significant to cooperation with police but to a smaller effect than legitimacy.

Table 1

Beta Weights of Determinants of Cooperation with the Police

Variable	Caucasians	African Americans	Hispanics
Legitimacy	.41***	.45***	.48***
Risk	.09*	.19***	.23***
Age	-.17***	-.21***	-.14**

Note. Adapted from “The role of procedural justice and legitimacy in shaping public support for policing,” by J. Sunshine, and T. R. Tyler, 2003, September, *Law & Society Review*, 37(3), p. 532.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Next, Sunshine and Tyler (2003) found that procedural justice was the largest significant precursor to legitimacy across all ethnic groups. Distributive fairness was significant among white and African American but not Hispanic members. Sunshine and Tyler (2003) went further and looked at the antecedents of procedural justice. They found that quality of treatment and quality of decision-making were both significant across all ethnic groups. Hispanic individuals leaned heavily towards the quality of treatment while white members weighed interpersonal treatment more than decision-making, but to a lesser extent than Hispanics. African American individuals were more balanced than the others with quality of decision-making being slightly more important than the interpersonal treatment (Sunshine and Tyler, 2003).

Finally, Sunshine and Tyler (2003) concluded that of all variables measured, no other variable had the sweeping influence that legitimacy did on police/community relations. Their findings also support the idea that legitimacy is a social value that is distinct from performance evaluations. Sunshine and Tyler (2003) stated, “By focusing on the psychology underlying views about their legitimacy among members of the public,

the police can enhance their image in the eyes of the public” (p. 535). These findings support the idea that over time, the police can better adjust public behavior by focusing on legitimacy that leads to self-regulation from the public. These findings are important for policing since it was found earlier that legitimacy is separate from performance evaluations as police have more control over how they treat people than the crime rate. Regardless of ethnicity, people tend to cooperate more with the police when they view the police as legitimate (Sunshine and Tyler, 2003). Overall, it was found that people are more accepting of and cooperative with authorities when they are treated with fairness and respect (Sunshine and Tyler, 2003).

A study conducted in Australia investigated whether one procedurally just encounter with police could influence the perception of both the specific encounter and the police in general. (Mazerolle, Antrobus, Bennett, & Tyler, 2013). In the experiment, how drivers were treated during a road block was manipulated. The normal procedure is very short and to the point with minimal talking. The experimental procedure included elements of procedural justice and community policing. Procedural justice includes four elements; first, citizens having the opportunity to tell their side of the story or have a voice before a decision is made. Second, citizens need to see that police are acting neutrally; possibly by the officer being open about procedures and how decisions are made. Third, citizens being treated with dignity and politeness with their rights being respected. Lastly, citizens concentrate on the character and intentions of the police. Citizens want to feel that the police are caring and genuinely want to do what is best for people (Tyler, 2014). The major action of the stop that differed was the ability for the citizen to be able to voice their opinion; the citizen was also informed of accident

statistics from the previous year and that the police genuinely wanted to lower them. After the stop all drivers were given a survey which was used to measure their perceptions. The sample was 2,746 surveys that returned after the experiment (Mazerolle et al., 2013).

Mazerolle et al. (2013) found that those who received the experimental procedure reported higher levels of perception of procedural justice than those who receive the standard procedure. Mazerolle et al. (2013) specified that positive perceptions of procedural justice were significantly correlated to police legitimacy suggesting that improving perceptions of procedural justice can increase perceptions of police legitimacy. Mazerolle et al. (2013) supports Sunshine and Tyler (2003) in the statement that if the police are seen as legitimate, then citizens are significantly more likely to cooperate with the police. Similar to the results of Sunshine and Tyler (2003), Mazerolle et al. (2013) concluded that perceptions of police, resulting from a very short encounter with police, can shape a citizen's general view of the police.

Schuck and Rosenbaum (2005) conducted a similar study looking at how global and neighborhood attitudes change and differ. They found that whether a negative contact with police happened in the neighborhood or not, it was still associated with negative neighborhood and global attitudes towards police. Schuck and Rosenbaum (2005) found that non-negative contacts with the police in the citizen's neighborhood were associated with statistically significant higher positive perceptions of police.

Hinds and Murphy (2007) conducted a study in Australia where 2,611 surveys were collected to analyze and test two hypotheses. The first hypothesis was: "That legitimacy influences public satisfaction with police separately from instrumental

evaluations of police performance or distributive justice” (Hinds and Murphy, 2007, p. 34). The second hypothesis was: “That legitimacy itself develops from aspects of policing that are distinct from police performance; that legitimacy is fostered not through instrumental judgements, but rather through judgments about interactions between police and the community that are viewed as procedurally fair” (Hinds and Murphy, 2007, p. 34). Hinds and Murphy (2007) found that both those who feel the police use appropriate levels of procedural justice and distributive justice when dealing with the public and those who think the police perform well in dealing with crime, were significantly more likely to perceive the police as legitimate. In this study, procedural justice had a greater effect than both distributive justice and performance with crime.

Hinds and Murphy (2007) also found that their second hypothesis was supported with the finding that five variables factored into satisfaction with the police: Legitimacy, procedural justice, distributive justice, police performance, and income level. Procedural justice and legitimacy were found to significantly account for a greater amount of the variability in satisfaction. Hinds and Murphy (2007) determined that people are more likely to support the police when they are viewed as legitimate and legitimacy was found to be positively correlated with procedural justice.

A study conducted by Hawdon and Ryan (2003) included 130 participants that were phone interviewed. Hawdon and Ryan (2003) found that the extent that residents believed police were patrolling the neighborhood and could be trusted were significant positive predictors of police perceptions. On the other hand, participants hearing of crime in the neighborhood and the fear of being victimized were significant negative predictors of police perception. Contact with the police was not a significant factor in

the overall perception of police effectiveness. Hawdon and Ryan (2003) also found that being a victim of crime was not significant in the perception of police. Once visibility and community solidarity were controlled for, it was found that interactions between police and citizens had no effect on satisfaction with the police. Hawdon and Ryan (2003) stated an implication of this study is that administrators should increase their officers' visibility since it is significantly important to the participants' perception of police.

Gill, Weisburd, Telep, Vitter, & Bennett (2014) stated:

The community-oriented approach, which promotes positive relationships and collaboration between police and citizens over police imposition of enforcement and control over citizens, may foster procedural justice (fair, consistent, respectful, and accountable policing), enhanced trust in police, and higher citizen ratings of their performance. (p. 403)

Gill et al. (2014) conducted a review of existing research analyzing 65 studies that evaluated community-oriented policing. They found that community-oriented policing did not show a statistically significant reduction in crime. Gill et al. (2014) also found, after removing one severe outlier, that increased community-oriented policing resulted in a statistically significant increase in citizens' perceptions of improvements in disorder and in citizens' satisfaction with the police. Gill et al. (2014) reinforces the idea that community-oriented policing is not intended to prevent crime but rather to change the relationship between the police and the public. Gill et al. (2014) concluded that while community-oriented policing does not result in a lowered crime rate, it does increase satisfaction with police and lowers perceptions of disorder.

Shulhofer, Tyler, and Huq (2011) stated that emphasizing fairness is critical to police success in maintaining social order. Shulhofer et al. (2011) state that strict law enforcement and arresting for low-level offenses is more likely to bring resentment, weaken legitimacy, and undermine voluntary compliance. Shulhofer et al. (2011) stated:

In the procedural justice model, officers are not oriented toward addressing situations primarily with the threat of force. Instead, officers are trained to view every citizen contact as an opportunity to build legitimacy through the tone and quality of the interaction, with force a last result. (p. 351)

In a traffic stop, if an officer is using a procedural justice approach, “Officers would aim to treat citizens courteously, briefly explain the reason for a stop, and, absent exigent circumstances, give the citizen an opportunity to explain herself before significant decisions are made” (Shulhofer et al., 2011). If citizens believe the police are using unfair procedures it can delegitimize them and result in resistance from citizens (Shulhofer et al., 2011).

Shulhofer et al. (2011) reinforce the importance of procedural justice by stating that even if no legal action is taken upon a citizen, they can still be majorly affected by the experience. Procedural justice does not state that police cannot use force, but when that force is done even-handedly and with respect, it will be viewed as reasonable and justified thereby making it more acceptable (Shulhofer et al, 2011). To work towards a procedural justice approach and improving legitimacy direction must come from the top of the organization. Leaders must stress the importance of helping citizens feel comfortable and safe around police and not threatened (Shulhofer et al., 2011). “If we

can adopt police styles that communicate respect and nurture public trust, we can address the central concerns of both minority and majority populations” (Shulhofer et al., 2011).

Perceptions of Campus Police

Griffith, Hueston, Wilson, Moyers, & Hart (2004) conducted a study at West Texas A&M University analyzing student perceptions of campus police services. They found that the police were approachable due to the fact that 71% of the students who were a victim of crime reported the incident (Griffith et al., 2004). Even though students reported that the police were approachable, the visibility of the department was low with only 41% of students indicating they had at least one contact with the police (Griffith et al., 2004).

There have been numerous incidents involving police that have pushed student-police relations, campus police training, and use of force to the forefront. In 2011, at University of California Davis, two campus police officers pepper sprayed a line of students peacefully protesting by sitting on the ground (Campbell, 2016). This incident not only caused tensions to flair on campus but also cost University of California Davis almost one million dollars in legal settlements (Campbell, 2016). In 2017, at Georgia Tech University, campus police officers shot and killed a student wielding a knife with mental health concerns (Stack, 2017). This incident brought many questions as to why the officers did not use nonlethal force and the adequacy to handle mental health (Stack, 2017). Unfortunately, Georgia Tech University campus police officers, like many campus police officers, are not equipped with tasers (Stack, 2017). In 2017, at Evergreen State College it was recommended by the Chief of Police that the college be shut down due to being unsafe after a series of events that occurred on campus which included

protestors confronting and surrounding faculty and administration and blocking campus police from intervening (Kolowich, 2017). The recommendation was declined by the President and tensions continued to flare, while the Chief of Police later stated she felt questioned and unsupported by the college (Kolowich, 2017). All parties on campus: Students, staff, and faculty felt unsafe on campus during that time until the following year when it was a fresh start for all (Kolowich, 2017). The entire incident was not only detrimental to relations on campus but cost the university \$500,000 in a legal settlement, \$100,000 to move graduation off campus, and \$10,000 in damage to campus (Kolowich, 2017). All three of these incidents combine to show the negative effects on the entire campus that can occur when student affairs and campus police do not work together to handle a situation in the best way.

Influences on Partnerships

There could be any number of reasons a university would decide to create a partnership between campus police and student affairs. Two major factors are community and campus influences. The influences on campus police and student affairs partnerships will be explained, starting with the community influences. Next the influences from the campus will be laid out to combine to explain why these partnerships are coming to fruition.

Community influences. According to Sullivan, Anthony, Tate, and Jenkins (2018), 987 people were shot and killed by police in 2017. The 987 fatal incidents were slightly lower than the 995 total in 2015. Sullivan et al. (2018) states that the number of unarmed individuals fatally shot has lowered from 94 in 2015 to 68 in 2017. White males accounted for 44% of the fatal shooting victims in 2017, African-American males

were 22% of all fatal shooting victims, and Hispanic males accounted for 18% of fatal shooting victims (Sullivan et al., 2018). Of the total 987 individuals shot and killed, almost three out of four were armed with either knives or guns (Sullivan et al., 2018).

