REPORT OF THE VIRGINIA
DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE SERVICES

Interim Report on Potential Minimum Core Operational Functions for Campus Police and Security Departments

TO THE GOVERNOR AND
THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

HOUSE DOCUMENT NO. 16

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
RICHMOND
2014

October 31, 2014

The Honorable William J. Howell, Speaker of the House
Virginia House of Delegates
General Assembly Building, Room 635
Richmond, VA 23219

The Honorable Walter A. Stosch, President pro tempore
Senate of Virginia
General Assembly Building, Room 626
Richmond, VA 23219

Dear Delegate Howell and Senator Stosch:

Attached is the "Interim Report on Potential Minimum Core Operational Functions for Campus Police and Security Departments" as directed by Chapter 278 of the 2014 Virginia Acts of Assembly.

The due date for the final report was November 1, 2014. Due to the complexity of the topic, and the need to include findings from the Governor's Task Force on Combating Campus Sexual Violence (unavailable until June of 2015), DCJS requested permission to submit the final study report on November 1, 2015.

Please contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,

Francine C. Ecker
Director

Attachment

cc: The Honorable Brian Moran, Secretary of Public Safety and Homeland Security

Criminal Justice Service Board • Committee on Training • Advisory Committee on Juvenile Justice
Advisory Committee to Court Appointed Special Advocate and Children's Justice Act Programs
Private Security Services Advisory Board • Criminal Justice Information Systems Committee

www.dcjs.virginia.gov

Interim Report on

Potential Minimum Core Operational Functions

for Campus Police and Security Departments

Preface

CHAPTER 278 of the Acts of Assembly of the 2014 General Assembly required the Department of Criminal Justice Services to identify minimum core operational functions for college campus police and security departments:

> *That the Department of Criminal Justice Services shall conduct a study to identify potential minimum core operational functions for campus police departments established pursuant to § 23-232 or 23-232.1 of the Code of Virginia and other campus security departments as may be established by public or private institutions of higher education pursuant to § 23-238 of the Code of Virginia. In conducting this study, the Department shall determine the existing capacity of campus police departments and other campus security departments, the costs of bringing existing departments into compliance with such minimum core operational functions, and legislative amendments needed in order to require compliance by such departments. In identifying such functions, the Department shall work with other public and private stakeholders as deemed appropriate. The Department shall report its findings to the Governor and the General Assembly by November 1, 2014.*

The study was assigned to the DCJS Criminal Justice Research Center and the DCJS Virginia Center for School and Campus Safety. Additionally, DCJS established a Study Advisory Committee, consisting of members from the Virginia Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators (VACLEA), State Council of Higher Education in Virginia, and other state and local stakeholder (see Appendix 1 for complete member list).

Due to complexity of the study topics, and relevant work by the Governor's Task Force on Combating Campus Sexual Violence which will not be completed until June of 2015, DCJS requested and received permission to submit the final report for this study until November of 2015. The current report provides an interim report on study progress to date.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

The 2014 General Assembly directed the Department of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS) to study potential minimum core operational functions for campus police and security departments, to include determining the existing capacity of these departments, the costs of bringing existing departments into compliance with such functions, and legislative amendments needed to require compliance by such departments. DCJS was directed to report its findings to the Governor and the General Assembly by November 1, 2014.

Due to complexity of the study topics, and relevant work by the Governor's Task Force on Combating Campus Sexual Violence which will not be completed until June of 2015, DCJS requested and received permission to submit the final report for this study until November of 2015. The current report provides an interim report on study progress to date.

As of October 24, 2014, DCJS has accomplished the following on the study:

- Established a Study Advisory Committee, consisting of members from the Virginia Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators (VACLEA) and other state and local officials;
- Presented a plan for the study at the June 2014 VACLEA Summer Conference, and gathered input on study issues from police and security officials from many different campus settings;
- Identified 71 Virginia institutions of higher education for inclusion in the study, based on different types of institutions designated in *the Code of Virginia*;
- Identified current standards for campus police/security departments established by the International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators (IACLEA), the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies, Inc. (CALEA), and the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS);
- Sent a survey to the 71 institutions included in the study to identify police/security functions now being conducted by the institutions, assess how effectively these functions are being conducted, identify obstacles to effective conduct of these functions, and solicit information on potential additional functions; and
- Collected preliminary data on the costs of conducting campus police/security functions.

Preliminary findings obtained to date include the following:

- There is great variation in the size, responsibilities and resources of campus police and security departments throughout Virginia. A "one-size fits all" approach to campus police/security functions will not work.
- Currently there is no statutory definition of "core operational functions" for Virginia police departments of any type. Defining potential minimum core operational functions for campus police departments raises the question of whether such minimum functions should also apply to all police departments in Virginia.
- Current *Code* language concerning the responsibilities and requirements for Virginia police departments is vague and scattered, making it difficult to clearly identify what is required to operate a police department. This may present a problem to institutions wishing to establish police departments.
- In addition to the current §9.1-1300 establishing sexual assault policies for Virginia law-enforcement agencies, efforts are now underway to develop guidelines and/or standards for campus law enforcement responses to campus sexual assault cases. Although these will not be available until mid-2015, they should be included in any minimum core operational functions for campus police/security departments.

The current report also contains *preliminary* findings from the DCJS survey of campus police and security departments. Although not representative of all institutions included in the study, these findings are presented as an indicator of the findings and issues which the final 2015 study report will address.

Study Authority and Background

Study Authority

Chapter 278 of the 2014 Virginia Acts of Assembly directed the Department of Criminal Justice Services to conduct a study to *identify potential minimum core operational functions for campus police departments established pursuant to § 23-232 or 23-232.1 of the Code of Virginia and other campus security departments as may be established by public or private institutions of higher education pursuant to § 23-238 of the Code of Virginia. In conducting this study, the Department shall determine the existing capacity of campus police departments and other campus security departments, the costs of bringing existing departments into compliance with such minimum core operational functions, and legislative amendments needed in order to require compliance by such departments. In identifying such functions, the Department shall work with other public and private stakeholders as deemed appropriate. The Department shall report its findings to the Governor and the General Assembly by November 1, 2014*

Background

In the aftermath of the Sandy Hook Elementary School shootings tragedy in December of 2012, Governor McDonald established the Governor's School & Campus Safety Taskforce to review and recommend improvements in safety at Virginia schools and campuses. The Taskforce's final report, issued in October 2013, made numerous recommendations for improving safety at Virginia's colleges, universities and other institutions of higher education. Among these was the following recommendation addressing campus police and security departments:

Recommendation Number PS-26

Minimum Training Standards: Recommends that all campus police departments have the following minimum training standards:

- All campus police departments should be required to meet a set of minimal operational standards set by the Department of Criminal Justice Services, in order to be certified as Virginia police departments. These minimal standards will guarantee uniformity of operations in campus police departments that will reduce risk liability and increase professional performance.
- All campus security or public safety departments without law enforcement authority should be required to meet a set of minimal operational standards, set by the Department of Criminal Justice Services, in order to be certified as Virginia campus security or public safety agencies. These minimal standards will guarantee uniformity of operations in security and campus safety that will reduce risk liability and increase professional performance.

