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The purpose of the study was to provide an assessment of campus police departments throughout the 15 public community and junior colleges in Mississippi. This research could provide Mississippi community and junior college administrators the opportunity to observe and appraise the overall safety of their respective campuses in comparison to safety practices of the other campus police departments in the state. This study will lay the foundation for further research of campus police departments and can assist administrators and boards of trustees of Mississippi’s public community and junior colleges with annual and long-range planning efforts.

This study included campus police/security departments in all of Mississippi’s public community and junior colleges. Data were collected to provide an overview of police/security departments at Mississippi’s public community and junior colleges. A portion of the study contains information/data gathered from a random sample of students at one rural, public community college in the northern region of Mississippi concerning campus safety and their satisfaction of services provided by campus police.
The researcher utilized a mixed-methods design to study existing descriptive information pertaining to the 15 Mississippi public community and junior college campus police departments, existing crime statistics reported by each public community and junior college in Mississippi, and existing data gathered by the Itawamba Community College administration from their students concerning their perception of campus police and safety issues. The researcher created a composite student satisfaction score and utilized a one-way ANOVA to determine the significance level of student perception concerning campus police and safety issues.

In answering the research questions, the researcher discovered that Mississippi community and junior college campus police/security reported less favorable attitudes pertaining to funding and staffing their respective departments and positive attitudes pertaining to their ability to attend and provide training opportunities. The researcher found that Mississippi public community and junior college campuses seem to be safe, reporting low crime statistics in the Campus Safety and Security Data Analysis Cutting Tool. Lastly, the researcher discovered that student satisfaction of campus police and safety issues at one rural Northeast Mississippi community college increased from 2007 to 2011.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Community and junior colleges in Mississippi strive to provide educational opportunities to individuals in their respective districts through academic, career technical, workforce training, and adult basic education/General Educational Development (GED) preparation. As stated on the Mississippi State Board for Community and Junior Colleges (SBCJC, 2011) website, “Mississippi’s community and junior colleges offer a wide variety of curriculum trades and professional training opportunities to meet everyone’s need at an affordable cost” (p. 1). In offering these cost-efficient educational opportunities, community and junior colleges complement their mission by promoting and providing safe, secure environments to enhance the campus learning experience. This huge responsibility typically begins with campus police/security employed by each community and junior college. Not only are these officials responsible for law enforcement, security, and emergency response, but they also serve in providing numerous support services throughout the college. The following are examples of possible support services: vehicle assistance, vehicle registration, lost/found, and surveying campuses for adequate lighting or possible hazards. College life today seems to have an increase of a more outspoken, troubled student population. According to an article posted on the American Psychological Association (APA, 2011) website, the American College Counseling Association released survey results and found
that 44% of college students who seek services through college counseling centers suffer from severe psychological disorders; this number has increased from 16% in 2000. In addition, the number of students taking psychiatric medication has increased. The survey indicated that one in four students is taking psychiatric medication as opposed to 17% in 2000 (APA, 2011). The use/abuse of recreational and prescription drugs is more prevalent among college students today. According to results from the National Survey on Drug Use and Health (2009), the use of illegal drugs among 18- to 22-year-old full-time college students rose from 20.2% in 2008 to 22.7% in 2009. Among those illegal drugs, there was a significant increase specifically in marijuana, nonmedical use of psychotherapeutic drugs, and OxyContin (Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, 2010).

In addition to drug use, violence continues to emerge among college campuses, whether it is harassment/assault or a campus shooting involving an active shooter. Catastrophic active shooters on college campuses can even be traced back to August 1, 1966. Kingsbury, Brush, Green, and Schulte (2007) suggested that “the first publicized mass killing in the United States” (p. 48) occurred when Charles J. Whitman, a student at the University of Texas at Austin, opened fire from the observation deck of the Main Building on campus, killing 15 people and wounding 31 more. This single event helped to steer college campuses away from campus security and toward the hiring of armed police (Kingsbury et al., 2007). A more recent campus shooting took place on April 16, 2007, when Seung-Hui Cho killed 32 and wounded several others on the campus of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (Virginia Tech) in Blacksburg, Virginia. Cho was noticed and reported by fellow students and Virginia Tech employees
as struggling with mental issues, and some of these people had actually sought to get him some assistance. Cho even participated in a court-ordered medical test, where he was declared normal and was advised to seek some outpatient counseling services (Shute & Comarow, 2007). After a thorough investigation of the Virginia Tech shooting, the Virginia Tech Review Panel found that there was no form of mass communication distributed on campus signaling the urgency for a campus lockdown immediately upon receiving reports of a shooting on campus. A form of mass communication was distributed, but that distribution went out close to 2 hours following the first shootings. Also, almost 2 hours passed between the first killings committed by Cho and his second round. Throughout this 2-hour time span, Cho was able to go back to his dorm room, change clothes, and visit a nearby post office to mail a package to the National Broadcasting Company (NBC) and a letter he had composed to the English Department at Virginia Tech. Because there was no campus lockdown during this lengthy time span, Cho was able to become mobile on the Virginia Tech campus, entering another building, approximately 2 hours after killing two people, to begin his second wave of killings (Davies, 2008).

Another recent example of a troubled student occurred on January 8, 2011, in Tucson, Arizona. Outside a shopping mall, Representative Gabrielle Giffords was involved in a political rally when Jared Loughner opened fire, killing 6 people and injuring 14, including Giffords. Loughner had been enrolled at Pima Community College since 2005 and was suspended by Pima Community College administration in September 2010 for his ongoing disruptive behavior. Loughner had experienced several run-ins with
the Pima Community College campus police before making a video concerning the college, which led to his suspension (Tresniowski et al., 2011).

In response to such incidents and alarming data, campus safety has become a major concern on college campuses, and that safety begins with campus police officers. There is very little information available concerning community college campus police and, specifically, Mississippi’s public community and junior college campus police departments. However, 6.6 million of 13.9 million students enrolled in public higher education institutions are at public 2-year community colleges (United States Census Bureau, 2008). As the population of students enrolled at 2-year community colleges continues to grow, more student-related problems could arise, along with the need for community colleges to provide safe, secure environments.

This study examined campus police departments across the 15 Mississippi community and junior colleges. Variables studied included location(s), number and types of officers utilized at each location, money allocated, equipment purchased and utilized, training opportunities, emergency planning, and annual crime reports. The researcher gathered information on the extent to which the departments worked with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to achieve National Incident Management System (NIMS) compliance. A portion of the study contains information/data gathered from a random sample of students at one rural, public community college in the northern region of Mississippi concerning campus safety and their satisfaction of services provided by campus police.
Statement of the Problem

This study was conducted based on the lack of previous research examining campus police departments at the 15 Mississippi public community and junior colleges. Because there is no thorough assessment of campus police departments in Mississippi’s public community and junior colleges available, presidents and vice presidents do not have enough information to make proactive decisions, as opposed to reactive decisions, regarding the safety of their respective campuses. The results from this study provide a descriptive review that could be helpful to Mississippi’s community and junior college presidents, vice presidents, and officers. This study provides an overview of all 15 community colleges in Mississippi, including location(s), number and types of officers utilized at each location, money allocated, equipment purchased and utilized, training opportunities, institutional emergency planning, annual crime reports, and NIMS compliance.