Najdowski, Bottoms, & Goff (2015) sampled undergraduate students at the University of Illinois at Chicago for a two-part study. The study looked at racial differences with stereotype threat, with the first part using a more general or abstract situation and the second being a very specific situation (Najdowski et al., 2015). “Stereotype threat is being at risk of confirming, as self-characteristic, a negative stereotype about one’s group” (Steele and Aronson, 1995). Here stereotype threat would have African-American students being, “Concerned they will be judged and treated unfairly by police, in line with those stereotypes” (Najdowski et al., 2015). Considering the more abstract situation, Najdowski et al. (2015) found that African American students were significantly more likely to feel they experience stereotype threat during police encounters than White students. Both white men and white women significantly disagreed that they experience stereotype threat in police encounters (Najdowski et al., 2015). African-American men significantly agreed and African-American women did not clearly indicate whether they experienced stereotype threat in police encounters (Najdowski et al., 2015).

In the second part of the study, participants were given a very specific scenario and asked to continue the survey with their feelings from that situation in mind (Najdowski et al., 2015). It is also important to note that the sample for the second part of the study only included males (Najdowski et al., 2015). “African-American men were significantly more likely to expect that they would be accused of wrongdoing by the

officer and anticipated feeling significantly more stereotype threat in the encounter” (Najdowski et al, 2015, p. 469). Najdowski et al. (2015) found that African-American men were also significantly more likely than white men to anticipate feeling anxious and behaving suspiciously in the encounter.

Campus influences. Since the mass shooting at Virginia Tech University on April 16, 2007 there have been 122 people killed and 198 people injured by gunfire on a college campus (Jones, 2018). Of the 320 people shot, 148 were shot during 26 mass shooting incidents, where three or more people were shot at once (Jones, 2018). The remaining 172 individuals were shot during single victim incidents (Jones, 2008). Those who were shot when a gun fired unintentionally accounted for 15 of the 320 people shot (Jones, 2008). Twenty-six people killed themselves with the use of a firearm on a college campus (Jones, 2008).

In a webinar, two representatives, a Sergeant from the police department and the Vice President for Student Affairs and Services, from a large public university were asked what brought about the creation of their new inclusion and anti-bias unit (Shea, 2016). They stated that with everything going on outside of the university they wanted to be proactive and that the driving force behind these partnerships were the events going on nationally and they wanted to be open and transparent with their community (Shea, 2016).

Campus police are different than traditional police in their ability relate to, “the atmosphere of trust, respect, and perceptually safe havens that our colleges and universities so carefully embrace and expose their communities to” (Wilson & Wilson, 2011). This is seen when campus police advise or partner with student groups, partner

with faculty and staff, and assist in the providing of other non-law enforcement related quality of life services (Wilson & Wilson, 2011). Their ability to conduct these activities is what allows campus police to be more successful with community policing programs than traditional police (Wilson & Wilson, 2011).

Lewis, Wilks, Geiger, Barthelemy, & Livermore (2017) conducted a study looking at student perceptions of police in southern Louisiana. They found that African American students had significantly lower scores than white students which indicated a more negative attitude toward police (Lewis et al., 2017). Lewis et al. (2017) also analyzed the relationship between race using five specific statements. African American students were significantly more likely than white students to agree with all five of the following statements: Police use too much force in the daily conduct of their duty, more minorities are likely to become victims of police brutality than White individuals, police are more likely to use deadly force against an African American male than a White male, police need more training to be culturally competent, and police need more training on how to deescalate a situation (Lewis et al., 2017).

Elements of Successful Partnerships

In the same webinar mentioned above, the Chief of Police at The University of Arizona, Brian Seastone, was asked what helps sustain their partnership with student affairs? Chief Seastone stated that there has to be open and honest communication between all parties (Shea, 2016). There has to be a willingness to think outside the box as well as the inclusion of faculty, staff, and students (Shea, 2016). He continued that there needs to be accessibility to each other and explained that he has the Assistant Vice President of Student Affairs on speed dial and has weekly meetings with her. Lastly

Chief Seastone identified the importance of everyone leaving their egos at the door to reach an understanding that they are all working for a common goal (Shea, 2016).

Magolda (2005) explained a few issues and steps that should be taken when partnerships between student affairs and academic affairs are created. Magolda (2005) states that when these partnerships are being proposed they need to be questioned. “Is this partnership a good idea?” (Magolda, 2005). “Will this partnership help both students and partners?” (Magolda, 2005). Questions like these need to be answered as a first step to building meaningful, long-lasting partnerships (Magolda, 2005). Magolda (2005) further explains that partnerships need to be meaningful, reciprocal, and responsive. To have an understanding between all sides, visualizing and having a discussion on what specifically the partnership is supposed to be and the effects of it should be had by partners (Magolda, 2005).

Magolda (2005) stated that an issue he found in partnerships between student affairs and academic affairs was that student affairs members would take a lesser role in the partnership and undervalue themselves. Magolda (2005) continued that for partnerships to work neither department can be above the other; all parties have to act as educational connoisseurs and critics. Another issue Magolda (2005) found was that when partners would try to lessen the divide between them they would try to learn more about each other. A common problem was that the two sides lacked understanding of what guided their everyday practices and their own culture (Magolda, 2005). Both sides have to reflect on themselves before they can continue building a long-lasting partnership. Magolda (2005) concluded that these partnerships can often result in conflict because diverse populations are coming together. Conflict has to be accepted

and not repressed; partners come together to deal with differences and conflict (Magolda, 2005).

Kezar (2003) surveyed senior student affairs administration to discover what strategies were most useful in creating successful collaborations between academic and student affairs. Senior administrative support and leadership was found to be the most important strategy for change and the success of the collaboration (Kezar, 2003). Even though participants felt that senior administrative support was most important to collaborations it was found to not be statistically significant to successful collaborations (Kezar, 2003). It was found that cross-institutional dialogue and setting expectations were the important factors to student affairs administration in the facilitation of change (Kezar, 2003).

Davis, Mateu-Gelabert, and Miller (2005) found a similar result when they investigated the decline of civilian complaints against police in two of New York's 77 precincts. In 1994, with the implementation of a new policing approach, crime rates declined but complaint rates increased from the previous year except in the 42nd and 44th precincts which saw a decrease in complaints (Davis et al., 2005). Davis et al. (2005) interviewed officers in those two precincts who were active during that time as to what was happening to keep complaints low while crime rates were also declining. Davis et al. (2005) found that the Commanding Officer in both precincts had a very strong commitment to respectful policing. They made it clear to their officers and supervisors that complaints were not going to be taken lightly (Davis et al., 2005). One Commanding Officer even went as far as to inform officers on special assignments that if complaints were received they would be removed from the assignment (Davis et al., 2005). These

Commanding Officers successfully changed the police culture at the time making their officers understand that civilian complaints were a serious issue and could be detrimental to their career (Davis et al., 2005).

Going along with the idea that change starts from the top, Wolfe and Nix (2016) researched the connection between The Ferguson Effect and officers' willingness to partner with the community. The Ferguson Effect is a hypothesis that suggests that officers are aware of the negative publicity of their profession and that they could be recorded at any time that came out of the incident between police and the community in Ferguson, Missouri in 2014 (Wolfe and Nix, 2016). As an apparent result of this incident and the national exposure it generated, officers are seen as being less willing to do their job to avoid being accused of racial profiling or using excessive force (Wolfe and Nix, 2016). Wolfe and Nix (2016) found that officers who were less motivated as a result of the Ferguson Effect were less willing to partner with the community. However, two factors were able to negate the above stated connection. First, "Deputies who believed their department distributes outcomes to employees fairly, behaves in a procedurally fair manner when dealing with deputies, and treats employees with respect and dignity, tended to express a greater willingness to collaborate with the community" (Wolfe and Nix, 2016). Second, deputies who showed higher levels of self-legitimacy or had more confidence in their authority were more willing to partner with the community (Wolfe and Nix, 2016). When all three factors: The Ferguson Effect, organizational justice, and self-legitimacy were taken into account, The Ferguson Effect no longer had a statistically significant effect on officers' willingness to partner with the community (Wolfe and Nix, 2016). "This is encouraging for police agencies because it reveals that when supervisors

are fair and cultivate confidence among officers, they can minimize the harmful effects of negative publicity” (Wolfe and Nix, 2016).

Dhillon (2013) interviewed senior managers researching what they felt was important for strong educational partnerships in England. Dhillon (2013) found that partnerships are built on a continuum of weak to strong based on specific factors. Three themes presented themselves in the data: Trust; networks and governance structure; and norms, values and motivations (Dhillon, 2013). The most important factor to a strong and successful partnership was the trust between members of the partnership (Dhillon, 2013). The second most important factor was identified as shared goals among members (Dhillon, 2013). “The data also illustrate the pivotal role of key individuals (especially senior managers) in leading, managing, and sustaining partnership in working on the ground” (Dhillon, 2013).

The U.S. Department of Justice [DOJ] (2015) gave five recommendations for building police-community relationships. First, “Acknowledge and discuss with your communities the challenges you are facing” as there needs to be an acknowledgement of the history of injustices that minorities have faced over time (DOJ, 2015). Even though many officers were not even born during the Jim Crow era, there still has to be an understanding of how that history effects people’s feeling about police (DOJ, 2015). Second, “Be transparent and accountable” so that when an incident occurs, as much information as possible should be given out as quickly as possible; with the understanding made clear that the information is preliminary and could change with time (DOJ, 2015).

Websites should also be updated regularly with policies, civilian complaints, and other issues (DOJ, 2015). Next, in order to “Take steps to reduce bias and improve cultural competency” the DOJ recommended that officers at all levels receive training on diversity, implicit bias, and cultural competency (DOJ, 2015). Fourth, “Maintain focus on the importance of collaboration, and be visible in the community” argues that there are benefits to both community members and police when police get to know members of the community (DOJ, 2015). Interactions between police and the community can build mutual trust which is important to addressing problems and reducing crime. Lastly, “Promote internal diversity and ensure professional growth opportunities” (DOJ, 2015) argues that departments should work to increase their overall workforce diversity by race and other demographics (DOJ, 2015). There should be opportunities for career growth as well as developmental trainings and internal processes should be transparent and fair; when a department creates this environment, officers are more likely to demonstrate these qualities (DOJ, 2015).

Theoretical Framework

In their book *Educating by Design*, Strange and Banning (2001) stated that there were three hierarchal purposes required for an educational environment to be successful: Safety and inclusion, involvement, and community. These three purposes were deduced from, and in line with, Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs. Strange and Banning (2001) acknowledged that safety and inclusion are distinct in and of themselves; however, they combined them into one due to the relationship that they have with each other. Both elements of the purpose have the ability to enhance or hinder the other and both are needed to allow for involvement and community to be present (Strange and Banning,

2001). “If one fears for personal safety or if one feels unwelcome, either condition is detrimental to the individual and to the campus community” (Strange and Banning, 2001, p. 115).

The next purpose that must be considered once safety and inclusion have been met is the involvement of students (Strange and Banning, 2001). Applying Astin’s Theory of Involvement, Strange and Banning (2001) stated, “If active learning is the goal, institutions must also look beyond issues of belonging, stability, and comfort to consider the nature of environments that might encourage engagement and the investment of time and effort” (p. 137). The goals of education (learning, growth, and development) are more aided by active participation by a student than just a sense of security and a physical presence (Strange and Banning, 2001).

The last purpose that must be met for an educational environment to be successful is a sense of community (Strange and Banning, 2001). While communities do contribute to the first two purposes identified, they also create a sense of full membership allowing students to engage in distinct opportunities (Strange and Banning, 2001).