As a step toward accomplishing this recommendation, the 2014 General Assembly directed DCJS to study *potential minimum core operational functions* for campus police and security departments, along with potential costs and legislation associated with establishing these functions. The DCJS Center for School and Campus Safety and the DCJS Criminal Justice Research Center were assigned this task.

DCJS determined that all of the information needed to properly address the multiple aspects of campus police and security departments could not be properly gathered and assessed by November 1, 2014. DCJS therefore

requested, and received, permission to provide an interim report in November 2014, and, following additional required research, provide a final report in November of 2015.

This report is the interim report, which provides information on study progress as of October 20, 2014.

Study Process

Advisory Committee Established

Due to the complex issues involved in this study, DCJS consulted with the Virginia Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators (VACLEA) and established an Advisory Committee to guide the study. The Advisory Committee contained representatives to provide input from higher education officials, officials from various types of police and security departments at Virginia campuses, municipal and county officials, and the Office of the Attorney General.

The Advisory Committee provided (and will continue to provide) assistance with study issues including:
- Defining overall issues the study must address
- Input from all stakeholders involved
- Institutions of higher education to examine in the study
- Development of a survey of these institutions for data collection
- Interpretation of the survey findings
- Issues related to costs associated with meeting potential minimum core operational functions
- Issue related to legislative amendments needed for compliance with minimum core operational functions

A list of the Advisory Committee members is contained in Appendix 1.

VACLEA Annual Conference Presentation

In June 2014 DCJS staff attended the statewide VACLEA Summer Conference in Virginia Beach and made a presentation on the study to VACLEA members to inform them of the study and solicit input on the study. This provided an opportunity for police and security officials from many different campus settings to provide input on the study.

Based on information provided by members of the Advisory Committee, by VACLEA and by DCJS staff at the Virginia Center for School and Campus Safety, major study issues and stakeholder concerns were identified and discussed. Based on these discussions, it became apparent that all of the topics which the study directive listed could not be properly researched and addressed by November 1 of 2014. The complexity of the issues which emerged is discussed below.

Study Issues are Varied and Complex

Early in the study, it was determined that identifying potential core minimum operational functions for campus police and security departments – which could eventually result in mandated functions for these departments – involves several complex and interrelated issues. These issues include:

1. *There is great variation in the size, responsibilities and resources of campus police and security departments throughout Virginia, as they reflect the uniqueness of the institution's community. Institutions can be urban or rural, residential or commuter, two- or four-year, and the supporting police or security departments range from large, fully accredited campus police departments to small security departments with only a handful of employees. Minimum core operational functions based on a simple "one-size-fits-all" approach will not work. Similarly, cost estimates for departments to come into compliance with minimum core operational functions*

will vary greatly depending on the size, responsibilities and resources of campus police and security departments.

Members of the study Advisory Committee emphasized that any study of campus law enforcement police/security departments, and any recommendations for core operational functions for these departments, must recognize the differences in the size, duties and resources of these departments, as well as the mission and purpose of the institution. Campus police/security can range from part-time "one man in a cubicle" security officers up to fully accredited, 24/7 operations police departments at large state universities. It may be advisable to consider developing different minimum core operational functions for campus police departments and campus security departments.

Additionally, although some campus police departments may meet many (or all) of the statutory requirements for municipal police, campus police usually are dealing with a different environment than municipal or county police. Campus police and security departments are required to adhere to stringent federal reporting, procedural and investigatory mandates that are not mandatory for local law enforcement departments.

The fact that campus law enforcement duties and responsibilities can differ from those of municipal police is noted by the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA), which stated that "it was recognized that agencies providing services in an educational setting faced unique challenges, as well as specific reporting requirements and responsibilities that are not common within the broader law enforcement community."

The range of duties performed on different sizes and types of campuses was also cited in a 2009 campus survey report from the National Association of College and University Business Officers: "The police force typically consists of sworn and armed officers at public four-year colleges and universities; in contrast, only about one-third of independent institutions have sworn and armed officers, as do fewer than half of public two-year colleges."

2. *Currently there is no statutory or formal definition of "core operational functions" for Virginia police departments of any type, whether they serve institutions of higher learning, cities, counties or towns. Therefore, defining what may become mandatory minimum core operational functions for police departments serving these institutions raises the question of whether such mandatory minimum core functions should also apply to all police departments in Virginia.*

Discussions with law enforcement officials indicated that issues related to establishing core minimum operational functions may need to be reviewed by representatives of the broader law enforcement community, not just those from campus law enforcement (for example, the Virginia Association of Chiefs of Police). There may be statutory or administrative obstacles to establishing state-mandated operational functions which apply to only a single group of police departments in Virginia. This would require a much broader amount of review and input than if the review were limited to only campus law enforcement officials.

3. *Current Code language concerning the responsibilities and requirements for Virginia police departments is scattered, making it difficult to clearly identify what is required to operate a police department.*

Discussions with law enforcement officials indicated that compliance with core minimal operational functions would require police departments to clearly understand all aspects of the *Code of Virginia* and the *Virginia Administrative Code* which govern these departments. Established police departments should be familiar with

these requirements, but agencies which may be required to become compliant may have a difficult time locating and understanding the many relevant *Code* sections.

It may be desirable to consider consolidating and clarifying the relevant *Code* sections to make it easier for newer or smaller agencies to understand all relevant laws and regulations.

