

ATTITUDES OF CAMPUS STUDENTS AND CAMPUS POLICE
PERSONNEL TOWARD CAMPUS LAW ENFORCEMENT
AT UW-STOUT

By

Wesley D. Revels

A Research Paper

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the
Master of Science Degree in
Training and Development

Approved for Completion of 4 Semester Credits
198-750 Field Problem in Training and Development

Research Advisor

The Graduate College
University of Wisconsin-Stout
December, 1999

The Graduate College
University of Wisconsin-Stout
Menomonie, Wisconsin 54751

ABSTRACT

Revels (Writer)	Wesley (First)	D. (Initial)	
Attitudes of Campus Students and Campus Police Toward Campus Law Enforcement at UW-Stout			
(Title)			
Training and Development (Graduate Major)	Dr. Joseph Benkowski (Research Advisor)	December, 1999 (Month/Year)	113 (No. of Pages)
APA (Name of Style Manual Used in this Study)			

College and university campuses were traditionally held to be sanctuaries of high learning where violations of university policy were commonly judged and punished by the institution's administration. The increased outbreaks of campus violence on many campuses during the late 1960's and the crime trends throughout the United States in general forced colleges and universities to begin to reexamine the safety and security needs of their students, faculty and visitors. Technological, cultural and economic changes in the world directly influenced many of the problems confronting the administrators.

Today, college and university law enforcement agencies have many of the same concerns and problems of other law enforcement agencies. Violent crimes, disruptive behavior and property damage can and does occur in their jurisdiction (Neilsen, Pander and Powell 1994).

Colleges have discovered the need for and have created enforcement agencies made up of sworn law enforcement officers.

The problem of developing an effective and meaningful law enforcement agency is a problem not to be taken lightly. Campus law enforcement officers are responsible for the safety and protection of a community within a community. The officers must perform their duties and enforce the laws in a manner consistent with that of the Constitution. The campus law enforcement officers are responsible for the creation and maintenance of a safe environment for all that choose to utilize the university.

The purpose of this study is to compare the attitudes of students and police officers toward campus law enforcement at the University of Wisconsin-Stout. It is hoped that the information gathered in this study can assist the students, police officers and administration in identifying some of the problem and concerns expressed by the participants.

Creating a safe environment on a college campus is of the utmost importance. In most instances this is the first time that these young students will be living on their own. Their parents do not want them to be victims of crime. With this in mind the following questions are asked:

Where should the campus police focus their attention and resources?

What do students and police officers perceive as the present and future function of campus law enforcement?

What services and programs are needed to enhance the effectiveness of the police department?

Is there communication between campus law enforcement and the students?

Do the students feel comfortable going to the police officers when they need assistance and is there a feeling of security on the campus?

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
LIST OF TABLES	vii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ix
Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION	1
Problem statement	2
Purpose of the study	3
Research Hypothesis	3
Definitions	4
Chapter 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	5
Introduction	5
History of Campus Security	5
Security and Campus Life	9
Police Authority	11
Armed Security Personnel	12
Related Studies	12
Chapter 3 RESEARCH METHODS	15
Introduction	15
Instrument	15
Sampling	17
Demographics	18
Data Collection	21
Limitations	22

Chapter 4	ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS	23
	Introduction	23
	Data Analysis	24
Chapter 5	SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	49
	Introduction	49
	Statement of the problem	49
	Summary of Study Procedure	50
	Sample Population	50
	Instrumentation	50
	Data Collection	52
	Survey Response Rate	52
	Conclusions	52
	Hypothesis One	52
	Hypothesis Two	53
	Hypothesis Three	53
	Hypothesis Four	53
	Recommendations to the police	54
	Recommendations to the Administration	56
	Recommendation to the students	57
	References	58
Appendix A:	Research survey	60
Appendix B:	Student letter	66

Appendix C:	Police Officer letter	68
Appendix D:	Faculty letter	70
Appendix E:	Human research subject consent form	72
Appendix F:	Narrative Response to questions	74

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	Page
1 Gender of the survey participants	18
2 Academic status at UW-Stout	19
3 Academic credit level	19
4 Location of residence	20
5 Racial/Ethnic background	20
6 Service activities performed by University Police	24
7 Criminal activities that can be discouraged through directed patrol	25
8 Priority ranking for the crime of theft	26
9 Priority ranking for the crime of battery	26
10 Priority ranking for the crimes of credit card fraud and check forgery	27
11 Priority ranking for the crime of sexual assault	28
12 Priority ranking for the crimes of moped and bicycle theft	29
13 Priority ranking for the crime of damage to property	30
14 Priority ranking for the crimes of auto and auto part theft	31
15 Priority ranking for drug law violations	32
16 Priority ranking for alcohol law violations	33
17 Population's emphasis on responsibilities regarding crime on campus	34
18 Priority ranking for motor vehicle patrols	35
19 Priority ranking for foot patrols	35
20 Priority ranking for bike patrols	36
21 Priority ranking for crime prevention programs	36

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
22 Priority ranking for drug and alcohol education	37
23 Priority ranking for public assistance	38
24 Priority ranking for traffic enforcement	39
25 Priority ranking for drug enforcement	40
26 Priority ranking for alcohol enforcement	41
27 Number of participants who were crime victims	41
28 Number of crimes reported to the University Police	42
29 Behavior of officer that responded to the reported crime	43
30 Level of courtesy exhibited by the officer that responded to the crime	44
31 Number of survey participants who have attended crime prevention programs	45
32 Number of participants who would refer the program to others	45
33 Comparison of the University Police to other police agencies	46
34 How well do the students know the police officers	47
35 How accessible is the police department to the students	48

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to express many thanks and much appreciation to Dr. Joseph Benkowski, my research adviser, for his patience, advice and guidance.

My thanks goes to Erin Graham for her assistance in the distribution and collection of the surveys.

The cooperation of the students and security personnel of the University of Wisconsin-Stout who participated in the survey was greatly appreciated.

Thanks to Director Lisa Walters for her insights into the operation of the University Police department.

A special thanks to my wife, Terri, my son, Brandon, and my daughter, Amanda. They are truly what makes this degree worthwhile.

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Introduction

College and university campuses were traditionally held to be sanctuaries of high learning where violations of university policy were commonly judged and punished by the institution's administration. The increased outbreaks of campus violence on many campuses during the late 1960's and the crime trends throughout the United States in general forced colleges and universities to begin to reexamine the safety and security needs of their students, faculty and visitors. Technological, cultural and economic changes in the world directly influenced many of the problems confronting the administrators. The metropolitan area that many campuses were a part of experienced rapid growth.

Today, college and university law enforcement agencies have many of the same concerns and problems of other law enforcement agencies. Violent crimes, disruptive behavior and property damage can and does occur in their jurisdiction (Neilsen, Pander and Powell 1994). Colleges discovered the need for and have created enforcement agencies made up of sworn law enforcement officers. In many ways the mission of campus law enforcement is unique and complex largely due to the environment in which it must function. It is of the utmost importance that the mission of the college or university be enjoined with the creation of a safe learning environment and the ethical and responsible enforcement of university policy, state and federal laws and municipal ordinances.

In 1990 Congress passed the Crime Awareness and Campus Security Act. This legislation was passed in response to growing concern over university liability, the administration's response to crime victimization and the level of fear on campuses.

These coupled with pressure from the media resulted in the passing of the Security Act. The Crime Awareness and Campus Security Act of 1990 mandated that post-secondary schools publicly report certain crime statistics and security policies. In the past, it was subject to debate as to whether or college campuses were required to report crime statistics. Even now with the legislation in place there are concerns as to whether or not campus crime statistics are reported accurately. Campuses have historically played down or minimized crime and fear.

Problem statement

The problem of developing an effective and meaningful law enforcement agency is a problem not to be taken lightly. Campus law enforcement officers are responsible for the safety and protection of a community within a community. The officers must perform their duties and enforce the laws in a manner consistent with that of the Constitution. The campus law enforcement officers are responsible for the creation and maintenance of a safe environment for all that choose to utilize the university.

Creating a safe environment on a college campus is of the utmost importance. In most instances this is the first time that these young students will be living on their own. Their parents do not want them to be victims of crime. With this in mind the following questions are asked:

Where should the campus police focus their attention and resources?

What do students and police officers perceive as the present and future function of campus law enforcement?

What services and programs are needed to enhance the effectiveness of the police department?

Is there communication between campus law enforcement and the students?

Do the students feel comfortable going to the police officers when they need assistance?

Is there a feeling of security on the campus?

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to compare the attitudes of students and police officers toward campus law enforcement at the University of Wisconsin-Stout. It is hoped that the information gathered in this study can assist the students, police officers and administration in identifying some of the problem and concerns expressed by the participants.

Research Hypothesis

For the purpose of this research it is assumed that the survey instrument will provide a valid measurement of student and campus police officer attitudes. The major hypotheses are:

- 1) The UW-Stout police department has a positive impact on reducing the fear of victimization and also enhances the quality of life on the UW-Stout campus.
- 2) That the police officers and students agree that there is a need for the campus police.
- 3) The students and police officers hold different views as to the roles, functions and philosophy of the campus police.
- 4) There is a need for additional programs and interaction between campus police and the students to create an informed student body. The following sub-hypotheses will be examined:

The fear of crime victimization is minimal at UW-Stout.

The police officers are visible at campus activities.

The police officers are approachable and truly concerned about interaction with the student body.

If crime is observed being committed on campus, it is reported to the police department.

Police officers should patrol residence halls to protect student from vandalism and theft.

One of the main functions of the police department is to enforce parking regulations.

Definitions

Community Oriented Policing – “The movement has focused on programs that foster five elements: (1) a commitment to crime prevention, (2) public scrutiny of the police, (3) accountability of police action to the public, (4) customized police service, and (5) community organization.” (Swanson, Taylor, & Territo, 1998, p. 15, 16).

Foreseeability – “as a general rule, a landowner has no duty to protect one on his premises from criminal attack by a third person, but if such an attack is reasonably foreseeable, such a duty may arise between a landowner and his invitee.” (Nielsen, Pander, & Powell, p. 251).

CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

History of Campus Security

Campus security has changed dramatically over the past 104 years. The first recognized campus police department was established on Yale University in 1894 (Neilsen, Pander and Powell 1994).

During the late 1800's Yale was similar to many other universities in that the campus occupied a large portion of a city. As a result of this close proximity everything that occurred on campus seem to effect the city of New Haven and vice versa. There were frequent "town verses gown" confrontations that strained the relationship between Yale and the community of New Haven. This was particularly true in 1894 when rumor spread that students from the Yale Medical School were digging up corpses to use as cadavers. This lead to a violent confrontation between the New Haven police officers and students.

After one of these violent confrontations a town-gown ad hoc committee was formed in an attempt to improve the relationship and create an alliance between the two groups. The committee recommended that two New Haven police officers be assigned to the Yale campus. It was the committee's hope that interaction between the officers and students would help improve relations and build trust. When a request for volunteers was circulated there was resistance from many of the officers. Some officers reacted as if recruits were being sought to be thrown to the lions. However, two brave New Haven officers, William Weiser and James Donnelly volunteered (Neilsen et al. 1994).

As each day passed Officer's Weiser and Donnelly worked toward establishing a rapport with the students. Some Officers were concerned that Weiser and Donnelly would leave for their daily campus duties to never be seen again. Some members of the campus community did not like the idea of the officers leaving the university each evening and "telling what went on at Yale" to their superiors (Neilsen et al. 1994). In September of 1894, Yale hired the officers away from the city and established the Yale Campus Police Department. In 1914, Weiser wrote in his book, entitled Yale Memories:

As our acquaintance and friendships with the boys were constantly on the increase, it came our knowledge that our success had excited envy in many quarters. The position that we made for ourselves by hard work, constant service, civility, kindness and patience, so attracted others that we had trouble of a different nature to fight. Members of the regular force, now that students did not openly resent our presence, desired to take our place on campus, and were watching for an opportunity to turn things their way. Pressure had been brought to bear upon the commissioners to transfer Jim and myself, and appoint others in our place.

In the early 1900s, universities had little need for a security force. The universities depended on assistance from local law enforcement agencies on an as needed basis. During this period campuses were experiencing few problems.