“Communities, at their most fundamental level, are recognized by their distinct and celebrated historical identities, their balance of interdependent roles and relationships, their norms and procedures for functioning, and their linkages to the larger society” (Strange and Banning, 2001, p. 162). Communities allow individuals within to engage each other in pursuit of learning, growth, and development (Strange and Banning, 2001).

There are four components to every campus environment: Physical, human aggregate, organizational, and constructed (Strange and Banning, 2001). “Whether natural or synthetic, the physical aspects of any campus environment offer many

possibilities for human response, rendering some behaviors more probable than others. It is the nature of this influence to be both functional and symbolic” (Strange and Banning, 2001, p. 15). A functional influence is the ability of an environment to make a behavior more or less likely (Strange and Banning, 2001). An example of a functional influence would be whether the tables and chairs in a class room are stationary or not. If the tables and chairs are stationary, then that takes away the ability to form groups and collaborate (Strange and Banning, 2001). A symbolic influence is how the message that the environment sends to people affects their behavior. An example of symbolic influence is the affect that racial graffiti might have on how welcome minorities feel on campus (Strange and Banning, 2001).

The human aggregate component of an environment is an understanding that the characteristics of the people in the environment can project the dominant characteristics of the environment (Strange and Banning, 2001). When considering the human aggregate, a goal is a high level of person-environment congruence (Strange and Banning, 2001). “The degree of person-environment congruence is predictive of an individual’s attraction to and satisfaction or stability within an environment” (Strange and Banning, 2001, p. 52). When there is a high degree of congruence then an individual is more likely to stay in that environment (Strange and Banning, 2001).

When an individual has a low degree of congruency there are three ways they may fix the situation: By leaving the environment, by changing the environment, or by adapting to the dominant characteristics (Strange and Banning, 2001). What the individual will choose to do is dependent on the levels of differentiation and consistency of both the individual and the environment (Strange and Banning, 2001). Differentiation

is the difference in the amounts of the most and least common characteristics; for example, a highly differentiated environment or individual is dominated by a single characteristic (Strange and Banning, 2001). Consistency is the amount of other characteristics that are similar to the dominant ones (Strange and Banning, 2001). A high level of differentiation and consistency whether in an individual or environment makes them more resistant to change (Strange and Banning, 2001). If both the individual and the environment have a high level of differentiation and consistency then the individual is likely to leave the environment to find one more congruent (Strange and Banning, 2001). When one, either the individual or the environment, is less differentiated and consistent than the other they are more likely to adjust to the more resistant one (Strange and Banning, 2001).

The organizational component of an environment is how a combination of organizational structures creates the different characteristic environments affecting the ability of the environment to reach its goals (Strange and Banning, 2001). The combination of organizational structures creates environments with varying degrees of dynamism (Strange and Banning, 2001). A dynamic environment is normally flexible, easily adjusts to change, and has an emphasis on quality. On the other hand, static environments are more rigid causing them to be more likely to resist change, and focuses on quantity (Strange and Banning, 2001). There four measures of organizational performance that are central to the success of a university: Innovation, efficiency, quantity of production, and morale (Strange and Banning, 2001).

The constructed component is, “the notion that examining collective personal perspectives of an environment is critical for understanding how people are attracted to a

particular environment” (Strange and Banning, 2001, p. 86). There are three concepts within the constructed component: The relationship between environmental press and individual need, Social climate, and campus culture (Strange and Banning, 2001).

Environmental press is the reports by either observers or participants of activities on the campus (Strange and Banning, 2001). How the environmental press correlates with the needs of the individuals in the environment will either enhance or inhibit growth in the environment (Strange and Banning, 2001).

Once again, the four main components of an environment are: Physical, human aggregate, organizational, and constructed (Strange and Banning, 2001). A university is tasked to find the combination of components that allows them to most effectively establish the three hierarchal purposes of a successful educational environment: A sense of safety and inclusion, involvement, and community (Strange and Banning, 2001). Meeting those three purposes should put a university in the best position possible to reach the educational goals of learning, growth, and development (Strange and Banning, 2001).

Summary

In this chapter a review of the current relevant literature was given. First, the history of campus policing was described; beginning with formation of the first campus police department up to more recent data on the current operation and role of campus police. Next, what current perceptions of police are and how there are formed was explained. The major influences in the creation of effective partnerships both on campus and in the community by police departments was explored. The elements that contribute to a successful partnership between campus police and student affairs on the college campus was explained. Finally, the theoretical framework guiding this study was

described using Strange and Banning's theory of campus ecology. In the next chapter the methodology of this study will be described.

CHAPTER III

Methodology

This study used a qualitative approach to gather the best practices and trace the development and continuance of a positive healthy relationship by speaking with Chief Student Affairs Officers (CSAO) and Chiefs of Police (CP). A qualitative method was selected to provide the most descriptive and open responses of the selected participants. This format allowed participants to freely express thoughts on the subject and the interactive nature of the interview should provide opportunities to share personal perspectives.

Design of the Study

The study was a phenomenological qualitative study. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with four participants on two different large public research one institutions. Each interview was scheduled for approximately one hour and interviews were conducted in sequence with both partners on each campus being interviewed prior to the next set of participants.

Participants/Sample

The study had a purposeful sample of four participant from two different universities. The participants demonstrated positive relationships as evidenced by their participation in presentations coordinated by professionals at the institution on the benefits of positive partnerships between the offices through national student affairs professional associations. The participants were the Chief of Police (CP) and Vice President of Student Affairs (CSAO), or an equivalent position, representing the partnership between campus police and student affairs at their respective universities.

The CP and CSAO were able to designate a representative within their department to take their place in the process. They were initially contacted through email, which is included in Appendix A.

Research Site

Institution A is a large public research one university located in a southwest urban setting. Institution A has a total enrollment of 44,831 students and a campus size of 392 acres. At University A, the Chief of Police reports to the Interim Senior Vice President for Business Affairs and CFO. Institution B is a large public research one university in a suburban area in the northeast. Institution B has a total enrollment of 22,970 students on a campus of 1,996 acres. At University B, the Chief of Police reports to the Executive Vice President and University Treasurer.

Instrument

Interviews were conducted in semi-structured format over the telephone with single participants. The interview protocol is available in Appendix C. The interview questions were developed from the research as well as the research questions stated in chapter one. An open format interview allowed participants to freely share information in a comfortable and confidential format.

Data Collection

The interviews were recorded on two digital recording devices. The participants were labeled by their position followed by A or B. The Chief of Police and Vice President from the same university were labelled with the same letter. The participants were emailed the consent form prior to the interview and an opportunity for them to ask any questions they may have had was provided, which can be found in Appendix B.

They were also emailed the interview protocol to allow them to prepare and collect their thoughts on the questions.

Data Analysis

The interviews were transcribed and reviewed for common content. The transcriptions were coded to identify any themes found during the interviews. These themes were used to identify patterns in the nature of the partnerships and common elements shared by both institutions.

Treatment of Data

The interview recordings and transcriptions were saved on a flash drive which will be kept in a locked safe. Only the researcher had access to the data to preserve confidentiality. The interviews were put in folders on the flash drive grouped by university. All names were removed from the transcriptions to keep confidentiality high. All recordings and notes will be kept for three years according to IRB requirements and then destroyed.

Summary

This chapter explored the methodology of the study starting with the design of the study. Next the participants, research site, and instrument were explained. Lastly, the data collection, treatment, and analysis were stated. The next chapter will explain the data that was collected.

CHAPTER IV

Findings

The purpose of this qualitative study was to create an understanding of the actions and outcomes of strong, positive partnerships between student affairs and campus police. The research was guided by three research questions: What are the essential elements necessary for a successful partnership between Student Affairs and Campus Police (*Essential Elements*), what are the benefits to the institution when Student Affairs and Campus Police have a successful partnership (*Benefits to the Institution*), and what are some best practices and programs that have developed from the partnership between Student Affairs and Campus Police (*Best Practices and Programs*)? The themes that emerged from the four semi-structured interviews are discussed below.

Essential Elements

When discussing the partnerships on their campuses, participants highlighted elements of the partnerships that were needed for success. When compiling the data, four themes emerged that were essential elements for successful partnerships. These themes include: Leadership, Buy In, Communication, and Positive Relationships.

Leadership. All four participants mentioned leadership as being essential to the partnership between the two offices. Three out of the four participants discussed how new leadership was a critical factor for their partnerships to be successful. The Chief Student Affairs Officer (CSAO) of University A explained their professional relationship with the campus police when they first transitioned into their role:

In transitioning into the Dean of Students Office, at that time our Dean of Students Office was under a great deal of transition. There were some

relationships that had some strain over the period of time leading up to that transition, so it was an interesting move into our office because there were some folks lined up at the door wanting to share their experiences and how they hoped we might improve their relationship. Rebuilding and establishing that relationship with our police force was pretty significant at the beginning of my career.

New leaders in the departments was also a factor for the Chief of Police (CP) at University A who shared that their relationship with student affairs developed when new leadership came in and that those new relationships allowed them to avoid past problems and create a connection that was critical for creating a Good Samaritan program on their campus. “Once I became Chief, we got it done pretty quickly but there had been some hold ups along the way over the years, so I’m very pleased we were able to do that program.” The Good Samaritan program was a result of the partnership between campus police and student affairs at University A. The CSAO at University B highlighted the role leadership played when they were asked how the relationship began. “I think no doubt it started when the [current] Chief of Police was hired about six months to a year before I came...Frankly, a lot of it is just based on his leadership.”

Once the goal of the partnership was decided upon, the CP at University B described the critical utilization of leadership to emphasize the mission to subordinates. “I guess that’s our primary mission is that we’re law enforcement; but as much as we’re in the law enforcement business, I tell my officers that we’re also in the education business and the customer service business.” Leadership in both the idea of new

leadership bringing new change and a chance for a partnership and in the idea of leadership pushing the change from the top down.

Buy-in. All four participants mentioned buy in during their interviews. The University A CP discussed buy-in by talking about issues their partnerships has had. When asked what difficulties they experienced during the evolution of the relationship the CP stated, “There’s pushback, both within the police department and other departments that fall under the Dean of Students office.” Later in the interview the CP at University A mentioned buy in again. When asked how their staff has adjusted their practices, policies, or programs due to the relationship, the CP stated:

Sometimes my staff, meaning members of the department, will say that we’re caving to the Dean of Students or other groups...as you know change is always difficult, it is sometimes met with resistance; but I think overall, we have a pretty good understanding and trust and respect that if it doesn’t work then we’ll find another way to do it.

The CSAO at University A also brought up how they addressed the issue of buy-in when they were asked about difficulties experienced during the evolution of the relationship. “There’s still folks out there who think it’s an us versus them and I think for the most part we’re all on the same page.”

University B’s CP discussed how they have been successful in creating buy-in from their individual members. When asked how the relationship developed the CP discussed the importance of the department’s mission in the process and stated, “We’ve adopted that philosophy from the bottom of the agency to the top of the agency. We all understand the concept and we look for those education opportunities.” The CP also

mentioned buy-in later in the interview when they were asked how they convey the relationship to their staff as a leader. The CP at University B explained how they have created buy-in:

I think the message has been reinforced and they've seen. It's one thing to tell somebody something and try to get them to buy-in, but when you explain something to somebody and you explain the reason they actually see you're not just telling them, you're actually showing them what you do, and then they see that return on the investment. Then there is buy-in. It's all about getting the buy-in and it took some time to get that buy-in, but I think in every agency you have one or two naysayers. I would say the vast majority of our police officers here have all bought into the mission of this whole idea that we want to be transparent, we want to build trust, we want to be excellent in customer service, and occasionally we're going to have to arrest people.