4. *Efforts are now underway in Virginia to develop guidelines and/or standards for campus law enforcement agencies on how to address campus sexual assault cases. Although guidance from these efforts will likely affect campus law enforcement functions, these results of these efforts will not be available until at least June of 2015.*

In August 2014, Governor McAuliffe established the Governor's Task Force on Combating Campus Sexual Violence. Among the Task Force's directives are to "recommend best practices for protocols used by campus officials, including campus police, Title IX Coordinators, and others, to respond to sexual violence on campus" and to "recommend best practice to reinforce existing relationships and form new relationships between Virginia's institutions of higher education, campus police, local law enforcement, commonwealth's attorneys …. that will delineate respective responsibilities for investigations, sharing of information, and training."

The Task Force is directed to provide a final report and recommendations to the Governor by no later than June 1, 2015. Additionally, the Task Force will issue other reports as necessary or as requested by the Governor.

Due to the complexity of the issues above, and the need to incorporate the mid-2015 findings and recommendations of the Governor's Task Force, DCJS requested, and received, permission to extend the completion date for the final report until November of 2015.

Institutions of Higher Learning Involved in Study

Three *Code of Virginia* sections authorize institutions of higher learning to establish some form of campus police or security service:

1) *§ 23-232* authorizes 26 named "public institutions of higher learning" to establish a "campus police department."
2) *§ 23-232.1* authorizes "private institution of higher education" to establish a "campus police department" if the officers it employs comply with the requirements for law-enforcement officers established by DCJS.
3) *§ 23-238* authorizes other institutions to establish "security departments" whose officers and employees do not have police powers, or to rely upon municipal, county or state police forces or to contract for private security services

Based on these three authorizations, DCJS identified 71 Virginia institutions relevant to the current study. These institutions ranged from Virginia's largest public universities (such as George Mason University, Virginia Commonwealth University, and Virginia Tech) to small private institutions (such as Emory & Henry College and Sweet Briar College). A complete list of the 71 institutions identified is provided in Appendix 2).

Current Standards for Campus Police and Security Departments

Because there are now no formal minimal core operational functions specified for Virginia campus law enforcement and security departments, DCJS identified and examined what standards, procedures and guidelines have been developed nationally. Three major published documents were identified:

1. *International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators (IACLEA) Accreditation Standards Manual*, First Edition; Revision 1. Published by IACLEA in November 2013.

   According to ICLEA, these standards, part of the ICLEA accreditation program, are viewed as "best practices and appropriate criteria for the effective and efficient operations of a campus public safety agency."

2. *Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies, Inc. (CALEA) Campus Security Standards Manual,* Version 1.7. Published by CALEA in August 2014.

   According to CALEA, "these standards are intended for all levels of campus education, not just the college and university setting…. and will result in safer campus communities and more effective law enforcement service." The CALEA Campus Security Accreditation Program is designed for educational campus security agencies or departments that primarily employ non-sworn security officers and identify themselves as a "campus security force."

3. *Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education CAS Self-Assessment Guide for Campus Police and Security Programs*. Published by CAS in August 2012.

   According to CAS, the purpose of its standards is to "guide campus and police and security programs to best practices in their new roles." VACLEA members advised DCJS that the CAS document is the guide often used by campus deans and presidents when assessing campus security issues. CALEA also offers accreditation programs for sworn and non-sworn departments in Public Safety Communications, Public Safety Training Academies and others.

It is important to note that the IACLEA and CALEA standards referenced above are *accreditation* standards for a law enforcement agency. IACLEA and CALEA accreditation denotes a high level of professional operation, and exceeds what would be considered minimum core standards. Many small campus police and security departments cannot be expected to achieve all of the standards required for law enforcement accreditation. These standards were referenced only as a starting point for ideas on which to begin developing a list of potential core minimum operational functions for campus police and security departments.

Based on examination of the standards in the three documents above, and in conjunction with the Study Advisory Committee, DCJS developed a *preliminary* list of potential minimum core operational functions for campus police and security departments. This list, consisting of five major function categories and 38 sub-functions, was created to serve as a starting point for work to develop a final recommended list of potential minimum core operational functions. For this starting point, the following functions were identified:

1. *The prevention and detection of crime*
- Patrol operations
- Investigative services
- Special investigative services
- Traffic collision investigation
- Crime prevention
- Community involvement
- Community relations
- Public information/education

2. *The apprehension of criminals*
- Transporting detainees
- Processing detainees
- Juvenile detention

3. *The safeguard of life and property*
- Physical security/access control
- Critical incident management planning
- Campus escort services
- Assist motorists on campus roadways
- Emergency phones/alarms/surveillance systems
- Victims services

4. *The preservation of peace*
- Preserve safe/orderly campus, enforce laws
- Traffic/parking services
- Traffic engineering
- Traffic direction/control
- Traffic safety education
- Athletic/special event/crowd management

5. *Administration of police and security*
- Evidence collection, storage and control
- Facilities/property management
- Vehicle management
- Communications/dispatch/crime reporting
- Establish mutual aid agreement with local LE
- Emergency communications
- Personnel administration
- Weapons management/storage/control
- Records management
- Records/reports distribution
- Publish reports/statistics, including Cleary Act
- Title IX compliance
- Internal affairs
- Fiscal management
- In-service training and education for officers

Once this preliminary list of potential core minimum operational functions was created and reviewed, the next step was to compare this preliminary list of *potential* functions to the *actual* functions now being conducted by campus police and security departments at the 71 institutions examined in the study.

Survey of Campus Police and Security Departments

To gather information on the characteristics and current functions of police and security departments at Virginia institutions of higher education, DCJS conducted a survey of the 71 institutions. The survey questions were developed in conjunction with VACLEA, and were designed to gather information on the following topics:

- Name and type of organization that provides security for the institution.
- Whether the organization providing security is a police department, security department or other type of organization.
- If the organization is a police department, whether or not the department is accredited, and by what accrediting organization.
- What types of security functions (based on the list above) are now conducted by the organization.
- How effectively each security function is being conducted.
- Obstacles to providing effective security functions.
- Suggestions for additional functions that should be provided for campus security.

A complete copy of the survey questions is provided in Appendix 3.

In September 2014 an email containing a link to the DCJS on-line survey was sent to the chief/director of the police and/or security department of the 71 Virginia institutions of higher education identified for the study. The email contained a letter from Chief Craig Branch, President of the Virginia Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators, and a letter from the DCJS Director, explaining the purpose of the survey and requesting participation. The survey invitation emphasized that all survey results published would not identify any institution or police/security department by name. (To ensure this confidentiality, original survey data provided by the respondent and containing anything identifying the name of the institution, will be destroyed following analysis of the data).

