

Final Report and Recommendations from the Ad-Hoc Committee on Campus Police April 26, 2007

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background Information

During the fall 2006 semester, the three major constituencies at The College of New Jersey – faculty, students, and staff – all voiced significant concerns about the operations of TCNJ's Campus Police Department. In response to a substantial number of specific complaints, the representative bodies representing each of these constituencies – the Faculty Senate, the Student Government Association, and the Staff Senate – formed an Ad-Hoc Committee to investigate the nature of these complaints and propose solutions to what had become a widely-shared perception that the Campus Police Department was out-of-sync with TCNJ's Mission and Core Beliefs.

The Committee met twice per week between October 2006 and March of 2007, excluding the time when the College was on semester break. During its initial meetings, the Committee learned about the details of the many complaints from faculty, students, and staff alike alleging unprofessional conduct on behalf of the Campus Police.¹ The Committee also interviewed a number of people from the campus community related to the operations of TCNJ's Campus Police Department, including people in civilian leadership role, sworn officers who work in managerial/supervisory capacities, "rank and file" line-officers, and security officers. Having completed its work, the Committee issues this report of its findings along with a number of recommendations for improving the Campus Police Department at TCNJ.

B. Overview of Findings

Through our review, the Committee identified three problem areas in the operations of TCNJ's Campus Police Department. These areas are: (1) hiring; (2) training and evaluation; and (3) organizational structure, oversight, and management/leadership. The Committee will address each of these items in turn, and then make specific recommendations for improvement. We recognize, however, that it is unlikely that these problems can be fixed in a matter of days or weeks. It will take the coordinated efforts of several constituencies within the TCNJ Campus community to bring about positive, sustained, and effective change.

¹ These complaints were brought to the Committee by representatives from the Faculty Senate and the Student Government Association who had already assembled a body of complaints on their own as part of their representation duties of their respective constituencies.

II. FINDINGS

A. Overall Impressions

More than any one particular operational item, the Committee is most concerned about the apparent disconnect between those serving within the Campus Police Department and the larger TCNJ campus community. Any number of these people clearly viewed the Ad-Hoc Committee as a nuisance – something with which they would rather not have had to deal. This was evident in the reluctance of some Campus Police supervisors to even meet and talk with the Committee and in the fact that several supervisors who did meet with the Committee clearly did so unhappily as evidenced by a hostile tone, an uncooperative attitude, and evasive answers to questions.

The Committee is also concerned how some officers view their roles. Several officers testified that they saw "no difference" in the role or mission of Campus Police from those of municipal or city police departments. The Committee respectfully disagrees with that perspective. Different police agencies serve different roles and operate under different models (see Table 1 in Appendix A). For one thing, policing a college campus and policing a city or town are qualitatively different ventures. For example, larceny is generally considered to be the most frequently occurring campus crime (e.g., Bromley, 2003). That is not to say that violent crime does not occur on college campus, but the frequency of violent crimes on college campuses is dramatically lower than in municipalities (Fisher, Sloan, Cullen & Lu, 1998). Thus, even the crime control functions of campus police departments differ to some degree than those of municipal police departments.

But such practical differences aside, what most concerns the Committee is that too many members of the Campus Police Department fail to see themselves as members of the larger TCNJ community.² Simply stated, our Campus Police Department must change to become the model of a community policing organization.

A number of Campus Police officials, both civilians and sworn officers, testified to the Committee that they felt there were "no problems" within Campus Police or with the Department's relationship with the larger TCNJ community. These people explained that complaints from faculty, students, and staff were merely manifestations of "differences in

² The Committee notes that the disconnect between the Campus Police Department and the larger campus community extends to relationships off-campus. TCNJ Campus Police Department has not developed meaningful partnerships with other law enforcement personnel in New Jersey even though many of its individual officers have such connections. Consider, for example, that TCNJ refused to allow Campus Police officers to participate in local parades or to attend funerals/memorial services for fallen officers elsewhere in the State of New Jersey. If officers wanted to attend such services, they had to take time off from work; transport themselves in their own vehicles; and were prohibited from being in uniform. Campus Police does not exist in a vacuum as an insular operation. It is a part of TCNJ, a part of the larger Mercer County community, and one of many law enforcement organizations within the State of New Jersey. The Department needs leaders who recognize all three of these truisms and who will take steps to embrace its role as part of larger communities.

perception" rather than symptoms of any true problems. The Committee disagrees. As Part II.B. of this report should make clear, there are numerous problems with TCNJ's Campus Police Department that must be addressed.

Finally, the Committee is deeply concerned that TCNJ's Campus Police Department fails to embrace and implement true community policing both in its philosophy and operations. While certain practices that are commonly associated with community policing have been partially implemented on-campus (e.g., bicycle patrols), TCNJ ought to be the epitome of a community policing model. Sadly, it is not. As a rule, Campus Police officers, for example, tend not to provide campus escorts to students, preferring to leave that task to unarmed security officers. Similarly, some police officers rely on security officers to engage in foot patrols of campus, rather than being actively engaged in foot patrols themselves. And perhaps the strongest evidence that TCNJ's Campus Police Department does not adhere to a community policing model is the fact that TCNJ's Crime Awareness Program has been either moribund or defunct for several years.

At its core, community policing is not a set of tactics, but instead is an organizational strategy for running a department. In its most promising form, this strategy has two essential elements. First, it requires that citizens, at the neighborhood level, meet regularly with police to jointly define neighborhood crime problems and set police priorities. This consultation serves four functions: (1) it allows neighborhood residents to express their concerns and needs; (2) it gives police a forum to educate citizens about neighborhood crime issues; (3) it allows citizens to state complaints about the police themselves; and (4) it gives police a chance to report back on what actions they have taken and what successes (or not) they have had. The second critical element is that, citizens, again at the local level, take responsibility for helping to address the problems that they have identified (Forman, 2004, pp. 7-8).

B. Specific Areas of Concern

1. *Hiring Process*

Sadly, it appears that TCNJ is mandated by New Jersey state law to adhere to a deeply flawed hiring process which does not lend itself to flexible hiring of the officers who would best fit the campus environment.

a) "The List": The Process of Obtaining an Applicant Pool

Campus Police positions are filled according to the civil service regulations governing New Jersey Department of Personnel "classified positions." The pool of applicants is created by the State of New Jersey. The State periodically administers a qualifying exam to all people who desire to be police officers in the State. The people who fail this test are disqualified; those who pass are then ranked. However, scores on the test do not necessarily have anything to do with the way a candidate is ranked. So long as an applicant passes the test, even if he or she does so with the lowest possible passing score, if he or she is a disabled veteran of the U.S. armed forces, that applicant is ranked at the "top of the list." After all disabled veterans are ranked, the next group of people who are given priority in hiring are

non-disabled veterans of the armed forces. Only after all veterans are ranked are non-veteran applicants ranked according to their scores on the qualifying exam.

When TCNJ has an opening for a police officer, the State sends the College a ranking of people who are "on the list." Given the ranking system, disabled veterans are always first-in-line to fill a police vacancy. Only once all disabled veterans have been eliminated as potential hires is the College permitted to examine non-disabled veterans "on the list." And, only if no one from the non-disabled veterans list is eligible to be hired is the College permitted to even begin looking at non-veterans "on the list." The opportunity to look at non-preferred applicants (i.e., non-veterans) arises periodically. In such a situation, Human Resources told the Committee that the College may interview up to three qualified people who are highly ranked on "the list" given their qualifying exam scores.

Hiring through this civil service process contributes to TCNJ's problems with Campus Police Department in two distinct ways. The College is often in a position of having to hire someone because they are "on the list," rather than because the College feels the applicant would make a good Campus Police officer. Thus, the College has hired people whose personal attitudes are clearly not in accord with the College's Mission and Core Beliefs.

b) Selecting from "The List"

Within the hierarchy described in the last section, the College must go down "the list" and conduct an investigation of the top-ranked person waiting for a policing job. That investigation is supposed to include an interview, a background investigation, a medical examination, and a psychological evaluation.³ According to Human Resources, an applicant's poor performance during the interview does not constitute a "valid reason" for not hiring someone next "on the list." If an applicant "passes" all three qualifying tests, he or she basically cannot be denied employment even if the interview does not go well. For example, if an applicant has a criminal history that is uncovered during the background investigation, that constitutes "a valid reason" for not hiring the applicant. However, if an applicant has no criminal history and otherwise passes the remainder of the background check, the medical examination, and the psychological test, then it appears that the College is without discretion to pass on hiring an applicant even if the College feels the person would not be a "good fit" for the Campus Police Department. Thus, someone who has "job-hopped" from police department to police department, or someone who came-off as abrupt, unprofessional, and overly aggressive during a job interview must nonetheless be hired.