Purpose of the Study and Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to describe the various campus police departments throughout the 15 community and junior colleges in Mississippi during the 2010–2011 academic year. The following research questions were answered in order to meet the purpose of the study:

1. How do campus police/security departments vary at each community and junior college in Mississippi?
2. What is the current status of the environment at each community and junior college in Mississippi as described by the Campus Safety and Security Data Analysis Cutting Tool?

3. What is the perception of campus police/security pertaining to one rural Northeast Mississippi community college as measured by the student satisfaction surveys from 2007 to 2011?

These questions were fulfilled by reporting on the various campus police departments in Mississippi’s 15 community and junior college, which included officer hiring practices, departmental staffing, departmental funding, officer training, equipment purchased and utilized, and crime reports. Also, the researcher examined the extent to which each campus police/security department in Mississippi is involved in emergency planning for its respective institution and each department’s involvement with FEMA to achieve up-to-date compliance with NIMS requirements. Further, the researcher gathered information/data concerning campus safety and student perception of campus police/security services from one rural, public community college in the northern region of Mississippi.

**Significance of the Study**

A thorough assessment of campus police departments throughout Mississippi’s community and junior colleges has not been completed. This research provides Mississippi community and junior college presidents and vice presidents the opportunity to observe all public community and junior college campus police/security departments in the state of Mississippi, giving them the opportunity to appraise the overall safety of
their respective campuses in comparison to safety practices of the other public community and junior colleges in Mississippi as they relate to campus police departments. This study lays the foundation for further research of campus police departments and can assist administrators and boards of trustees of Mississippi’s public community and junior colleges with annual and long-range planning efforts. Safety on college campuses is not an issue that can afford to be addressed in a reactive manner. This study can serve as a guide for Mississippi public community and junior colleges in being proactive concerning campus safety.

**Limitations and Delimitations**

The researcher acknowledges the following possible limitations and delimitations of this study:

1. The study is limited to the 15 public 2-year community and junior colleges in the state of Mississippi.
2. The study concentrated on data obtained concerning the 2010–2011 academic year.
3. The study depended on information/data obtained from all 15 Mississippi community and junior college campus police departments, which could pose a threat to the internal validity of the study.
4. The study depended on data from the United States Department of Education Office of Postsecondary Education. The entry of data from the United States Department of Education could contain errors.
5. A portion of the study depended on information/data obtained from one rural, public community college in the northern region of Mississippi.

The data collected from the public community and junior colleges in this study were all within the state of Mississippi and may not be generalizable for public community and junior colleges in other areas of the country. The data collected concerning a rural, public community college in the northern region of Mississippi may not be generalizable to the other public community and junior colleges in Mississippi. Conclusions that came from this study concerning campus police/security in Mississippi’s public community and junior colleges pertain to items and issues in the state of Mississippi and should not be generalizable to community colleges in other regions of the United States.

**Definition of Terms**

The following terms are defined for the purpose of this study:

1. *Campus lockdown* refers to a method to initiate an effective and expedient response in the event of a hostile intruder/violent student or employee (Itawamba Community College, 2011).

2. *Campus police* refers to police officers that are employed by school districts, colleges, or universities who have completed law enforcement training and are sworn. They serve to provide protection for the campus environment as a whole (U.S. Legal, 2011).

3. *Community college* refers to a 2-year college that is supported by the government and can award the associate’s degree (Merriam-Webster, 2011).

5. *General Education Development* (GED) is a test taken by national and international individuals who have not graduated from high school, authorizing academic achievement that is the equivalent to a high school diploma (American Council on Education, 2011).

6. *Higher Education Opportunity Act* (HEOA) refers to federal law that was enacted in August 2008 that reauthorized the Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965; a set of guidelines that all institutions of higher education are required to adhere to as set by the United States Government (United States Department of Education, 2011).

7. *Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act* (Clery Act) refers to law requiring all institutions of higher education to collect, report, and disseminate all crime data; give timely warnings in relation to crimes that pose a threat to the safety of students and/or employees; and to inform the public of safety/security policies on campus (United States Department of Education, 2011).

8. *Mass communication* refers to the method of delivering messages to students and employees in case of emergency or imminent danger (Itawamba Community College, 2011).
9. *National Incident Management System* (NIMS) refers to an organized, aggressive approach that serves as a guide for all government and non-government agencies and the private sector to assist in mitigating loss of life, property, or harm to the environment (FEMA, 2011).

10. *Office of Postsecondary Education* (OPE) refers to a department within the United States Department of Education that plans policies and governs programs concerning education beyond the high school level (Office of Postsecondary Education, 2011).

11. *OxyContin* refers to a brand-name drug for oxycodone, which is a narcotic formulated from morphine (Medical-Dictionary, 2011).

12. *Psychotherapeutic drugs* refer to prescription drugs used to treat anxiety, depression, or other mental disorder symptoms (Medical-Dictionary, 2011).

13. *Title IV* refers to a component of the Higher Education Act of 1965 that governs financial assistance awarded to students to assist them in paying for their college education (United States Department of Education, 2011).
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Community and junior colleges in Mississippi strive to provide educational opportunities to individuals in their respective districts through academic, career technical, workforce training, and adult basic education/GED preparation. In offering cost-efficient educational opportunities, community and junior colleges complement their mission by promoting and providing safe, secure environments to enhance the campus learning experience. This huge responsibility typically begins with campus police/security employed by each community and junior college. Not only are these officials responsible for law enforcement, security, and emergency response, but they also serve in providing numerous support services throughout the college.

The researcher examined literature related to the basic need for all humans to feel safe and secure in their environment. This was followed by a brief discussion on the formation of private security in the United States and the roles it plays in today’s society. Next, the researcher reviewed literature concerning law enforcement in the United States, which includes a historical perspective, followed by the various agencies established under law enforcement, responsibilities of police officers, and the three eras of policing. The researcher explored the mission of the U.S. community college and then presented a history of Mississippi’s public community and junior college system from its
beginning in 1922 through 2002. Finally, the researcher reviewed current literature
dealing with best practices of community college campus police and campus safety.