The survey presented the police and/or security department with a list of 38 basic campus security functions derived from the CALEA Standards for Campus Security Agencies, the IACLEA Accreditation Standards Manual, and the CAS Self-Assessment Guide for Campus Police and Security Programs. Each department was asked to review the list of functions and indicate which of the functions it currently provides. The survey instructions noted that several of the source documents for the listed functions are intended to provide accreditation standards, which are much higher standards than minimal core functions, and for that reason not every function listed on the survey was viewed or implied to be considered a necessary function. The president, dean or chief executive of each institution surveyed received a separate email to make them aware that the institution's police/security department was being contacted to participate in the survey.

Summary of Preliminary Survey Findings

As of October 20, 2014, about 55% (39 of the 71 institutions surveyed) had responded to the survey. DCJS will report the full survey results, and its interpretation of these results, when all surveys have been received and the survey findings have been analyzed, reviewed and discussed with the Study Advisory Committee, VACLEA and the DCJS Center for School and Campus Safety.

This section provides *preliminary* results based on the 39 institutions which have so far responded to the survey. Readers are cautioned that these preliminary findings are intended only to present general characteristics and trends seen in the data reported so far by the institutions. The final findings will be presented in the 2015 final report.

All Institution Types Combined

Among the 39 institutions so far responding to the survey, the following institution types were included:

Type of Institution	Number Responding	Percent of Total Responses
Public Institutions Authorized to Establish Police Departments by § 23-14 (excluding community colleges)	16	41%
Community Colleges with Police Departments Established Under § 23-14	8	20%
Private Institutions with Police Departments Authorized per § 23-232.1	3	8%
Institutions with Security Departments/Other Security Services per § 23-238	12	31%
Total	*39*	*100%*

As an indicator of the various types of police and security departments responding to the survey, the following department titles were reported by the institutions:

- Police Department
- Security Department
- Office of Campus Safety
- Department of Safety and Security
- Department of Campus Safety
- Security

- Security
- College Security
- Department of Public Safety
- College Security Department
- Security Services
- Security Office

Among all institutions combined, the following are the functions most and least frequently reported (as a percentage of all respondents) as now being performed by the police and/or security departments:

Five MOST Frequently Performed Functions	*Five LEAST Frequently Performed Functions*
Patrol operations (95%)	Juvenile detention (20%)
Physical security/access control (95%)	Traffic engineering (25%)
Emergency phones/alarms/surveillance system (93%)	Special investigative operations (35%)
Critical incident management planning (90%)	Processing detainees (38%)
Campus escort services (90%)	Facilities/property management (45%)

The following sections provide general findings concerning the functions currently being performed by each of the four major types of institutions surveyed. Readers are again reminded that these are *preliminary* findings.

Public Institutions Authorized to Establish Police Departments by § 23-14

The following functions were reported as the most and least the frequently now being conducted by public institutions authorized to establish police departments by § 23-14 (excluding community colleges):

Two-thirds or More of institutions DO Perform These Functions	Two-thirds or More of Institutions DO NOT Perform These Functions
• Patrol operations	• Juvenile detention
• Investigative services	• Traffic engineering
• Traffic collision investigation	
• Crime prevention	
• Community involvement	
• Community relations	
• Public information/education	
• Transporting detainees	
• Physical security/access control	
• Critical incident management planning	
• Campus escort services	
• Assist motorists on campus roadways	
• Emergency phones/alarms/surveillance system	
• Victims services	
• Preserve safe and orderly campus/enforce law	
• Traffic/parking services	
• Traffic direction/control	
• Athletic and special events/crowd management	
• Evidence collection, storage and control	
• Vehicle management	
• Communications/dispatch/crime reporting	
• Establish mutual aid agreement with local LE	
• Emergency communications	
• Records management	
• Records/report distribution	
• Publish/report statistics, including Cleary Act	
• Title IX compliance	
• Fiscal management	
• Personnel administration	
• In-service training and education for officers	
• Weapons management/storage/control	

Functions reported as being performed by a moderate number of institutions (i.e., did not fall into the top two-thirds being performed or the top two-thirds not being performed) included: Special investigative operations, Traffic safety education, Facilities/property management, and Internal affairs.

Community Colleges with Police Departments Established Under § 23-14

The following functions were reported as the most and the least frequently now being conducted by public community colleges with police departments under § 23-14:

Two-thirds or More of Institutions *DO Perform These Functions*	Two-thirds or More of Institutions *DO NOT Perform These Functions*
• Patrol operations	• Special investigative operations
• Investigative services	• Processing detainees
• Traffic collision investigation	• Juvenile detention
• Crime prevention	
• Community involvement	
• Community relations	
• Public information/education	
• Transporting detainees	
• Physical security/access control	
• Critical incident management planning	
• Campus escort services	
• Assist motorists on campus roadways	
• Emergency phones/alarms/surveillance system	
• Victims services	
• Preserve safe and orderly campus/enforce law	
• Traffic/parking services	
• Traffic direction/control	
• Traffic safety education	
• Athletic and special events/crowd management	
• Evidence collection, storage and control	
• Vehicle management	
• Establish mutual aid agreement with local LE	
• Emergency communications	
• Records management	
• Records/report distribution	
• Publish/report statistics, including Cleary Act	
• Title IX compliance	
• Internal affairs	
• Fiscal management	
• Personnel administration	
• In-service training and education for officers	
• Weapons management/storage/control	

Functions reported as being performed by a moderate number of institutions (i.e., did not fall into the top two-thirds being performed or the top two-thirds not being performed) included: Traffic engineering, Facilities management, and Communications/dispatch/crime reporting.

Private Institutions with Police Departments Authorized per § 23-232.1

NOTE: Only three of these institutions have responded to the survey to date. Therefore, no analysis of data for these institutions is provided other than that shown in the table below, which is not representative of these types of institutions. A more complete analysis of these institutions' data will be provided in the final report.