The Committee recognizes that TCNJ is highly limited by state law in its discretionary decision-making with regard to hiring officers within the constraints imposed by state civil service hiring regulations. However, there may be ways to improve the hiring process for new Campus Police recruits. The Committee recommends that Human Resources investigate ways in which the interview process could be improved to better screen candidates on "the list" – even if doing so requires changes in state law. The Committee therefore encourages

³ Surprisingly, there is no physical fitness test.

the College to reach-out to members of the state legislature and call on them to address the shortcomings of the current system.

c) Lengthy Background Checks

Many police departments in New Jersey complete their background investigations of applicants in under a month. In fact, two months is considered to be a long time for the process to be completed. At TCNJ, however, background checks have routinely taken between six months and a full year. Such delay has resulted in some excellent candidates taking positions with other police departments that were offered to them during the pendency of TCNJ's slow background investigations process. Background checks must be accomplished more efficiently in the future.

d) Qualifications

TCNJ's Mission Statement says that the College is dedicated to the "transformative power of education." It also states that the College "will be a national exemplar in the education of those who seek to sustain and advance the communities in which they live." Yet, TCNJ is bound to the civil service hiring system that does not require police officers at any rank to have any education beyond high school that would help officers "advance and sustain" the very community they serve. In contrast to the New Jersey civil service hiring of police, numerous municipalities in New Jersey require at least an associate's degree; a handful require a four-year degree; and several departments require a graduate degree to go beyond the rank of sergeant. There is a wealth of social scientific data to support the proposition that college-educated police perform better and more professionally than those who are not college educated (e.g., Roy & Bonn, 2004; LaGrange, 2003; Kakar, 1998; Shernock, 1992; Roberg, 1978; Cascio, 1977). Degreed officers: are better report writers and decision makers; better understand both the ethical and legal aspects of their jobs; act more professionally; have fewer complaints filed against them; and are generally higher-quality officers (Johnston & Cheurprakobkit, 2002). It is ironic that at an institution of higher education, we do not have hiring requirements that would allow us to have a police force that better understands life on a college campus through their own first-hand educational experiences. It is particularly troubling that people in positions of leadership lack both formal higher education and specialized police training (see next section) to serve at the ranks in which they now hold even though scholarly research in policing demonstrates that advance degree-holders perform better in supervisory and administrative policing posts (Krimmel & Lindenmuth, 2001; Polk & Armstrong, 2001).

Given the benefits of an educated police force, the Committee recommends that TCNJ lobby members of the state legislature to create an opt-out process from the civil service hiring system so that the College would be free to impose more stringent educational and training requirements with respect to police hiring and promotion – especially for people holding the rank of sergeant and above. If the creation of such an opt-out process is not possible, the Committee recommends that TCNJ investigate privatizing its Campus Police Department.

2. Training and Evaluation

Law enforcement officers at all ranks within the TCNJ Campus Police Department are not taking advantage of training opportunities and would seem to need more evaluation of their operational behavior. TCNJ is a member of CUPSA – College and University Police and Security Association. Yet, TCNJ police and security officers do not participate in CUPSA training programs, even though they are free to their member institutions. Moreover, TCNJ Campus Police officers and security officers are not provided with any other type of advanced training that is offered by the State of New Jersey, the Mercer County Prosecutor's Office, or any of the dozens of municipal training programs for police officers.

a) Field Training Program

For the first fourteen weeks of a new hire's employment as a Campus Police officer at TCNJ, he or she is paired with a more senior officer (usually a squad sergeant) to learn the proverbial "lay of the land." This "field training" does not include any advanced post-police academy training in law enforcement methods, but rather is an orientation to the location of buildings, the operations of the campus, etc. It is also an orientation to how things are done at TCNJ. The officers who conduct such field training, however, have never been trained to provide such guidance to new hires. That fact aside, at the end of these fourteen weeks, the training officer is supposed to "sign-off" on the new hire, certifying to his or her superior officers that the new officer is ready to patrol the campus on his/her own, without the need for constant supervision while on duty. However, there have been officers who were not recommended for such duty. Yet, in spite of the training officer's recommendation for continued supervision of the new hire, such feedback has been disregarded, as at least one non-recommended new hire was nonetheless permitted to work autonomously.

b) Inadequate Training

Once a new hire has completed the fourteen-week orientation period discussed in the preceding paragraph, the training that TCNJ provides for its officers basically ends. On a semi-annual basis, state law requires officers to requalify for firearms use. Other than engaging in such requalification on a shooting range, the Committee learned that no officer receives any additional training in things like advance criminal investigations, advance tactical weapons, crash investigation, crime scene investigations for detectives, first-responder training, public relations, internal affairs investigations, ethics, anti-gang training, grant-writing, advanced interview and interrogation techniques, traffic control, property and evidence management, sex crimes investigation, or suicide intervention. The only training that TCNJ's Campus Police officers receive are those few programs that are periodically mandated by the Mercer County Prosecutor's Office (NJDOCJ, 2002, p. 6). Additionally, sergeants and lieutenants do not undergo police leadership and supervision training. This lack of training at all levels must be relegated to the past. All officers should be provided with advanced and continuing law enforcement training appropriate to rank and to the needs of the Department (see Appendix C for recommendations regarding rank-appropriate training). The Committee recommends that the College take advantage of free training programs that are

offered through CUPSA. For training that cannot be obtained free of charge, the College must budget funds to provide for the training of its Campus Police officers from the plethora of advanced police training programs that are offered through the State of New Jersey and its municipalities. Doing so will help Campus Police officers "sustain and advance" the TCNJ community in accordance with TCNJ Mission.

c) Remedial Training for Problematic Officers

In light of the lack of educational requirements for hiring, there are a number of officers who cannot write reports without significant errors. The same is true for some officers who cannot communicate orally with members of the TCNJ community, their visitors, and the College's neighbors. These officers receive no training in report writing, language skills, and communication skills. The Committee feels that these individuals must be provided with training to help remedy the deficiencies in their performance.

3. Organizational Structure, Oversight, and Management/Leadership

According to the line-officers who spoke with the Committee, there is an absence of leadership from the top-down within Campus Police. From what the Committee has learned, it appears this failure of leadership is due, in part, to a number of reasons having to do with both problems concerning the organizational structure of the Campus Police Department and the personnel responsible for oversight and management of the Department.

a) Flawed Structural Hierarchy

For several years, someone at the rank of lieutenant has been in charge of TCNJ's Campus Police Department. Sadly, the two most recent people to serve at this rank have done so in provisional capacities. This, in part, has limited their ability to make tough managerial decisions. Moreover, as outlined in the previous section, some of the people promoted to serve in this leadership role on a provisional basis lacked the education and the advanced professional training that are normally prerequisites to promotion to such a high rank.

Moreover, the fact of the matter is that someone of a rank higher than lieutenant is usually in charge of a police department. The Committee strongly feels that the Department should have a chief, a captain, and lieutenant, or a chief and two lieutenants. Until such a structure is put into place, whoever is in the top-ranking position within Campus Police will simply be overwhelmed without the support of other, qualified managers to share in the supervision and administration of the Department.

b) Interference with the Chain-of-Command

For the last few years, some members of the Campus Police Department have operated outside the chain-of-command. This created a wide range of problems. For example, rank-and-file officers did not know who was responsible for what within the Department. Similarly, having officers operate outside the chain-of-command impaired the lieutenant's

ability to establish any sort of discipline within the Department since some subordinates did not report to him. Finally, having select officers operate outside the chain-of-command created animosity among members of the Campus Police Department that remains in place now even though some managerial changes have been made.

c) Lack of Consistency in Operations

Daily operations of the Campus Police Department vary dramatically from shift to shift depending on which squad is on patrol. Squads differ in their attitudes, levels of professionalism, and in their levels of enforcement of both laws and campus regulations. Certain sergeants and the officers who report to them take proactive steps to insure the safety of the campus; in contrast, other squads are merely reactive to emergency situations. Some officers, however, may be too aggressive, causing unnecessary strife not only among and between members of the Campus Police Department, but also for other members of the TCNJ community.