During the 1920s and 1930s the universities utilized security personnel who performed the duties of "watchmen". The watchmen focused on the protection of the university property. They walked a regular beat at night to act as a fire watch, close and lock doors, tend the boilers and perform other maintenance tasks.

It was not until the early 1930s that the watchmen began to be held responsible for enforcing rules and regulation. They were expected to enforce curfew violations, drinking regulations and keep members of the opposite sex out of the dormitories among other things. The “campus cops” as they were often called either did not or would not report the violations. Few violators were reported to the dean for disciplinary action.

It was in the 1950s that campus administrators began placing an emphasis on establishing some kind of police presence on their campuses. Some universities hired retired police officer to head their campus security departments. The universities were able to hire these retirees at a low rate of pay. Most of those hired were police officers with little or no administrative experience. Because of security department’s small budgets or no budget, emphasis remained on the protection of property. In 1953 a group of Northeast campus security administrators formed the Northeastern College and University Security Association for the purpose of promoting professionalism and developing a network of security administrator.

In 1958 the National Association of College and University Traffic and Security Directors was formed. This organization was renamed in 1967 and again in 1980. Its current title is the International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators.

A period of unrest and cultural change occurred during the late 1960s and early 1970s. Campuses were scenes of mass demonstrations, takeovers of entire buildings, disruptive sit-ins, vandalism, arson and many similar actions. These times clearly opened the eyes of many campus administrators. The need for highly trained security personnel was more evident than ever before. Social unrest was the catalyst that moved campus security toward professionalism. A need for change quickly became a reality. Campus security was ill prepared and in most instances lacked the training and experience to control or resolve these situations.

The lack of training and experience on the part of the security personnel forced the schools to rely on local and state law enforcement agencies for help. Local law enforcement seemed insensitive to campus issues. They attempted to resolve the incidents by using force and making arrests. Often times this approach only provoked more violence. This rebellion and disobedience to order culminated in 1970 when the National Guard shot several students at Kent State University in Ohio.

Through a cloud of unrest and violence, university administrators realized the need for a professional and well-educated security force trained specifically to address the concerns and issues of their university. The bitter experiences of the past told them that they must work toward controlling situations on campus with their own personnel. Colleges began to place an emphasis on a low keyed, highly professional approach, using trained officers who were either enrolled in a degree program or had already received a degree. With the upgrading of security personnel a professional attitude emerged, salaries became more competitive and security personnel began receiving the same benefit packages as local police officers.

Today college and university campuses are comparatively calm. Crimes perpetrated against single victims are more prevalent than the large scale riots of the past. Crimes of theft, assault, rape, and armed robbery are on the upswing. Terrorism in the United States is a growing concern. University campuses are not immune from terrorist acts. Universities and colleges are extremely open and highly accessible, as they should be. By the same token the nature of some research activities at various campuses could make them prime targets.

Security and Campus Life

Campuses must focus their efforts toward prevention and service if they wish to characterize to department as successful. Often times because of their enforcement activities, the campus police or security department feels there is a need for them to be a separate entity within a University system. This separation from the life, activities and mission of the educational institution may result in a lack of confidence in and respect for the department and it's personnel. It is important that the faculty, students, staff and police fully understand the mission of their individual departments and the mission of the university. It makes good sense to keep the campus community informed about campus law enforcement activities. An informed community is one that has the information needed to make accurate judgments regarding law enforcement activities.

The best public relations conduit is still the individual officer. Each officer can make or break the department's image through contacts with people, response, performance, general appearance, demeanor and involvement in campus activities. Campus law enforcement agencies should be viewed as part of the educational process. The mission therefore should be directed toward educating the campus community. Channels of communication should remain open and personnel should be accessible.

As we were constantly on the lookout for opportunities to show the students our good will, we began to be tolerated. Often late at night, and under peculiar and trying circumstances, we were held up and told to explain our mission (Weiser 1914).

Constant effort should be expended to gain and maintain the respect and confidence of the campus community. The fact that college students are often apathetic toward campus law enforcement makes this an area that needs attention daily. The police department can be “sold” to the community through personal appearances, both formal and informal, by the Director of Security and other members of the department. Security should be involved in the orientation process. Student should be made aware of the services offered by the department and know the security personnel by sight.

Education on crime prevention should be an important part of every campus police department. Students can be given information on precautionary measures that may prevent them from becoming a crime victim. In a traditional sense one of law enforcement’s major weaknesses is that of being reactive. Law enforcement spends too much of it’s resources on answering calls for service and not enough on providing information to the public about their own security responsibilities and crime prevention measures. Education opportunities can enhance the department’s image. Date rape is an example of an educational opportunity. Many campus security departments have designed programs to educate the student body about date rape and interpersonal violence. A prevention program such as this could be made part of the freshman orientation (Neilsen 1994).

Several court decisions have addressed issues concerning the University’s liability to student victims of campus crime and have used the doctrine of foreseeability as the standard for establishing liability. Congress responded by passing the Crime Awareness and Campus Security Act of 1990, which mandates post-secondary schools publicly report certain crime statistics and security policies. Several state legislatures have also enacted reporting legislation.

Administrators have begun to implement a variety of educational crime prevention programs, as well as security procedures, to reduce crime, risk, and fear (Fisher, p85 1994)

Police Authority

The question of whether or not a university should employ personnel with police authority is complex. Do the officers have the training necessary to assume the responsibility of police authority? What is the current quality and level of supervision? Who will develop the policies and procedures regulating the use of the police authority? Many aspects of the campus community must be considered before a decision is made. An examination of the campus crime statistics will provide information on the types of crimes being committed and the problems that have occurred in the past. The current personnel should be evaluated to determine if they possess good judgment regarding the use of the police powers.

Some campus administrators, faculty, and students believe that having personnel with police authority on University campuses is not necessary. In their opinion, the ability to make a citizen's arrest is all that is needed on a University campus. The ability to make a citizen's arrest gives the security personnel no more authority than that of a private citizen. Inappropriate use of a citizen's arrest can create liability on the part of the University. Two of the most commonly litigated actions against police agencies are false arrest and false imprisonment.

Relying on the ability to make a citizen's arrest has its significant shortcoming. In many jurisdictions the sworn police officer can also arrest, upon probable cause, for a misdemeanor not committed in his or her presence. Usually, the campus officer who has no police power other than that of a private citizen can only make an arrest for misdemeanors that are committed in his or her presence.

Under common law a campus police office having only citizen arrest powers can arrest for a felony not committed in his or her presence upon reasonable cause, but the felony must have been committed (Neilsen et al. 1994). The possibility of false arrest or false imprisonment is high. This situation brings up the question about the arrest of known felons by under trained, non-sworn officers. Is this a safe responsible way to do business?

Employing security officers with police authority is not without it's drawbacks. The law is sometimes confusing and rigid. The officers must be well versed in the powers of arrest and areas such as search and seizure.

Armed Security Personnel

Arming security personnel is a sensitive issue and the question of whether or not to arm security personnel is one that warrants careful consideration. To answer this question many of the same questions that were asked during the implementation of police authority will need to be answered. The consequences of this issue places a large burden on the head of the department. Some Universities oppose security officer carrying weapons, saying that firearms have no place in an educational atmosphere. Many universities believe that they can maintain a separate society. In recent years there has been less resistance to arming security personnel. This is primarily due to the increase in the crime rate. As one student stated, "How can we expect our officers to protect us when they can't even protect themselves?" (Neilsen 1994)

Related Studies

In August of 1972, Ronald Gaber a graduate student at the University of Wisconsin-LaCrosse presented a paper titled Attitudes of Residence Hall Students and Security Toward Campus Security. The purpose of this study was to compare the attitudes of students and security personnel toward the campus security force at the University of Wisconsin-LaCrosse.

Gaber conducted a random sampling of 10 percent (239) of residential hall students at the University of Wisconsin-LaCrosse. Forty-five percent of the sampling were females and 55 percent were male. The survey also included 14 (100 percent) members of the security department.

In documenting the results of this study, Gaber discusses five areas: Student Involvement, Referral Procedures, Arrest Power and Firearms, Patrolling of Residence Halls, and Control of Group Behavior.

Gaber found that the majority students surveyed wanted to play a part in the campus security program, but the security personnel did not want the student involvement. Gaber writes that the majority of students and security personnel agree as to the procedure for reporting violations of housing rules, and State and Federal law violations. They agree that housing violations should be reported to the Office of Housing and violations of State and Federal law to the city police. The survey results did not show a clear distinction between the opinions of the security personnel and students related to the power of arrest. Fifty-three percent of the students and 54 percent of the security personnel agreed that security personnel should not arrest students. Students indicated that security should patrol the residence halls to protect students from vandalism and theft. The students did not want security patrolling the halls looking for violations of Housing rules or State and Federal laws. The security personnel agreed with the students about vandalism and theft but also felt that they should be looking for violations of laws also. Students expressed their displeasure with Security's involvement in party raids, snowball fights, and mud slides. Fifty-nine percent of the students felt that security should not be involved in these activities. Eighty-four percent of the security personnel felt they should be involved. The students did agree that the security personnel should control riots and demonstrations. (Gaber 1972)

During the summer of 1992, John J. Sloan, Ph.D., Department of Criminal Justice, University of Alabama at Birmingham, Bonnie S. Fisher, Ph.D., Department of Political Science, University of Cincinnati and Deborah L. Wilkins, B.S., Department of Criminal Justice, University of Alabama at Birmingham undertook a two-year study of crime and crime related issues at the University of Alabama-Birmingham. The research involved administering a survey to a randomly selected panel of 395 faculty, staff, and students in August of 1992 (Time 1) and again in August/September of 1993 (Time 2). The purpose of the study was to collect data on the panel members' general attitudes about crime and security on the UAB campus, victimization experiences on campus, perceptions on how big a problem crime is on the UAB campus, attitudes toward the UAB Police, crime prevention activities and awareness of changes occurring between Time 1 and Time 2 in security policies and physical design features on campus.

The results of this study show that a majority of the panel members felt the UAB campus was safer than the surrounding community, they also believed the campus had a serious crime problem, expressed fear of walking alone on campus at night, perceived a high likelihood of being a crime victim while on campus, believed not enough information was available concerning crime on the UAB campus, but felt that crime on campus could be reduced through a more concerted effort by faculty, staff, and students. The results indicate members of the UAB community appear to have accepted an image of the campus as a "dangerous" place, especially at night.

CHAPTER 3

Research Methods

Introduction

This chapter describes the instrument, population sampling, demographics, data collection and study limitations. The purpose of this study is to compare the attitudes of University of Wisconsin-Stout students and police officers toward campus law enforcement.

Instrument

In order to define the differences and similarities between the attitudes of the two populations it was decided that a questionnaire would be needed. Located was a survey that was originally administered on the University of South Florida campus by the campus police department. The wording of the survey was modified to meet the needs of this study. (Appendix A).

Question 1 of the instrument consisted of a list of eleven service activities performed by the University Police and asked the population to rank the activities in one of four levels of importance. The choices were very important, somewhat important, somewhat unimportant and not important.

Question 2 explains that many criminal activities can be discouraged through directed patrol activities. This question asked the participants to assign a level of priority to a list of crimes. The three levels of priority choices are high, moderate and low.

Question 3 consisted of a list of crime and asked that a level of priority be assigned to each crime indicating where the University Police should concentrate their investigative efforts. The participants were asked to rank the crimes from 1 - 9, 1 being the highest priority and 9 being the lowest.

Question 4 asked the participants to indicate what they felt their responsibilities were in relationship to crime on campus. The participants could choose from assisting victims needing help, reporting suspicious activity, reporting crime, assisting police officers needing help and participating in crime prevention programs. The participants had the choice of marking as many or as few of the areas as they wanted.

Question 5 consisted of a list of police services and asked that a level of priority be assigned to each service indicating where the University Police should concentrate their efforts. The participants were asked to rank the services from 1 - 9, 1 being the highest priority and 9 being the lowest.

Question 6 is set up to determine how many of the participants have been victims of crime in the previous 12 months on the campus. If a participant answered yes, they were instructed to move through the question and answer questions related to crime reporting, officer behavior, officer courtesy and what the officer could have done to increase the victims satisfaction with the handling of the complaint.

Question 7 asked the participants whether or not they had attended a crime prevention program sponsored by the University Police and if so, describe the topic. This question also asked the participant if they would recommend the program to some else.