Two-thirds or More of Institutions *DO Perform These Functions*	*Two-thirds or More of Institutions* *DO NOT Perform These Functions*
• Patrol operations	• Special investigative operations
• Investigative services	• Traffic engineering
• Traffic collision investigations	
• Crime prevention	
• Community involvement	
• Community relations	
• Public information/education	
• Transporting detainees	
• Processing detainees	
• Juvenile detention	
• Physical security/access control	
• Critical incident management planning	
• Campus escort services	
• Assist motorists on campus roadways	
• Emergency phones/alarms/surveillance system	
• Victims services	
• Preserve safe and orderly campus/enforce law	
• Traffic/parking services	
• Traffic direction/control	
• Traffic safety education	
• Athletic and special events/crowd management	
• Evidence collection, storage and control	
• Facilities/property management	
• Vehicle management	
• Communications/dispatch/crime reporting	
• Establish mutual aid agreement with local LE	
• Emergency communications	
• Records management	
• Records/report distribution	
• Publish/report statistics, including Cleary Act	
• Title IX compliance	
• Internal affairs	
• Fiscal management	
• Personnel administration	
• In-service training and education for officers	
• Weapons management/storage/control	

Institutions with Security Departments or Other Security Services per § 23-238

The following functions were reported as the most and the least frequently now being conducted by institutions with security departments or other security services per § 23-238:

Two-thirds or More of Institutions *DO Perform These Functions*	*Two-thirds or More of Institutions* *DO NOT Perform These Functions*
• Patrol operations	• Special investigative operations
• Investigative services	• Traffic collision investigation
• Crime prevention	• Transporting detainees
• Community involvement	• Processing detainees
• Physical security/access control	• Juvenile detention
• Critical incident management planning	• Traffic engineering
• Campus escort services	• Traffic safety education
• Assist motorists on campus roadways	• Evidence collection, storage and control
• Emergency phones/alarms/surveillance system	• Facilities/property management
• Preserve safe and orderly campus/enforce law	• Weapons management/storage/control
• Traffic/parking services	
• Traffic direction/control	
• Athletic and special events/crowd management	
• Emergency communications	
• Records management	
• Records/report distribution	
• Publish/report statistics, including Cleary Act	
• Title IX compliance	
• Personnel administration	
• In-service training and education for officers	

Functions reported as being performed by a moderate number of institutions (i.e., did not fall into the top two-thirds being performed or the top two-thirds not being performed) included: Community relations, Public information/education, Victim's services, Establishing mutual aid agreements with local law enforcement, Internal affairs and Fiscal management.

Effectiveness of Functions Now Being Performed

For each function which an institution reported performing, the institution was asked to rate how effectively it believes it is performing the function, using the following scale: 1) Extremely Effective, 2) Very Effective, 3) Moderately Effective, 4) Slightly Effective, or 5) Not Very Effective.

Among all four types of institutions combined, two-thirds of more of the institutions *which reported that they now perform* the following functions rated their performance of these functions as "Extremely Effective" or "Very Effective":

Functions Now Being Performed and Rated as "Extremely Effective" or "Very Effective" *(ratings for all institution types combined)*		
Patrol operations (77%)	Physical security/access control (77%)	Publish/report statistics, including Cleary Act (90%)
Special investigative operations (79%)	Campus escort services (76%)	Title IX compliance (76%)
Community involvement (69%)	Emergency phones/alarms/surveillance system (71%)	Fiscal management (73%)
Community relations (79%)	Assist motorists on campus roadways (89%)	Personnel administration (74%)
Public information/education (69%)	Preserve safe and orderly campus/enforce law (83%)	In-service training and education for officers (83%)
Transporting detainees (67%)	Traffic direction/control (80%)	Weapons management/storage/control (86%)
Processing detainees (67%)	Athletic and special events/crowd management (74%)	
Juvenile detention (75%)	Establish mutual aid agreement with local LE (79%)	

Among all four types of institutions combined, the following functions were most frequently rated as being performed "Moderately Effective":

- Traffic collision investigation (44%)
- Victim's services (42%)
- Traffic engineering (45%)
- Vehicle management (48%)
- Records/reports distribution (41%)

Among all four types of institutions combined, very few rated a function which they are now performing as only "Slightly Effective" or "Not Very Effective". However, the following functions being performed were rated as "Slightly Effective" or "Not Very Effective" by 10% or more of the institutions performing them:

- Crime prevention (11%)
- Processing detainees (13%)
- Juvenile detention (12%)
- Communications/dispatch/crime reporting (10%)

Costs to Bring Current Departments into Compliance

A review of available information on the costs of operating a police/security department, whether for a campus or a public municipality, revealed that there are no fixed guidelines for these costs. The costs of operating such a department vary depending on factors such as: size of population served, number and types of employees (full or part-time, sworn or civilian, armed or unarmed, etc.), types and levels of training desired or required, range of duties and responsibilities assigned, types of equipment required (vehicles, firearms, computers, etc.), and crime types/rates off-campus areas of concurrent jurisdiction (such as off-campus student housing areas).

DCJS was able to identify general cost estimates that have been developed for police departments. The Bureau of Justice Statistics, in the 2007 report *Local Police Departments*, reported the following annual operating costs based on a sample of about 3,000 local police agencies:

Population served	Per department	Per sworn officer	Per employee	Per resident
10,000-24,999	$3,260,000	$103,100	$78,700	$212
2,500-9,999	$1,127,000	$87,200	$69,400	$211
Under 2,500	$263,000	$56,400	$49,400	$209

It should be stressed that the BJS figures above represent annual operating costs for municipal and county police departments, not for campus police departments, which may have different characteristics.

DCJS also was able to obtain a limited sample of annual operational cost data from several types of Virginia campus police and security departments. These samples are not representative, but do provide preliminary data on annual costs for campus police/security departments.

A large public university with a student population of about 30,000 reported an annual police department operating budget of about $8 million, with about 73% of this for personnel costs. The institution has a fully accredited police department providing 24/7 services, and employed more than 200 people.

Two public community colleges with student populations of about 10,000 reported annual operating budgets of $1 million to $1.7 million, with about 70% to 90% of this for personnel costs. These institutions also had fully accredited police departments providing 24/7 services, and employed from 30 to 35 people.

Although DCJS will gather additional information on campus police/security department operating costs, discussions with VACLEA indicate that it will be unfeasible to estimate "average" operating costs for individual campus police or security departments. There is simply too much variation in factors which will affect operating costs at each individual institution, such as:

- Size of student population, staff and physical campus
- Some institutions have a single campus, while other have multiple campuses, including satellite campuses
- Personnel costs vary based on personnel characteristics such as:
    - o Mix of full-time vs. part-time employees
    - o Mix of sworn vs. non-sworn personnel
    - o Mix of employees directly employed by institution vs. employees who are contracted employees
    - o Use of volunteer security staff
    - o Use of contracts/ agreements with local law enforcement agencies for assistance

DCJS will develop more precise cost estimates in the 2015 final report. It is anticipated that, due to the unique characteristics of each institution, only general costs can be estimated. Regardless of what minimum core operational functions may be adopted, it is likely that each institution will have to estimate its costs for compliance with these functions on a case-by-case basis.