**Safety and Security**

According to Merriam-Webster (2011), the definition of *safety* is “the condition
of being safe from undergoing or causing hurt, injury, or loss” (p. 1). Merriam-Webster
(2011) defined *security* as “the quality or state of being secure, as freedom from danger
or freedom from fear or anxiety” (p. 1). Safety and security are connected directly to
people as they function in their daily lives. The connection safety and security have to
people is best described by Abraham Maslow, known as one of the founders of
humanistic psychology. Humanists state that the fate of human beings is determined by
the conscious decisions made in their lives (Lahey, 2011). To explain this humanistic
approach to psychology, Maslow developed what he termed a hierarchy of five
needs/motives. Within his hierarchy of needs/motives, he hypothesized that as humans
fulfill the lower needs in life—biological, safety/security, and love and belongingness—
they will be able to fulfill their higher needs, such as self-esteem and self-actualization
(Lahey, 2011). The need for safety/security is second on Maslow’s hierarchy of
needs/motives. After individuals satisfy their needs for hunger and thirst, or biological
needs, they must satisfy their needs to feel safe and secure. To do this, individuals must
feel that they are at a low risk of being harmed. Once an individual feels that he or she is
safe and secure, that person will take the next step in moving closer to the last stage, self-
actualization (Lahey, 2011).
The connection between Maslow’s second hierarchical need and law enforcement is the ability people possess to defend themselves to feel safe/secure. Although people possess the ability to defend themselves, many times they prefer to utilize alternate resources, such as private institutions and law enforcement, to feel safe in their homes and communities. This theory also applies to safety and security in the workplace. If people believe that their place of employment is safe and secure, they will perform at a higher level and their productivity will increase (Johnson, 2005).

**Private Security**

Within the United States or other regions of the world, the use of private security is not a new idea. There is evidence that prehistoric people had safety/security issues and, in turn, groups of people joined together to serve as protection. In an attempt to protect their families, people built homes in caves or on the sides of cliffs in order to keep themselves safe from natural and environmental dangers (Johnson, 2005).

In colonial America, all capable citizens of Boston, Massachusetts, were required to watch over the city in an attempt to keep order in the town and be watchful of potential fires. Groups such as these were sufficient until cities, along with crime, began to grow. As this growth occurred, public police forces were established to help maintain law and order (Johnson, 2005). In the rural South, the law enforcement involved armed citizens who formed slave patrols and vigilante groups before and during the Civil War. These groups took it upon themselves to enforce slave laws and patrol the slave and free-black population.
Police agencies were actually created before the Civil War, but they did not have the capabilities to deal with issues concerning the increasing crime rates due to people moving to more urbanized areas of the country. Noticing this problem, many public police officers established their own private detective agencies in the larger cities. Following this, more and more private detective agencies began emerging, as individuals with little to no police experience began setting up their own practices. Around 1850, Henry Wells and Walter Fargo established the American Express company to transport bank documents. By 1852, they expanded their services to include the transportation of valuables/gold, using the name Wells, Fargo & Company. Once Wells, Fargo & Company acquired all the business west of the Missouri River and the American Express had all business east of the Missouri River, they hired guards to protect the valuables they were transporting and detectives to investigate any crimes that occurred in the transportation process (Johnson, 2005).

As the mid-19th century came around, local police could not handle the increase in crime. As criminals became regional, the local police found they were lacking authority to help eliminate these crimes occurring across jurisdictions. Noticing this, Allan Pinkerton founded the Northwest Police Agency to specifically deal with crimes across regions, including crimes against the railroad industry. Later, Pinkerton founded another agency, which was known as the Pinkerton Protection Patrol (Johnson, 2005).

Following the Civil War, the United States continued to grow, geographically, out west. With that growth and the discovery of gold came the need to protect the assets of individuals. Because the area was lacking in law enforcement, citizens began forming their own vigilante groups to protect themselves from the gangs of outlaws. A cattle
rustling was one of the issues that citizens faced out west by outlaw gangs. In response to cattle rustling, the Wyoming Cattle Growers Association hired a group of private detectives to patrol the open range and assist in eliminating this crime. The governor of Texas decided to handle cattle rustling in a different fashion. He authorized cattle herders to hire people to shoot any unauthorized visitors on the property of local ranchers.

Following the Civil War, the United States began going through an industrialization period. With this period came more opportunities for private security. Within the emerging industries came a need to protect their assets and assist in eliminating strikes. During this time, local police forces gained the ability to conduct investigations outside their boundaries. This improved their services and shifted the role of private security agencies to perform guard duties (Johnson, 2005).

As the 20th Century emerged, the need to protect new industries came to surface. With that, industrial security programs were created. To protect them from harm, all railroad and express companies were converted from private to government ownership and control. Along with this conversion, their security guards became employees of the government. With that, President Franklin Roosevelt made into law Executive Order 8972, which established military guards to protect industries related to national defense. The need for security to protect national defense materials increased during the years of the Korean War and the Cold War, leading to the creation of the National Industrial Security Program (Johnson, 2005).

On September 11, 2001, international terrorists attacked the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. These attacks brought forth the importance private security plays in the United States. A lack of security in United States airports was a contributing factor to the
international terrorists succeeding with their attacks on U.S. soil that day. This proved that government and industries in the United States are capable of coming under attack and security plays a vital role in ensuring the safety of U.S. citizens (Johnson, 2005).

Current local, state, and federal law enforcement officers do not have the workforce to prevent all crimes, so U.S. businesses and citizens turn to private security to protect their properties and homes. It is reported that more than $100 billion is spent annually on private security across the globe. The National Association of Security Companies indicated that $13 billion is spent annually on private security in the United States. More than ten thousand U.S. firms employ close to 1.1 million people compared to about seven hundred thousand public law enforcement agencies (Gaines & Miller, 2011).

**Early History of United States Law Enforcement**

Law enforcement in the United States was actually modeled from agencies that evolved in England. In the mid-1700s, London, England, was one of the largest populated cities in the Western world. Although crime was rampant in this large city, most citizens of London did not like the idea of having a police force that operated under the city government. Since the king or other government entities were known for abusing military power against their citizens, people were cautious of adding another entity that could place more restrictions on their freedom. This feeling began to decline as Sir Robert Peel was able to move the Metropolitan Police Act through Parliament. Peel’s model was used as a guide when Boston, Massachusetts, formed the first organized police department in the United States. Under Peel’s Metropolitan Police Act, police followed nine basic
principles (Gaines & Miller, 2011). According to Gaines and Miller (2011), those principles were as follows:

1. The police force must be organized along military lines.
2. Police administrators and officers must be under government control.
3. Emphasis must be placed on hiring qualified persons and training them properly.
4. New police officers must complete a probationary period; if they fail to meet standards during this time, they will not be hired as permanent officers.
5. Police personnel should be assigned to specific areas of the city for a specific time period.
6. Police headquarters must be centrally located in the city.
7. Police officers must maintain proper appearances at all times in order to gain and keep the respect of citizens.
8. Individual police officers should be able to control their temper and refrain from violence whenever possible.
9. Police records must be kept in order to measure police effectiveness. (p. 149)

The first organized police department formed from this model in 1838 in Boston consisted of six full-time police officers. A few years later, in 1844, new precedent for the modern-day police department was set by combining day and night watches under the command of one police chief. By the time of the Civil War era, several U.S. cities formed police departments based on the Metropolitan Police of London model (Gaines & Miller, 2011).

The first established city police department’s only means of communication was face-to-face meetings or messages sent through messengers. Another way of
communication in the early stages of city police departments was through a telephone-pole light system. This system was used to make the police aware of a call that was awaiting a response. Once the 1850s arrived, police departments had access to telegraph networks that joined police headquarters with their districts. Later, a fire alarm system and call boxes were utilized to signal that officers were stationed at their posts (Hess & Orthmann, 2011).