Question 8 asked the participants to rate the overall service of the University Police to that of other police agencies with which they are familiar. The participants could choose from better, same, worse or cannot evaluate.

Question 9 asked the participants how well they know any of the University police officers. The participants could choose from very well, on a first name basis, moderately well, acquaintance only and do not know any.

Question 10 asked the participants to indicate their feeling as to the accessibility of the University police. The participants could choose from very accessible, accessible, remote, very remote and don't know.

Questions 11 - 13 asked the participants to make remarks regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the University Police Department and what the police could do to improve public safety on the campus.

Page 6 of the instrument asked the participant for demographic analysis information consisting of gender, age, academic status (full-time or part-time), number of credits completed, location of residence (on or off campus), and racial/ethnic background. Appendix E the Human Research Subjects Consent Form was attached to the instrument to allow it to be reviewed by the participants.

Sampling

A stratified sampling of students was used for the study. The study was conducted during the fall semester of the 1999 - 2000 academic year at the University of Wisconsin-Stout. The target population was separated into four academic credit levels. Those students with 0 - 30 credits, 31- 70 credits, 71 - 100 credits and 101 - 130 credits. The target population consisted of 5 percent of the students registered at UW -Stout from each of the credit levels described. A meeting was held with Jeff Kerslinger at the registrar's office to obtain the enrollment data needed to conduct the survey. Enrollment figures for the Fall 1999 academic term were not yet available. Enrollment data for the Fall term of academic year 1998 is being used for this study. During the Fall term of 1998 there were 2119 Freshman, 1443 Sophomores, 1288 juniors, and 1914 Seniors enrolled at UW-Stout for a total of 6774 students.

Surveys were administered to 5 percent of each of the four credit levels. 105 surveys to students with 0 - 30 credits, 85 surveys to students with 31 - 70 credits, 71 surveys to students with 71 - 100 credits, and 95 surveys to students with 101 - 130 credits. The target population also includes 10 sworn members of the campus police department.

Demographics

Tables 1 - 5 below describe the demographics of the survey population. Included is gender, age, academic status (full-time or part-time), number of credits completed, location of residence (on or off campus), and racial/ethnic background.

Table 1 describes the gender of the survey participants.

Table 1
Survey gender

Indicates the participants gender.

	M	F
Freshmen	49	29
Sophomore	39	45
Junior	44	27
Senior	38	32
Police Officer	5	1

Note response scale m=male f=female

Note: Not all participants answered all of the questions.

Totals: males = 175 females = 134

Table 2 describes the survey participant's status at UW-Stout.

Table 2
Academic status

Indicates the participant's academic status.

	FT	PT
Freshmen	77	0
Sophomore	80	1
Junior	69	2
Senior	66	3
Police Officer	0	1

Note response scale ft=full-time pt=part-time

Note: Not all participants answered all of the questions

Totals: full-time students = 292 part-time students = 7

Table 3 is the number of credits completed by the survey participants.

Table 3
Academic credit level

Indicates the number of academic credits

	1	2	3	4
Freshmen	78	0	0	0
Sophomore	0	85	0	0
Junior	0	0	71	0
Senior	0	0	0	70
Police Officer	0	1	1	1

Note response scale 1=0 - 30 2=31 - 70 3=71 - 100 4=101 - 130

Note: Not all of the participants completed all of the questions.

A good cross section of students were surveyed.

Table 4 is an indication of where the survey participant's reside.

Table 4
Location of residence

Indicates whether the survey participants live on campus or off campus.

	Y	N
Freshmen	64	14
Sophomore	32	52
Junior	8	63
Senior	8	62
Police Officer	0	6

Note response scale y=on campus n=off campus

Note: Not all participants answered all of the questions

Totals: on campus = 112 off campus = 191

Table 5 describes the racial/ethnic background of the survey participants.

Table 5
Racial/Ethnic background

Indicates the survey participant's racial/ethnic background.

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Freshmen	0	1	70	0	1	4
Sophomore	1	0	73	0	2	8
Junior	0	0	65	0	2	3
Senior	0	0	62	0	2	5
Police Officer	0	0	6	0	0	0

Note response scale 1=african american 2=hispanic 3=white 4=native american
5=other, specify 6=i choose not to answer

Note: Not all participants answered all of the questions

Totals: African Americans (1) Hispanics (1) White (276) Native Americans (0) Other (7)
Choose not to answer (20)

Data Collection

With the assistance of a graduate student, the surveys were administered to those classes that had the highest number of students that matched the target population and administered on site to ensure a high rate of return. A letter was attached to each survey for review by each participant (Appendix B). The letter explained the purpose and importance of the study. Students were asked to complete the survey and then return it.

The campus police officers received their surveys at the police department and were asked to return them in the envelopes that were provided. There was a slight difference in the cover letter that was provided to the students and police officers. The difference was the group title that the survey was directed designation. Director of Police and Parking Services, Lisa Walter indicated that she would attach a memorandum to the survey directing the police officers attention to the survey and requesting their participation.

105 surveys were given to students with 0 - 30 credits, 85 surveys were given to students with 31 - 70 credits, 71 surveys were given to students with 71 - 100 credits, and 95 surveys were given to students with 101 - 130 credits. 10 surveys were given to the sworn officers of the University Police Department.

78 surveys were returned from students with 0 - 30 credits, 85 surveys were returned from students with 31 - 70 credits, 71 surveys were returned from students with 71 - 100 credits and 70 surveys were returned from students with 101 - 130 credits. 6 surveys were returned from the University Police Department.

The data was then transferred from the surveys to a spreadsheet. A total of 35 Tables were created for the purpose of analyzing the data. The data from Questions 1 and 2 was transferred

from the spreadsheet to the software Minitab for the purpose of calculating Mean and Standard Deviation. These calculations are included in Tables 6 and 7. The data included in Tables 1 – 5 and 8 – 35 was retrieved from the spreadsheet manually.

Limitations

There are several limitations to this study:

- (1) The participants in this study are just a section of the students not the total population.
- (2) A comparison between on campus and off campus students is not a part of this study.
- (3) The race of the majority of the survey population is white. Only a small portion are minorities.

CHAPTER 4

Analysis of Findings

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to compare the attitudes of students and police officers toward campus law enforcement at the University of Wisconsin-Stout. A series of tables have been developed from the responses to the survey questions for the purpose of analyzing the data.

Data Analysis

Table 6 is a list of service activities performed by University Police.

Table 6
Service activities

Indicates how the participants felt about each of these activities.

	Freshmen			Sophomore			Junior		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Take possession of found property	78	3.03	0.79	85	3.04	0.90	71	3.29	0.74
Assist people locked out of cars	78	3.17	0.80	85	3.38	0.69	71	3.39	0.78
Investigate vehicle accidents	78	3.32	0.86	85	3.47	0.68	71	3.38	0.64
Deliver emergency messages	78	3.34	0.81	85	3.51	0.72	71	3.49	0.75
Conduct vehicle safety inspections	78	2.16	0.93	85	2.34	0.92	71	2.16	0.89
Office/residence hall security checks	78	2.55	0.98	85	2.89	0.89	71	2.87	0.92
Check welfare of residents	78	2.69	0.84	85	2.69	0.89	71	2.84	0.92
Assist people locked out of dorms/offices	78	2.79	0.93	85	2.75	0.86	71	2.78	0.98
Teach crime prevention	78	2.47	0.87	85	2.61	0.87	71	2.56	0.87
Assist stranded motorists	78	3.08	0.82	85	3.41	0.64	71	3.53	0.62
Enforce parking regulations	78	2.11	0.99	85	2.35	0.90	71	2.09	0.92

	Senior			Police Officer		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Take possession of found property	70	3.28	0.78	6	2.66	1.03
Assist people locked out of cars	70	3.45	0.79	6	2.50	0.83
Investigate vehicle accidents	70	3.37	0.81	6	3.16	0.40
Deliver emergency messages	70	3.42	0.82	6	3.66	0.51
Conduct vehicle safety inspections	70	2.14	0.88	6	1.83	0.98
Office/residence hall security checks	70	2.95	0.89	6	2.83	1.16
Check welfare of residents	70	2.82	0.92	6	3.66	0.51
Assist people locked out of dorms/offices	70	2.88	0.97	6	2.16	0.75
Teach crime prevention	70	2.78	0.94	6	3.50	0.83
Assist stranded motorists	70	3.21	0.89	6	3.33	0.81
Enforce parking regulations	70	2.05	0.81	6	2.66	0.81

Note response scale 1=not important 2=somewhat unimportant 3=somewhat important 4=very important

Table 6 indicates that the calculations of mean and standard deviation for the service activities are closely grouped.

Table 7 is a list of criminal activities that can be discouraged through directed patrol.

Table 7
Criminal activities

Indicates what level of priority police should give to each activity.

	Freshmen			Sophomore			Junior		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Burglaries	78	2.82	0.47	85	2.82	0.38	71	2.84	0.36
Property damage	78	2.64	0.50	85	2.63	0.48	71	2.70	0.45
Auto theft	78	2.82	0.48	85	2.91	0.27	71	2.88	0.31
Traffic law enforcement	78	1.85	0.68	85	1.88	0.56	71	1.81	0.54
*Robberies	78	2.87	0.43	85	2.91	0.35	71	2.87	0.44
Office/Residence theft	78	2.52	0.52	85	2.69	0.48	71	2.59	0.55
Sexual assaults	78	2.89	0.38	85	2.95	0.21	71	2.97	0.16
Theft of car parts	78	2.57	0.57	85	2.63	0.55	71	2.55	0.52
Loud parties	78	1.60	0.72	85	1.51	0.59	71	1.47	0.58
Moped/Bicycle theft	78	2.39	0.69	85	2.45	0.62	71	2.22	0.70
Drug enforcement	78	2.30	0.72	85	2.26	0.76	71	2.25	0.71
Alcohol enforcement	78	1.91	0.84	85	1.89	0.76	71	1.77	0.72
Parking enforcement	78	1.60	0.77	85	1.69	0.72	71	1.39	0.54

	Senior			Police Officer		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Burglaries	70	2.88	0.32	6	2.83	0.40
Property damage	70	2.58	0.49	6	3.00	0.00
Auto theft	70	2.85	0.35	6	3.00	0.00
Traffic law enforcement	70	1.74	0.58	6	2.16	0.40
*Robberies	70	2.86	0.38	6	2.83	0.40
Office/Residence theft	70	2.55	0.55	6	2.66	0.51
Sexual assaults	70	2.91	0.40	6	3.00	0.00
Theft of car parts	70	2.52	0.60	6	3.00	0.00
Loud parties	70	1.54	0.65	6	2.33	0.51
Moped/Bicycle theft	70	2.40	0.62	6	2.50	0.54
Drug enforcement	70	2.25	0.75	6	2.83	0.40
Alcohol enforcement	70	1.87	0.72	6	2.66	0.51
Parking enforcement	70	1.50	0.63	6	2.00	0.89

Note response scale 1=low 2=moderate 3=high

*Robbery is a theft involving the use of force or the threat of force by the offender.

Table 7 indicates that the calculations of mean and standard deviation for the service activities are closely grouped. The students ranked traffic enforcement significantly lower than did the police officers.

Table 8 describes the priority ranking for the crime of theft completed by the survey population indicating where the police should concentrate their investigative efforts.

Table 8
Theft

Indicates what level of priority the survey population assigned to the crime.

	Priority Ranking								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Freshmen	5	10	18	13	7	1	3	2	1
Sophomore	4	9	27	19	2	5	4	3	0
Junior	6	11	23	10	10	3	4	0	0
Senior	6	6	26	11	12	3	4	1	0
Police Officer	1	0	0	1	1	1	2	0	1

Note response scale 1=highest priority 9=lowest priority

Table 8 shows the students ranking the crime of theft in the mid to high range of the scale. A significant number of students from all of the groups ranked theft as the number 3 priority.

Table 9 describes the priority ranking for the crime of battery completed by the survey population indicating where the police should concentrate their investigative efforts.

Table 9
Battery

Indicates what level of priority the survey population assigned to the crime.