The CSAO at University B also emphasized buy-in when they were asked how their relationship with campus police developed. While highlighting the police working to improve things on campus the CSAO stated, "I can't force that, you can't be like this is what you should do. So, I have to give them a lot of credit for also being really invested in doing things I think we often wouldn't associate with traditional law enforcement."

Giving an example of the buy-in from the police department, the CSAO explained:

They came up with that idea but then came to us and say this is in its infancy, this is what we're thinking, can we work together? Do you think this would fly? We don't want to do it if you guys aren't okay with this.

The CP at University B gave another example of the importance of buy-in in the developing relationship between both departments when they discussed how their staff had adjusted as a result of the relationship. The CP explained:

We've had so much great buy-in from our police officers that now I don't have to be the one coming up with the ideas...our officers have bought in to the point where they said instead of giving students a ticket for jaywalking, we could refer them to the Office of Student Conduct. Our officers then actually created a safety course that's geared towards pedestrian safety...so it's educational, as opposed to punitive.

Buy-in was important for these relationships. University A was still struggling with buy-in with their staff, but progress was clearly being made; while University B described their successes with buy-in among all staff on their campus.

Communication. All four participants consistently mentioned communication as vital to their successful partnership between offices. The importance of communication was the first thing the CSAO at University B address when discussing how they keep the relationship going:

Communication, I think a lot of communication. What communication lets us do is to get on the same page because sometimes police are one of the folks who tend to be criticized because their actions tend to be more public than other people...I think it really is a lot of constant communication.

The CP at University A also immediately emphasized communication when they described how they keep the relationship going. "Oh, constant meetings, good

communication, the Dean of Students and I probably talk at least once or twice a week. My staff is also in touch with the Dean of Student office probably on a daily basis.”

The CSAO at University A emphasized communication in a similar way while discussing the extent to which communication is used in their partnership:

Those of us who are doing the work every day we're on the phone regularly, we're texting, we have a really open relationship. Regardless of the overall organizational challenges we might face, those of us working together day to day, we have the relationships where we're completely reliant on one another.

The CP at University B emphasized the importance of communication to describe the partnership on their campus:

I would say that, if not on a daily basis, several times a week I'm in contact with them and it's very open. I think that's the key to everything and what I do is develop that relationship...If they have a question about anything day or night they can call me. If I have a question about anything day or night I can call them, and it works out great.

Both CSAOs stressed the importance of communication in establishing good relationships with campus police. The CSAO at University A shared, “Just having really open communication because I do think the biggest barrier is how do we share information,” was critical to success while the CSAO at University B shared that for other universities looking to create a partnership:

Communication for sure, I think you have to air the grievances I think at some point in the process you have to get that out there...I think that stuff needs to get out there because it's very hard to solve those things.

The Chiefs of Police at both institutions also highlighted the importance of having open communication using the example of their campus emergency response team. University A's CP shared, "We may not always agree on the way we're going to do it but there's always a good open conversation and we come out with a good plan to ensure whatever we're doing is successful." University B's CP discussed how vital communication can be in emergencies:

On a college campus or anywhere, you can have a critical incident happen at any time. When you have a critical incident, you don't want to be out there exchanging business cards with people. You want to have that relationship built up in advance.

The CSAO at University A later discussed what happens when communication is not utilized correctly:

I sometimes worry that folks who are in the peripheral or leadership positions, not necessarily touching this every day may not understand the depth and complexity of the relationship so I worry that if they don't have a strong sense of how we're doing things that they may make a misstep that has a trickledown effect.

All four participants discussed how imperative communication was to their successful positive partnerships. Communication was emphasized the most out of all themes present throughout all interviews.

Positive relationships. Three of the four participants discussed the attributes of positive relationships as being important to their partnership between offices. Within the topic of positive relationships three specific subthemes emerged: Understanding, Respect, and Trust.

Understanding. The University B CSAO emphasized how critical understanding was for their partnership:

It is challenging to interpret what student affairs does to somebody who's not student affairs trained, but that was such a critical thing for them to understand what our goals were. Ultimately, we overcame that by finding common ground around we're both in this for student safety.

The CSAO at University A described a similar struggle on their campus:

There were folks who were like, we don't even know what happens when we send stuff over there. We don't call the officers who arrested a student and tell them what we did so I think a lot of them felt like it was an unfinished business like somebody was a real jerk to them and then what did you all even do? So I think we needed to put ourselves out there... I think too that they're willing to invest as much time as we are.

The CP at University B shared how they overcame that challenge to have understanding between their offices:

You can't do it overnight that's the most blaring thing is a lot of people want to build a program, and they want a quick fix and unfortunately, it's not a quick fix because you have to understand and appreciate each other's roles. Part of the reason why this works well is that we've spent a lot of time having the Division of Student Life educating police officers on what their role and mission is and the little things like the problems and hurdles they've had to overcome over the years. They spent that time and we've spent time to understand that role and vice versa.

Understanding each other in a relationship can be difficult but it is critical as the participants described.

Respect. The CSAO at University A discussed respect from their side of the partnership:

I think my staff just respects the work that they do and especially if they do a ride along they completely understand it after that. One of my staff is a former police officer and the other is a conduct junky so he did his ride along and recognizes we just hear about the throw up, the officers sometimes get it on them...it's nothing but respect.

The CP at University B highlighted respect in their partnership as well, "We're colleagues, but we're also friends, we respect one another, and we understand each other's divisions." It is important to build on that understanding to create respect in these partnerships between offices.

Trust. The CSAO at University A described the importance of trust within the partnership for them, "My biggest barrier is the trust. How do I know you're not going to throw me under the bus? Part of it is the student records we all have, being protected by different things." The University B CSAO also emphasized trust as being vital to the development of the partnership:

I think trust—building trust was a really important thing...it's been slow but when different events have come, working side by side and at the end of the day trusting each other; valuing what it is that each of us bring and how those roles are unique

The CP at University A discussed trust when they were describing these relationships taking time:

The longer that you're able to maintain these relationships, the better it is.

Sometimes some people look at things and say change is good and to a certain extent, change is good. However, when you're talking about relationship building, building trust, and those kinds of things, that takes time. When people move out of key positions and they bring new people in, you have to start the process all over again.

Trust, while difficult to cultivate, is essential to having a strong positive relationship. Understanding each other is the first step to these relationships. Next, the offices must respect each other, but that cannot be achieved until there is an understanding of the offices. Once respect is built, trust, which seemed to be the most difficult for these partnerships, can be created. When all three elements are present these positive relationships are formed between offices. These positive relationships were essential to these partnerships between student affairs and campus police.

Benefits to the Institution

Participants were asked what some of the positive outcomes were that resulted from the strong relationship between both offices. Four themes emerged from the participants' responses as they identified the benefits from the partnership for the institution: Educational Focus, Communication, Improved Relationships, and Improved Safety.

Educational Focus. All four participants emphasized things being more educational as a benefit to the institution produced from these partnerships between campus police and student affairs. The University A CP highlighted the educational aspect of their diversion program which came about from this partnership:

Through that program it allows the student the opportunity to work through the Dean of Students program and if they successfully complete that there is no record of an arrest what so ever, the diversion has been completed. If they fail to complete it, or they aren't qualified for the program then they would go through the regular criminal justice process.

The CSAO at University A also discussed the educational aspects of their diversion program:

They don't just jump to a criminal outcome because we have a diversion program where they can just send students to us directly versus giving them a criminal ticket. We do a lot of things to be developmental and it's been pretty great. Very few students squander that opportunity because having no criminal ticket for something that you did when you were 19 can really go a long way when you're job searching later on.

The University B CSAO emphasized that having an educational philosophy was a benefit to the institution that rose from the partnership. "One of the most unique things about being in this relationship is that there is a really strong ethos of education in our police department." The CSAO later highlighted how they continued to keep education as a priority benefits the partnership, but they still struggle with it:

It was about five or six years ago they realized we need to hire a police officer that's oriented in a way to be a campus police officer because a lot of law enforcement see campus policing as an easy way to get your foot in the door, but they're not necessarily invested in the educational mission of the institution. They've really changed their hiring practices and their recruitment practices to

yield officers who are really interested in being in this environment of policing. That describes a little bit of the way we partner but I would say that the theme there is that we're both oriented around the education of the campus community so that creates a really strong common ground.

The CP at University B discussed the core of this benefit of education:

Every situation that we run into doesn't have to end in arrest. Most minor situations when people are in violation of a minor law or rule and they're students, they're referred to the Office of Student Conduct and that process is much more educational than punitive....so certain times there's things that happen on a college campus where you have to put the handcuffs on people and the officers get that, but there's also opportunities on a college campus where maybe you just do some educational messaging right out there on campus. Maybe it doesn't even result in a referral to Student Conduct. Maybe it's just resolved right there between the student and the police officer. Maybe they have that intermediate step between arrest and warning where they send the student to Student Conduct. It's all situationally driven, but I think the officers have really bought into the concept and they understand that we're in the education and public service business as much as we are in the law enforcement business.

The CP highlighted the benefit of an educational approach again with a specific example from their officers:

Our officers have bought in to the point where they said, 'Hey, instead of us giving them a ticket, could we refer them to the Office of Student Conduct?' Then our police officers actually created a safety course that's geared towards

pedestrian safety. Now, when they refer a student to the Office of Student Conduct instead of giving them a ticket for jaywalking, the student comes in and actually meets with police officers to talk about safety and why it's important so it's educational as opposed to punitive.

Every participant discussed education as a benefit to the institution. Universities are educational entities and partnerships between campus police and student affairs are emphasizing education as a benefit.

Communication. Communication was not only an essential element to the partnership, but it was also counted as a benefit to the institution arising from the partnership between the two offices. All four participants mentioned improved communication as a positive result of the partnership. The CP at University A described how increased communication has impacted their campus because of this partnership. "We don't do things in a vacuum, we involve the student community, we involve faculty and staff in a lot of these things, so it really is a true partnership."

The CSAO at University A states how communication has become faster because of the partnership between offices:

I have my go-to folks, but I also know that they have a hierarchy that's much more stringent than ours. If I have a question related to one area I can't just go to my go-to guy everything because I have to respect the fact that he's got a supervisor even though I know his supervisor is just going to ask him to do it. The reality is I have to honor who sits on what committee. I've gotten to the point where now I've navigated it where I just copy my go-to on it so he knows it's coming because if I call him directly I've probably got an answer within an hour.

Whereas, if I go through the hierarchical piece it might be a days' turnaround time so part of it is laziness but also this instant gratification world with all this technology we have. Since this is the guy I'm on the phone with once a day it's super easy for us to just process everything and not necessarily get caught up in the bureaucracy of it all.

The CSAO went on to further give a more specific example of the benefits of faster communication:

I've asked my colleague, hey can you look at this report and let me know if there is anything we should know? Do we need to call parents? Is there an elevated concern here? Yes, we'll get the police report but sometimes that will take 3-7 days depending on how many things are going on. He'll just let me know, hey here's some stuff that's relevant that's in the report; there's just a more open sharing because we all know three days' time can make a huge difference if a student's depressed or a student has been abusing substances. It's pretty amazing the way that we can rely on each other.

The University B CSAO emphasized how the communication has improved between offices because of the partnership:

I can call them anytime with a question or concern and not worry...it's like yeah, I would totally call the Chief of Police and consult or pass this by and see what their perspective is. That's a definite positive, when you don't feel restrained to share information because you're afraid of the response, it has not been like that.