**Law Enforcement Agencies**

Throughout the course of history, as America continued to change, different federal, state, county, and local agencies were formed for the betterment of law enforcement. Federal agencies established over time that reported to the Department of Justice were the U.S. Marshals Office (the oldest federal agency), the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Federal Drug Enforcement Administration, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Bureau of Prisons. On November 25, 2002, the Department of Homeland Security was established as a result of the September 11, 2001 international terrorist attacks in the United States. It is the third largest cabinet department in the federal government following the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs (Hess & Orthmann, 2011). Once the Department of Homeland Security was formed, some shifting and re-structuring of agencies occurred. Currently, the Department of Homeland Security houses three agencies: U.S. Customs and Border Protection, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and U.S. Secret Service. The Department of Justice now houses four agencies: the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Drug Enforcement Administration, the U.S. Marshals Service, and the
Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives. The Department of the Treasury houses one agency, the Internal Revenue Service (Gaines & Miller, 2011).

States have counterparts to the federal agencies mentioned. Some of those include state bureaus of investigation and state fire marshal divisions. The main law enforcement entities at the state level are the state police and state highway patrol. Both of these entities enforce state laws except within municipalities (Hess & Orthmann, 2011). According to Gaines and Miller (2011), state police agencies were created for four reasons:

1. To assist local police agencies, which often did not have adequate resources or training to handle their law enforcement tasks
2. To investigate criminal activities that crossed jurisdictional boundaries (such as when bank robbers committed a crime in one county and then fled to another part of the state)
3. To provide law enforcement in rural and other areas that did not have local or county police agencies
4. To break strikes and control labor movements (p. 161)

At the county level, the three main entities include the county sheriff, the county police, and the coroner. The county sheriff serves as the chief law enforcement officer for the county and is usually elected by the people. Sheriffs have the power to appoint deputies to assist in providing protection and various other functions. County police departments are not found in every county; they are only utilized where the city and county governments have joined together and operate under a chief of police. Local entities provide law enforcement at the local level. Entities coming under the local level
can be city police, constables, city marshal, and municipal police (Hess & Orthmann, 2011).

**Police Responsibilities**

According to the literature, Gaines and Miller (2011) found that the responsibilities of the police are centralized around four areas. First, the police serve the public to enforce the laws, from which the term *law enforcement officer* is derived. As a law enforcement officer, the primary thought would be that police officers spend large amounts of time fighting crime. In reality, only half of the duties police officers tend to deal with are crime related. The other half of their duties deals with various services, such as medical assistance, maintaining order, and patrolling traffic. The majority of arrests made by police officers deal with public annoyances as opposed to violent crime. Gaines and Miller (2011) reported that in 2008 “11.7 million arrests were made for drunkenness, liquor law violations, disorderly conduct, vagrancy, loitering, and other minor offenses, but only about 600,000 arrests were made for violent crimes” (p. 157).

The second responsibility with which police officers are charged daily is providing various services. As mentioned earlier, police officers spend large amounts of time providing various services to the public. Examples of these services are traffic patrol, emergency responders, providing assistance during domestic disputes, relaying directions to tourists, and assisting families in finding their lost loved ones. Because police officers seem to be first responders to various disaster scenes, they tend to be placed in dangerous situations as they are the first ones on the scene to provide assistance. As police departments in the United States continue to adopt a philosophy of
community policing, they are experiencing more situations in which they must handle problems with homeless people and those who are mentally ill (Gaines & Miller, 2011).

The third responsibility of the police involves preventing crime. Today, this responsibility can be related to the actions taken against terrorists. However, asking police to prevent crime might be a request that cannot be achieved. Obviously, the presence of police in particular areas can prevent some crimes from taking place. Citizens have even reported feeling safer in their homes and neighborhoods knowing that police officers patrol their areas frequently. Another way in which the police have seemed to deter crime is by providing exemplary police services in their respective cities/districts. Cities such as New York and Los Angeles have seen a drop in their crime rates recently, which citizens believe is due to the aggressive and creative approach the police departments have taken. On the other hand, there are factors that the police cannot control that can lead to criminal actions. Poverty, high unemployment rates, lack of morals, and low educational opportunities are just a few examples of factors that the police cannot control, yet tend to contribute to crime (Gaines & Miller, 2011).

The last responsibility of the police is preserving the peace, which is connected to the third responsibility of preventing crime. By law, police officers can use the power to arrest people in a situation where no crime has occurred but the potential is present. An example might be a police officer responding to a call of a domestic dispute. The officer who responds to this call can use his or her powers of threat, arrest, or restraint if he or she deems necessary, in order to prevent the situation from escalating to a possible homicide. An act of this nature would be one of preventing crime and preserving the peace (Gaines & Miller, 2011).
Three Eras of Policing

In their widely used textbook *Introduction to Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice*, Hess and Orthmann (2011) credited Kelling and Moore with categorizing policing into three different eras: the political era, the reform era, and the community era. The political era began in 1840 and continued through 1930 and is described as a time in which law enforcement personnel received their authority from politicians, which led to police corruption. As stated by Hess and Orthmann (2011), a major factor involved in police corruption was the spoils system, which led to politics interfering with the police. Because of the spoils system, politicians had a tendency to hire incompetent police officers and give them key positions in police departments, rewarding their friends for their support.

Citizens began to tire of the police corruption that took place within their respective cities. They began to seek ways in which politics would not control the police forces. One method used to break the political control was by changing the chief of police from an appointed position to an elected position. With that, it was decided that the municipal chief of police would be elected to serve a short term to prevent this position from becoming too powerful or corrupt. This system worked by not allowing the chief of police to be in power long enough to become corrupt, but, because of the shortened term, the chief of police did not have the time to become proficient in the position. Further, because the term of this position was so brief, the people elected to the position often remained employed in their civilian jobs, spending the majority of their time in their civilian jobs while neglecting their duties as chief of police (Hess & Orthmann, 2011).
Hess and Orthmann (2011) indicated that by the mid-1800s, “administrative police boards or commissions were established” (p. 26). These boards contained a combination of judges, mayors, and private citizens and were actually considered in control of the police departments. Once again, a major weakness of this system was that the board members seemed to hinder the police departments, causing more political corruption. In response, some areas turned to state control of local agencies in hopes to provide uniform law enforcement. Considering the laws had a tendency to not be enforced equally under this system, control of local police agencies returned to the local governments (Hess & Orthmann, 2011).

In 1883, Congress passed the Pendleton Act in an attempt to eliminate police corruption. According to Hess & Orthmann (2011), “[t]he Pendleton Act created the civil service system for government employees and made it illegal to fire or demote a worker for political reasons” (p. 27). With this act, a Civil Service Commission was established, which called for a testing procedure to be used to hire new employees. The test was available to all citizens, and people were hired based on their scores on the tests. Also, the act removed any obligation government workers previously had to give political service or payments (Hess & Orthmann, 2011).