Legislative Amendments to Require Compliance

Possible legislative amendments will be developed when more data are gathered and assessed, and provided in the final 2015 report. Specific legislative amendments cannot be developed until the recommended list of potential core minimum operational functions is created.

Final 2015 Study Report

During 2014-2015, DCJS will continue to examine and expand on the issues identified in this report, and provide a final report by November 1, 2015.

Appendix 1
Study Advisory Committee Members

Craig Branch
Chief of Police
Germanna Community College Department of Police & Security, and President, VA Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators

Jeff Brown
Chief of Police/Director of Public Safety
Hampden-Sydney College

Linda Bryant
Office of Attorney General

Thomas Bullock
 Virginia Municipal League

David Gardner
Director of Campus Safety
Department of Safety
Sweet Briar College

Rhonda Harris
Chief of Police/Director of Public Safety
Old Dominion University

Eric Hols
Director of Campus Safety & Emergency Management
Office of Campus Safety
Marymount University

Kelvin Maxwell
Chief of Police
Thomas Nelson Community College

David M. McCoy
Associate Vice President of Public Safety & Chief of Police
University of Richmond

Kirsten Nelson
State Council of Higher Education in Virginia (SCHEV)

George Okaty
Director of Safety & Security
Tidewater Community College Safety & Security Department

Mary T. Savage
Emergency Preparedness & Safety Manager
Virginia Community College System

Dana Schrad
Executive Director
VA Association of Chiefs of Police

Nancy Sullivan
Virginia Association of Counties

John Venuti
Chief of Police/Assistant Vice President of Public Safety
Virginia Commonwealth University

Appendix 2
Institutions of Higher Education Examined in Study

Public Institutions Authorized to Establish Police Departments by § 23-14	
Christopher Newport University	Southwest Virginia Higher Education Center
Eastern Virginia Medical School	The College of William and Mary
George Mason University	University of Mary Washington
Institute for Advanced Learning and Research	University of Virginia
James Madison University	University of Virginia's College at Wise
Longwood University	Virginia Commonwealth University
Norfolk State University	Virginia Military Institute
Old Dominion University	Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University
Radford University	Virginia State University
Richard Bland College	Woodrow Wilson Rehabilitation Center
Roanoke Higher Education Authority and Center	

Community Colleges with Police Departments Established Under § 23-14	
Blue Ridge Community College	Northern Virginia Community College
Central Virginia Community College	Southwest Virginia Community College
Germanna Community College	Thomas Nelson Community College
J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College	Virginia Highlands Community College
Lord Fairfax Community College	Virginia Western Community College
Mountain Empire Community College	Wytheville Community College

Private Institutions with Police Departments Authorized per § 23-232.1	
Bridgewater College	Liberty University
Emory and Henry College	Regent University
Ferrum College	University of Richmond
Hampden-Sydney College	Virginia Union University
Hampton University	

Institutions with Security Departments or Other Security Services per § 23-238	
Appalachian School of Law	Patrick Henry Community College
Averett University – Danville	Piedmont Virginia Community College
Bluefield College	Randolph College
Christendom College	Randolph-Macon College
Danville Community College	Rappahannock Community College
Eastern Mennonite University	Roanoke College
Eastern Shore Community College	Shenandoah University
Hollins University	Southern Virginia University
Institute for the Psychological Sciences	Southside Virginia Community College
Jefferson College of Health Sciences	Sweet Briar College
John Tyler Community College	Tidewater Community College
Lynchburg College	Virginia Intermont College

Mary Baldwin College	Virginia Wesleyan College
Marymount University	Washington & Lee University
New River Community College	

Appendix 3
Campus Police/Security Department Survey Questions

Potential Campus Police and Security Functions Survey

This survey presents you with a list of *potential* minimum core operational functions. Depending on the type of department you have, and the size and characteristics of your department and the campus it serves, not all of the potential functions listed may apply to your department.

The information provided by your department will be confidential. No information will be reported about how any individual campus/university or any individual police or security department responded to the questions.

Identification

The following identification questions ask you to provide your campus and contact information. They are being asked only in case we need to contact you for more details about your survey responses. None of the identifying information will be contained in the report of the survey findings.

1. What is the name of the college/university that you serve?
2. What is your name?
3. What is your title?
4. What is your telephone number?
5. What is your email address?

Type of Department

Many campus organizations providing security are considered either a "Police Department" or a "Security Department." Please review the statutory definitions for each provided below and indicate whether your organization is best described as a Police Department or a Security Department.

Police Department means that the department must require that each officer complies with training and other requirements for law enforcement officers established by DCJS per Chapter 1 (§9.1-100 et seq.) of Title 9.1. *http://law.lis.virginia.gov/vacode/title9.1/chapter1/*

Security Department means that the department's officers and employees shall <u>not</u> have the powers and duties set forth in §23-234. *http://law.lis.virginia.gov/vacode/title23/chapter17/section23-234/*

6. Based on the definitions provided above, please select the type of department that has primary responsibility for safety and security on your campus (or if your campus has neither, select the last listed option).

- Police Department
- Security Department
- Our campus has neither a Police Department nor a Security Department based on the above definitions and the linked statutory definitions

If the respondent selects "Our campus has neither a Police Department nor a Security Department based on the above definitions and the linked statutory definitions," in response to Q6, the survey will end.

<u>If 6 = Police</u>

6a. What is the *full name* of your police department?

6b. By which of the following organizations is your police department accredited?

- Virginia Law Enforcement Professional Standards Commission (VLEPSC)   Y/N
- Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA)   Y/N
- International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators (IACLEA)   Y/N

<u>If 6 = Security</u>

6a. What is the *full name* of your security department?