The CP at University B discussed how communication has improved operations on their campus because of the partnership:

I think the relationship has helped reinforce the message that we try to put out to the troops. It's important that they realized that we have an open dialogue and professional relationship with the Division of Student Life because they also need to reach out to different partners in the Division of Student Life to accomplish their mission. At the end of the day, we're in the education business, but the university can't be functional without it being safe so we're all in the safety business as well. Those partnerships just make things go so much smoother.

The University B CP went further to emphasize communication improving with students as well because of programs and services that started because of their partnership:

It's great because they're able to hear it direct from me or members of my team. If they hear a rumor about something that's going on or they don't understand something, they hear directly from the horse's mouth instead of getting it third and fourth hand.

For all participants communication was a major benefit to the institution that the positive relationship created and maintained. The partnership allows communication to be faster, more efficient, and to include others in the conversations about the operations of the institution and to the benefit of the students.

Improved relationships. Three of the four participants emphasized that relationships between the people in both offices improved because of the partnership between offices. The CSAO at University A emphasized that there was improvement in the image of the office because of the partnership:

Especially in the past few years, it's made our parents and our students recognize that campus police are a resource. When I first started here, campus police were

just someone to avoid when you were stumbling home at night if you were living in the residence halls. They've really put themselves out there...I just think that our community recognizes that campus police are a critical part of our day to day and that we need to foster that relationship. Not just the Dean of Students Office but all of our organizations and our students in terms of compliance and working with them and then I think our parents know they have a new resource. We get a lot of parents who will call over to campus police or over here just because they remember us from orientation and they don't know what to do or they're worried about their student...We all just realize we all have a part in this community and it's not always perfect and it's not always pretty but for the most part we put ourselves out there with a smile.

The CSAO at University B described how their partnership worked to improve relationships on their campus during tough times:

It's listening on both sides and then with the more complex issues I always think about when all the police brutality stuff was coming to a head. Our police's leadership came to us and said we want to make sure we have better relationships with students of color on this campus. It was then us saying this is what you need to hear about how students of color perceive the police and it really has nothing to do with you and your police department. It's more their lived experiences with police period; then it was, can we think of forums that we can facilitate to help these two speak and hear one another. Again, the Captain of the police department stops by the Center for Black Culture at least twice a month to just sit with students to be visible.

The University B CP emphasized how critical the partnership was to improving relationships:

I think because of the relationship that we have with the Division of Student Life, not only has our relationship with them improved, but it's improved all the time with our students as well. As you can imagine, on a college campus a quarter of your population changes every year. You get the seniors to graduate, you get the new incoming freshman; every year there's new leadership with the Student Government Association and different registered student organizations. You're constantly in the process of building new relationships and because of the trust and transparency that we have with our student body it just makes it go so much smoother. We're not in an adversarial role with our students at all.

Improving relationships was a benefit that was clear in both partnerships. Three out of the four participants addressed the improved relationships during their interviews.

Improved safety. All four participants emphasized how the partnership has helped them work on different issues and improve student safety. The CP at University A discussed the essence of their partnership with Student Affairs:

It's working on projects together, strategizing, looking at issues that are confronting the country as a whole or the university; working together to see what we can do to either minimize the impact or do something different to assist groups or individuals.

The CSAO at University A also emphasized the improvement of student safety specifically concerning mental health on their campus due to the strong relationship between the offices:

We talk in the middle of the night when we have a student in crisis. We have an officer on our Behavioral Intervention Team every week. We have officers that we work with for our Threat Assessment Team. They help us with remedial measures when there's a matter of immediacy; welfare checks when they're close to campus... Those of us who are actually meeting with the students or have contact in the middle of the night are making sure that we're communicating so that we don't miss any steps in continuity of care.

Later in the interview the CSAO again discussed the improvements regarding student safety because of the partnership:

Our mental health and first aid training that our officers went through has been great because I noticed that our officers are able to spend a lot more time just because of the size of our campus and the number of officers with students who are going through some level of crisis so quite honestly that's been great. They've even been willing to go off site to some of our frequent flyers in terms of suicide ideation so that's also been great because when they have interaction with a student they know have been on our radar they really take it to the next level in terms of making sure that student's safe even to the point where they've gone to the house if a student lives at home and talked with parents; things that have been really helpful for us to make sure that we're accepting their level of risk live versus two days later when we finally hear about it... I just think people are making a lot of great extra effort.

Mental health safety has greatly improved on University A as a result of the collaborations between both offices. At University B, the CSAO also emphasized an

improvement in student safety, specifically addressing mental health as a result of the partnership between the offices:

The counseling center has sat down with the police to talk about what's the most dignified way that they can transport a student to a mental health facility. When one of our therapists is committing a student, our counseling center is in the student center, so we don't necessarily want a student being taken out in handcuffs to then go to a mental health facility.

University B's CSAO described other ways that student safety has improved on their campus in addition to mental health concerns:

We're really good at the reactive, we're not always good at the proactive and I would say that's one of the best outcomes because the relationship has allowed us to be much more proactive. Speaking of controversial speakers, that has been an area that's obviously been really difficult for a lot of campuses... Again, that's us going to them and them coming to us saying, hey there's this group that has registered to use our green, tell us about this student organization. What do you know about this student organization? Are we worried about this event? I think the ability to share information and get data to assess risk to campus is a huge positive outcome. They're not student development people, that's not how they're trained but we've been able to impart a lot of that to them so that's been a positive outcome... I think at the end of the day it's about safety, so I think that we're a safer campus because of the communication.

The CP at University B agreed that working closely with campus police has led to improvements in student safety, "Over the years the relationship has improved, student

safety has improved, and trust has improved. It's a win-win for everybody involved but it takes time and energy to do it, you have to be committed to it." All four participants shared the improvement in student safety due to the relationship between student affairs and campus police and how their students are benefitting from the connections.

Best Practices and Programs

Participants discussed several practices and programs that have been established on their campuses because of these partnerships. Four themes resulted from the interviews where participants discussed these programs: Teams, Events with Police, Training, and Closing the Loop.

Teams. Three of the four participants discussed different teams that were utilized with these partnerships. The CP at University A highlighted the work of their Campus Emergency Response Team (CERT) as a positive outcome of the partnership between offices:

The work that we do with our Campus Emergency Response Team, working to keep the campus safe for our campus community, which the Dean of Students Office is intimately involved with. We really just continue working together, we may not always agree on the way we're going to do it but there's always a good open conversation and we come out with a good plan to ensure whatever we're doing is successful.

University A's CSAO discussed both their Threat Assessment Team and Behavioral Intervention Team (BIT) and the benefit the BIT has brought:

We have officers that we work with for our Threat Assessment Team. We have an officer in our Behavioral Intervention Team every week... We don't let time

lapse; if our BIT Lead, I don't know that he's ever actually disagreed with what we've done, but he's told us when his hands are tied on something. He's also told us when he thinks we should involve them. If campus police has ever responded in a way that's made students feel unsafe, we let him know so that he can figure out how to process it with folks because, again, he's going to know better than we are how to talk to those officers and he's part of their structure but also he's not afraid of giving people feedback so I think that we know it gets back to them.

The CSAO at University B also discussed their Student Behavior Consultation Team and success it has found because of the partnership:

We meet often, they are part of our Student Behavior Consultation Team so that's a weekly meeting. I think through those meetings you learn about the perspectives and you learn to appreciate that there's a tension of a difference. Student Affairs are a little more fluffy and light about stuff and the police tend to be more cynical. I think they've seen the criminal element more and they don't always trust people. I think in the Student Behavior Consultation Team there was a point we got to a few years ago to say, it feels like our group is not optimized because we have this tension and the tension came from a difference of opinions. A couple years ago, we got to a point where this tension means our group is working well. If everybody showed up and had the same opinion about how we should deal with students of concern that's when you get group think and then you miss something. So, we kind of embraced that and thought this is cool. We know we're coming from different perspectives and sometimes we're able to say

year the police's perspective is really valuable here and we should take a bit more of a hard line based on the risk that this poses to our campus.

These teams are great opportunities for these partnerships. The teams offer more lines of communication and further expand the benefits to the institutions.

Events with police. Three of the four participants described creating events to allow police to interact with the community. These events were created because of the partnership between offices. The CSAO at University A described Coffee with a Canine Office, an event that started on their campus because of the strong partnership between offices:

We don't have attack version canine officers, we just have bomb sniffing officers or drug sniffing officers, so we've actually started doing a thing where, at the start of the semester, we have coffee with a cop but we call it coffee with a canine cop so our staff is out there handing out coffee and the canine officers are there just to get love. We get like 600 students coming out because when we bring officers into our space for our event with therapy animals, that hits students differently when police enter a space, whereas if we're outside with them suddenly they're just totally approachable. I think, again, back to that how can we use our relationship to strengthen their approachability for students? I think that event has been somewhat ridiculously popular because not only are we giving away free coffee but, while the police officers aren't necessarily something that the students are dying to talk to, they definitely want to meet the police officer dogs, so we use that as the way to get out in front of students as well and it's actually great.

Both University A participants mentioned an event on their campus called Pizza with Police. The CSAO at University A described it as:

Our Police Chief and his staff decided to do Pizza with Police, so they came to us and said can you be gate keeper? How can I get into Interfraternity Council? How can I get into, and they just listed a bunch of groups. It's great to know they can go off on their own, do their own thing, have their own independent identity with students, and that this is reinforcing the values that student affairs has.

The CP at University A highlighted the event in their own words:

We're doing Pizza with Police, so we've gone around the last couple weeks, and we met with the Interfraternity Council. We met with the Student Government Association, we have a meeting next week with the Center for Black Culture, just different registered student organizations. We're going out, we're providing pizza, we're giving them a short presentation or an overview about the department and some programs we have in place; then we just have an open dialogue. It's great because they're able to hear it direct from me or the members of my team. If they hear a rumor about something that's going on or they don't understand something, they hear directly from the horse's mouth instead of getting it third and fourth hand.

The CP of University B described a second event that is held on their campus:

I talked about how safety's everybody's issue. We meet with the Student Government Association every spring and we walk the campus with their leadership. We talk about where they feel safe, where they don't feel safe, where they'd like to see additional lighting, where they like the blue light signs, and

where they'd like to see video cameras. We take that input every year to make the campus safer.

These events proved critical for the police in assisting to open lines of communication with the students. Without the help of student affairs and the partnership that is in place, those events may not have been possible and the benefits they created would have never transpired. These programs and services helped to break down negative impressions possessed by students and replace them with seeing the campus police as a resource for students rather than an obstacle.

Training. Both CSAO's discussed the opportunity for training because of the partnership being in place between offices. University A's CSAO discussed the utilization of ride-alongs to improve understanding between offices and to show appreciation of the difficulty of the police's job:

It's easy to get in the rote memory of what we need to do every day, we remind ourselves to get into ride-alongs periodically when we've got new staff in particular so that people see the new faces also so that they know that we know how hard they are working when we're in bed; that we see some of the drama as it unfolds because I think sometimes, whether it's our Greek organizations or just the level of drug use that students might be starting to participate in, for them seeing it live they sometimes want us to see that as well.

Ride-alongs were great for one on one interaction but there was a need to discuss issues in a group setting. Shift change training was critical for getting those questions answered and having those discussions:

Recognizing that we see the day shift all the time because we have protests and things that happen over the period of the day; then also getting in and doing some shift change training because they might have questions and usually somebody from command or somebody who's been on our Behavioral Intervention Team will say, hey, they keep wanting to know when XYZ, and I say okay, well how about let me know what shift change I can come to and we'll talk about it so they get a chance to ask us questions because they don't see us all the time like their colleagues and usually try to bring some fresh baked cookies when we show up too.