	Priority Ranking								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Freshmen	2	28	6	9	4	2	3	1	1
Sophomore	8	35	9	9	7	3	1	2	3
Junior	1	31	12	3	5	2	1	6	2
Senior	8	29	5	9	4	3	2	4	1
Police Officer	1	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0

Note response scale 1=highest priority 9=lowest priority

Table 9 shows a significant number of students from all groups ranking the crime of battery as the number 2 priority. The majority of all participants ranked battery in the higher range of the scale. This crime has a significant impact on the person.

Table 10 describes the priority ranking for the crimes of credit card fraud and check forgery completed by the survey population indicating where the police should concentrate their investigative efforts.

Table 10
Credit card fraud and check forgery

Indicates what level of priority the survey population assigned to the crime.

	Priority Ranking								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Freshmen	1	5	4	7	6	10	7	9	11
Sophomore	4	4	8	9	10	8	6	11	14
Junior	1	1	4	2	8	13	13	10	10
Senior	1	1	11	6	7	10	8	7	15
Police Officer	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	1	0

Note response scale 1=highest priority 9=lowest priority

Table 10 indicates the majority of all participants ranked credit card fraud and check forgery in the lower range of the scale.

Table 11 describes the priority ranking for the crime of sexual assault completed by the survey population indicating where the police should concentrate their investigative efforts.

Table 11
Sexual assault

Indicates what level of priority the survey population assigned to the crime.

	Priority Ranking								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Freshmen	45	4	4	4	1	1	1	0	0
Sophomore	46	8	7	2	1	0	1	2	7
Junior	48	7	1	3	0	0	0	0	5
Senior	42	11	3	3	0	1	2	1	3
Police Officer	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Note response scale 1=highest priority 9=lowest priority

Table 11 indicates that the vast majority of participants ranked sexual assaults as the number 1 priority. This crime has a significant impact on the victim.

Table 12 describes of the priority ranking for the crimes of moped and bicycle theft completed by the survey population indicating where the police should concentrate their investigative efforts.

Table 12
Moped/Bicycle theft

Indicates what level of priority the survey population assigned to the crime.

	Priority Ranking								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Freshmen	0	3	0	6	10	12	12	8	9
Sophomore	1	5	3	6	10	15	16	9	8
Junior	2	1	3	6	6	14	16	7	8
Senior	1	2	0	9	13	14	13	9	5
Police Officer	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	1

Note response scale 1=highest priority 9=lowest priority

Table 12 indicates that the majority participants ranked moped and bicycle theft in the lower range of the priority scale.

Table 13 describes of the priority ranking for the crime of damage to property completed by the survey population indicating where the police should concentrate their investigative efforts.

Table 13
Damage to property

Indicates what level of priority the survey population assigned to the crime.

	Priority Ranking								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Freshmen	1	1	11	8	16	11	5	6	1
Sophomore	1	2	5	7	20	17	12	6	4
Junior	1	3	2	21	17	7	6	6	0
Senior	1	5	9	11	13	14	10	2	1
Police Officer	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	2

Note response scale 1=highest priority 9=lowest priority

Table 13 indicates that the majority participants ranked damage to property in the mid range of the priority scale. The table shows that material possessions are important to the participants but not as important as being victims of a crime such as sexual assault or battery.

Table 14 describes the priority ranking for the crimes of auto and auto part theft completed by the survey population indicating where the police should concentrate their investigative efforts.

Table 14
Auto and auto part theft

Indicates what level of priority the survey population assigned to the crime.

	Priority Ranking								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Freshmen	1	4	9	9	9	10	11	5	2
Sophomore	3	7	9	11	14	13	11	5	1
Junior	2	5	9	10	14	15	5	3	0
Senior	4	8	6	11	11	11	8	6	1
Police Officer	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	1	1

Note response scale 1=highest priority 9=lowest priority

Table 14 indicates that the majority participants ranked auto and auto part theft in the mid range of the priority scale. The table shows that material possessions are important to the participants but not as important as being victims of a crime such as sexual assault or battery.

Table 15 describes the priority ranking for drug law violations completed by the survey population indicating where the police should concentrate their investigative efforts.

Table 15
Drug law violation

Indicates what level of priority the survey population assigned to the crime.

	Priority Ranking								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Freshmen	2	3	5	3	4	8	11	22	1
Sophomore	2	3	8	7	4	7	17	22	4
Junior	2	4	7	4	4	7	14	20	1
Senior	1	3	6	3	5	6	11	23	8
Police Officer	0	1	3	0	2	0	0	0	0

Note response scale 1=highest priority 9=lowest priority

Table 15 indicates that the majority of student participants ranked drug law violations in the lower range of the priority scale. The police officers ranked drug law violations in the mid to higher range of the priority scale. A rationale for this might be that the students view using drugs especially marijuana as a personal decision and not an area where the government should intervene. The police officers view the use of illegal drugs as a definite violation of the law and a problem that leads to many other crimes being committed.

Table 16 describes the priority ranking for alcohol law violations completed by the survey population indicating where the police should concentrate their investigative efforts.

Table 16
Alcohol law violation

Indicates what level of priority the survey population assigned to the crime.

	Priority Ranking								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Freshmen	3	2	1	2	2	5	7	7	29
Sophomore	5	2	1	2	6	6	6	14	32
Junior	2	0	2	4	2	2	4	11	36
Senior	2	0	3	2	2	4	9	13	31
Police Officer	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	1	1

Note response scale 1=highest priority 9=lowest priority

Table 16 indicates that the majority of student participants ranked alcohol law violations in the lower range of the priority scale.

Table 17 indicates the survey population's emphasis on responsibilities regarding crime on campus.

Table 17
Dealing with crime on campus

Indicates the areas where the participants felt a responsibility.

	N	1	2	3	4	5
Freshmen	78	67	44	66	41	21
Sophomore	85	81	54	69	41	17
Junior	71	66	48	63	37	18
Senior	70	63	54	62	37	18
Police Officer	6	6	6	6	4	5

Note response scale 1=assist victims needing help 2=report suspicious activities 3=reporting crime
4=assisting police officers needing help 5=participating in crime prevention programs

n=number of participants (participants could check more than one response)

Table 17 indicates that the majority of participants agree that their primary responsibilities regarding crime on campus lay in the areas numbered 1, 2, and 3.

Table 18 is a description of the priority ranking for motor vehicle patrols completed by the survey population.

Table 18
Motor vehicle patrols

Indicates what level of priority the survey population assigned to the service.

	Priority Ranking								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Freshmen	15	11	8	8	4	2	7	2	2
Sophomore	27	12	8	9	5	1	5	2	2
Junior	22	8	6	5	3	6	6	3	5
Senior	20	9	8	8	4	1	5	1	3
Police Officer	1	1	2	1	0	1	0	0	0

Note response scale 1=highest priority 9=lowest priority

Table 18 indicates that the majority of participants agree that motor vehicle patrols by the University Police should be a high priority.

Table 19 is a description of the priority ranking for foot patrols completed by the survey population.

Table 19
Foot patrols

Indicates what level of priority the survey population assigned to the service.

	Priority Ranking								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Freshmen	1	9	6	6	5	10	9	9	4
Sophomore	4	8	8	5	12	11	8	6	9
Junior	2	9	6	9	12	4	6	9	7
Senior	5	11	6	8	7	9	4	5	11
Police Officer	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	2	0

Note response scale 1=highest priority 9=lowest priority

Table 19 indicates a wide range of ranking for foot patrol. No specific group ranked this high or low.

Table 20 is a description of the priority ranking for bike patrols completed by the survey population.

Table 20
Bike patrols

Indicates what level of priority the survey population assigned to the service.

	Priority Ranking								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Freshmen	5	5	11	2	7	9	9	7	4
Sophomore	1	10	10	6	8	12	11	9	4
Junior	4	7	10	9	6	10	6	9	3
Senior	0	3	13	6	13	3	7	16	5
Police Officer	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	2

Note response scale 1=highest priority 9=lowest priority

Table 20 indicates a wide range of ranking for bike patrol. No specific group ranked this high or low.

Table 21 is a description of the priority ranking for crime prevention programs completed by the survey population.

Table 21
Crime prevention programs

Indicates what level of priority the survey population assigned to the service.

	Priority Ranking								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Freshmen	9	7	7	11	6	5	7	3	4
Sophomore	11	5	3	9	9	7	1	6	6
Junior	13	9	6	12	5	10	2	3	4
Senior	9	7	9	12	6	8	3	4	8
Police Officer	2	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0

Note response scale 1=highest priority 9=lowest priority

Table 21 indicates a wide range of ranking for crime prevention programs. No specific group ranked this high or low.

Table 22 is a description of the priority ranking for drug and alcohol education completed by the survey population.

Table 22
Drug and alcohol education

Indicates what level of priority the survey population assigned to the service.

	Priority Ranking								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Freshmen	4	1	6	8	12	9	2	12	5
Sophomore	5	5	9	8	8	6	13	8	9
Junior	0	4	8	7	8	7	13	9	8
Senior	3	6	1	7	6	10	13	10	5
Police Officer	1	2	6	0	1	0	0	0	0

Note response scale 1=highest priority 9=lowest priority

Table 22 indicates that the highest number of participants ranked drug and alcohol education at the lower end of the priority scale.

Table 23 is a description of the priority ranking for public assistance completed by the survey population.

Table 23

*Public assistance

Indicates what level of priority the survey population assigned to the service.

	Priority Ranking								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Freshmen	14	8	11	5	4	7	4	2	4
Sophomore	10	7	14	10	5	8	7	9	1
Junior	12	7	14	2	10	7	5	6	1
Senior	13	13	6	7	9	8	4	2	4
Police Officer	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	1	0

Note response scale 1=highest priority 9=lowest priority

*motorist assists, door unlocks

Table 23 indicates that the highest number of participants ranked public assistance at the higher end of the priority scale.

Table 24 is a description of the priority ranking for traffic enforcement completed by the survey population.

Table 24
Traffic enforcement

Indicates what level of priority the survey population assigned to the service.

	Priority Ranking								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Freshmen	7	7	3	8	8	3	6	17	0
Sophomore	6	10	4	5	10	8	6	20	2
Junior	8	8	3	9	6	7	9	11	3
Senior	9	6	6	2	8	10	9	12	4
Police Officer	1	1	0	2	0	1	1	0	0

Note response scale 1=highest priority 9=lowest priority

Table 24 indicates that the highest number of participants ranked traffic enforcement at the mid to lower range of the priority scale. A rationale for this might be that the students see traffic enforcement as being directly related to their personal finances.

Table 25 is a description of the priority ranking for drug enforcement completed by the survey population.

Table 25
Drug enforcement

Indicates what level of priority the survey population assigned to the service.

	Priority Ranking								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Freshmen	7	7	3	8	8	3	6	17	0
Sophomore	6	10	4	5	10	8	6	20	2
Junior	8	8	3	9	6	7	9	11	3
Senior	9	6	6	2	8	10	9	12	4
Police Officer	1	1	0	2	0	1	1	0	0

Note response scale 1=highest priority 9=lowest priority

Table 25 indicates a wide range of ranking for drug enforcement. No specific group ranked this high or low. A rationale for this might be that the students view using drugs especially marijuana as a personal decision and not an area where the government should intervene. Table 15 indicated that the majority of participants felt that drug law violations should be a lower investigative priority. In this table the rankings are spread out with more toward the higher range of the priority scale.

Table 26 is a description of the priority ranking for alcohol enforcement completed by the survey population.

Table 26
Alcohol enforcement

Indicates what level of priority the survey population assigned to the service.

	Priority Ranking								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Freshmen	4	3	5	2	6	7	1	6	25
Sophomore	3	2	8	3	4	7	7	7	30
Junior	2	5	5	1	5	7	5	11	23
Senior	2	7	3	8	4	3	10	12	17
Police Officer	0	1	0	0	3	1	1	0	0

Note response scale 1=highest priority 9=lowest priority

Table 26 indicates that a high number of students ranked alcohol enforcement as a low priority. 5 of the 6 police officers that participated in the survey ranked alcohol enforcement as a mid to lower range priority.

Table 27 is the number of participants who were victims of crimes in the last 12 months.

Table 27
Crime victims

Indicates the number of crime victims in the survey population.

	Yes	No
Freshmen	5	73
Sophomore	9	76
Junior	11	59
Senior	4	66
Police Officer	0	6

Note: Some of the participants did not answer all of the questions

Table 27 shows the largest number of crime victims were Sophomores or Juniors.