6b. Which of the following *best* describes the organization that provides security on your campus? *(check one)*
- Office of campus safety, campus security, public safety
- Security provided by other campus employees (ex: physical plant, building and grounds staff, etc)
- Security provided by contract/private security company
- Security provided by local public law enforcement agency (ex: county/municipal police or sheriff)
- Other (briefly describe)

List of Potential Minimum Core Operational Functions

Please review the following categories of *potential minimum core operational functions* and indicate which of the functions are *now being conducted* by your (PD/SD). Keep in mind that campus and department size can range from very small to very large, so not all of the potential functions listed may be applicable to your department.

7. For each listed potential minimum core operational function, check yes if your department currently conducts the function or check no if your department does *not* currently conduct the function.

Potential Minimum Core Operational Functions		
The prevention and detection of crime		
Patrol Operations [source: IACLEA (sec 9.1); CALEA (sec 21)]	Yes ○	No ○
Investigative Services [source: IACLEA (sec 13); CALEA (sec 22)]	Yes ○	No ○
Special Investigative Operations [source: IACLEA (sec 13.2)]	Yes ○	No ○

Traffic Collision Investigation [source: IACLEA (sec 10.2); CALEA sec 29)]	Yes ○	No ○
Crime Prevention [source: IACLEA (sec 12.1); CALEA (sec 23.1)]	Yes ○	No ○
Community Involvement [source: IACLEA (sec 12.3); CALEA (sec 23.2); CAS (sec 8.1)]	Yes ○	No ○
Community Relations [source: IACLEA (sec 12.3); CAS (sec 8.1)]	Yes ○	No ○
Public Information/Education [source: IACLEA (sec 12.3.4); CALEA (sec 27); CAS (sec 1.4, 2.1)]	Yes ○	No ○
The apprehension of criminals		
Transporting Detainees [source: IACLEA (sec 8.3); CALEA (sec 1.2.5)]	Yes ○	No ○
Processing Detainees [source: IACLEA (sec 8.1); CALEA (sec 1.2.5)]	Yes ○	No ○
Juvenile Detention [source: ACLEA (sec 8.4.1); CALEA (sec 21.2.6)]	Yes ○	No ○
The safeguard of life and property		
Physical Security / Access Control [source: IACLEA (sec 12.2)]	Yes ○	No ○
Critical Incident Management Planning [source: IACLEA (sec 17); CALEA (sec 24)]	Yes ○	No ○
Campus Escort Services [source: CALEA (sec 21.1.5)]	Yes ○	No ○
Assist Motorists on Campus Roadways [source: IACLEA (sec 10.3.4); CALEA (sec 29.2.1)]	Yes ○	No ○
Emergency Phones/Alarms/Surveillance System Management [source: CALEA (sec 21.6)]	Yes ○	No ○
Victims Services [source: IACLEA (sec 13.3); CALEA (sec 28)]	Yes ○	No ○
The preservation of peace		
Preserve safe and orderly campus/enforce law [source: CAS (sec 1.1)]	Yes ○	No ○
Traffic/Parking Services [source: IACLEA (sec 10); CALEA (sec 29)]	Yes ○	No ○
Traffic Engineering [source: IACLEA (sec 10.3.2); CALEA (sec 29.1.3)]	Yes ○	No ○
Traffic Direction/Control [source: IACLEA (sec 10.3.1); CALEA (sec 29.1.4)]	Yes ○	No ○
Traffic Safety Education [source: IACLEA (sec 10.3.6); CALEA (sec 29.2.4)]	Yes ○	No ○
Athletic and Special Events/Crowd Management [source: CALEA (sec 24.2.2)]	Yes ○	No ○
Administration of police and security		
Evidence Collection, Storage and Control [source: IACLEA (sec 14, 15); CALEA (sec 33-34)]	Yes ○	No ○
CAS (sec 11.1 - 11.5)	Yes ○	No ○
Vehicle management [source: CALEA (sec 21.3)]	Yes ○	No ○
Communications / Dispatch / Crime Reporting System / Tip line [source: IACLEA (sec 11.1, 11.2); CALEA (sec 31)]	Yes ○	No ○
Establish Mutual Aid Agreements with Local Police Department [source: CALEA (sec 5.1)]	Yes ○	No ○
Emergency Communications [source: IACLEA (sec 11.2); CALEA (sec 8.5, 31)]	Yes ○	No ○
Records Management [source: IACLEA (sec 16); CALEA (sec 32); CAS (sec 6.7)]	Yes ○	No ○
Records/Report Distribution [source: IACLEA (sec 16.2); CALEA (sec 32)]	Yes ○	No ○
Publish/Report Statistics and Information, including Clery Act Reporting [source: IACLEA (sec 16.3); CALEA (sec 9, s2.1.4); CAS (sec 8.4)]	Yes ○	No ○
Title IX Compliance [source: IACLEA (sec 18)]	Yes ○	No ○
Internal Affairs [source: IACLEA (sec 4.2); CALEA (sec 25)]	Yes ○	No ○
Fiscal Management [source: IACLEA (sec 1.2.1); CALEA (sec 8.1): CAS (sec 9.1 - 9.3)]	Yes ○	No ○
Personnel Administration [source: IACLEA (sec 3, 5); CALEA (sec 11-17); CAS (sec 4.1 - 4.11)]	Yes ○	No ○

In-Service Training and Education for Officers [source: IACLEA (sec 6); CALEA (sec 18)CAS (sec 4.8, 4.9)]	Yes ○ No ○
Weapons Management / Storage / Control [source: IACLEA (sec 7.2); CALEA (sec 2.1.9)]	Yes ○ No ○

Each function in the above list that <u>was checked</u> as being conducted (if 7 = yes), will appear in a table and the respondent will be asked the following:

7a. You indicated that the below listed functions are currently being conducted by your PD/SD. For each listed function, please rate the effectiveness of your department's current ability to provide this function. (select one for each function)

Extremely effective
Very effective
Moderately effective
Slightly effective
Not very effective

Each function in the above list (7a) that was rated as "Slightly effective" or "Not very effective" will appear in a table and the respondent will be asked the following:

7b. You indicated that the current ability of your PD/SD to provide the below listed functions are only "slightly effective" or "not very effective." Please indicate which of the following factors are obstacles to your department's ability to be more effective in providing each of these functions. (select all that apply for each listed function)

Financial resources not available
Personnel resources not available
Training not available
Lack of support from campus administration
Conflicts with current campus policy/practice
Other

For each function where "other" was checked as an obstacle (7b = other), a follow-up question will be asked:

7b-1. In the previous question, you were asked to select which of the listed obstacles affect your department's ability to provide effective _____. You indicated that there were other obstacles which were not listed. Please briefly describe those other obstacles.