Racial segregation and discrimination were prevalent during the political era. African-American police officers were provided specially marked vehicles to use in their patrol, and they were only allowed to arrest citizens within their own race. To add to the discriminatory practices during this era, few Black officers had the opportunity to advance or were given special assignments. Not only did racial discrimination exist, but also female police officers experienced restrictions as well. By the end of the 1800s, the
movement to employ women as regular police officers gained attention. Marie Owens later became known as the first female police officer in the United States. She was appointed to her position by the mayor of Chicago following the death of her husband, who was a police officer. The mayor appointed her to this position as a means to assist in supporting her financially. She was considered an employee and was on the payroll for 30 years before retiring. Her main areas of responsibility while being employed on the police force were to assist detectives in cases involving females and regular court duties. Later in 1908, Lola Baldwin became the first female to be sworn in as a police detective. Although she was hired to handle more responsibilities than her predecessors, her role was still not seen as equivalent in comparison to the other uniformed male officers. By 1912, the idea of having females employed as police officers was changing in the eyes of the public. Women were being welcomed more into police departments, and the first female chief of police was appointed in the city of Milford, Ohio, by the mayor. At the conclusion of World War I, more than 220 cities employed female police officers (Hess & Orthmann, 2011).

The political era of policing was also marked by a couple other pertinent events. In 1899, the juvenile justice system was created in an attempt to focus more on rehabilitating youth and giving them a second chance. The Prohibition movement began in 1920, stemmed from the passage of the Eighteenth Amendment in 1919. As stated by Hess and Orthmann (2011), the Eighteenth Amendment “outlawed the manufacture, sale or transportation, including importing and exporting, of intoxicating liquor beverages within the United States and its territories” (p. 29). Much hostility and hatred were
directed toward the police forces during Prohibition, and the police forces struggled to control the consumption of alcoholic beverages (Hess & Orthmann, 2011).

The second era of policing, the reform era, began in 1930 and continued until 1980. This era began in response to the deficiencies of the Political Era. As stated by Hess and Orthmann (2011), “the reform era of policing was characterized by authority coming from the law and professionalism; crime control as their [police officers] primary function; a centralized, efficient organization; a professional remoteness from the community; and emphasis on preventive motorized patrol and rapid response to crime” (p. 30). During this time, a police chief and former town marshal, August Vollmer, was a loud voice in support for reform to policing. Roberg and Kuyendall (as cited in Hess & Orthmann, 2011) referred to Vollmer as “the Father or Dean of Modern Police Administration” (p. 30). Vollmer is credited with various reform movements, such as the use of motorized patrol, implementation of a centralized fingerprint system, implementation of psychological screening for law enforcement applicants, and emphasizing police officers obtaining a college education. Actually, Vollmer worked with San Jose State College to develop a program that offered a degree in law enforcement. In short, Vollmer is credited with bringing professionalism to law enforcement (Hess & Orthmann, 2011).

In Introduction to Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, Hess and Orthmann (2011) indicated that Manning described three fundamental changes to reform the role of police officers in the 1930s:

1. Crime statistics were linked to police professionalism through establishment of the Uniform Crime Reports.
2. Police began to tie their fate to changes in crime rates as measured by these 
published figures.

3. Police began to symbolize their mission in terms of the technological means 
by which they were said to accomplish it. (p. 30)

In 1968, Congress authorized the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act. 
As part of this act, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration and the National 
Institute of Justice was established. The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration was 
charged with working jointly with state and local governments responsible for crime 
reduction and law enforcement, while the National Institute of Justice served the role as a 
research and development agency as a means to prevent and reduce crime and improve 
the criminal justice system. Another major act passed during the reform era was the 
“[t]he Equal Employment Opportunity Act prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex, 
race, color, religion, or national origin in employment of any kind, public or private, 
local, state or federal” (p. 33). Even though they still faced discrimination, minorities and 
women gained legal equality with White male officers during the reform era (Hess & 
Orthmann, 2011).

The third era of policing is known as the community era; it began in 1980 and has 
continued to the present day. According to Hess and Orthmann (2011), community era 
policing is “characterized by authority coming from support, law and professionalism; 
provision of a broad range of services, including crime control; decentralized 
organization with more authority given to patrol officers; partnerships with the 
community; and use of foot patrol and a problem-solving approach” (p. 34). Whereas
previous law enforcement agencies followed a reactive approach, the community era policing follows a proactive approach, preventing crime before it actually happens. Law enforcement in this era is not known for being involved in corrupt politics. The recruitment of officers, their discipline, and their advancement within the organization is no longer connected to the political arena (Hess & Orthmann, 2011).

Communication services have continued to improve during the reform era. Police radios and patrol cars have enhanced the protection for law enforcement officers. In an attempt to provide more efficient response times, police radios and telephone networks have been connected through the use of police dispatchers. Modern technological computer programs have increased the effectiveness of police operations. The practice of hiring women as police officers has vastly improved, and more women are being placed in administrative positions within police organizations (Hess & Orthmann, 2011).

Hess and Orthmann (2011) asserted the following concerning community era police officers:

Today’s local police officers must be law enforcement generalists with a working knowledge of federal, state, county and municipal law; traffic law; criminal law; juvenile law; narcotics, liquor control; and countless other areas. However, this accounts for only approximately ten percent of what a modern police officer does. Today’s officers spend ninety percent of their time providing a variety of services while protecting life, property and personal liberty. They must be aware of human factors and understand the psychological and sociological implications of their work. They must deal with all citizens, rich and poor, young and old, in ways that maintain the community’s support and confidence. Policing and
partnering with this greatly diverse citizenship is no small challenge or responsibility. (p. 35)

**The Mission of the Community College**

According to the book *The American Community College* (Cohen & Brawer, 2003), the second annual meeting for the American Association of Junior Colleges took place in 1922 and a junior college was defined as “an institution offering two years of instruction of strictly collegiate grade” (p. 3). Cohen and Brawer (2003) went on to state that by 1925, the definition of junior college was changed to the following:

The junior college may, and is likely to, develop a different type of curriculum suited to the larger and ever-changing civic, social, religious, and vocational needs of the entire community in which the college is located. It is understood that in this case, also, the work offered shall be on a level appropriate for high-school graduates. (p. 4)

In their early stages, junior colleges were prevalent. It was reported that 20 existed in 1909, but 170 existed just 10 years later. Cohen and Brawer (2003) stated that “by 1922 thirty-seven of the forty-eight states contained junior colleges” (p. 13). Out of 207 two-year colleges in operation in 1922, 137 were supported by private funding. Enrollment figures in 1922 indicate that 20,000 students attended 2-year colleges; public colleges were averaging around 150 students, and private colleges were averaging around 60 students.