Table 28 is the number of crimes that were reported to the University Police by the survey participants who were victims of crimes in the last 12 months.

Table 28
Crimes reported

Indicates the number of crimes reported to the University Police.

	Yes	No
Freshmen	3	2
Sophomore	1	8
Junior	7	3
Senior	1	3
Police Officer	N/A	N/A

Note: All of the participants were not required to complete all sections. The initial question for this section was, "Were you the victim of a crime on the UW-Stout campus in the last 12 months?"

Note: None of the police officers were crime victims.

Table 28 shows that Juniors reported the largest number of crimes to the University Police.

Table 29 describes the behavior of the officer that responded to the reported crime.

Table 29
Officer behavior

Indicates the behavior of the officer.

	1	2	3	4
Freshmen	1	3	0	0
Sophomore	1	0	1	1
Junior	0	4	2	0
Senior	0	2	1	0
Police Officer	N/A			

Note response scale 1=very helpful 2=somewhat helpful 3=not helpful 4=don't recall

Note: All of the participants were not required to complete all sections. The initial question for this section was, "Were you the victim of crime on the UW-Stout campus in the last 12 months?"

Note: None of the police officers were crime victims.

Table 30 describes the level of courtesy exhibited by the officer who responded the crime report.

Table 30
Courtesy

Indicates the courtesy level exhibited.

	1	2	3	4
Freshmen	2	1	1	0
Sophomore	1	0	0	2
Junior	0	4	2	0
Senior	1	1	0	0
Police Officer	N/A			

Note response scale 1=very courteous 2=somewhat courteous 3=not courteous
4=don't recall

Note: All of the participants were not required to complete all sections. The initial question for this section was, "Were you the victim of a crime on the UW-Stout campus in the last 12 months?"

Note: None of the police officers were crime victims.

Table 31 is the number of survey participants who have attended crime prevention programs sponsored by the University Police.

Table 31
Crime prevention programs

Indicates the number of crime prevention programs attended.

	Yes	No
Freshmen	0	73
Sophomore	6	79
Junior	8	63
Senior	5	65
Police Officer	3	3

Note: All of the participants did not answer all of the questions.

Table 31 indicates that a small number of the participants have attended a crime prevention program.

Table 32 is the number of participants who attended crime prevention programs that would recommend the program to someone else.

Table 32
Crime prevention program referrals

Indicates the number participants that would refer the program.

	Yes	No
Freshmen	N/A	N/A
Sophomore	5	0
Junior	5	1
Senior	5	2
Police Officer	3	0

Note: None of the freshmen had attended a crime prevention program

Table 32 indicates that most of the participants who had attended a crime prevention program felt they would recommend the program to someone else.

Table 33 is a comparison of the UW-Stout Police Department and other police departments that the participants are familiar with.

Table 33
Overall service comparison

Indicates how the University police measure up to other police departments.

	1	2	3	4
Freshmen	9	42	5	21
Sophomore	3	46	8	28
Junior	3	34	8	26
Senior	5	25	10	29
Police Officer	5	0	0	1

Note response scale 1=better 2=same 3=worst 4=cannot evaluate

Note: Not all of the participants completed all of the questions.

Table 33 indicates that most participants feel that the University Police Department is similar to other police departments. A large number of the participants indicated that they could not evaluate the department. This is probably a result of not having any contact with the University Police Department.

Table 34 is an indication of how well the students know the police officers.

Table 34
Relationship with Officers

Indicates the relationship between the police and students.

	1	2	3	4
Freshmen	0	0	10	67
Sophomore	0	5	12	68
Junior	2	6	12	51
Senior	4	3	10	51
Police Officer	4	1	0	0

Note response scale 1=very well, on a first name basis 2=moderately well
3=acquaintance only 4=do not know any

Note: Not all of the participants completed all of the questions.

Table 34 indicates that there is very little relationship between the police and students.

Table 35 describes how the participants feel about the accessibility of the University Police.

Table 35
Accessibility

Indicates a rating of accessibility.

	1	2	3	4	5
Freshmen	4	26	12	4	29
Sophomore	2	30	14	4	34
Junior	3	18	19	2	29
Senior	6	11	15	7	30
Police Officer	3	3	0	0	0

Note response scale 1=very accessible 2=accessible 3=remote
4=very remote 5=don't know

Note: Not all of the participants completed all of the questions.

Table 35 indicates that a significant number feel the officers are accessible or didn't know. The students who indicated that they did not know may have had little or no contact with the police.

Chapter 5

Summary, Conclusion and Recommendations

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to compare the attitudes of students and police officers toward campus law enforcement at the University of Wisconsin-Stout. It is hoped that the information gathered in this study can assist the students, police officers and administration in identifying some of the problem and concerns expressed by the participants.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of developing an effective and meaningful law enforcement agency is a problem not to be taken lightly. Creating a safe environment on a college campus is of the utmost importance. Campus law enforcement officers are responsible for the safety and protection of a community within a community. Campus administration is responsible for incorporating the need for law enforcement into the academic environment taking in consideration all of the stakeholders. In doing so they can maintain an environment that is conducive to learning.

The police officers need the support of the administration, faculty and students along with the tools necessary to be able to effectively perform their duties. The officers must perform their duties consistent with the policies of the University and enforce the laws in a manner consistent with that of the Constitution. The campus law enforcement officers are responsible for maintaining a safe environment for all that choose to utilize the university.

The students need to know that they have access to a trained, dedicated and concerned police agency that is equipped to assist them if a need arises. The students are part of a community within a community; they should be made to feel comfortable reporting crime and requesting assistance from the University Police.

Summary of Procedure

Sample Population

A stratified sampling of students was used for the study. The study was conducted during the fall semester of the 1999 – 2000 academic year at the University of Wisconsin-Stout. The target population was separated into four academic credit levels. Those students with 0 - 30 credits, 31- 70 credits, 71 - 100 credits and 101 - 130 credits. The target population consisting of 5 percent of the students registered at UW -Stout from each of the credit levels described. Enrollment figures for the Fall 1999 academic term were not yet available. Enrollment data for the Fall term of academic year 1998 is being used for this study. Surveys were administered to 5 per cent of each of the four credit levels. 105 surveys to students with 0 – 30 credits, 85 surveys to students with 31 – 70 credits, 71 surveys to students with 71 – 100 credits, and 95 surveys to students with 101 – 130 credits. The target population also includes 10 sworn members of the campus police department.

Instrumentation

Question 1 of the instrument consisted of a list of eleven service activities performed by the University Police and asked the population to rank the activities in one of four levels of importance.

Question 2 explains that many criminal activities can be discouraged through directed patrol activities. This question asked the participants to assign a level of priority to a list of crimes.

Question 3 consisted of a list of crime and asked that a level of priority be assigned to each crime indicating where the University Police should concentrate their investigative efforts.

Question 4 asked the participants to indicate what they felt their responsibilities were in relationship to crime on campus. The participants could choose from assisting victims needing help, reporting suspicious activity, reporting crime, assisting police officers needing help and participating in crime prevention programs.

Question 5 consisted of a list of police services and asked that a level of priority be assigned to each service indicating where the University Police should concentrate their efforts.

Question 6 determined how many of the participants have been victims of crime in the previous 12 months on the campus. If a participant answered yes, they were instructed to move through the question and answer questions related to crime reporting, officer behavior, officer courtesy and what the officer could have done to increase the victims satisfaction with the handling of the complaint.

Question 7 asked the participants if they had attended a crime prevention program sponsored by the University Police and if so, describe the topic. This question also asked the participant if they would recommend the program to some else.

Question 8 asked the participants to rate the overall service of the University Police to that of other police agencies with which they are familiar.

Question 9 asked the participants how well they know any of the University police officers.

Question 10 asked the participants to indicate their feeling as to the accessibility of the University police.

Questions 11 - 13 asked the participants to make remarks regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the University Police Department and what the police could do to improve public safety on the campus.

Page 6 of the instrument asked the participant for demographic analysis information consisting of gender, age, academic status (full-time or part-time), number of credits completed, location of residence (on or off campus), and racial/ethnic background.

Appendix E the Human Research Subjects Consent Form was attached to the instrument to allow it to be reviewed by the participants.

Data Collection

The data was then transferred from the surveys to a spreadsheet. A total of 35 Tables were created for the purpose of analyzing the data. The data from Questions 1 and 2 was transferred from the spreadsheet to the software Minitab for the purpose of calculating Mean and Standard Deviation. These calculations are included in Tables 6 and 7. The data included in Tables 1 – 5 and 8 – 35 was retrieved from the spreadsheet manually.

Survey Response Rate

Seventy-eight surveys were returned from students with 0 – 30 credits, 85 surveys were returned from students with 31 – 70 credits, 71 surveys were returned from students with 71 – 100 credits and 70 surveys were returned from students with 101 – 130 credits. Six surveys were returned from the University Police Department.

Conclusions

Listed below are the four major hypotheses from Chapter 1 that were to be examined during this study.

Hypothesis One

The UW-Stout police department has a positive impact on reducing the fear of victimization and also enhances the quality of life on the UW-Stout campus. The information gathered during

this study could not be used to draw any specific conclusions regarding the impact that the University Police may or may not have on reducing the fear of victimization on campus.

Hypothesis Two

That the police officers and students agree that there is a need for the campus police. The information from this study indicates there is definitely a need for the University Police.

Hypothesis Three

The students and police officers hold different views as to the roles, functions and philosophy of the campus police. The study indicates differences of opinion and confusion between the students and police officers and at the same time there are many areas of agreement.

Hypothesis Four

That there is a need for additional programs and interaction between campus security and the students to create an informed student body. The study found that there is little interaction between the police and students. This lack of interaction creates misunderstandings and misperceptions. This research found the following:

- That the police have a good relationship with the RA
- There is a higher priority on violent crime than other crime
- Traffic enforcement was ranked as a low priority by students
- Property crime high priority for students – lower for police
- Significant difference in the dealing with crime responsibilities on campus
- Motor vehicles patrols were ranking as a high priority
- Public assistance was ranked high by the students and low by the police
- Alcohol enforcement was ranked low by the students and police
- The number of crime victims was low for the freshman and seniors and high for the sophomores and juniors.

- 7 of the 11 juniors who were crime victims reported the crime to the police.
- Less than 11 percent of the student participants who were able to evaluate the police rated them as better than other police agencies that they are familiar with. 5 of 6 police officers rated themselves as better than other agencies
- A significant number of the participants did not know any of the police officers
- About 57% of the student participants who were able to evaluate the accessibility of the police ranked them as accessible or very accessible. About 43% of the student participants who were able to evaluate the accessibility of the police ranked them as remote or very remote.

Recommendation to the Police

The following recommendations, based on the results of this study and the research questions, are proposed for further study:

It's apparent that the police have a good working relationship with most of the Residential Assistants. This is most likely due to the interaction between the police and the RA's. If the police and the RA's have the ability to create positive relationships why can't the relationship between the police and the rest of the student population move to the same level? It's recommended that the police take advantage of every opportunity that avails itself to interact with the students. Whether these contacts are during crime prevention education, casual day to day contact or while answering calls for service. Mutual respect and trust builds long term relationships and the fact that a campus has a rotating population make this task even more difficult.

During this study the students and the police ranked motor patrol as a relatively high priority. In small patrol areas foot patrol and bike patrol can be more effective than motor vehicle patrols. Foot and bike patrols allow officers closer contact with the public. At night these types of patrol can be especially useful because of officer opportunity to make closer and quieter observations.

For the students to have a complete understanding of the duties, responsibilities and actions of the police department education must occur. A Community Oriented Policing program called Citizen Police Academy is being started in many police departments. The programs are molded to fit into the individual communities but the concept remains the same. The program begins by getting a group of citizens together who want to learn more about their police department and issues concerning the police department in their community. The police officers serve as the instructors providing information on such topics as recruitment, public relations, the investigative process, parking enforcement and many others. These programs create an excellent opportunity to build a positive rapport between the citizen and the police department. If the University Police want to be understood by the students they must deliver their message. One perception that could be changed with the implementation of this program is the misconception that the police officers are nothing more than security guards. The fact of the matter is that they are sworn police officers with the same powers and authority of a municipal police officer.