As stated above in the previous sub-section, there is great animosity among a number of Campus Police Officers. The lack of consistency in operations is a major contributing factor to this animosity. For example, some officers apparently have a much more "laid-back" attitude towards enforcement of parking rules, noise regulations, and alcohol laws. In contrast, there are other officers who aggressively pursue the enforcement of these laws and policies and fail to exercise the restraint or discretion that may be called for when relatively minor infractions occur on a college campus. While the Committee does not condone lax law enforcement practices that rise to the level of neglect of a police officer's duties, the Committee feels that a number of practices that appear to be routine for select officers are unnecessary and are incongruous with TCNJ's Core Belief that it is "a caring, friendly, and respectful community." Examples of such conduct include ticketing and towing vehicles with expired registrations rather than issuing warnings; ticketing drivers for driving one or two miles-per-hour over the speed limit; and officers using an unnecessarily hostile tone-of-voice with other members of the community rather than a respectful one.⁴

d) Lack of Internal Discipline Structure

The TCNJ Campus Police lacks a proper disciplinary structure and procedures. Discipline is supposed to be "progressive." Progressive discipline begins with a verbal warning. If the behavior is not corrected, the next step is for a supervisor to document the problem in writing and issue a written reprimand. From there, increasing levels of discipline are supposed to be used, such as a reduction in shifts on duty, suspensions, and eventually dismissals. But the Committee heard testimony from Campus Police officers that there is a lack of consistency in

⁴ When questioned about the way in which Campus Police interact with TCNJ faculty, students and staff, officers emphasized the need to treat "all members of the community" the same, whether they are affiliated with TCNJ, are visitors to our campus, or are members of the surrounding community. While there is merit to the notion that everyone should be treated in a similar manner, the Committee is concerned that in some instances, everyone may be being treated equally, but equally badly. In practice, everyone should be treated similarly – with dignity and respect.

the way discipline is internally handled. For example, there has been little or no discipline of select officers who are routinely late for work, are not in uniform, or who act in an unprofessional manner.

Part and parcel of the problem with internal discipline is the way in which complaints are handled. The Committee is well aware of the fact that the overwhelming number of complaints that are brought to the attention of Campus Police supervisors consist of baseless complaints from people who were properly ticketed for violations of parking rules or motor vehicle laws. But the Committee is concerned that complaints about the behavior of certain police officers who act in an overly aggressive, rude, disrespectful, or downright hostile manner towards members of the TCNJ campus community go largely ignored. There is a problem with accountability within the Campus Police Department. There is no formal policy governing the processing of complaints. Some disappear because they are intentionally discarded; others are lost; and still others lie dormant for such a long period of time that they are merely forgotten. Those complaints that are responded to are often handled with nothing more than repeated verbal warnings without any progressive disciplinary steps ever being taken. A formal complaint process must be developed and implemented on a uniform basis. This process cannot be one that allows those in supervisory capacities in Campus Police to simply shield one of their own. At minimum, the Campus Police Department should have an internal affairs officer who (or unit that) is properly trained to handle "policing the police." Moreover, a civilian Campus Police Advisory and Review Board should also be established to bring other members of the community into the process of reviewing the actions of officers.

e) Develop and Follow Standard Operating Procedures

Municipal police departments often have hundreds of "SOPs" – Standard Operating Procedures. According to the testimony the Committee heard, TCNJ has a mere eight SOPs. Not having SOPs has palpable consequences. It contributes to the inconsistencies in law enforcement from shift-to-shift depending on which squad is on duty. It causes confusion for line-officers who do not know how they should perform their duties in certain circumstances. It also creates managerial problems.

Even more disturbing than the lack of policies and procedures is the fact that the College was directed to correct this deficiency twice in the last decade by the State of New Jersey Division of Criminal Justice (once in 1997 and again in 2002), but the leadership of the Campus Police Department failed to do so. During its last external review of TCNJ's Campus Police Department, the State Division of Criminal Justice (a part of the State Attorney General's Office) stated, in relevant part:

The College of New Jersey's Campus Police Department currently has an extremely limited set of regulations and policies to direct officers in performance of their duties. There were no written rules and regulations to guide officer conduct, and standard operating procedures were limited to mandatory policies prescribed by the county prosecutor, and a few select department policies. The program assistant is in the process of acquiring guidelines and procedures that are available from the Division of Criminal Justice policy CD and website.

We recommend that the department develop rules and regulations for the department, as well as standard operating procedures beginning with areas of high exposure, such as use of force and vehicular pursuit. The development of policy should be a participatory process where subject matter experts are solicited to assist the director or chief with recommendations (NJDOCJ, 2002, p. 13).

Unfortunately, the lack of standardized procedures has led to great animosity between officers, some of whom have developed an "us-versus-them" attitude with respect to officers whose policing philosophy and behaviors differ from their own. Such animosity could be greatly reduced if there were policies in place to facilitate officers handling situations in a standardized manner. Accordingly, SOPs should be developed and implemented with all deliberate speed.

The Committee notes that the lack of rules, regulations, and standard operating procedures is due, in no small part, to the fact that the civilian supervisors of Campus Police for the last few years have no background in law enforcement management and supervision. Another contributing factor to the lack of developed protocols is that high-ranking members of the Campus Police Department lack both formal education in police organization and management as well as any specialized training in the supervision of a police department. TCNJ needs a qualified chief who can adapt model SOPs to the needs of our Campus Police Department. Such a person should not only have years of law enforcement experience, but also should have both formal education in criminal justice or public affairs management, and professional training in police supervision and management.

f) Problems with Campus Security

It is clear that many constituencies at TCNJ fail to realize that the College uses both unsworn security officers and sworn police officers. To rectify this situation, TCNJ must better differentiate between security and police in terms of both appearance (i.e., uniforms) and authority.

Unfortunately, security officers receive no training whatsoever. In fact, some security officers who were certified to administer CPR have not been encouraged to renew their certification! The lack of training for security officers is one of the major underlying causes for the many complaints brought to the Committee from students. Security officers are told by Campus Police officers that security personnel's job is to "observe and report." But security officers apparently do not see themselves as part of Campus Police. This is highly problematic because the security officers assume (because they have not been trained otherwise), that they are not governed by the same set of federal and state laws (as well as campus policies and regulations) that constrain police behavior just because they are not sworn law enforcement officers. Thus, for example, security officers mistakenly believe that they need not comply with the requirements of the Fourth Amendment concerning search and seizures; accordingly, they conduct random stops and searches of students and their property without warrants, probable cause, or a bona-fide exception to the Fourth Amendment's warrant requirement. But proper training would educate security officers that the law is quite different from their current understanding.

The Fourth Amendment applies only to action by the government, not to private conduct. Therefore, the government action threshold is easily fulfilled when the actor is a federal, state, or local government official. The requirement is easily unfulfilled when the actor is a private party acting independent of government policy, authority, direction, or acquiescence. A search by a private actor is not necessarily, however, a private search. A search by a private actor is within the coverage of the Fourth Amendment, if the search is conducted pursuant to official government policy or at the direction of a government agent. Furthermore, a private search is also considered public and under the rubric of the Fourth Amendment when there is governmental acquiescence in the private party's conduct. Therefore, the government action threshold can be fulfilled by government actors conducting the search, by government actors directing or facilitating private actors in a search, or by government actors acquiescing in a search conducted by private actors. (Johnston, 1997, p. 1509-10).⁵

Campus security officers appear to believe they are exempt from the requirements of the Fourth Amendment simply because of a statement in TCNJ's publication *A Guide to Residence Living*. On page 9 of that document, the College sets forth, in part, TCNJ's alcohol policy. The last sentence of that policy reads:

As per the College Alcohol policy, any staff member has the right to inspect packages and coverings entering a residence hall. You may view the full text of College Alcohol Policy and other policies at www.tcnj.edu/~studlife/handbook.

Nothing in the *Student Handbook* grants authority for staff members to conduct "inspections" of packages and/or coverings as students enter residence halls. Thus, the citation to the *Student Handbook* as the source of such authority is mistaken. Second, even if the above quoted material created an independent policy concerning "inspections" (a creative way of saying "searches"), it is clear from the fact that the policy statement (which appears never to have been approved through governance by CSCC) is intended to govern the actions of TCNJ staff when student-residents are entering a residence hall; it is not clear, however, that this policy was intended to allow Campus Police or security officers to conduct searches without regard to the Fourth Amendment. Third, and most importantly, even if – for the sake of argument – the College intended this policy to constitute a waiver of students' Fourth Amendment rights, such a unilaterally mandated waiver of rights would not likely constitute a "voluntary" waiver of rights for Fourth Amendment purposes as applied to the actions of Campus Police and security.⁶ The Committee calls for this provision of TCNJ regulations to

⁵ See, e.g., *New Jersey v. T.L.O.*, 469 U.S. 325, 336-67 (1985) (holding that school officials who carry out "searches and other disciplinary functions" pursuant to school policies are "representatives of the State" and are therefore subject to the "strictures of the Fourth Amendment"); *O'Connor v. Ortega*, 480 U.S. 709 (1987) (holding that a state hospital supervisor was limited by the Fourth Amendment); *United States v. Mekjian*, 505 F.2d 1320, 1327-28 (5th Cir.1975) (government knowledge and tacit approval of private search invokes Fourth Amendment protection); *Corngold v. United States*, 367 F.2d 1 (9th Cir.1966) (evidence suppressed because government officers either participated in private search or private actor conducted search at government officer's request); *United States v. Stein*, 322 F. Supp. 346 (N.D.Ill.1971) (evidence obtained by informant suppressed because police encouraged informant to gather evidence); *State v. Riser*, 294 S.E.2d 461 (W.Va.1982) (police may not direct a private search and escape Fourth Amendment).