The CSAO at University B highlighted the importance and role of training between offices multiple times as being a critical element:

Student Conduct regularly goes in and meets with each patrol in their roll call once a year to go over the changes in the code of conduct. The police offices have gone to this and the officers give us feedback on this...I think it's really a lot of communication, it's us getting in front of the police and getting in front of the patrol officers. They [conduct staff] have been a gatekeeper for that and that's come in different formats, for instance, showing up at the roll call to go over changes in the student code of conduct...I think there's training that happens, there's joint training that happens whether that's tabletop exercises like a more formal type of thing or whether that's an informal, let's talk about how we would deal with this situation or event.

Both CSAOs felt that the partnership helps to provide a platform for additional training with the campus police. Being able to get in front of as many officers as possible to train,

inform, and answer any questions that might be lurking was made possible because of the successful partnership between offices. Training was able to manifest in several formats from formal, structured training down to conversations and discussions about issues both departments have faced.

Closing the loop. The CSAO at both Universities emphasized the importance of “closing the loop” between students and police by providing them an opportunity to talk through issues as a result of the partnership created between both offices. The CSAO at University A described the opportunity as:

I still don't give them students' FERPA protected information unless they can demonstrate a health or safety concern, but if they're anxious just to talk to a student because of a interaction that they had with them I will call the student and be like, hey they're here right now would you like to talk to them? I'll give their phone number, I'll try and close the loop...I want to respect that they're trying to do the best they can by the students when it comes to matters related to bad choices.

The University B's CSAO highlighted two different forms of closing the loop and why it was important, first:

When all of the police brutality stuff was coming to a head [in the country], they [campus police] came to us and said we want to make sure we have better relationships with students of color on this campus. Then it was us saying this is what you need to hear about how students of color perceive the police and it really has nothing to do with you and your police department. It's more their lived experiences with law enforcement. Then it was, can we think of forums that

we can facilitate to help these two speak and hear one another? The Captain of the police department stops by the Center for Black Culture, I would say, at least twice a month just to sit with students to be visible.

Secondly the CSAO at University B shared another example of how they work to close the loop with their students:

Speaking of controversial speakers...we sit down with the president of the student organization that's bringing in the speaker. We help them understand the risk to the campus. We help them understand how it's in their best interest that we're really intimately involved and we're both at the table, Student Affairs and Campus Police, and we're both intimately involved in the planning of the event. The fact that the police are able to bring all of their resources to bare on behalf of the students, it's like hey we want your bent to be successful. The more we can plan, the better chance it has of being successful.

Closing the loop was an important element for these partnerships to improve relationships with students on their campus. Bringing both offices to the conversation gives more opportunities for the benefits of the partnerships to affect the campus communities. By creating greater trust, it allows both Student Affairs and Campus Police to be seen as allies and supporters of students, even of controversial topics, instead of being an adversary.

Summary

This chapter laid out the findings of the four semi-structure interviews conducted. First, the essential elements of partnerships were described with the themes including: Leadership, buy-in, communication, and positive relationships. Next, the four

kinds of benefits to the institution created by the partnership between campus police and student affairs were identified: Educational focus, communication, improved relationships, and improved safety. Lastly, some of the best practices and programs from the partnership between campus police and student affairs on both campuses were included. The four themes for the best practices and programs section including discussions regarding: Teams, events with police, training, and closing the loop. Chapter V will provide an analysis of the results and how the findings from this study inform practice and can help direct future research and application.

CHAPTER V

Discussion, Recommendations, and Conclusion

The purpose of this qualitative study was to create an understanding of the actions and outcomes of strong, positive partnerships between student affairs and campus police through interviews with professionals participating in the partnerships. Four participants from two universities engaged in these partnerships answered questions in semi-structured interviews guided by three research questions: (1) What are the essential elements necessary for a successful partnership between Student Affairs and Campus Police?; (2) What are the benefits to the institution when Student Affairs and Campus Police have a successful partnership?; (3) What are some best practices and programs that have developed from the partnership between Student Affairs and Campus Police? This chapter will share the results of this study as they pertain to previous research, recommendations for student affairs professionals, and recommendations for future research.

This chapter will discuss the results found in Chapter IV and how they align with the existing literature. Three main themes rising from the research questions were: The essential elements of the partnership, the benefits to the institution, and best practices and programs that maintain and support the partnership will be examined to apply the findings to improve similar partnerships on other campuses.

Essential Elements

When considering what essential elements were necessary for a successful partnership between Student Affairs and Campus Police, leadership was the first element identified by the participants as being critical for these partnerships to be successful. The

participants felt leadership was needed to create an environment and mentality that would welcome these partnerships. Davis, Mateu-Gelabert, and Miller (2005) found that two Commanding Officers in the NYPD were the key factor that was necessary to change police culture. The two Commanding Officers' precincts were the only ones to change for the better and that change attributed directly to their leadership (Davis et al., 2005). Shulhofer, Tyler, and Huq (2011) found that to work towards change, direction must come from the top of the organization and leaders must stress the importance of those efforts.

Kezar (2003) found that leadership was found to be the most important strategy for change and the success of collaboration. The leadership also needs to create a more dynamic environment to allow it to be more flexible to change (Strange and Banning, 2001). Leadership is critical for these partnerships to be successful and for change to occur and the participants stressed its importance in the development and maintenance of their partnerships. The motivation and changes need to come from the top of the organization and work its way down, which is especially true for the campus police as the hierarchical operations are more strictly adhered to than in student affairs divisions.

The second essential element highlighted by the participants was buy-in from the rank and file members of both units. Wolfe and Nix (2016) described The Ferguson Effect, a hypothesis that states that police officers are less willing to partner with the community when they fear being accused of racial profiling or using excessive force which results in less motivation to do their job. Two factors that were able to negatively impact the formation of connections were organizational justice and self-legitimacy (Wolfe and Nix, 2016). If the leadership that was critical to these partnerships is present,

and supervisors were seen as fair and had created an environment inspiring confidence among officer, then staff buy-in can be improved. Buy-in is essential because those on the ground have to believe in the partnership and the changes that are happening, or ideas will never get past the idea stage. Effective partnerships can start with the leadership but to be truly successful, those who are interacting with the students everyday need to be the ones invested in the partnership.

Communication was the third essential element for successful partnerships and was the most crucial according to the participants. Participants emphasized communication both between leadership and subordinates and between offices. Kezar (2003) found that institutional dialogue was important to student affairs in facilitating change. For these partnerships, lines of communication need to be opened up first between leadership and subordinates. Vertical communication allows any questions to be answered and allows the changes to strengthen lower in the hierarchy. The horizontal communication between offices is critical for the next essential element, positive relationships. Without meaningful communication the relationships will not grow, and the partnership will be more superficial and weakened because of it.

After positive and regular communication was established among all actors in the partnership, the development of positive relationships was critical for long-term prospects of the partnership between both offices. Participants emphasized three attributes of these positive relationships; understanding, respect, and trust. Magolda (2005) found that offices do need to have an understanding of each other for partnerships, but they also need to understand themselves first before they can understand the other office in the partnership. Magolda (2005) stated that for partners to have a better understanding of

each other, discussions need to be had about what the partnership is supposed to be and the effects it should have. Several participants stressed that they needed to better understand what their partners did in their jobs in order to deepen the partnership. Understanding is critical to the partnership because it sets the foundation for the other two attributes. Without understanding respect cannot be cultivated and without understanding and respect trust cannot be built between partners.

Respect was the second attribute in the participants' discussions about positive relationships. Participants stated that it was important for their members to have respect for the other office concerning what they do, the issues they face, and where they have come from. In the previous research, respect was not highlighted as a factor in successful partnerships. A reason for this may be the result of the lack of existing research on the partnerships between student affairs and campus police. While different, the partnerships between student affairs and campus police do share some similarities to the partnerships between student affairs and academic affairs which have been studied more thoroughly in the literature. Campus police however are significantly different from student affairs, more so than the difference between student affairs and academic affairs, and for these partnerships to work there needs to not only be understanding of both offices, but a respect for what each of them do.

Trust was the final attribute of positive relationships that was emphasized by the participants who shared that trust was critical for these partnerships to be successful. Dhillon (2013) found that trust between offices was the most important factor in a strong and successful partnership. Participants described having to work on trust and that it was not something that was just intrinsically there. The difficulty with building trust comes

from having to create the understanding and respect before the trust can be built. All three attributes were critical to building positive relationships between offices in the partnership.

These essential elements described by the participants actually had a specific order to them in the development process. The initial decision to change needs to come from the top of the organization so leadership is the first essential element that needs to be present. Once the leadership has started the process, then those leaders can begin the work to establish buy in with their employees. Staff who endorse the leaderships view of the value of the partnership will create a strong office within themselves which will further strengthened as the partnership develops. Once each office is solidified with buy in, communication can be used to connect the two offices in the partnership and start to strengthen the partnership. Lastly, the development of positive relationships is the final agent to fully solidify the partnership as successful and strong. Without positive relationships the partnership would be mediocre and only somewhat successful. These relationships, which have their own order of attributes, are critical for strong successful partnerships between student affairs and campus police.

Benefits to the Institution

The second theme that was examined looked at the benefits to the institution when Student Affairs and Campus Police had a successful partnership. The first benefit emphasized by participants was the existence of an educational focus on their shared work. Participants stated that as a result of their partnership, interactions with students became much more educational in focus than punitive. The emphasis on education mimics the community-oriented approach that Gill, Weisburd, Telep, Vitter, & Bennett

(2014) describes that encourages positive relationships and collaboration which may enhance procedural justice, trust, and citizen ratings of police performance. The educational focus is similar to the procedural justice model where, “Officers are trained to view every citizen contact as an opportunity to build legitimacy” (Shulhofer, Tyler, and Huq (2011). Strange and Banning (2001) remind us that a university has three educational goals; learning, growth, and development. This educational focus not only help the police conduct those policing tactics that lead to further benefits but will also help the university meet its educational goals for the students.

Another benefit to the institution as a result of the partnership was improved communication. Participants emphasized that the partnership between student affairs and campus police significantly improved communication between the offices. They described the communication as being faster, more efficient, and including more individuals in those conversations. Past research focused more on how to create partnerships with others rather than looking at the benefits of them. There was very little existing research concerning partnerships between campus police and student affairs which made comparisons difficult. Communication was not only an essential element in the creation of these partnerships, but it was also a significant benefit emphasized by participants numerous times.

The third benefit to the institution was improved relationships for the police with the community. Participants felt the partnership was a critical element for police to improve relationships with students, parents, faculty, and staff. Sunshine and Tyler (2003) found that legitimacy had the most significant positive effect on police/community relations. Sunshine and Tyler (2003) also found that legitimacy was

significantly based on the ideas of procedural justice, performance evaluations, and distributive justice judgements. The partnership between campus police and student affairs was responsible for the improved relations involving police.

In the next section the best practices and programs will be fully discussed however, Schuck and Rosenbaum (2005) found that non-negative contacts with the police in the citizen's neighborhood were associated with statistically significant higher positive perceptions of police. Similarly, Hawdon and Ryan (2003) found that the extent that residents who believed that police were patrolling the neighborhood and could be trusted were significant positive predictors of perceptions of the police. Increasing officers' visibility is a significant change important to the perceptions of the police (Hawdon and Ryan, 2003).