Almost 10 percent of the participants were victims of crime in the last 12 months. Only about 42 percent of these victims reported the crime to the University Police. An emphasis should be placed on getting more victims to report crime to the police. One recommendation would be to make the crime reporting as convenient as possible for the students. A computerized reporting template could be attached to the University Police web site or blank police report forms could also be kept in areas where students gather to be completed and put in a drop box.

Recommendation to the Administration

The following recommendations, based on the results of this study and the research questions, are proposed for further study:

Currently the police officers are permitted to carry a firearm between the hours of 9:00pm and 7:00am. Arguments can be made that there is a greater danger to police officers during the hours of darkness and that carrying a firearm after 9pm in the evening is less disruptive to the education process. Let's consider the topic of workplace violence. This type of incident is most likely to occur during the day hours on campus. Workplace violence incidents are often deadly in nature. If the police officers are armed only after 9:00pm I would not expect that they would come running to help when gunfire is reported. No community is immune from violent acts. Part of the University Police's ability to protect is missing from the slogan "To Protect and Serve". In the simplest of terms a decision has been made to allow the police officers only to be armed part-time. This prevents them from intervening in deadly situations for a large portion of everyday. The image of a police officer is severely diminished both in the mind of the officer and the people that he/she serves when the officer's ability to protect is restricted. Day to day the most important thing for a police officer to be able to do is return home at the end of the shift. The recommendation is made that the officer's be armed during every tour of duty.

One aspect of the community is that the community should be involved in its law enforcement. Not to the extent they have the authority to set policy for the police department. However, there is a need for a mechanism where the various segments of the community can express their concerns and get accurate information about the operation of the department. It is recommended that a committee representative of the campus population be established to discuss public safety concerns of the community.

Recommendation to the Students

The following recommendation, based on the results of this study and the research questions, are proposed for further study:

The students should look for opportunities to interact with the police officers and take advantage of crime prevention programs being offered by the University Police. The students must understand that it is not the police that who enact the laws. Don't direct your frustration toward the police for doing their jobs when you are found in violation. Work with the police to create an environment that assists in making your college experience one that you will look back on with pride and a sense of accomplishment.

When the students become victims of crime they should report the crime to the University Police. Information on the types of crimes being committed and the location of the crime allows the police to make better use of their resources.

Understand that crime on the campus is not and should not be the sole responsibility of the University Police. Everyone who is a part of the campus community shares in the responsibility in reporting crime and helping to make the campus a safer place.

REFERENCES

- Benedict, J. R., & Crosset, T. W. (1995, May). Male student-athletics reported for sexual assault: A survey of campus police departments and Judicial Affairs offices. Journal of Sport & Social Issues, Vol. 19 Issue 2, p126, 15p, 2 charts.
- Benedict, K., Casper, J. D., & Kelly, J. R. (1998, February). Cognitions, attitudes and decision-making in search and seizure cases. Vol. 18(2), 93-113.
- Cox, T. C., & White, M. F. (1998, June). Traffic citation and student attitudes toward the police: An examination of selected interaction dynamics. Journal of Police Science & Administration, Vol. 16(2), 105-121.
- Dwyer, W. O. (1994). Managing campus security: Issues for police officers at public institutions. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ 486 593)
- Fisher, B. S. (1995, May). Crime and fear on campus. Annals of the American Academy of Political & Social Science, Vol. 539, p85, 17p.
- Fisher, B. S., Sloan J. J., & Wilkins, D. L. (1995). Crime, Fear of Crime, and Related Issues on the UAB Campus: Final Report, University of Alabama-Birmingham, Criminal Justice Department.
- Gaber, R. R. (1972). Attitudes of Residence Halls Students and Security Personnel Toward Campus Security. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Wisconsin-LaCrosse.
- Gable, R. K., & Santucci, K. B. (1998). Student perceptions of campus safety at a large rural university. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 417 648)
- Garcia, P. A. (1994, October). Creating a safe school environment. Thrust for Educational Leadership, Vol. 24 Issue 2, p22, 3p, 2 charts.
- Gearey, R. (1997). College cop-out. New Republic, Vol. 217 Issue 19, p21, 3p.
- Goldberg, A. L., & Reaves, B. A. (1996, December). Campus law enforcement agencies, 1995. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 408 883)
- Hernandez, D. G. (1996). House demands enforcement. Editor & Publisher, Vol. 129 Issue 44, p10, 2p.
- Johnson, P. (1992). Unpublished master's thesis, University of South Florida.
- Markewich, T. S., & Ott, M. D. (1983, June). Report of the security survey at the University of Maryland at College Park. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 238 367)

Mowery, A. (1997). Safe school survey: Post-secondary survey results. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 405 766)

Nichols, W. D. (1995, June). Violence on campus. FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, Vol. 64 Issue 6, p1, 5p, 3bw.

Nielsen, R. C., Pander, M. S., & Powell J. W. (1994). Campus Security and Law Enforcement. (2nd ed.). Newton, MA: Butterworth-Heinemann

Okaty, G. J. (1997, July). Can security regain campus security business? Security management, Vol. 41 Issue 7, p152, 2p, 1bw.

Paulk, C. J. (1997, September). Campus crime real despite what you read. Quill, Vol. 85, p48, 2p.

Siegel, D. (1994, May). What is behind the growth of violence on college campuses? USA Today Magazine, Vol. 122 Issue 2588, p32, p3, 2bw.

Shearing, C., & Wood, J. (1998, January). Canadian Journal of Criminology, Vol. 40 Issue 1, p81, 15p.

Smith, M.C. (1988). Coping with crime on campus. New York: Macmillan Publishing.

Stephens, R. D. (1996, September). 40 ways to safer schools. Education Digest, Vol. 62 Issue 1, p13, 6p.

Swanson, C. R., Taylor, R. W., & Territo, L. (1998). Police Administration: structures, processes, and behaviors. (4th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Appendix A
RESEARCH SURVEY

The following is a list of service activities performed by the University Police Department. Indicate how you feel about the importance of each activity.

Very Important 4	Somewhat Important 3	Somewhat Unimportant 2	Not Important 1

The following questions relate specifically to the UW-Stout Police Department. The police through directed patrol activities can discourage the following types of criminal activities from being committed.

Check one answer only for each item:

	3 High	2 Moderate	1 Low
1. What level of priority should the university police give to:			
Burglaries	_____	_____	_____
Property Damage	_____	_____	_____
Auto Theft	_____	_____	_____
Traffic Law Violations	_____	_____	_____
*Robberies	_____	_____	_____
Office/Residence Theft	_____	_____	_____
Sexual Assaults	_____	_____	_____
Theft of Car Parts	_____	_____	_____
Loud Parties	_____	_____	_____
Moped/Bicycle Theft	_____	_____	_____
Drug Enforcement	_____	_____	_____
Alcohol Enforcement	_____	_____	_____
Parking Enforcement	_____	_____	_____

*Robbery = A theft involving the use of force or the threat of force by the offender.

2. Which of the following crimes do you think the University Police Department should concentrate their investigative efforts toward solving? Please rank the items 1 through 9 (1 = Highest priority and 9 = Lowest priority).

Theft (Any location)
 Battery
 Credit Card Fraud and Check Forgery
 Sexual Assault
 Moped/Bicycle Theft
 Damage to Property
 Auto and Auto Part Theft
 Drug Law Violations
 Alcohol Law Violations

3. As a campus community member, what is your responsibility in relation to dealing with crime on campus? Check all that apply.

Assist victim needing help
 Report suspicious activity
 Reporting crime
 Assisting police officers needing help
 Participating in crime prevention programs

4. Please rank the following police services. Please rank the items 1 through 9 (1 = Highest priority and 9 = Lowest priority).

Motor vehicle patrols
 Foot patrols
 Bike Patrols
 Crime Prevention programs (eg: Neighborhood Watch, Operation ID)
 Drug and Alcohol Education
 Public Assistance (eg: motorist assists, door unlocks)
 Traffic Enforcement (Not parking enforcement)
 Drug Enforcement
 Alcohol Enforcement

5. Within the last 12 months have you been a victim of crime on the UW-Stout campus?

Yes
 No

If the answer is no, go to question #7

Did you report the crime to the UW-Stout Police Department?

Yes

No

If no, why not? _____

Described the officer's behavior who responded to your call:

Very Helpful

Somewhat Helpful

Not Helpful

Don't Recall

Describe the level of courtesy displayed by the officer handling your call.

Very Courteous

Somewhat Courteous

Not Courteous

Don't Recall

What could the officer have done to increase your satisfaction with the contact?

6. Have you attended or participated in a University Police Department crime prevention program?

Yes

No

If no, go to question #8.

If yes, what was the topic of the program? _____.

Would you recommend that others attend the same program?

Yes

No

7. Based upon your own experience how would you rate the overall service of the UW-Stout Police compared to other police departments you know?

Better
 Same
 Worse
 Cannot Evaluate

8. How well do you know any University police officers?

Very well, on a first name basis
 Moderately well
 Acquaintance only
 Do not know any

9. Would you describe UW-Stout police officers as? (Check only one)

Very Accessible
 Accessible
 Remote
 Very Remote
 Don't Know

10. What do you consider the greatest strengths of the UW-Stout Police Department?

11. What do you consider the greatest weaknesses of the UW-Stout Police Department?

12. What changes would you recommend to the UW-Stout Police Department in order to improve the public safety of the campus community?

Please answer the following questions for demographic analysis.

Are you:

Male
 Female

How old are you?

What is your status at UW-Stout?

Full-time student (12 or more credits per semester)
 Part-time student (Less than 12 credits per semester)

How many credits have you completed?

0 - 30
 31 - 70
 71 - 100
 101 - 130

Do you reside on campus?

Yes
 No

What is your racial/ethnic background?

African American
 Hispanic
 White
 Native American
 Other, specify _____
 I choose not to answer this question.

Please review Human Research Subjects Consent Form located on the back of this page.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE

Appendix B
STUDENT LETTER

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-STOUT
MENOMONIE WISCONSIN

October 18, 1999

Dear Students:

The survey that you have agreed to complete will be used to measure your attitudes and perception toward campus law enforcement at the University of Wisconsin-Stout. The purpose of this study is to compare the attitudes of students and police officers toward campus law enforcement at the University of Wisconsin-Stout. It is hoped that the information gathered in this study will assist the students, police officers and administration in identifying some of the problem and concerns expressed by the participants.

You have been selected as part of a stratified sample of UW-Stout students to complete this questionnaire. It is extremely important that your responses be as honest as possible. Your responses will remain anonymous.

This study is being done as part of the requirements leading to a Master's Degree in Training and Development.

Your participation and honesty is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Wesley D. Revels
Student, University of Wisconsin-Stout

Appendix C

POLICE OFFICER LETTER

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-STOUT
MENOMONIE WISCONSIN

October 18, 1999

Dear UW-Stout Police Officers:

The survey that you have agreed to complete will be used to measure your attitudes and perception toward campus law enforcement at the University of Wisconsin-Stout. The purpose of this study is to compare the attitudes of students and police officers toward campus law enforcement at the University of Wisconsin-Stout. It is hoped that the information gathered in this study will assist the students, police officers and administration in identifying some of the problem and concerns expressed by the participants.

You have been selected as part of a stratified sample of UW-Stout students and police officer to complete this questionnaire. It is extremely important that your responses be as honest as possible. Your responses will remain anonymous.

This study is being done as part of the requirements leading to a Master's Degree in Training and Development.

Your participation and honesty is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Wesley D. Revels
Student, University of Wisconsin-Stout

Appendix D
FACULTY LETTER

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-STOUT
MENOMONIE WISCONSIN

October 20, 1999

Dear UW-Stout Faculty:

This survey will be used to measure the attitudes and perception toward campus law enforcement at the University of Wisconsin-Stout. The purpose of this study is to compare the attitudes of students and police officers toward campus law enforcement at the University of Wisconsin-Stout. It is hoped that the information gathered in this study will assist students, police officers and administration in identifying some of the problem and concerns expressed by the participants.

I am requesting that the survey be administered in your class. The survey will take approximately 15 minutes for the students to complete. A graduate student, Erin Graham, at your convenience will administer the survey.

I appreciate any consideration you may give to this request. Your cooperation and participation will be greatly appreciated.

This study is being done as part of the requirements leading to a Master's Degree in Training and Development.