Cohen and Brawer (2003) stated that the “term junior college was applied more often to the lower-division branches of private universities and to two-year colleges
supported by churches or organized independently, while community college came gradually to be used for the comprehensive, publicly supported institutions” (p. 4). Cohen and Brawer went on to define the community college as “any institution accredited to award the Associate in Arts or the Associate in Science as its highest degree” (p. 5), while Vaughn (2000) defined the community college as “a regionally accredited institution of higher education that offers the associate degree as its highest degree” (p. 2). With those definitions in mind, Cohen and Brawer (2003) indicated that the community college has five missions: academic transfer preparation, vocational–technical education, continuing education, remedial education, and community service, while Vaughn (2000) stated that the mission of the community college is “to provide access to postsecondary educational programs and services that lead to stronger, more vital communities” (p. 3).

Students who are served by community colleges are best described by Cohen and Brawer (2003) as “number and variety” (p. 37). Community college enrollment has “increased from just over five hundred thousand in 1960 to more than 2 million by 1970, 4 million by 1980, and nearly 5.5 million by the end of the 1990s” (Cohen & Brawer, 2003, p. 37). With the increase in overall student population, there has also been an increase in the number of nontraditional-age students attending community colleges. This can be attributed to the open door access that community colleges have, which provides potential students the opportunity to enroll with little ease of commitment. It can also be attributed to the various programs and flexible schedules offered by community colleges that prove to be beneficial to the older population. Adults currently in the workforce have the opportunity to upgrade their skills or obtain new skills, enabling them the opportunity
for advancement. They have options of achieving this through day classes, evening
classes, online classes, or a mixture of all (Cohen & Brawer, 2003). According to Cohen
and Brawer (2003), the National Center for Education Statistics reported in 1993 that “the
mean age of community college students had surpassed age thirty-one” (p. 40). Vaughn
(2000) stated that public community colleges service around “10 million students per
year—five million in credit courses and another five million in noncredit courses,
activities, and programs” (p. 1). He went on to estimate that about “45 percent of first-
time college students and 49 percent of all minority college students attend a community
college” and close to “51 percent of community college students are first-generation
students” (p. 1).

**History of Mississippi’s Public Community and Junior Colleges**

Mississippi’s public junior colleges began in 1922 with Senate Bill No. 251,
introduced by Dr. Julius Christian Zeller from Yazoo County. Two agricultural high
schools, Pearl River County Agricultural High School in Poplarville and Hinds County
Agricultural High School in Raymond, were the first to take advantage of this legislation
and began offering educational opportunities beyond a high school diploma. During this
historical first year of the Mississippi public junior college system, Pearl River enrolled
13 students and Hinds enrolled 30 students. Three years later, from 1925 to 1926, two
other agricultural high schools began offering college work, and by 1929, 11 junior
colleges existed in Mississippi. These 11 junior colleges are referred to as the “original”
junior colleges from time to time (Young & Ewing, 1978). The junior colleges included
the following:
1. Pearl River County Agricultural High School in Poplarville
2. Hinds County Agricultural High School in Raymond
3. Holmes County Agricultural High School in Goodman
4. Harrison-Stone Agricultural High School in Perkinston
5. Sunflower County Agricultural High School in Moorhead
6. Kemper County Agricultural High School in Scooba
7. Jones County Agricultural High School in Ellisville
8. Tate County Agricultural High School in Senatobia
9. Copiah-Lincoln in Wesson
10. Newton County in Decatur
11. Pike County in Summit

In 1928, Senator Zeller introduced Senate Bill No. 131 to the Mississippi legislature. This bill established a commission to control these junior colleges, known as the Commission of Junior Colleges. Additionally, House Bill 263 appropriated a separate budget amount to the agricultural high schools for use of freshman and sophomore junior college work. Before passage of this bill, the agricultural high schools were not appropriated separate funding to assist in financing the junior college work (Young & Ewing, 1978).

The agricultural high school superintendents were selected by the Board of Trustees to lead and serve as directors of the junior colleges. Primary day-to-day operational funding for junior colleges was provided by the local boards of supervisors, while legislators made small financial investments. Additionally, legislators were
responsible for developing the ground rules for the agricultural high schools (Young & Ewing, 1978).

Only 4 of the 11 original junior colleges were located in North Mississippi. As each junior college opened its doors for the first year, none had a freshman class enrollment reach 100. Superintendents were always optimistic that this number would increase because the junior colleges were operating beside an agricultural high school with size. Also, superintendents were confident that the student population would have a desire to attend 2 years of college and achieve an education that might not be possible if junior colleges did not exist. As predicted, junior college enrollment did increase and students were taking advantage of the opportunity to gain a college education close to home. The Mississippi junior college system was designed to maintain an open door policy that allowed any determined student with a willingness to learn the opportunity to attend college. For those students who faced financial constraints, scholarships, loans, bus transportation, and job opportunities existed to assist them (Young & Ewing, 1978).

For the most part, the agricultural high schools had academic buildings in fair condition and dormitories that were livable. Each agricultural high school was required by law “to have a farm, a dairy, a garden, and other facilities in land, animals, and equipment” (Young & Ewing, 1978, p. 8). During the first year of operation for each junior college, a total of 88 instructors were teaching college courses; 17 of those taught only college courses; and 14 of those held a master’s degree. Apparently, this had no adverse effect on the educational attainment of students attending Mississippi junior colleges. There was no difference in grades of junior- and senior-level students who took freshman and sophomore classes at a university than those who took freshman and
sophomore classes at a junior college before transferring to a university (Young & Ewing, 1978).

Competitive activities were offered to students from the onset of the Mississippi junior college system. The original competitive events that were offered to junior college students included girls’ and boys’ basketball, girls’ and boys’ tennis, track, volleyball, football, and baseball. These programs were seen as a foundation for physical education and health. Leaders felt that by offering competitive activities, students had the opportunity to develop physically and gain leadership skills to assist them in the future. Each school in the state played each other, with all operating under the guidelines of the Junior College Conference.

The year 1932 marked the second decade of the Mississippi public junior college system. According to Young and Ewing (1978), “[t]he second decade began with an enrollment of 2,761 students. The total enrollment reached the high point of 4,074 during the 1939-1940 session, an increase of 600 students over the 1938-1939 session” (p. 24). The Great Depression had an impact on all junior colleges during this decade, giving reason for Young and Ewing (1978) to label the decade “The Years of Struggle” (p. 19). With recent enrollment increases, junior colleges had a need to add more buildings and purchase more equipment in order to keep up with their growing population. Funding for these additions was not available due to the Great Depression’s impact on the economy (Young & Ewing, 1978).

The first decade ended with 11 junior colleges. A new institution was added during the second decade, Meridian Municipal Junior College. The presidents and boards of trustees of all public junior colleges in Mississippi established the Mississippi Junior
College Literary and Athletic Association, giving leaders the opportunity to hold regular meetings together and provide direction for the system. Regional accreditation became a major focus during this decade. The regional accreditation agency for Mississippi was the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). Being regionally accredited defined the college as meeting regional standards academically and removing any doubt that junior college credit hours could be transferred to a senior college or university. By the end of the second decade, all but three public junior colleges in Mississippi had received full regional accreditation (Young & Ewing, 1978).