Each function in Q7 that <u>was checked</u> as NOT being conducted (if 7 = no), will appear in a table and the respondent will be asked the following:

7c. You indicated that the below listed functions were not currently conducted by your department. Please indicate why each function is not currently conducted. (select all that apply for each listed function)

Considered unnecessary for this campus
Financial resources not available
Personnel resources not available

Training not available
Lack of support from campus administration
Conflicts with current campus policy/practice
Other

For each function where "other" was checked as an obstacle (7c = other), a follow-up question will be asked:

7c-1. In the previous question, you were asked to indicate why your department is currently unable to provide _____. You indicated that there was another reason besides those that were listed. Please briefly describe the other reason(s).

Additional Questions

8. Are there any core functions now being conducted by your department which are not listed above, but which you feel should be considered as potential minimum core functions? If yes, please list these functions.

9. In addition to the potential minimum core functions previously listed, are there any other potential minimum core functions that you feel should be considered for your campus or for similar Virginia college/university campuses? If yes, please list these functions.

<div align="center">

**Thank you for completing the DCJS
Potential Campus Police and Security Functions Survey**

Your responses will help the Virginia Center for School and Campus Safety and the Virginia Association of Campus Law Enforcement Executives identify possible core minimal functions for campus police and security departments.

*Responses to the survey's questions will not be reported by individual institution or department name.
DCJS will provide a final report on the survey's findings to the 2015 General Assembly. We will notify you when the report is made available on our website.*

</div>

Appendix 4
Code of Virginia Sections Relevant to
Police and Security at Institutions of Higher Education

Below is a partial list of *Code of Virginia* sections relevant to police and security departments at Virginia institutions of higher learning. This list does not contain all potentially relevant sections; identification of all relevant sections will require further research. However, even this partial list serves to illustrate the many statutory and administrative issues which must be examined and considered in developing minimum core operational functions for campus police and security departments.

§ 23-232.   Establishment authorized; employment of officers.

§ 23-232.1.   Authorization for campus police departments in private institutions of higher education.

§ 23-232.2.   Inspection of criminal incident information.

§ 23-233.   Appointment of officers.

§ 23-233.1.   Establishment of auxiliary police forces; powers, authority and immunities generally.

§ 23-234.   Powers and duties; jurisdiction.

§ 23-234.1.   Extending police power of public institutions of higher education beyond boundaries thereof; jurisdiction of courts.

§ 23-235.   Officers to comply with requirements of Department of Criminal Justice Services.

§ 23-236.   Investigation of prospective officers; terms of employment; uniforms, etc.

§ 23-237.   Termination of employment of officers.

§ 23-238.   Security departments and other security services.

Appendix 5
Code Sections Relevant to
Police and Law Enforcement Generally

Below is a partial list of *Code of Virginia* and Virginia Administrative Code sections relevant to police and law enforcement generally. This list does not contain all potentially relevant sections; identification of all relevant sections will require further research. However, even this partial list serves to illustrate the many statutory and administrative issues which must be examined and considered in developing mandated minimum core operational functions for campus police and security departments.

Code of Virginia

§ 9.1-110.	School Resource Officer Grants Program and Fund.
§ 9.1-113.	Compliance with minimum training standards by certain officers; exceptions.
§ 9.1-114.	Compliance with minimum training standards by officers employed after July 1, 1971, by officers appointed under § 56-353 after July 1, 1982, and by part-time officers.
§ 9.1-115.	Forfeiture of office for failing to meet training standards; termination of salary and benefits; extension of term.
§ 9.1-116.	Exemptions of certain persons from certain training requirements.
§ 9.1-165.	Definitions.
15.2-1704.	Powers and duties of police force.
§ 15.2-1705.	Minimum qualifications; waiver.
§ 15.2-1706.	Certification through training required for all law-enforcement officers; waiver of requirements.
§ 15.2-1707.	Decertification of law-enforcement officers.
§ 19.2-11.01.	Crime victim and witness rights.
§ 19.2-73.2.	Law-enforcement officers to issue subpoenas; penalty.
§ 19.2-78.	Uniform of officer making arrest.
§ 19.2-80.	Duty of arresting officer; bail.
§ 19.2-80.2.	Duty of arresting officer; providing magistrate or court with criminal history information.
§ 19.2-81.3.	Arrest without a warrant authorized in cases of assault and battery against a family or household member and stalking and for violations of protective orders; procedure, etc.
§ 19.2-81.6.	Authority of law-enforcement officers to arrest illegal aliens.
§ 52-14.	Availability of VCIN system.

Administrative Code

CHAPTER 20.	RULES RELATING TO COMPULSORY MINIMUM TRAINING STANDARDS FOR LAW-ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS
CHAPTER 30.	RULES RELATING TO COMPULSORY IN-SERVICE TRAINING STANDARDS FOR LAW-ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS, JAILORS OR CUSTODIAL OFFICERS, COURTROOM SECURITY OFFICERS
CHAPTER 40.	RULES RELATING TO COMPULSORY MINIMUM TRAINING STANDARDS FOR UNDERCOVER INVESTIGATIVE OFFICERS
CHAPTER 180.	CRIME PREVENTION SPECIALISTS

Appendix 6
Information Sources

IACLEA Accreditation Standards Manual, First Edition; Revision 1. International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators. November 2013.

CAS Self-Assessment Guide for Campus Police and Security Programs. Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education. August 2012.

Establishing Appropriate Staffing Levels for Campus Public Safety Departments. Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, U.S. Department of Justice. July 2011

Campus Security Guidelines: Recommended Operational Policies for Local and Campus Law Enforcement Agencies. Major Cities Chiefs Association. July 2009.

Campus Law Enforcement 2004-2005. Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report. U.S. Department of Justice. February 2008.

Campus Safety Legislative Recommendations. Virginia State Crime Commission. 2008.

Results of the National Campus Safety and Security Project Survey. National Association of College and University Business Officers. July 2009.

The Impact of the Structure, Function and Resources of the Campus Security Office on Campus Safety. Bennett, P.A. University of Nevada, Las Vegas. UNLV Thesis/Dissertations/Professional Papers/Capstones. May 2012.

Governor's School & Campus Safety Taskforce Final Report. Office of the Governor, Commonwealth of Virginia. October 2013.

Local Police Departments, 2007. Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice. December 2010.