Sincerely,

Wesley D. Revels
Student, University of Wisconsin-Stout

Appendix E

HUMAN RESEARCH SUBJECTS CONSENT FORM

HUMAN RESEARCH SUBJECTS CONSENT FORM

I understand that by returning this questionnaire. I am giving my informed consent as a participating volunteer in this study. I understand the basic nature of the study and agree that any potential risks are exceedingly small. I also understand the potential benefits that might be realized from the successful completion of this study. I am aware that the information is being sought in a specific manner so that no identifiers are needed and so that confidentiality is guaranteed. I realize that I have the right to refuse to participate and that my right to withdraw from participation at any time during the study will be respected with no coercion or prejudice.

Note: Questions or concerns about participation in the research or subsequent complaints should be addressed first with the researcher or research advisor and second to Dr. Ted Knous, Chair, UW-Stout Instructional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research, 11HH, UW-Stout, Menomonie, WI 54751, phone (715) 232-1126.

Appendix F

NARRATIVE RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS

Note: The narratives are documented as they were written on the surveys, except for the profanities.

0 - 31 Credits Narrative responses

Question # 6

Did you report the crime to the UW-Stout Police Department? If no, Why not?

Our RA reported it.

Wouldn't have helped.

What could the officer have done to increase your satisfaction with the contact?

Rather than accusing and being suspicious from the start, assume we're innocent until proven guilty (blew 0's on a breathalyzer and officer was still really rude - didn't have possession of alcohol either).

Nothing.

Keep me updated.

Question # 7

Have you attended or participated in a University Police Department crime prevention program? If so, what was the topic of the program?

Question# 11

What do you consider the greatest strengths of the UW-Stout Police Department?

Traffic violations

They are strict

Make us feel safe on campus. Comfort and security.

They are easy to find because they are always driving around campus. No really sure - I've never been in an encounter with the police.

Don't know any.

Know none

There right away when needed.

Good night patrol.

Numbers

Many patrols

Many of them

Public assistance (door unlocks) Sexual assault, stranded motorists, alcohol enforcement.

They appear when not needed.

Emergency situations

Parking regulations

You always see them around campus for access.

Always one around.

Their numbers

I'm not sure.

They are always patrolling the campus.

The number of people.

None

Attitudes toward drinking.

Not sure

No clue - They like to hide.

Quick response, easy to talk to.

They are always around trying to keep the campus safe.

Security, escort service.

They respond to calls quickly.

They are all over.

Unsure

Guns

I don't see any difference between police and UW-Stout police except the disadvantage of having authority only on campus.

Alcohol prevention

Have no clue, only been here 2 months.

None

Don't know.

Don't know

Don't know

Escort system

Always accessible

Speed of assistance

Haven't seen them do anything yet, only give pointless tickets at parties

Nice cars

24 hour patrol

They are always around

Always driving around

None

They got fast cars

Provide good service

They are always around

I don't know
To get somewhere quick

Availability

Cannot evaluate

How little power they have

Help people

#'s of officers especially combined with Menomonie Police Dept.

Question# 12

What do you consider the greatest weaknesses of the UW-Stout Police Department?

I feel like if I or any of my friends were drinking and there was an emergency, we would not call the cops because of the fact that we were drinking.

Don't know any.

To much emphasis on alcohol arrests.

Not courteous - make you feel like a criminal before they're even sure you're guilty.

Giving unnecessary parking tickets.

Attitude

Nothing

Don't see them often

Drug and alcohol education

They appear only when not needed.

Controlling crime

Catching drunks walking in the street

They don't act on enough of the little crimes and stuff.

Don't know

All the drinking tickets they give.
I'm not sure.

I don't know any of them. They should patrol on campus.

None

Watching the parking lots.

No clue - Never see them.

Not enough on foot, accessible.

They get parking ticket happy. Why should they really care if you park between 2 and 7 when not that many people are even around.

They focus on the fairly harmless crimes such as under age drinking.

They are all over.

Unsure

Obesity

I don't see any difference between police and UW-Stout police except the disadvantage of having authority only on campus.

Drug prevention

Have no clue, only been here 2 months.

Public urination

Don't know

Don't know

Don't care

I never see them

They don't give tickets to people who take up 2-3 spaces parking in parking lots. Too many people park at such an angle that you can't park or leave too small of a space that you can't park.

Theres so many cops

I don't know their numbers, so if I don't there's many more who don't
Transportation help for the disabled

Low #'s

They're only UW Police

I don't know

Never see them, only in cars

They are too concerned with alcohol. It's going to happen no matter what. Concentrate on
vehicle damage, camera in parking lots.

None

They give too many parking tickets

I don't know

Drinking violations

Number of officers

Cannot evaluate

How old they are

Too much emphasis on parking and drinking

Question# 13

**What changes would you recommend to the UW-Stout Police Department in order to
improve the public safety of the campus community?**

More police on campus.

Have an "open-policy". It is imperative to cut down on underage drinking especially drinking
and driving. But for those that are safe and responsible, make them feel comfortable calling
in for an emergency without the fear of underage ticket. "open - policy"

More patrols (Bike/foot), get to know as many students as possible, hold public "crime"
meeting where current topics (happening in the area) are discussed, classes (self defense)
are offered at convenient times (often).

If a party is disturbing someone, do something. If not, stay the hell away.

None - good job patrolling and keeping an eye on things

Nothing - doing okay

Foot patrol at night

Just circulate the area around UW-Stout more frequently between the hours of 8 - 12am

Loosen up on the parking and parties - this is a college!

Change their priorities

Be more accessible

Have more of them.

Not arrest kids for drinking.

None

They should patrol on bikes through campus.

Don't worry about stupid drunks.

More of them

Not to worry about the little things (underage drinking), worry about the big ones (rape, fights, etc)

N/A

Bike patrols?

Have self-defense classes.

More phones.

None

Patrol parking lots for loud noise after 2 a.m. on weekdays.

Leave skate boarders alone.

Free haircuts.

Advertising emergency numbers.
More drug prevention

Have no clue, only been here 2 months.

Play frisbee with the kids.

Quit busting parties.

None

None

Emergency phone numbers on campus.

Be around!

I wouldn't know where to find them if I had a problems. I never see any cops when I'm on campus. I don't think they have been doing much this year.

See them around more. You never see them around campus.

Doing good

Help people not ticket them

None

I don't know

Not as many drinking fines

I would like to see the officers more

None

Need cops to walk on campus especially at night

None

None

Bike or foot patrols talk to students get to know them

More patrols

None
 Leave us alone

31 - 70 Credits Narrative responses

Question # 6

Did you report the crime to the UW-Stout Police Department? If no, Why not?

Because I was drunk

An officer witnessed it so I didn't have to

Didn't think anything would come of it

No it was the last day of school, someone stole my bike seat

What could the officer have done to increase your satisfaction with the contact?

I wish he could have caught the guy that was kicking my car.

Not being a jerk

Question # 7

Have you attended or participated in a University Police Department crime prevention program? If so, what was the topic of the program?

Hate crime

Safety - personal and protecting your possessions

Alcohol and drug prevention

Work w/department

A lot of different ones for RA training

Question# 11

What do you consider the greatest strengths of the UW-Stout Police Department?

Giving parking tickets

Many mobile units

From my point of view they seem to be doing a good job because I don't hear of crimes very often.

Haven't had much contact with the police

I'm not really sure, cause I never really had a problem

I don't know

Being accessible and helpful when needed

Always around after the bars let out

Cheerful attitudes

Don't know

Timely and efficient help when needed

I haven't had to call upon the UW-Stout Police

Don't know any because all I see them doing is driving around,

Never utilized or been approached by

Their vehicles

They're always there pretty quick if you need them

Accessible if needed

Create safe environment

Numbers

They're there when you need them

That I've never been bothered by them

Don't know much about them

Busting house parties

I feel safe walking around campus

I feel safe at school, they must be protecting us
Available

They're tough

Don't know

Close ties to campus

I can't answer this because I never come in contact with them or what they do.

Easy to patrol campus because of the small town

There is a million of them with doing to do but come hassle you.

Easy to get ahold of

I don't know any of them because I've never had any encounters with them.

The police officers not security

There are always cops around so you can easily find someone is you're in trouble.

Always driving around

Well they're always around

Staying on campus

There are many around

Preventing low crimes on campus such as drinking.

Fast

A lot of them

I see them constantly around

Very attentive

Dealing with drunks and handling situations in the dorms.

I have no experience with this

Willingness to help students and educate

I recently heard that there is a new escort service on campus. I'm glad to see that Stout is finally catching up on the needs of it's campus.

Question# 12

What do you consider the greatest weaknesses of the UW-Stout Police Department?

Everything - they really don't care, they are lazy.

Poor PR, too many on a power/ego trip

The overwhelming concentration on alcohol violations.

Haven't had much contact with the police

They can cut down a little on giving parking tickets though (Find something more important)

I don't know

Too much spare time because they ticket a car that has only been parked for 2 minutes over the limit.

The police are mostly interested in busting underage drinkers

Too tough on parking violations

Too many parking tickets

Don't know

I don't know of any

Do not know or see to often

Never utilized or been approached by them

Need more night patrols for people walking home/around

This is a comment: My friend was stopped by a UW-Stout police officer on homecoming. She was carrying a beer in her hand. She and I understand she is at fault but one of the officers was laughing at her. She was stopped by two bike officers. She was treated very rudely and I think this is unacceptable. It gives me a negative outlook on the department.

I don't know any of them

Can't carry guns
Busting underage parties

Haven't even heard of them until now or knew all that they did till reading this.

Little respect for students

They always come only for petty things, nothing that really matters

They drive around in cars. This is not necessary. Menomonie already has plenty of patrolling officers. UW-Stout doesn't need anymore.

Thinking that they a push around the students

Leaving students alone

Too noseey

To strict on the underage drinkers, what else do they have to do.

Not sure

Small shoes

Their absence

I don't really see them around much

Sometimes rude

I can't answer this, I never come in contact with them or what they do.

To strict

Not really knowing them or seeing them on campus

Nothing

Have to patrol, control a lot of different areas, crimes offenses ect.

They are concerns too much with underage drinking most underage people drink at sometime. It is not as if they are different than others. There is no need to give poor college students expensive tickets. A ticket will not change their attitude toward drinking.

Concerned about underage drinking to much

They're not very visibly around campus unless it's party nights.
Short handed and not carrying weapons

They give way too many parking tickets and are very interested in giving parking tickets.

Always driving around

I don't see much of them.

To many at times

Having to many officers for to little work

A--holes

Rudeness

They're not in the middle of campus

Question# 13

What changes would you recommend to the UW-Stout Police Department in order to improve the public safety of the campus community?

You're the crime preventer, you figure it out.

Don't go looking for trouble, be more respectful, courteous to students, we aren't all trouble makers

Worry more about crimes rather than a party or alcohol violations

Make yourself known to more students, more familiar

I don't know

Worry more about crime than parking violations

Carry around shillelaghs, handcuffs and pepper spray

Don't know

Don't know

Focus more on serious crimes rather than minor ones

More patrol on foot

New police officers

Talk with students and find out what we want them to spend more money and time on.

Be more visible, talk to kids when they're walking around campus

Carry guns

A better accomplishment of their existence. Worry less about vehicles

Make them more socialable, phones like at UWEC

Teach awareness and become closer to students.

More foot patrol

Be nice

Leave people alone unless they request your services

Not sure

Hire more

Big flashing lights on their cars every time. Ex. Clocking cars for speeding

More foot patrol

Don't know

More security at night

None

Nothing

Put blue lights on top of campus phones w/alarms if there is an emergency

More officers and foot patrol

Maybe concentrate more on drinking and driving rather than underage drinking, I think that's a more severe problem.

Make them more friendly

They could hang out on campus more (especially residence halls)
Escort to dorms late at night

Salt the roads instead of sand

Public relations

Focus more on crime that hurts people not herbs (marijuana)

More patrols around fieldhouse and library in the late evenings

Location

71 - 100 Credit Narrative response

Question # 6

Did you report the crime to the UW-Stout Police Department? If no, Why not?

Solved it myself

Off-campus

What could the officer have done to increase your satisfaction with the contact?

Find the f-----r who vandalized.

Could've helped me understand more.