The third decade of Mississippi public junior colleges began with the United States involved in World War II. Several students in the junior college system participated in the war effort, which caused a decline in junior college student enrollment. Mississippi public junior colleges had reached a total enrollment of 4,074 students prior to World War II, but enrollment fell to 1,375 students during the 1943–1944 sessions. Along with losing student enrollment, junior colleges were also losing faculty members as a result of the war efforts. According to Young and Ewing (1978), “[l]ong-range plans for growth and development had to be postponed” (p. 25). Junior colleges were in a difficult position of striving to maintain academic excellence for the students enrolled and providing cooperation with the war effort (Young & Ewing, 1978).

Following World War II, junior colleges felt a responsibility to provide programs and services for returning veterans. Many returning veterans had an immediate need for family housing in order to attend school. Junior colleges made the decision to expand dormitory facilities, which was made possible through the Federal Public Housing Act. Returning veterans were in need of training/skills in order to enter the workforce.
Buildings assigned to the State Building Commission and other war surplus buildings were erected on junior college campuses to provide the space needed for more training (Young & Ewing, 1978).

Originally, two junior colleges were to open in Northeast Mississippi in 1941. Because of World War II, they were delayed from opening until 1948. The two planning to open in Northeast Mississippi (Itawamba County Agricultural High School and Prentiss County Agricultural High School) were located in two districts that had no junior college. In 1949, Coahoma County Agricultural High School was established, making it the first public junior college for Black students in Mississippi. In 1950, state law was changed to reflect the name change from “Agricultural High School and Junior College” to “Junior College” (Young & Ewing, 1978, p. 31). This proved to be important because the local supervisors of the supporting counties could now designate local tax dollars toward junior college support and know that it was not designated to support agricultural high schools. By the end of this decade, enrollments had made a turn for the better and were increasing (Young & Ewing, 1978).

By the time the fourth decade arrived, “[t]he Mississippi junior colleges had established themselves as leaders in higher education on the state and regional levels and were participating in all areas of development of the junior college movement on a national basis” (Young & Ewing, 1978, p. 35). All 12 junior colleges that existed in 1942 were fully accredited by SACS during this decade. The two additional junior colleges in Northeast Mississippi that were established in 1948 reached full accreditation during this time period. The open door policy for admission into Mississippi’s public junior colleges has remained intact since it was established, along with the Mississippi junior college
system, in 1922. Any high school graduate continued to have the opportunity to seek a college education. Young and Ewing (1978) stated that “[n]ursing education became a vital part of the public junior college program in Mississippi during this decade” (p. 39). Pre-nursing programs were offered, and the first Practical Nursing Program was established in one Mississippi junior college. It was noted that if bus transportation services were offered by junior colleges to people in their districts, more students would have the opportunity to attend college and acquire a degree. By November 1971, 15 of 16 Mississippi junior colleges were providing bus transportation in their respective districts with a total of 111 buses running regular routes (Young & Ewing, 1978).

As the year 1962 began, so did the fifth decade of the Mississippi public junior college system. Freshman and sophomore level courses taken at junior colleges are equal to those taken at a senior college or university, and the credits earned at junior colleges are transferrable. Short-term training programs have been established to meet industrial training needs of the state. Students now had more flexibility to attend college with evening classes being an option. The allied health field had grown over the years, and more junior colleges were offering allied health programs in order to help meet the needs of the state. Young and Ewing (1978) asserted that “more than fifty percent of the high school graduates in Mississippi who enter college began their college training at a junior college” (p. 44) during the fifth decade. A Division of Junior Colleges within the State Department of Education was established in 1968.

During the 50-year period since Mississippi established public junior colleges, student population has increased and changed. By the 1971–1972 sessions, the student enrollment for Mississippi’s public junior colleges had increased to 60,869. Each junior
college in Mississippi now reports directly to its local board of trustees, which serves as the chief governing body. Young and Ewing (1978) stated that “[e]ach junior college in Mississippi is a multi-county district junior college, with the exception of one municipal public junior college” (p. 50). During the first 50 years, 66 presidents served the 16 public junior colleges. According to Young and Ewing (1978), “records show that these colleges had six hundred and thirty seven years of operation. This would indicate an average of nine plus years for each of the sixty-six presidents” (p. 52).

To best summarize the history of Mississippi’s community colleges from 1972 to 2002, the Mississippi Association of Community and Junior Colleges (2007) credited Dr. William F. Scaggs as stating the following: “It was a time of transformation. The colleges moved from struggling educational afterthoughts to full participation in our state’s educational landscape. It was a bumpy ride, but the progress was steady” (p. 1).

From 1972 to 2002, many changes took place, including several leadership changes. The Mississippi Association of Community and Junior Colleges (MACJC) emerged to work with SBCJC. Dr. George Vaught Moody served as the first executive director of SBCJC, followed by Dr. Olon Ray and Dr. Wayne Stonecypher. The first staff of SBCJC was comprised of five members who operated under a total budget of $260,994. Three additional full-time staff members were approved for hire in 1988. Under Dr. Ray’s leadership, SBCJC gained 11 more full-time positions and eight time-limited positions. The SBCJC budget grew during his tenure from about $334,000 to $28 million in fiscal year 2001. Dr. Stonecypher provided exemplary leadership by achieving the following (MACJC, 2007):
[T]ackling such issues as the transfer of day-to-day operations of the postsecondary vocational-technical program, the vast changes from a funding formula based primarily on headcount to one based on the number of full-time equivalent students, and the continuation of a strong articulation agreement that covered the transfer of credits from the community/junior colleges to the universities. (p. 4)

During this era of Mississippi’s community colleges, the system observed the hiring of the first female president, Dr. Vivian Presley of Coahoma Community College, as well as several females moving into leadership roles within SBCJC (MACJC, 2007).

The 1972–2002 era of community colleges in Mississippi witnessed integration within all institutions. Harris Junior College and Utica Junior College merged with Meridian Junior College in 1970 and Hinds Junior College in 1982. Leading the way for integration was Gulf Coast Junior College, who opened its campuses to diverse student populations during the 1965–1966 sessions. Funding appropriated from the state of Mississippi increased from $7.6 million in 1970 to $174 million in 2002. To ensure the transfer of community college credits to all 4-year institutions, it was concluded that an articulation agreement between the two entities be drafted. In October 1991, Dr. Ray Cleere, Institutions of Higher Learning Commissioner, and Dr. Olon Ray, SBCJC Director, officially presented and distributed the document.

The 1972–2002 Mississippi community college era saw a focus on the addition of new technology to the classrooms and workforce training. A $29.95 million bond was issued in the mid-1990s to revive technology within all community colleges. In 1997, a committee was formed to research the potential to offer online college credit courses in
the Mississippi community college curriculum. At the conclusion of the study, the Mississippi Virtual Community College (MSVCC) was created. Classes through MSVCC were first offered in the spring 2000 semester with a total enrollment of 1,350 students. Community colleges continued to increase online course offerings for their respective schedules, and by fall 2002, enrollment had grown to more than 12,000 students (MACJC, 2007).