The partnership allows the police to interact with the community in positive ways rather than just when they are arresting someone, and that change has led to improved relationships with the community. Improved relationships also brought the police to the table more often with faculty and staff in efforts outside of crisis or enforcement roles which has led to improved relationships among all parties. Gill et al. (2014) found that community-oriented policing resulted in a statistically significant increase in citizen's satisfaction with the police and concluded that community-oriented policing is not intended to prevent crime but rather to change the relationship between the police and the public. This increase in visibility is positive as Griffith et al. (2004) found that even though students found the police approachable, only 41% of students indicated they had at least one contact with the police.

The final benefit to the institution from these partnerships was an improvement in overall feelings of safety in the campus community. Participants felt that safety on campus greatly improved especially when it came to handling mental health issues and making time for students in need. Reaves (2015) found that entry-level sworn officers were required to receive an average of 1,027 hours of training their first year with two-thirds of those hours in the classroom and the last third in the field. Peak et al. (2008) found that the mean number of annual training hours for campus police officers beyond initial recruit training was 47 hours per year while also finding that 94% of agencies who responded had such requirement. The partnership between campus police and student affairs produces this benefit because of the increase in training between offices. The participants also discussed how improvements in policies and procedures between the offices increased student safety. This benefit is important because the need for safety and inclusion on campus is a key element in the successful creation of supportive environments on campus (Strange & Banning, 2001). One participant emphasized that particular point when they said, “At the end of the day, we’re in the education business, but the university can’t be functional without it being safe so we’re all in the safety business as well.”

Best Practices and Programs

The final focus of the study was on what best practices and programs have developed from the partnership between Student Affairs and Campus Police at these two institutions. The first program discussed by participants was about the use of various teams which were beneficial because they are another method to bring campus police and student affairs to the same table to discuss and work on things. In 2012, Reaves (2015)

found that 97% of campus police departments serving 2,500 or more students were meeting regularly with campus administrators. Sitting down and discussing issues not only allows these partnerships to be reactive but more proactive. Being more proactive is why Michigan State University created their inclusion and anti-bias unit (Shea, 2016). With everything happening at the national level concerning police brutality and the Black Lives Matter movement they wanted to be a driving force behind these partnerships and be open and transparent with their community (Shea, 2016). At first there may be conflicting perspectives as one participant described, but that is not a terrible thing. Magolda (2005) states that conflict must be accepted and not repressed; partners need to come together to deal with differences and conflict.

The second practice that developed from these partnerships between campus police and student affairs were specific events planned with police. While one university had pizza with the police and the other had coffee with a cop the idea and motivation were the same. Getting the police in front of the community to interact more often than simply when an arrest is happening and changing community perceptions of those officers. Schuck and Rosenbaum (2005) findings that non-negative contacts with the police in the citizen's neighborhood were associated with statically significant higher positive perceptions of police emphasizes the importance of these types of events. Hawdon and Ryan (2003) stated that an implication of their study was that departments should increase their officers' visibility because it is significantly important to positive perceptions of police. Previous research points to the value of having citizens and police interact more often and in positive settings for improvements in relations and legitimacy. Legitimacy was found to be a significant determinant of cooperation with police and

influence on police/community relations (Sunshine and Tyler, 2003). The U.S. Department of Justice gave five recommendations for improving police-community relations, one of which was to be more visible in the community (DOJ, 2015). Campus police departments need to get out in front of their community and these partnerships are the vessel for that. Student affairs has the event planning history, they understand what students will come to or how they will react to an event, and they can help the campus police be successful in their endeavors for improvement.

The third practice developed through these partnerships were specific trainings for both offices. These trainings focused on ways to utilize and improve procedures already in place and increase understanding of offices between partners. The participants discussed how trainings given by the student affairs side of the partnership were scheduled to occur at a shift change in order to have as many officers present as possible. These trainings allowed officers to ask any questions they may have about the code of conduct or bring up issues they are seeing in the community. Without these partnerships these trainings were not likely to happen which could result in issues and problems in the future. This practice is closely connected to all of the four benefits to the institution that were discovered. With a better understanding of the code of conduct, officers can refocus their interaction with students in smaller situations so that there can be more of an educational focus. These trainings also improve communication between partners and they have the ability to improve relations and safety because they add another tool to an officer's belt and assist in minimizing misunderstandings.

The last practice derived from having close partnerships between campus police and student affairs is the process of closing the loop. Closing the loop was a phrase used

by the participants to describe the ability of the student affairs professionals to connect the police with the student when appropriate that they may not normally have without the creation of the partnership. The participants described closing the loop overall as more about making that connection and allowing the police, the student affairs professional, and the student to discuss issues from multiple perspectives. This practice helps the institution fully realize all four benefits and is an extremely useful tactic for partnerships between campus police and student affairs.

Recommendations for Student Affairs Professionals

Considering the results from this study and existing research there are two main recommendations for professionals to improve relationships with campus police. The first recommendation is to do the preparation work before anything else. Magolda (2005) stated that offices need to ask themselves, “Will this partnership help both students and partners?” The current study found there were benefits to having a partnership between campus police and student affairs, however, every campus environment is different. When considering starting a partnership, offices need to look critically at their institution and decide if it would be beneficial.

The second part of the preparation work is to prepare your own office for the partnership before jumping into it. The first two and a half elements found to be essential for these partnerships can be done before the partnership even starts. Leadership, buy-in, and internal communication can, and arguably should, be built before offices jump into a partnership. Building these elements creates a strong office environment which will strengthen a partnership when offices move to create communication between offices and positive relationships. Offices can also utilize the four campus environment frames:

Physical, human aggregate, organizational, and constructed (Strange and Banning, 2011) to create an environment that is welcoming to a partnership.

The second recommendation is to consistently do assessment once the partnership is in place. These partnerships should be helping the university meet the three hierarchal purposes: Safety and inclusion, involvement, and community, which are needed to reach the three goals of education: Learning, growth, and development (Strange and Banning, 2011). If the partnership is not producing the benefits it should be or none at all, then assessment needs to be done to find the issues in the partnership. Regular assessment should be done with both the partners and students; partners are the obvious target of an assessment when issues are happening, but students are the determinant if the partnership is working and their perspectives should also be taken into account. Assessment should not only be done when there are issues, doing assessment consistently can help be proactive with issues and reduce partnerships just running through the motions every day.

Recommendations for Future Research

This study focused on partnerships between student affairs and campus police. Four participants from two large public institutions were interviewed to find what elements were essential for these partnerships to be successful, what the benefits were for the institution, and some best practices and programs. The following describes recommendations for future research:

- Conduct this study with large, medium, and small institutions. The participants for this study were from large institutions which may face different issues than small institutions, which may lead to different results.

- Conduct this study with private institutions. Private institutions differ from public in many ways including, governance, funding, legal obligations; all of which can cause differing results.
- Conduct a study interviewing university chiefs of police with different paths to their position and compare their philosophies concerning partnerships with student affairs. Comparing chiefs who worked their way through campus policing and those who worked in policing outside of campus and who were hired as a campus chief may show differences in philosophies.
- Conduct a triangulation study with partners and students. This will show if students agree with the partners especially concerning the benefits to the institutions.

Conclusion

This study looked at partnerships between campus police and student affairs. Through four qualitative interviews, participants from two institutions gave their perspectives on what elements are essential for these partnerships, what benefits resulted for the institutions, and some best practices and programs on their campuses as a result of the relationship. The interview protocol was created to gather a large amount of information, however, there were a few issues. First, there was a lack of responses for the question concerning difficulties experienced while creating the partnerships. Answers also became redundant later in the interviews, especially concerning the question asking for suggestions for improvement.

Many themes emerged that were consistent with the limited previous research that was found. Four elements were found to be essential for partnerships between campus

police and student affairs and the first element was Leadership. These partnerships had to start at the top of the organization, especially from the police side because of the strict hierarchical structure in place in those departments.

Next, buy-in from subordinates was needed to bring the ideas and philosophy from the leadership down to those who interact with partners and students every day. After buy-in with subordinates, communication, both internal and between offices needs to be established. At this stage, the partnership starts to intertwine the two offices leading to the next element, positive relationships. The positive relationships element is a combination of three attributes: Understanding, respect, and trust.

These attributes needed to occur in a specific order in order to create positive relationships between the offices; first, offices needed to understand their partner's office, where they have come from, the struggles they have faced, and what they want out of the partnership. Next, respect can be built between offices which is critical for the last attribute, trust. Respect is the lynchpin of these positive relationships. Without respect, trust cannot be built leaving only understanding; this causes the offices to be acquaintances, not partners. There has to be more than an understanding of the other office, offices have to respect what they understand to be able to fully trust the other office. Trust between offices is the final attribute of these positive relationships and the hardest to achieve because of the need for both understanding and respect prior to building trust. Not only did the attributes for positive relationships have an order, but the essential elements were found to have a specific order that was critical for building the partnerships between campus police and student affairs.

Concerning what benefits resulted for the institution, four key benefits emerged. First, it was found that the partnerships produced an education focus that was a benefit for the institutions. This benefit stemmed from the partnership transforming punitive interactions into educational ones through training, events, and communication. Second, it was found that partnerships between campus police and student affairs improved communications between the offices which was a valuable benefit to the institutions. The improved communication was caused by the positive relationships between offices, opening more lines of communication, and the increased opportunities for communication.

Next, the partnerships improved relations on campus, both between the two offices and between students and the police. The relationship improved because of the shifted focus to education, increased positive interactions with both partners and students through meetings and events, and increased communications. Finally, improved campus safety was an additional benefit to the institution created by the partnership between campus police and student affairs because the partnership increased communication and interaction between partners and students.

Finally, four best practices and programs were identified. First, the participation of partners on various institutional teams was found to contribute to all four benefits to the institutions by increasing communication between offices. Discussing issues on campus and solutions together creates improvements in the offices that may not have occurred without the partnership pulling the offices on teams together. Next, various events with campus police officers were found to lead to multiple benefits to the institution by increasing positive interactions between officers and students. Next,

trainings between the partners was found to best occur during times where the most impact could occur between the offices. These trainings assisted in creating all four benefits towards the institution that were found by discussing misunderstandings and issues that may not have been addressed without the partnership. Finally, closing the loop was a phrase used by participants to indicate partners connecting the police with students where a connection may not have been made without the existence of the partnership.

Overall, these offices were willing to do what was necessary to create an environment that cultivates success for the students. Running through the motions every day is not success as an office on a college campus. There are always improvements to be made and making an effort to improve every day is success. These partnerships are a process, they will not happen overnight, and issues will arise. The key is to take it day by day, strengthening one's own office first in order to be a strong partner. Once the partnership is created, having those awkward conversations to challenge preconceived notions is how people, offices, partnerships, and campuses grow. With a lot of time, open conversations, and effort everyday improvements will become visible and the environments provided to students on campus will be more safe, welcoming, and successful.