Get back to us about findings

They could have called me (they saw it happen) and they could have given me more information

Taken care of the situation right away or gotten a Menomonie police officer to do so

Showed up - helped with situation - deal with RA as a professional - do not belittle them

Question # 7

Have you attended or participated in a University Police Department crime prevention program? If so, what was the topic of the program?

Self Defense

Alcohol?? At RA class this summer.
Drinking/Driving

Date rape

RA training topics

Alcohol

RA Classs - Drug/Alcohol

Question# 11

What do you consider the greatest strengths of the UW-Stout Police Department?

Fast reaction to the scene in need, helpful, friendly.

Quick response time, they uphold the law.

They seem to be doing an OK job.

Friendly!

I don't like cops!

Visibility

If you need a walk home, they will, all you need to do is call.

Always able to find me.

So many of them

Don't know

Keep people in line somewhat but sometimes are a nuisance.

Haven't had any experience with them.

They are there when needed.

Wouldn't know

I haven't a clue.

Good response time, always around

I see them around

Theft investigations and alcohol citations

Helpful and accessible to students on campus

I haven't had any experience dealing with them

Busting dorm parties

Ability to cover the given area

On campus

I don't know, I haven't had any contact except for seeing parking tickets all the time

Have no experience in dealing with them

Being able to have fast access to campus building

Very accessible, responds immediately

Parking violations

Menomonie Police Department

Location

Do not know

Always there when you don't need them

Giving away drinking fines

Knowledge - sometimes

Don't know

Many of them and they always have someone on duty.

Aid in helping drug prevention and sexual assault.

Question# 12

What do you consider the greatest weaknesses of the UW-Stout Police Department?

Don't see them visually enough, especially on weekend and nights.

They should just stick to campus rules and regulations and let Menomonie deal with the rest.

Over-reacting! Sometimes they can be too strict and the fines in Menomonie are outrageous.

Patrolling the surrounding 2-3 blocks surrounding campus - mostly college student housing – very little light at night.

They are all over and there are too many. You're so nervous about doing something wrong while driving, etc. all the time.

I don't like cops!

Stopping theft and violence

Driving around

Busting parties if you start making this a dry campus people will leave after the first year.

Worry too much about little things. Need to concentrate more on the big issues.

Too strict on drunk walkers.

Don't know

Too into busting parties.

Haven't had any experience with them.

Focus too much on underage drinking.

When reading Stoutonia, seems like all they ever do is go after underage drinkers.

They concentrate too much on house parties.

Once you call them it takes them too long to get there. Usually everything is over or gone.

Their priorities are way out of whack

Too much time and money wasted on alcohol prevention (underage drinking) house parties

The emphasis that is placed on seeking out underage drinkers

They concentrate too much on underage drinking

Why bust party houses

Alcohol citations

Less accessible to those students off campus

Don't watch over lots well enough. Too interested in underage drinking.

Old and slow

Too strict on little things

Time mgmt.

Thefts in university lots

Should worry about on campus crimes only. Leave off campus stuff to the police

Don't know

Don't know

Have no experience in dealing with them

Their determination to stop alcohol parties and marijuana users

Robbery

Availability

Very low numbers, spend too much time dealing with petty incidents

They concentrate on house parties too much

Not concentrating on more important problems

Attitude

The officers seem unfriendly, unapproachable and intimidating. They seem to look down on most students, even the ones who aren't doing anything wrong.

Spend too much time worried about writing parking tickets

Some cops are very rude - I am an RA and in my experience the first thing most cops ask me is, "so what do you want now."

Not enough knowledge of what is happening in the dorm rooms.

Question# 13

What changes would you recommend to the UW-Stout Police Department in order to improve the public safety of the campus community?

Have emergency phones every 100 feet (most campuses have them and they are visible by a blue light).

Sticking just to campus rules and regulations.

Lights!

Quit focusing on parking and focus on real issues.

I don't like cops!

More bike/foot patrols - Police are more approachable, not like sitting behind the wheel.

Finding stolen stuff.

Monitor car thefts better.

Less cops, there are too many.

Worry to much about the little things. Need to concentrate on the big issues.

Walk around campus at night for those women like myself who have to walk home alone at night.

Have more on campus because I never see them.

Be more visible

Have them worry more about the other things that matter.

Be more timely.

Patrol parking lots more

None

No recommendations

Do their job

Be more accessible to campus. I've only ever seen 1 or 2 different campus cops, and I've been here for 4 years. And concentrate on more things than just busting parties. That's easy, why not be available as escorts for those who have to walk home late.

Concentrate more on things other than parties

Cops on foot after bar time

Nights watches on cars parked in the university lots

Blue lights and siren

Don't know

Have no experience in dealing with them

Leave pot heads alone if their not causing trouble. Only bust parties if the owners want the party to be broken up

Bike police

Be more open and friendly with the students

Be more involved and not be sitting and talking to another squad car

Change their attitude/motivation

Be available and courteous

They need to respond to the Residence halls much quicker, be polite to RA's who call them and try to help in the situation they are called for instead of trying to get out of there.

Get to know the students - make themselves known (in a good way).

101 - 130 Credit Narrative Response

Question # 6

Did you report the crime to the UW-Stout Police Department? If no, Why not?

Wanted a real cop

Because they gave me a ticket for something I did not do.

Menomonie P.D.

What could the officer have done to increase your satisfaction with the contact?

Followup better, not be accusing me

Caught the guy

Listen to my explanation instead of screaming at me like I'm guilty for wearing the same color shirt as the person who did the crime.

Question # 7

Have you attended or participated in a University Police Department crime prevention program? If so, what was the topic of the program?

Night safety program

RA training

Risk awareness

RA class - Drug prevention/detection

Sexual assault

Question# 11

What do you consider the greatest strengths of the UW-Stout Police Department?

No experience dealing with the police.

Timely response, supportive of RA staff.

The number of them

Awareness of crime

They do there job

I can't say

You see them driving around all the time.

Patrolling

The #'s of police officers in the community (Too many)

They do a good job of putting parking tickets on cars

When I lived in the dorms they were always easy to reach.

Unable to help

They are seen at least driving around.

Their numbers

Their all over, to many of them.

Extremely considerate toward student needs. Every officer I've come across is polite and helpful.

They unlock a building when needed.

There are always ten of ten on scene

Busting young adults

There always around

Their numbers

None, I only see them about once a year

Knowledgeable and understanding, quick response

Are easy to get ahold of when needed

The fact that UW-Stout has it's own department in such a small town is strength enough.

Vehicles are noticeable.

N/A

Never seen any officers on campus.

Don't know

Small campus to work with

They are there when you need them. Their cars are very noticeable.

Enforce parking

See them driving around a lot. A lot of them

Patrolling

Fairly prompt

There are lots of officers.

They are part of the university and therefore should know the university and it's policies.

Can't answer because I do not pay attention to police at Stout.

They give a lot of parking tickets.

Always there when needed.

Question# 12

What do you consider the greatest weaknesses of the UW-Stout Police Department?

No experience dealing with the police.

Don't take verbal threats serious enough

Giving tickets to people who weren't doing any harm. Especially under certain circumstances.

Parking tickets should not be important, Students pay \$1,600.00 a semester and shouldn't not have to pay for parking.

Worry to much about meter parking

Sometimes they are too sketchy

Need to stop waiting for meters to run out and then ticketing cars.

Lack of ability to follow through on a regular basis. Not enough staff. Watching traffic violations and not doing anything about it.

As an off campus student I no longer have the UW-Stout police department available to me at my residence. I know of other campuses that extend their police service and I wish ours would do the same.

Unable to help

Don't know how to get ahold of if needed.

No rubber bullets

To bossy

None

I never see them

Parking - how many tickets have I gotten one minute after my meter ran out?

Lack of visibility around campus

Too much time spent bugging kids not doing anything wrong instead of fighting real crime.

You never see them unless their busting kids in the dorms.

Not dealing with high priorities in the community

If you can't think back to when you were in college, that's pretty bad. College is supposed to be the best years of our lives, let us be!

No rubber bullets

Couldn't say, I never see them doing anything

Sometimes can be considered to tough

Numbers, how many UW-Stout officers are there? Students aren't really sure where and how many there are.

No night accompaniment for students to and from buildings.

N/A

Never seen any officers on campus

Don't know

Not known on campus positively.

Bad priorities

Number of patrols, unfocused

I do not think there is any

More time needed spent on serious crimes

Focusing on minor services such as tickets and fines for drugs and alcohol.

The officers pick on students, I have been pulled over on several occasions when I have done nothing wrong.

They don't get out and know people. I have been here at Stout for 3.5 years and have yet to meet or speak with an officer - they are too distant.

Can't answer because I do not pay attention to police at Stout.

They give a lot of parking tickets.

Question# 13

What changes would you recommend to the UW-Stout Police Department in order to improve the public safety of the campus community?

Don't live on campus. Don't know anything about the police department.

More walk throughs, Be more visible

Have them more friendly, not so hardnosed

Drive through parking lots and such so peoples belongs are safe.

Walk campus night and day. They should not worry so much about parking and parties. Worry more about somebodies safety.

Have better investigations

Nothing

Can't comment, Have never been a campus resident

Have escort service that assists off campus

More officers, customer service/human relations training

People kind of see them as an enemy because of their over emphasis on alcohol related issues.

Go to school

Advertise how to get ahold of

Since so many cars have theft problems put more lights in parking lots or patrol periodically checking lots.

Something to secure bikes outside better.

Focus on real problems, not parties off campus.

Do more patrols

Remember it is a college town and we should be allowed to have a little fun.

Ease up!

Wear "Mountie" caps. Get hottest looking cops to pose for 2000 calendar

Larger department, more officers

Maybe patrol more? Not really much

None, I feel they control everything very well. I feel safe when on campus

Perhaps more numbers

Concentrate on high level crimes and not so much on busting walking person under the influence or loud parties.

Be more involved with campus community i.e. outside of duties participate with events. Visit department offices. Make connections with campus staff/faculty. So we know who you are.

Campus security phones throughout campus, inside and outside.

N/A

Don't know

Be seen.

Stop worrying about parties and focus on theft.

Less emphasis on parking crimes

Have them patrol around a little more

Worry less about parking and more about theft.
More involvement

Focus on thefts and violent crimes.

Only stop people breaking the law.

Get out on foot and bike in order to interact with campus. Hire younger officers the campus can relate with or train older officers to relate with younger students. Re-inforce that the PD exists because students pay tuition and attend school at Stout. I get the feeling the PD doesn't like the students.

Safety is already tight on campus because everyone goes home on the weekend, and no one really causes a ruckus. (We are too busy earning degrees).

More on sight

Pay more attention to more serious issues occurring on campus.

Police Officer Narrative Response

Question # 6

Did you report the crime to the UW-Stout Police Department? If no, Why not?

What could the officer have done to increase your satisfaction with the contact?

Question # 7

Have you attended or participated in a University Police Department crime prevention program? If so, what was the topic of the program?

Alcohol awareness

Alcohol abuse awareness

Question# 11

What do you consider the greatest strengths of the UW-Stout Police Department?

Relationship with students, staff, faculty

Willingness to be available for crime prevention programs, ect.

Training of officers is good.

Ability to get as much training and education as one desires as long as it's within reason.

Their leadership's commitment to doing anything that creates a safer campus department.

It has a community based approach to policing

Question# 12

What do you consider the greatest weaknesses of the UW-Stout Police Department?

Short staffed compared to other campus police depts. in the State of Wisconsin.

Lack of staff. Unable to do all that we want to.

They are unarmed for most of the day.

Inability to get updated equipment. Having issues like carrying policies in the hands of the chancellor who is not a police officer.

Low visibility of officers. Need more active patrol, contact with students/staff and more foot patrol on grounds and building.

Lack of manpower - Not enough budget to properly provide patrol shift officers and the officers i.e. Education officers etc.

Question# 13

What changes would you recommend to the UW-Stout Police Department in order to improve the public safety of the campus community?

Provide officers with weapons so they can protect the community when called upon to do so.

Furnish firearms with more training.

Do more traffic control (drunk drivers as well as more drug interdiction practices). Be able to carry weapons 24 hrs a day for safety of officer as well as those that officers have sworn to protect.

Recognition from administration that these are trained police professionals and should be fully equipped, including firearms. Also, more engagement by officers in high visibility patrol and community policing type activities.

Increase # patrol officers and through education and enforcement continue the fight on drugs