⁶ *Ohio v. Robinette*, 519 U.S. 33, 39 (1996) ("The Fourth Amendment test for a valid consent to search is that the consent be voluntary.").

be revised so that it: (1) clearly applies only to the actions of college staff engaged in the enforcement of campus disciplinary procedures; and (2) does not constitute any type of a waiver of Fourth Amendment rights with respect to the actions of Campus Police or anyone acting under their direction, supervision, or command, including campus security staff.

g) Understaffing

For far too many years, the Campus Police Department has been operating at significantly understaffed levels. According to the State of New Jersey Division of Criminal Justice in their last review of TCNJ's Campus Police Department (2002), TCNJ officers work an average of 1800 hours per year. The Division of Criminal Justice wrote: "This is quite high compared to other agencies we have studied." They recommended that "a minimum of fifteen officers be assigned to the patrol function" including "ten patrol officers and five sergeants" (NJDOCJ, 2002, p. 10). In that same report, the Division of Criminal Justice also recommended the immediate hiring of a director or chief; a secretary to assist the director or chief with clerical support; and a civilian administrator (p. 9). The Division of Criminal Justice also recommended that the Campus Police Department "continue to assign one officer to conduct follow-up investigations. This investigator should receive training in interview and interrogation, crime scene processing, and internal investigations" (NJDOCJ, 2002, p. 10). Nearly five years have passed since those recommendations were made. Yet, TCNJ has not yet hired a director or chief and the recommended support personnel for this leader, nor has TCNJ increased the number of patrol units. Moreover, TCNJ recently eliminated the position of Detective-Sergeant – the position that was designed to conduct follow-up investigations. The Committee feels strongly that the College must implement the recommendations of the State of New Jersey's Division of Criminal Justice with respect to staffing levels.

The Committee also notes that the Division of Criminal Justice called for additional office support for Campus Police. The Committee learned such support has not been provided. Such understaffing has serious consequences. For example, the single dispatcher on duty at any given time has far too many responsibilities to be effective. He or she must respond to radio calls from officers; answer the non-emergency telephone lines; respond to 911 calls and amber alerts; interface with campus community members and campus visitors at the window of the Campus Police office; and issue parking passes and other vehicle permits. This situation should be remedied at once.

h) Forced Retention of Officers

Campus Police has been operating with many fewer officers than it should have on staff. Perhaps due, in part, to the fact that the Department is short-staffed, civilian TCNJ administrators with oversight authority over Campus Police have been unwilling to authorize transfers of TCNJ police officers to other policing jobs. Given the poor morale within the Campus Police Department, and further given a number of substantial personality conflicts within the ranks, TCNJ should allow officers who are unhappy working for the College to leave for employment elsewhere. Keeping officers on staff who clearly do not want to be

working for TCNJ's Campus Police Department contributes even further to poor morale and interpersonal conflicts.

4. *Miscellaneous Problems*

The three major areas outlined above – hiring; training and evaluation; and organizational structure, oversight, and management/leadership – are the areas the Committee feels are the most problematic for TCNJ's Campus Police Department. There are, however, a number of smaller problems that should also be addressed in order to facilitate the Department operating at the most efficient level possible.

a) Problems with Access Control

As a result of problems in Access Control operations, Campus Police are called away from their law enforcement and community-engagement responsibilities to lock and unlock buildings, offices, and the like. Professors should have keys to the classrooms in which they teach. Computers should enable and disable access to buildings on weekends. TCNJ IDs should be better-programmed for Access Control. And police officers should have master keys so that a sergeant does not need to respond to calls for building access.

b) Communication and Community Relations

In its last review of Campus Police, the New Jersey Division of Criminal Justice recommended that the Department "develop education programs for college staff and students designed to increase awareness of security problems" (NJDOCJ, 2002, p. 11). No such programs have been implemented by the senior officers in TCNJ's Campus Police Department in the nearly five years since that report was issued. Quite the contrary, TCNJ's Campus Police Department has consistently failed to interface with the larger communities in which it operates.

The Department should have at least one officer in charge of community relations. The campus should be better informed about policing and security matters. But simply sending emails or memos, or posting items on a web site (although an improvement over the current situation in which there is no communication between Campus Police and the larger campus community) would still be insufficient. Campus Police must become more participatory members of the TCNJ community. A community policing model should be adopted and systematically implemented. More campus police officers should participate in governance – especially on committees and in the planning of construction, parking, etc.

c) Faulty Equipment

Campus Police must deal with many equipment problems. These range from squad cars

and bicycles that are not properly maintained,⁷ to security cameras that do not record and alarms that sound for no apparent reason. Such problems detract from the time that the officers could be spending on the business of policing.

d) Lack of Proper Signage on Campus

Nearly everyone from whom the Committee heard testified that many problems with traffic and parking enforcement could be solved if TCNJ installed more signs around its campus that clearly delineated traffic regulations. Campus Police themselves have asked for more than twenty different signs to be erected so that drivers who may be unaware of certain rules and regulations could be better informed. This has not occurred.⁸ The Committee recommends that the College invest in all of the signs requested by Campus Police (see Appendix A). Doing so would go a long way in reducing complaints by drivers who feel they were unnecessarily targeted for traffic and/or parking violations.

e) Location of Campus Police

While the Committee feels that Campus Police does not operate in accordance with true community policing standards, it is undoubtedly difficult for police to feel a part of the campus community when they are not physically located within the central boundaries of TCNJ's campus. The Committee recommends that the College investigate the feasibility of moving Campus Police out of the Administrative Services Building to a more centrally-located part of campus, such as in the old library, Holman Hall, or Forcina Hall.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Restructure and Reorient Campus Police Using a Community-Oriented Policing Model

According to the Office of Community-Oriented Policing Services at the United States Department of Justice (2003):

Community policing focuses on crime and social disorder through the delivery of police services that includes aspects of traditional law enforcement, as well as prevention, problem-solving, community engagement, and partnerships. The community policing model balances reactive responses to calls for service with proactive problem-solving centered on the causes of crime and disorder. Community policing requires police and citizens to join together as partners in the course of both identifying and effectively addressing these issues.

⁷ Because bicycles have not been properly maintained, TCNJ's Campus Police Department has not been able to effectively engage in bicycle patrols – one of the few community policing tactics that the Department had attempted to put into practice.

⁸ The Committee heard conflicting reports about whether a "signage committee" had been formed to address the shortcomings with insufficient signage on-campus. If such a committee does exist, it has clearly not addressed the concerns of Campus Police regarding inadequate signage at TCNJ.

The core elements of community policing are described below:

Organizational Elements:

1. Philosophy Adopted Organization-Wide
2. Decentralized Decision-Making and Accountability
3. Fixed Geographic Accountability and Generalist Responsibilities
4. Utilization of Volunteer Resources
5. Enhancers

Tactical Elements:

1. Enforcement of Laws
2. Proactive, Crime Prevention Oriented
3. Problem-solving

External Elements:

1. Public Involvement in Community Partnerships
2. Government and Other Agency Partnerships

Unfortunately, TCNJ's Campus Police Department does not use a community-oriented policing model with respect to organizational, tactical, and external elements. More troubling, perhaps, is that many members of TCNJ's Campus Police Department have no desire to embrace a community-oriented policing approach to their jobs. Many are aloof, while others are overzealous, hostile, rude, and/or disrespectful. Both rank-and-file officers and those in leadership positions testified to the Committee in terms that matched those used by officers at Harvard in the 1990s nearly verbatim: "We don't work for the University [the College]. We're sworn police officers. We have to enforce the law" (Harvard Magazine, 1999). In response to those comments, Harvard's Chief of Police Francis "Bud" Riley responded that he "felt that emphasis was misplaced, that the department had to focus on what the community needed. That's where our authority comes from, the community." Chief Riley's point-of-view mirrors that of campus policing as set forth in Appendix A. It is also echoed by the Chief of Police of Boston College, Robert A. Morse, whose "policing emphasis is focused on the educational aspects rather than on the punitive side of law enforcement" (Morse, 2006). Sadly, far too many of TCNJ's Campus Police officers do not recognize the legitimacy of this model of policing.