References

- 14 high-profile police-related deaths of U.S. blacks. (2017, December 8). *CBC*. Retrieved from: <https://www.cbc.ca/news/world/list-police-related-deaths-usa-1.4438618>
- Adams, C. (2016, March 3). March 3, 1991: Rodney king beating caught on video. *CBS News*. Retrieved from: <http://www.cbsnews.com/news/mar0ch-3rd-1991-rodneking-lapdbeating-caught-on-video/>
- Campbell, A. (2016). UC Davis wants you to forget about its pepper spray incident. So here's the video. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved from https://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/uc-davis-pepper-spray-video_us_570fc93fe4b03d8b7b9fb62b
- Campus police law and legal definition. (n.d.). Retrieved from: <https://definitions.uslegal.com/c/campus-police/>
- Chenail, R. J. (2011). Interviewing the investigator: Strategies for addressing instrumentation and researcher bias concerns in qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report* 16(1), 255-262.
- Davis, R. C., Mateu-Gelabert, P., & Miller, J. (2005). Can Effective Policing Also Be Respectful? Two Examples in the South Bronx. *Police Quarterly*, 8(2), 229–247. doi: 10.1177/1098611104269531
- Dhillon, J. K. (2013). Senior Managers' perspectives of leading and managing effective, sustainable and successful partnerships. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 41(6), 736-750. doi: 10.1177/1741143213494186

- Distributive justice law and legal definition. (n.d.). Retrieved from:
<https://definitions.uslegal.com/d/distributive-justice/>
- Diversity & inclusion. (n.d.). Retrieved from: <https://mckkc.edu/counseling/diversity/>
- Gill, C., Weisburd, D., Telep, C. W., Vitter, Z., & Bennett, T. (2014). Community-oriented policing to reduce crime, disorder and fear and increase satisfaction and legitimacy among citizens: A systematic review. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, *10*, 399-428. doi: 10.1007/s11292-014-9210-y
- Griffith, J. D., Hueston, J., Wilson, E., Moyers, C. L., & Hart, C. L. (2004). Satisfaction with campus police services. *College student Journal*, *38*(1), 150-156.
- Grinberg, E., & Yan, H. (2018, March 16). A generation raised on gun violence sends a loud message to adults: Enough. *CNN*. Retrieved from:
<https://www.cnn.com/2018/03/14/us/national-school-walkout-gun-violence-protests/index.html>
- Hawdon, J., Ryan, J. (2003). Police-resident interactions and satisfaction with police: An empirical test of community policing assertions. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, *14*(1), 55-74. doi: 10.1177/0887403402250919
- Hinds, L., Murphy, K. (2007). Public satisfaction with police: Using procedural justice to improve police legitimacy. *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, *40*(1), 27-42.
- International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators. (2018). *FAQs for the media*. Retrieved from <https://www.iaclea.org/faqs-for-the-media>
- Jones, M. (2018). After Virginia Tech shooting, gun violence still claims victims on college campuses. *Collegiate Times*. Retrieved from:

http://www.collegiatetimes.com/news/after-virginia-tech-shooting-gun-violence-still-claims-victims-on/article_4c27a5f2-3a98-11e8-9165-4f568030151b.html

- Kezar, A. (2003). Achieving student success: Strategies for creating partnerships between academic and student affairs. *NASPA Journal*, *41*(1), 1-22.
- Kolowich, S. (2017). A radical college's public meltdown. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <https://www.chronicle.com/article/A-Radical-College-s-Public/241577>
- Lewis, L. M., Wilks, S. E., Geiger, J. R., Barthelemy, J. J., & Livermore, M. M. (2017). A racial divide: College student attitudes concerning police in south Louisiana. *Journal of Pan African Studies*, *10*(1), 206-223.
- MacQueen, K. M., McLellan, E., Metzger, D. S., Kegeles, S., Strauss, R. P., Scotti, R., Blanchard, L., and Trotter II, R. T. (2001). What is community? An evidence-based definition for participatory public health. *American Journal of Public Health* *91*(12), 1929-1938.
- Magolda, P. M. (2005). Proceed with caution: Uncommon wisdom about academic and student affairs partnerships. *About Campus*, 16-21.
- Mazerolle, L., Antrobus, E., Bennett, S., & Tyler, T. R. (2013). Shaping citizen perceptions of police legitimacy: A randomized field trial of procedural justice. *Criminology*, *51*(1), 33-63. doi:10.1111/j.1745-9125.2012.00289.
- Najdowski, C. J., Bottoms, B. L., & Goff, P. A. (2015). Stereotype threat and racial differences in citizens' experiences of police encounters. *Law & Human Behavior (American Psychological Association)*, *39*(5), 463-477. doi: 10.1037/ihb0000140

- Peak, K. J., Barthe, E. P., & Garcia, A. (2008). Campus Policing in America: A Twenty-Year Perspective. *Police Quarterly, 11*(2), 239–260. doi: 10.1177/1098611107306840
- Reaves, B. A. (2015). *Campus law enforcement, 2011-12* (NCJ 248028). Retrieved from <https://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=5216>
- Schuck, A. M., Roasenbaum, D. P. (2005). Global and neighborhood attitudes toward the police: Differentiated by race, ethnicity, and type of contact. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 21*(4), 391-418. doi: 10.1007/s10940-005-7356-5
- Shea, H. (2016, October 5). Student Affairs partnerships with Campus Police [Webinar]. In *Higher Ed Live*. Retrieved from <http://higheredlive.com/student-affairs-partnership-with-campus-police/>
- Shulhofer, S. J., Tyler, T. R., & Huq, A. Z. (2011). American policing at a crossroads: Unsustainable policies and the procedural justice alternative. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 101*(2), 335-374.
- Sloan, J. J. (1992). The modern campus police: A analysis of their evolution, structure, and function. *American Journal of Police, 11*(2), 85-104.
- Stack, L. (2017). Georgia Tech student leader is shot dead by campus police. *New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/09/18/us/georgia-tech-killing-student.html>
- Steele, C. M., & Aronson, J. (1995). Stereotype threat and the intellectual test performance of African Americans. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*, 797-811.

- Strange, C. C., & Banning, J. H. (2001). *Educating by design: Creating campus learning environments that work*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Sullivan, J., Anthony, Z., Tate, J., and Jenkins, J. (2018). Nationwide, police shot and killed nearly 1,000 people in 2017. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/investigations/nationwide-police-shot-and-killed-nearly-1000-people-in-2017/2018/01/04/4eed5f34-e4e9-11e7-ab50-621fe0588340_story.html?utm_term=.169581bbc8d8
- Sunshine, J., Tyler, T. R. (2003). The role of procedural justice and legitimacy in shaping public support for policing. *Law & Society Review*, 37(3), 513-548.
- Tyler, T. R. (2014). What are legitimacy and procedural justice in policing? And why are they becoming key elements of police leadership? *Legitimacy and Procedural Justice: A New Element of Police Leadership*, 6-17.
- U.S. Department of Justice, Community Oriented Policing Services. (n.d.). Procedural justice. Retrieved from <https://cops.usdoj.gov/Default.asp?Item=2866>
- U.S. Department of Justice, Community Relations Services. (2015). Importance of police-community relationships and resources for further reading. Retrieved from <https://www.justice.gov/crs/file/836486/download>
- Willson, C. P., & Wilson, S. A. (2011). Perceived roles of campus law enforcement: A Cognitive review of attitudes and beliefs of campus constituents. *Professional issues in criminal justice*, 6(1&2), 29-40.
- Wolfe, S. E., & Nix, J. (2016). The alleged “Ferguson Effect” and police willingness to engage in community partnership. *Law and Human Behavior*, 40(1), 1-10.

Yale University. (2017). *History of the YPD*. Retrieved from

<https://your.yale.edu/community/public-safety/police/history-ypd>

Appendix A

Participant Email

Dear CP A and CSAO A,

My name is Mike DiPalma and I am a second-year graduate student in the college student affairs program at Eastern Illinois University. I am currently writing a thesis on successful partnerships between Campus Police and Student Affairs and would like to phone interview the both of you for my research. I have identified your campus as having a successful partnership through your participation in a presentation concerning partnerships between Campus Police and Student Affairs. While I would like the interviews to be scheduled closely together to allow me to bring up points said by each side of the partnership if needed; they will be one on one. The interviews will take approximately one hour and will be recorded and transcribed. I will then code the transcriptions looking for themes among participants. Your names and university will be removed from the transcriptions and only I will know that information to keep confidentiality as high as possible. I would love to give you a call to go into further detail and answer any questions you may have. I look forward to hearing from you and thank you for your time.

Mike DiPalma

Appendix B

Informed Consent

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

A Qualitative Study on Partnerships between Student Affairs and Campus Police

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Mike DiPalma and Jon Coleman, from Counseling and Higher Education Department at Eastern Illinois University. Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. Please ask questions about anything you do not understand, before deciding whether or not to participate. You have been asked to participate in this study because your University has been identified as having a strong, positive partnerships between Student Affairs and Campus Police through your participation in national presentations.

The purpose of this qualitative study is to create an understanding of the actions and outcomes of strong, positive partnerships between student affairs and campus police through interviews with professionals participating in the partnerships. The results will provide best practice information for institutions to create a better learning environment for their students through similar partnerships on their campus. Currently, there is a lack of research on partnerships between student affairs and campus police found and this study will add to the research available.

If you volunteer to participate in this study, you will be asked to participate in a telephone interview that should take approximately one hour. The interview will be digitally recorded and later transcribed to review for common content. Both the recording and the transcript will be saved to a flash drive and kept in a safe with limited access to preserve confidentiality. All names of participants and universities will be removed from transcriptions to assist in confidentiality. The transcription of your interview will also be sent back to you to check for accuracy.

There are no perceived risks and there is no direct benefit to you from participation. This study will benefit universities by allowing them to understand the specifics of strong, positive partnerships from multiple perspectives. This will allow universities to either strengthen or establish a partnership between Student Affairs and Campus Police. This will also add to the lack of research currently available on the topic of partnerships between Student Affairs and Campus Police.

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission or as required by law. Confidentiality will be maintained by, as stated above, first removing all names and universities from the transcriptions. All data will also be kept on a flash drive in a safe with only the researcher having access to it, the information will not be shared with anyone else. The data will be destroyed after three years in accordance with IRB requirements.

Participation in this research study is voluntary and not a requirement or a condition for being the recipient of benefits or services from Eastern Illinois University or any other organization sponsoring the research project. If you volunteer to be in this study, you may withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind or loss of benefits or services to which you are otherwise entitled. There is no penalty if you withdraw from the study and you will not lose any benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

If you have any questions about this research, you may contact myself, Mike DiPalma at 906-281-7393, or at mtdipalma@eiu.edu. You may also contact my faculty sponsor, Dr. Jon Coleman at 217-581-7240, or at jkcoleman@eiu.edu.

If you have any questions or concerns about the treatment of human participants in this study, you may call or write:

Institutional Review Board
Eastern Illinois University
600 Lincoln Ave.
Charleston, IL 61920
Telephone: (217) 581-8576
E-mail: eiurb@www.eiu.edu

You will be given the opportunity to discuss any questions about your rights as a research subject with a member of the IRB. The IRB is an independent committee composed of members of the University community, as well as lay members of the community not connected with EIU. The IRB has reviewed and approved this study.

Appendix C

Interview Protocol Questions

1. Can you tell me about your professional employment history and how you got to your current position?
2. Can you describe your professional relationship with (campus police/student affairs) office?
3. How did this relationship develop?
 - a. Did this relationship exist prior to your taking on your position or did you assist in starting it?
 - i. Can you describe the history of the two offices with regards to this relationship?
4. What specific actions do you take to keep the relationship going?
5. What are some of the positive outcomes that have resulted from this relationship?
6. How has your office changed because of this relationship?
7. How do you feel this relationship has impacted the community of your campus?
8. During the evolution of this relationship what are some difficulties that you have experienced?
9. As a leader, how do you convey this relationship to your staff?
10. How has your staff adjusted their practices, policies, or programs due to this relationship?
11. Where do you see opportunities for improvement of the relationship in the future?
12. If another university was looking to create a similar partnership, what advice would you have for them?