A review of the Campus Police web site reveals nothing about the Department that suggests it subscribes and adheres to a community policing model. No mission statement, core beliefs and values, or vision statements are anywhere to be found on the web site. Moreover, parts of the web site are non-functional – most notably the "staff roster" section.⁹ How can officers be effective members of a community-oriented policing force when their identities are not even known to the campus?

Both the civilian and sworn officers who lead TCNJ's Campus Police Department must subscribe to and meaningfully implement community policing philosophies and practices. Moreover, they must put such philosophies into diurnal practice in their programs, decisions, and

⁹ Even the term "staff roster" reflects an older, more traditional policing model. This stands in sharp contrast to the web sites of many other institutions that have a welcome message from the chief of police and a link to "meet our officers" prominently displayed on their home page.

methods so that TCNJ's Campus Police Department can be transformed into the very model of a campus-community policing partnership. Toward that end, the Committee feels the following actions must be taken in order to align the work of TCNJ's Campus Police Department with the College's Mission and Core Beliefs:

1. The Mission of TCNJ's Campus Police Department must be changed to flow from and be in accordance with TCNJ's Mission and Core Beliefs. We refer Campus Police to the approaches taken at a number of our sister institutions whose approaches are endorsed by the Committee.

- a. *Amherst College:* The Campus Police Department exists to work in cooperation with the Amherst College community striving to provide a safe environment in which people may pursue academic and personal growth.

The Department seeks to enhance the quality of life on the Amherst College campus through a dedication to community service. The Department investigates problems as well as incidents, focusing on solutions and fostering a sense of community and safety at the College. The Department makes every effort to recognize and prevent circumstances that may create a hazard to the community. The Department will strive to gain the trust of the community by holding ourselves to the highest standards of professionalism, ethics and integrity. The Department adheres to the methods of the Community Oriented Problem Solving philosophy.

The Campus Police Department shall engage in the judicious enforcement of the Laws of the Commonwealth and the rules of Amherst College. The Department shall engage in proactive crime prevention measures and the apprehension and prosecution of those who present a threat to the community. The Campus Police Department shall operate within the guidelines of Federal, State and Local laws.

- b. *The College of William and Mary:* It is essential for any institution of higher learning to maintain an environment in which there exists a positive atmosphere and sense of well-being. Members of the academic community must perceive themselves as being well-protected, well-cared for, and secure in their environment. Only when this perception is established can the institution's primary missions of learning, teaching and researching be achieved. The primary purpose of the William and Mary Police Department is to support the academics through maintenance of a peaceful and orderly community and through provision of needed general and emergency services. The accomplishment of this purpose is fulfilled through constant attention to the areas of public safety, security, law enforcement and service assistance to the various departments and offices of the College. . . . The College Police Department places a high degree of priority on cooperation with the various departments of the university. In fulfilling the responsibilities associated with its purpose for existence, the College Police Department recognizes the overall academic mission. Concern for the community well-being, a desire to provide service and assistance whenever possible, and a constant desire to support the academic environment are all factors that are inherent in the department's daily operations and policies.
- c. *Miami University of Ohio:* The Miami University Police Department is composed of 29 sworn police officers commissioned by the State of Ohio, 6 communication specialists and 5 civilian support staff. Our mission is to maintain a safe community through collaboration, service, protection and enforcement with the goal of achieving a collective vision for a better future.

The members of our department value:

Humanity – We respect life and liberty. We are sensitive and inclusive, treating everyone with dignity and compassion.

Integrity – We are guided by the principles of justice. We employ the highest ethical standards; we demand accountability, consistency, fairness and honesty in the performance of our duties.

Professionalism – We take pride in our department. We are committed to excellence in our profession, and we maintain the highest standards of education in our field.

- d. *The University of Wisconsin at Madison:* We prevent crime and respond to individual and community needs with a well-equipped, trained, professional police agency.

In supporting the University's academic and research mission, we will continue our efforts to assure safety and security for all people who come in contact with the University of Wisconsin. With a commitment to serve with excellence, we will treat each individual with compassion and respect.

We safeguard and serve all individuals. We uphold the U.S. Constitution and human rights, honoring our history and building toward a positive future. We take pride in who we are and what we do.

2. In addition to a new mission, TCNJ's Campus Police Department must develop a vision statement, as well as core beliefs and practices. Again, the Committee recommends that the new leadership of Campus Police consider the following vision statements and goals from other institutions of higher education whose stated values reflect what the Committee feels should be those embraced at TCNJ:

- a. *The University of Maine:*

- Community policing stresses that officers are educators first and law enforcers second. Crime prevention and local problem-solving are the foundations of this method.
- Community policing model encourages students and official to become familiar with one another and a more approachable, personal basis. . . . With increased trust between students and officers, a comfort zone is created, reducing the common barrier between law enforcement and citizens.

- b. *The University of Wisconsin at Madison:*

- As leaders in University policing, our Vision is to provide protective services and expert guidance as our community adapts to the accelerating pace of worldwide change.
- Our values of Respect, Integrity, Compassion, and Honor will be modeled through the quality of our services. We will enhance our efforts to work in partnership with the University, aligned community agencies and our professional peers. We will utilize community feedback, self-assessment and best practices to solve community problems.
- Our organization will encourage professional growth and education. We will cultivate diversity and creativity that supports our values and Vision. We will recognize and reward service excellence in fulfilling our Mission.

- Our reputation will be a culture bonded in the highest ethical and professional standards in response to community needs.
3. Police presence on foot or bicycle on the campus is an essential component of community-oriented policing. But campus security officers, not Campus Police officers, do much of the foot patrol at TCNJ. And given the state of disrepair into which the Campus Police Department's bicycles have fallen, that element of community policing has all but vanished. The Committee recommends that Campus Police study ways to better implement both foot and bicycle patrol by its police officers.¹⁰
 4. In the spirit of community policing on a college campus, and in an effort to build trust and community relations, not all police encounters – even in relation to potential violators – should be about enforcement and sanctioning. A community policing philosophy implies an educational, non-confrontational approach whenever possible and emphasizes relationship-building between the police and the communities they serve (CSMSM). For example:
 - a. When Campus Police identifies a legally parked vehicle with an expired registration or inspection sticker, a community-oriented policing approach to the situation would not be to issue a summons and/or have the car towed (a practice that formed the basis of a large number of complaints from members of our campus community), but rather to warn the owner of the vehicle. If the owner fails to follow-up within a reasonable period of time (e.g., ten days), then issuing a ticket may be in order. Towing a car belonging to a TCNJ student, faculty, or staff member does not seem appropriate.
 - b. Faculty and students (particularly those in music, art, and the sciences) and staff (particularly those in student life and facilities) – must frequently pick-up or drop-off equipment and materials at various campus buildings. There were numerous reported incidents in which Campus Police officers harassed or even ticketed faculty or staff while they were performing such activities. Such conduct is incompatible with community-oriented policing.

There are many more specific examples the Committee could report here. But rather than belaboring the point, the Committee recommends that Campus Police clearly articulate a philosophy of community-oriented policing that emphasizes an advisement and counseling approach to the community it serves, whenever possible (just as the Office of Student Life has done with campus disciplinary matters). As part and parcel of such an approach, Campus Police should emphasize informal sanctions in situations where discretion is permitted. This philosophy should be a shared value of all Campus Police officers employed by TCNJ (CSUSM).

¹⁰ This recommendation has been adapted for TCNJ from the recommendations of the Final Report of the Task Force on Campus Policing at California State University at San Marcos (May 6, 2005). Hereafter in this report, any recommendation that is followed by citation to "CSUSM" has been similarly modified by the Committee.

5. Best practices in community-oriented policing on college and university campuses suggest that campus police officers should participate in defined educational ventures. Yet, TCNJ's Campus Police officers rarely engage in educational programs to proactively prevent crime or personal injury on our campus. The Committee recommends that TCNJ recruit and retain qualified police officers with an interest and ability to conduct educational sessions in cooperation with other segments of the campus community (CSUSM).
6. Problem-oriented policing is an essential component of community-oriented policing. In this approach, the police work to develop partnerships with the community to identify and address problems or issues within the community related to public safety. TCNJ's Campus Police does not engage in problem-oriented policing. For example, several officers refused to even meet with the Committee to discuss the issues facing Campus Police. And, several leaders of Campus Police who did meet with the Committee, both civilian and sworn officers, denied the existence of any problems, refusing to even listen to the concerns of the community. The Committee recommends that Campus Police work with the larger TCNJ community to identify areas of concern and develop shared, problem-oriented approaches to their resolution (CSUSM). The Committee further recommends that officers who refuse to participate in such community-engaged partnerships should ultimately be terminated from TCNJ's employ.

B. Hire a Qualified Chief of Campus Police Who Embraces Community-Oriented Policing

TCNJ announced its intention to hire a Campus Police Director. The preliminary job advertisement called for the hiring of a civilian:

[R]equired to possess a *bachelor's degree*, and a minimum of 10 years of progressively responsible and practical experience in a law enforcement *or related field*, 5 years of command level supervisory responsibility for operations that includes oversight of patrol units, field supervisors, investigations, communications and administration. In addition, the successful candidate must have experience in incident command and internal affairs procedures, with community policing and college/university experience strongly preferred. The position also requires strong interpersonal skills and the demonstrated ability to build a team, and work effectively with multiple agencies, students, faculty, staff and guests of the College (emphasis added).

The Committee disagrees that hiring such a person is in the best interest of the College for a number of reasons.

1. The inclusion of the phrase "or related field" is deeply troublesome, as it would allow someone with a background in private security, rather than sworn law enforcement, to qualify for the position. Our Campus Police Department is comprised of sworn law enforcement officers who need a supervisor with significant experience in policing, not a "related field."
2. Whoever is hired to lead campus police should hold a *master's degree* in criminal justice, police administration, or public affairs with a specialization in policing or criminal

justice. As the vision statement from the University of Maine quoted above stated: "Community policing stresses that officers are educators first and law enforcers second." Educators should be educated. Moreover, a well-educated police chief is more likely to encourage professional growth and education both within the Campus Police Department and within the campus community as a whole.

3. Most importantly, the Committee does not feel a civilian police director is the best hiring option. Each of the institutions from whom the Committee quoted language earlier in this report – Amherst College, Boston College, Harvard University, The College of William and Mary, Miami University of Ohio, and The University of Maine, and The University of Wisconsin – all have a chief of police, not a civilian director. Moreover, every single witness from whom the Committee heard testified that a chief of police was needed. We support the unanimous call we heard for a police chief because there are numerous limitations on having a civilian police director instead of a sworn police chief.

A civilian director may not perform police duties including conducting motor vehicle stops, engaging in patrol activities, answering calls for service and stopping or detaining individuals. A "director" may not wear a uniform or badge or carry a firearm, nor may he or she operate a motor vehicle which is equipped as a police car, including police band radios. Likewise, they have no powers of arrest and may not issue firearms permits. *N.J.S.A. 40A:14- 152; N.J.S.A. 2C:58-3. . . .* The Office of Attorney General has addressed the issue of the limits on the authority and actions of civilian police directors on multiple occasions. In addition to the statutory and caselaw restrictions placed upon civilian police directors, the Attorney General clarified other limitations inherent in this position. For example, civilian directors may not have access to criminal investigative reports, nor may he or she have access to criminal history information. Likewise, such individuals must refrain, unless specifically directed by the County Prosecutor, from directing the investigation of criminal activity. Nor may a "director," as a civilian, have access to internal affairs investigative files absent a court order. [*Opinion Letter from Deputy Attorney General O'Grady to Chief Robert DeLitta, Nutley Police Department, September 5, 1997*]. Moreover, a "director" may not examine confidential police reports or other confidential law enforcement documents, nor may he or she access the police department's terminal for data, including NJCIC and NCIC information, or operate a police vehicle or a vehicle equipped with a police radio. [*Opinion Letter from Deputy Attorney General Keating to Hon. John G. Laky, Warren County Prosecutor, April 9, 1999; Letter Opinion from Deputy Attorney General to Hon. Kevin Sanders, Mayor, City of Asbury Park, September 15, 2003*]. (NJSACOP, 2007, pp. 3-4).

In light of the limitations placed on civilian directors, the Committee calls upon the College to search for and hire a qualified chief of police. We urge the College to seek someone not only who has passed the required examinations, but also who has at least ten years of progressive experience in police supervision and management (including experience in incident command and internal affairs procedures); who has gone through the proper advanced training to hold such a rank; and who is additionally qualified through formal graduate education in criminal justice, police management, or public affairs. And, most of all, the person hired must have the professional and interpersonal skills necessary to reform and reinvent TCNJ's Campus Police Department within a community-oriented policing framework.

C. Change Campus Police Hiring Practices

TCNJ simply must improve its hiring practices. Given the benefits of an educated police force, the Committee recommends that TCNJ lobby members of the state legislature to create an opt-out process from the civil service hiring system so that the College would be free to impose more stringent educational and training requirements with respect to police hiring and promotion – especially for people holding the rank of sergeant and above. If the creation of such an opt-out process is not possible, the Committee recommends that TCNJ investigate privatizing its Campus Police Department.

In the event that TCNJ must operate within the constraints of the rigid framework of the State's civil service hiring structure, the College can still improve its hiring processes by doing faster background checks. Moreover, the interview process must be improved so that applicants who are unlikely to comport themselves professionally and in-line with the College's Mission and Core Beliefs, as well as community-oriented policing ideals and practices, can be screened-out.

D. Staffing

1. Once a new chief of police is hired, he or she should be empowered to hire the staff that is needed to operate Campus Police in an efficient manner. Towards this end, we urge the College to hire a second lieutenant or a captain, a fifth sergeant, and as many patrol officers as necessary to for Campus Police to be fully-staffed at its line allocation of 23 officers.
2. The College must set higher standards beyond the mere passage of a qualifying exam before people are put into positions of leadership or supervision within the Campus Police Department. While it is true that promotions and demotions within the Campus Police Department are made, in part, via a competitive examination process, there are other factors that may be considered in addition to passing a qualifying examination, such as the officer's on-the-job performance and the number of reprimands an officer has received. TCNJ must do a better job in making promotion decisions. Doing so, in turn, will require TCNJ to implement both better performance reviews of officers and a system of documenting officer conduct and discipline.
3. TCNJ must better differentiate between security and police in terms of both appearance (i.e., uniforms) and authority.

E. Training

1. There are a host of post-police academy training programs offered throughout the State of New Jersey. TCNJ's Campus Police Officers should be required to attend a certain number of advanced training courses as a part of their regular employment responsibilities. The Committee recommends that the College take advantage of free training programs that are offered through CUPSA. For training that cannot be obtained

free of charge, the College must budget funds to provide for the training of its Campus Police officers from the plethora of advanced police training programs that are offered through the State of New Jersey and its municipalities. Doing so will help Campus Police officers "sustain and advance" the TCNJ community in accordance with TCNJ Mission.

2. No one should be promoted to any rank (detective, sergeant, detective-sergeant, lieutenant, captain, or chief) without having been properly trained to hold these positions of supervision by an agency accredited to provide such training. We recommend that officers at all ranks receive training in the following areas: advance criminal investigations, advance tactical weapons, crash investigation, crime scene investigations for detectives, first-responder training, public relations, internal affairs investigations, ethics, anti-gang training, grant-writing, advanced interview and interrogation techniques, traffic control, property and evidence management, sex crimes investigation, and suicide intervention.
3. Additionally, we urge the College to halt its long-standing practice of promoting officers to supervisory or leadership positions without them having first gone through specialized training programs that are designed to teach them the skills necessary to effectively work at a supervisory rank (see Appendix C for a sample list of training courses that are appropriate to rank).
4. Sub-performing officers should be required to undergo remedial training to address their deficiencies.

F. Supervision and Discipline

There must be consistency of performance from shift to shift, and squad to squad. There must also be consistency in discipline. Hiring a new chief of police, and then making sure that those officers who hold the rank of sergeant and above are properly trained and educated commensurate with their rank will go a long way in professionalizing TCNJ's Campus Police Department. But just hiring a few qualified individuals will not be sufficient to address the problems with poor morale and ineffective discipline with the Campus Police Department. The Committee feels strongly that three additional steps must be taken to insure both corrective action and prophylactic measures for the future.

1. Campus Police must create and implement a standardized system for handling both informal and formal complaints. The manner in which complaints are currently handled is detrimental to building community. Complaints must be seriously reviewed and appropriate action must be taken in response to them to insure improvement for officer performance, community concerns, and public safety. Once a system is devised to handle complaints in a standardized manner, the complaint form must not be exclusively available at Campus Police. It should be available in deans' offices, the Office of Student Life, residence halls, and on the TCNJ web site so that people who wish to file complaints feel comfortable doing so.

2. Campus Police should hire officers at varying ranks with experience and training in internal affairs. Alternatively, TCNJ could educate, train, and then promote qualified people from within the Campus Police Department to serve in a specialized internal affairs position. The fact that the Department does not have a single person at any rank who is trained in internal affairs is inexcusable – especially since the State of New Jersey Division of Criminal Justice urged such a hiring or training twice over the last decade (once in 1997 and again in 2002).
3. The College should investigate the formation of a Campus Police Advisory and Review Board. Not only should this Board be empowered to conduct civilian review of complaints filed by members of the community against Campus Police Officers, but also should be proactive in working with the Campus Police Department to review its policies and practices within a community policing framework. We recommend that such an Advisory Board be modeled after the one at the University of California at Berkeley. The following is its mission statement:

The Berkeley Campus Police Review Board exists to review appeals taken from civilian complaint investigations undertaken by the University of California Police Department. In appropriate cases, it has the power to order the Department to reopen its investigation or to conduct its own independent investigation and hearings in the matter. The Board also performs an audit role, examining the overall performance of the Department's complaint process and the quality of police-community interactions and making policy recommendations concerning those issues as appropriate.

The composition of this Advisory and Review Board should include an active duty, sworn law enforcement officer from one of the surrounding communities (e.g., Trenton, Ewing, Pennington, or the State Police); a retired law enforcement officer; an attorney with relevant areas of practical experience; a representative from Human Resources; TCNJ faculty and students (preferably some of whom would have relevant areas of expertise, such as professors and students from the Departments of Criminology, Sociology, or Psychology); TCNJ staff members, including at least one representative from Student Life and one from the TACT (Town and College Together) Council; and at least one civilian member of the off-campus community (e.g., a local Ewing resident). No member of Campus Police or security should be permitted to serve on the Advisory and Review Board. The operations of this Board, including how cases get referred to it, should be studied by examining the best practices of other civilian review and advisory boards as well as any governing statutory or regulatory law. The New Jersey Division of Criminal Justice can be of great assistance in assembling such a review board and establishing its operating procedures.

G. Communication and Engagement Strategies

Community-oriented policing emphasizes excellent communications between police and the communities they serve. Communication must be bilateral; police must inform communities of their policy decisions as well as seek information that will make the community safer. In turn, community members must be encouraged to communicate their concerns about public safety and

about police actions (CSUSM). Unfortunately, neither the members of TCNJ's Campus Police Department nor the civilians who hold supervisory authority of the Department have been effective in communicating with the TCNJ campus community. Accordingly, the Committee recommends the following:

1. Campus Police must become more engaged members of the TCNJ campus community. The names and faces of all officers should be familiar to faculty, students, and staff alike. Campus Police should participate in many aspects of Welcome Week. Officers should attend campus events; serve on both standing and ad-hoc committees and task forces; be visible in the student center, academic buildings, and residence halls; and engage in continuing education through course enrollment. Officers should be assigned as liaisons to specific groups like the Faculty Senate, the Staff Senate, the Student Government Association, the standing committees of the governance structure, and various campus social organizations. In this way, officers can get to know the members of the community they serve and vice-versa. Officer liaisons should meet with their constituent groups at least once or twice per month to discuss campus trends, feedback from constituents, ongoing concerns, and opportunities for improvement in services (CSUSM).
2. Campus Police must establish better modes of communication with the campus. A Campus Police newsletter should be created. Campus Police should make better use of campus email and *The Signal* to communicate with the campus community. A crime awareness and prevention program should be instituted. A "crime tip hotline" could be established. And, most of all, Campus Police officers must communicate personally with all constituencies on campus regarding both routine and special matters.
3. The Campus Police web site should be completely revamped. A mission statement and guiding values should be clearly accessible from the Department's home page. A staff section of the web site should include photos and short biographies of all Campus Police personnel. It would also be helpful if officers added a statement of their own to their area of the Department's web site, perhaps explaining why they choose to work at TCNJ rather than in a municipal police department.
4. Create a "Campus-Watch" program (similar to Neighborhood Watch programs) and other opportunities for members of the TCNJ community to volunteer their time, energy, and talents towards helping Campus Police achieve the goals of community-oriented policing. The Committee also recommends that Campus Police investigate having an internship program for students (particularly those with expertise in criminal justice, community development, social work, and counseling).
5. It is undoubtedly difficult for police to feel a part of the campus community when they are not physically located within the central boundaries of TCNJ's campus. The Committee recommends that the College investigate the feasibility of moving Campus Police out of the Administrative Services Building to a more centrally-located part of campus, such as in the old library, Holman Hall, or Forcina Hall.

H. Obtain Grants

TCNJ has not actively sought grants to help fund community policing initiatives. The United States Department of Justice has millions of dollars of grant money available to help police departments, like TCNJ's, transform themselves into community-oriented policing units. The Committee recommends that the College hire staff (even if they are external consultants) to help TCNJ obtain grant money.

I. Enact Lawful Search Policies for Staff

TCNJ regulations need to be created through the standard governance process, starting with CSCC, so that policies concerning the searching of students by College personnel who are not police or security officers (or those acting in concert with them) are properly enacted. This policy should be created in consultation with both the Office of the Vice-President for Student Life and the Office of the State Attorney General so that the policies created comport with both campus disciplinary procedures and all applicable state and federal laws.

J. Implement Select Recommendations Previously Made By Others

1. Campus Police has compiled a list of signs that should be added to the campus (see Appendix A). Those signs should be purchased and erected with all deliberate speed. Faulty equipment should be repaired or replaced. Access Control should be improved.
2. The New Jersey Division of Criminal Justice made a number of recommendations in its last report to TCNJ that have gone largely ignored. The ones regarding hiring and training have already been highlighted earlier in the report (see page 12). Others that should be implemented include:
 - Developing an updated emergency plan for disaster management.
 - Commissioning the assistance of a K-9 unit to detect explosives.¹¹
 - Screening buildings before special events.
 - Negotiating a written agreement with Ewing Township about the respective jurisdictions of Campus Police and Ewing Police with respect to off-campus properties owned by The College of New Jersey, including initial response and follow-up investigations.
 - Developing a complete and meaningful series of policies and Standard Operating Procedures that generally follow the International Association of College Law Enforcement Administrators' (IACLEA) standards.

¹¹ Although not in the report from the New Jersey Division of Criminal Justice, the Committee also sees merit in having a K-9 unit that can detect drugs.

3. The development of the aforementioned programs and policies should be approached from a community-oriented policing perspective. Thus, various constituencies of the TCNJ community should be included in the creation of as many of these programs and policies as is feasible.

K. Restructure the Chain-of-Command to Facilitate Community-Oriented Policing

The Committee recommends that Campus Police be moved under the responsibilities of the Vice-President of Student Life. Such a structural reorganization would have the benefit of allowing Campus Police to more regularly interact with senior-level staff in the Student Life area who have expertise in building community. In fact, some actually have experience working within a community policing model on other campuses. Another benefit to such a restructuring would be that Campus Police could collaborate better with residence life, health and wellness services, and the other areas supervised by the Vice-President for Student Life. In turn, this would allow a community-based response to the most frequent type of law enforcement violation that Campus Police encounter on TCNJ's campus: alcohol and drug violations. Finally, such a restructuring would have the added benefit of allowing Campus Police and the Office of the Vice-President for Student Life to work together in a more collaborative and holistically integrative manner on student disciplinary matters than arise from student violations of laws and TCNJ rules and policies.

IV. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it is the Committee's hope that the recommendations contained in this report will enable the president to make decisions that would be in the best interest of our entire community. In the spirit of TCNJ's Mission, it is only then that we will truly have a sustained community where all members are able to advance.

Respectfully Submitted,

The Ad-Hoc Committee on Campus Police

Lynette Harris, co-chair and staff representative;
James Gant, co-chair and student representative;
Jim Bricker, faculty representative;
Hank Fradella, faculty representative;
Lorna Johnson, faculty representative;
Christina Puglia, staff representative;
James Lopez, staff representative; and
Steve Viola, student representative.

REFERENCES

- Bromley, M.L. (2003). Comparing campus and municipal police community policing practices. *Journal of Security Administration*, 26(2), 37-50.
- California State University San Marcos. (2005). Final report of the task force on campus policing. Retrieved March 4, 2007, from <http://www.csusm.edu/fas/Task/Task%20Force%20on%20Campus%20Policing%20final%20050605.doc>.
- Cascio, W.F. (1977). Formal education and police officer performance. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 5, 89-96.
- Fisher, B.S., Sloan, J., Cullen, F. & Lu, C. (1998). Crime in the Ivory Tower: The level and sources of student victimization. *Criminology*, 36(3), 671-710.
- Forman, J. (2004). Community policing and youth as assets. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 95, 1-48.
- Harvard University (1999, July-August). Community policing [Electronic version]. *Harvard Magazine*, 101(6). Retrieved March 4, 2007, from <http://www.harvardmag.com/ja99/jhj.police.html>.
- Johnston, B.M. (1997). The media's presence during the execution of a search warrant: a per se violation of the Fourth Amendment. *Ohio State Law Journal*, 58, 1499-1534.
- Johnston, C.W. & Cheurprakobkit, S. (2002). Educating our police: Perceptions of police administrators regarding the utility of a college education, police academy training and preferences in courses for officers. *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, 4(3), 182-197.
- Kakar, S. (1998). Self-evaluations of police performance: An analysis of the relationship between police officers' education level and job performance. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 21(4), 632-647.
- Krimmel, J.T. & Lindenmuth, P. (2001). Police chief performance and leadership styles. *Police Quarterly*, 4(4), 469-483.
- LaGrange, T.C. (2003). The role of police education in handling cases of mental disorder. *Criminal Justice Review*, 28(1), 88-112.
- Morse, R.A. (2006). Statement of the chief of police. Retrieved March 4, 2007, from <http://www.bc.edu/offices/bcpd/about/chief/>.

- New Jersey Division of Criminal Justice ("NJDOCJ"). (2002). Report of The College of New Jersey Campus Police Department Technical Assistance Project.
- New Jersey State Association of Chiefs of Police. (2007). Limitations of Authority Under NJ Law of Civilian Police/Public Safety Directors. NJSACP White Paper, available online at <http://www.njsacop.org/DIRECTORSLIMITATIONWHITEPAPER.pdf>.
- Polk, O.E. & Armstrong, D.A. (2001). Higher education and law enforcement career paths: Is the road to success paved by degree? *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 12(1), 77-99.
- Roberg, R.R. (1978). An analysis of the relationships among higher education, belief systems, and job performance of patrol officers. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 6, 336-344.
- Roy, R.; Bonn, S. (2004). Higher education and policing: Where are we now? *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, 27(4), 469-486.
- Shernock, S.K. (1992). The effects of college education on professional attitudes among police. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 3(1), 71-92.
- United States Department of Justice. (2003). What is community policing? Retrieved March 4, 2007, from <http://www.cops.usdoj.gov/default.asp?Item=36>.

APPENDIX A

Table 1: A Comparative Analysis of Police Models

	Traditional Policing	Community Policing	Campus Policing
Goals	Control of crime; deterrence and apprehension.	Crime control as a means of community order, peace, and security.	Crime control and disciplinary enforcement as a means to ensure campus order, peace, and security.
Framework	Reactive crisis management.	Preventive as well as reactive policing.	Preventive as well as reactive policing.
Authority	From law.	From society and community granted through law.	From college/university administration, faculty, staff, and students granted through campus rules and regulations, as well as law.
Roles	<p>Legally defined and limited by law.</p> <p>Distinct and separate agency of social control.</p> <p>Professional crime fighters.</p> <p>Address crime only.</p>	<p>Socially defined, framed by law.</p> <p>Part of larger social and legal agencies of community protection.</p> <p>One of a number of agencies of social order.</p> <p>Addresses crime and social problems that affect crime.</p>	<p>Environmentally defined.</p> <p>Part of larger social, legal, and educational communities.</p> <p>Peacekeeping and educational professionals.</p> <p>Addresses crime, as well as social, educational, and environmental factors that affect safety, security, and health of a campus community.</p>
Community – Police Relationship	<p>Police: passive role.</p> <p>Community as supportive but adjunct to police.</p>	<p>Police: Active role in policymaking serving community as client..</p> <p>Community as Client with shared responsibility for crime control and maintenance of social order.</p>	<p>Police: Active role in policymaking as part of an educational community.</p> <p>Non-police members of academic community are a part of the same community in which campus police function. Police, as a part of a learning community, share responsibility with educational professionals for crime control, maintenance of social order, and promotion of health and welfare of community members.</p>

Source: (Lanier, 1995; Jackson, 1992).

APPENDIX B

Signage Recommendations

1. "No Parking"
 - a. "J" Street: across from the "Visitor/Vendor " spaces
 - b. "D" Street: New Library extension (if legal – "Service Vehicles Only)
 - c. All dumpster areas – "No Parking – Tow Away Zone"
 - d. "J" Street – rear of Rec Center
2. "Loading Permit Required"
 - a. "D" Street: New Library – "Loading Area – Permit Required"
 - b. Kendall Hall loading dock
3. "No Stopping or Standing"
 - a. "C" Street: bordering Lot 8
 - b. "C" Street: bordering Lot 17
 - c. Metzger: bordering Lot 9
 - d. "F" Street: circle
4. "Authorized Vehicles Only"
 - a. ALL Townhouse Complexes
 - b. Lot 9 Access Road
 - c. Street 13
 - d. Holman & Forcina Walkway Ramp
 - e. Entrance to sallyport/lot 18
5. "Fire Zone" (sign and/or paint)
 - a. Rear of Wolfe
 - b. New Library? (D street extension)
6. "State Law: Yield to Pedestrians in Crosswalk"
 - a. Needed near main lots
 - b. Inconsistently used
7. Paint/Post Fire Hydrant areas

8. Parking Lot Signs
 - a. Clearer
 - b. Placement
 - c. Accurate – "3A"?
9. Fix meters
10. Entrance Signs
 - a. Parking Permit Required At All Times, Unless Otherwise Posted
 - b. Police Department (directions)
11. Survey: Parking & Lighting
 - a. Useless – not effectively utilized
12. Campus Police Department
 - a. Signs and directions needed

APPENDIX C

Recommended Post-Academy Training by Rank

A. Patrols

1-3 years of service

1. Bias Crimes
2. Courtroom Testimony
3. Domestic Violence Investigation I
4. Effective Writing
5. Police Professionalism
6. Street Encounters, Stops, and Frisks
7. Bike School
8. Gang Awareness
9. 2C, Title 39, and Arrest Search & Seizure Updates
10. Accident and Crash Investigation I
11. Off-Duty Survival
12. Weapon Retention and Self-Defense
13. De-Escalating Force

3-5 years of service

1. Accident and Crash Investigation II
2. Driving While Intoxicated Investigations/Horizontal Gaze N Class
3. Crime Scene Investigation
4. Interview and Interrogation
5. Evidence Technician
6. Methods of Instruction
7. Field Training Officer Preparation
8. Firearms Instructor (if needed)
9. Monadnock PR-24 Instructor
10. Many faces of Probable Cause
11. Oleoresin Capsicum Aerosol Training
12. Identifying Fraudulent ID's

5-10 years of service

1. Leadership and Supervision
2. Criminal Procedure Update
3. Auto Theft Investigation
4. Evidence Management
5. Organizational Integrity
6. Weingarten Rights, Garrity Rights, and Civil Liability
7. Building Clearing

B. Detective

1. Advanced Criminal Investigation
2. Investigator Safety and Security
3. Evidence Technician
4. Criminal Procedure Update
5. Many Faces of Probable cause
6. Interview and Interrogation
7. Anatomy of a Search Warrant
8. Asset Forfeiture
9. Advanced Counter-Terrorism
10. Domestic Violence Investigations for Law Enforcement Officers
11. Internet Crime
12. Investigative Photography
13. Narcotics Investigation

C. Sergeants

1. Leadership and Supervision
2. Methods of Instruction
3. Advanced Interview and Interrogation
4. Winning Approaches to Patrol Tactics
5. Community Policing Certification
6. Report Writing for Supervisors
7. Essentials of Effective Supervision
8. Performance Evaluation Process
9. Writing Effective Employee Evaluations
10. Managing Conflict in Your Organization
11. Investigation of Police Misconduct

D. Lieutenant

1. Advanced Leadership and Supervision
2. Internal Affairs Policy and Procedure
3. Discipline
4. Sexual Harassment in the Law Enforcement Workplace
5. Patrol Work Analysis
6. Police Chief's Orientation
7. Grant Writing for Law Enforcement
8. Death Notification/Traumatic Unanticipated Grief
9. Advanced Domestic Violence Investigations for Law Enforcement Officers
10. Screening and Crisis Intervention
11. Hostage Negotiation
12. Writing Policies and Procedures
13. Incident Command