**Community College Campus Safety**

It is extremely difficult to predict when and if a campus emergency will take place. Currently, campus safety personnel rely on frequent training and the use of technology to assist them in being proactive in terms of campus safety. Community colleges will face many of the same safety challenges that 4-year institutions have, but most community colleges face other safety challenges that are probably not present at 4-year institutions. The student population on the community college level appears to be a more flexible population. Community colleges have many commuter and part-time students attending their institutions. Also, community colleges employ a larger percentage of adjunct or part-time faculties than their 4-year counterparts. These issues make it more difficult to build a good relationship with students and become familiar with everyone who is employed on campus (McClure, 2009).

Community colleges need to determine what actions they will take to address these issues while simultaneously promoting a safe campus climate. Community college campus police should practice community policing, attempting to build good relationships with students. A behavioral intervention team needs to be organized for
each community college. These teams meet regularly throughout the school year to pinpoint students or employees who are displaying disruptive or problematic behaviors, in an attempt to be proactive and approach these people before an incident occurs. The literature quoted Brett Sokolow, President of the National Center for Higher Education Risk Management (NCHERM): “Community colleges are leading the charge in creating behavioral intervention teams” (McClure, 2009, p. 1). Team members should include campus police chiefs, vice presidents, deans, a counselor, and a housing director. Community colleges can incorporate technology into their daily activities that will assist them in campus safety. Utilizing identification cards (for students and employees) and security cameras can help deter crime on campus. Finally, community college campus police departments should work collaboratively with their local law enforcement agencies for training purposes and to develop a strong relationship in the event that they should be called upon for assistance (McClure, 2009).

**Summary**

The literature researched in this study begins with a brief discussion on safety and security. Campus police/security departments have a huge responsibility each day to promote and provide safety to the college community. If the college community feels safe while on their respective campus, they should feel free of danger and fear. This provides college students the opportunity to focus on learning and college employees the opportunity to focus on educating students. The researcher studied the evolution of security and law enforcement. Protection for the public began in the form of private security and transformed into law enforcement. Community college campuses employ
both law enforcement and security to aid in promoting and providing safe college environments. Security guards are not police academy trained which limits the role they play while enforcing college policies and standards. Campus police officers participate in a more formal training regimen giving them more knowledge of the law and more power to enforce college policies and standards. The researcher studied the general responsibilities of the police. These responsibilities hold true whether the officer is working city, county, or state law enforcement or college law enforcement. Finally, the researcher studied the mission of community colleges and the history of Mississippi public community and junior colleges. This study focused solely on campus police/security in the community college environment, in particular Mississippi public community and junior colleges.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter summarizes the research methodology used to assess campus police departments throughout Mississippi’s public community and junior colleges. There are a total of 15 public community and junior colleges in Mississippi, and all 15 have campus police/security departments. Data were collected using a mixed-method, triangulation research design to provide an assessment of campus police/security at Mississippi’s public community and junior colleges. No treatment or effect was imposed upon any group in order to carry out the research design. This study looked at the various campus police/security departments during the 2010–2011 academic year. Included in this chapter are the research design, population, description of instrument, data collection, and data analysis.

Research Design

According to Fraenkel and Wallen (2009), mixed-methods research “involves the use of both quantitative and qualitative methods in a single study” (p. 557). Within mixed-methods research, there are three main types of designs that a researcher could choose to utilize—exploratory design, explanatory design, or triangulation design (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009). The design type chosen by the researcher for this study was
the triangulation design. In utilizing the triangulation design, “the researcher uses both quantitative and qualitative methods to study the same phenomenon to determine if the two converge upon a single understanding of the research problem being investigated” (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009, p. 561).

**Population**

The population observed in this study is specific to each research question. For research question one, the researcher studied existing descriptive information pertaining to the 15 Mississippi public community and junior college campus police departments. The descriptive information was originally gathered by the Itawamba Community College administration as a means to evaluate their current practices concerning their campus police/security department. The researcher was granted permission to utilize this information to investigate number and type of officers hired, departmental funding and training, mass notification/emergency alert measures, and NIMS compliance.

For research question two, the researcher studied existing crime statistics reported by each public community and junior college in Mississippi. This data is reported annually to the Office of Postsecondary Education of the U.S. Department of Education. These statistics are compiled into the Campus Safety and Security Data Analysis Cutting Tool and are available to the public on the U.S. Department of Education website.

For research question three, the researcher studied existing data gathered by the Itawamba Community College administration. The researcher was granted permission to utilize data collected by Itawamba Community College from their students concerning their perception of campus police and safety issues as it relates to their institution. The
information is gathered annually by the institution as a means to evaluate their campus police/security department and their job performance.

Description of Instrument

The instruments used in this study are specific to each research question. For research question one, the instrument used by the researcher to study how campus police/security departments vary at each public community and junior college in Mississippi was a survey administered by the administration of Itawamba Community College. The survey was administered to all public community and junior colleges in Mississippi. Itawamba Community College administered this survey in an attempt to evaluate their current practices in campus police/security as compared to other Mississippi public community and junior colleges. The researcher was granted permission to investigate the existing information for purposes of this study.

For research question two, the instrument used by the researcher to study the current status of the environment at each public community and junior college in Mississippi was an existing data source published annually by the Office of Postsecondary Education of the U.S. Department of Education. Postsecondary institutions that receive Title IV funding are required to submit crime statistics and fire statistics to the Office of Postsecondary Education; these statistics are compiled into the Campus Safety and Security Data Analysis Cutting Tool. Postsecondary crime and fire statistics are required by the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act and the Higher Education Opportunity Act (Office of Postsecondary Education, 2011).
For research question three, the instrument used by the researcher to study the perception of campus police/security at one rural Northeast Mississippi community college was an existing data set originally administered by the administration of Itawamba Community College to its student body. This institution annually surveys its student body using a Likert scale format, requesting feedback as it pertains to student services. A portion of the survey requests feedback concerning campus police and safety issues. The survey does not collect any information to identify students. Itawamba Community College granted the researcher permission to study the results of the campus police section of this survey beginning with the year 2007 and ending in 2011.

**Data Collection**

For research question one, the researcher utilized an existing data set from Itawamba Community College. The institution granted the researcher permission to investigate the descriptive information for purposes related to this study. Itawamba Community College obtained the information from all Mississippi public community and junior colleges to evaluate their current practices within their campus police/security department.

For research question two, the researcher utilized an existing data set containing crime statistics reported by all 15 public community and junior colleges in Mississippi. This data set was obtained from the Office of Postsecondary Education’s Campus Safety and Security Data Analysis Cutting Tool. The researcher was able to gather data from the calendar year 2010, which was the most current data available.
For research question three, the researcher utilized an existing data source from Itawamba Community College. The institution granted the researcher permission to utilize the information they gathered from students in their annual student services survey. The student population is surveyed by Itawamba Community College administration each year concerning all aspects related to student services. The institution collects this data and utilizes it to evaluate individual departments. Since the information was originally collected by Itawamba Community College with no student identifiers, the researcher had no means for identifying any participants.

Research from this study was guided by three research questions:

1. How do campus police/security departments vary at each community and junior college in Mississippi?
2. What is the current status of the environment at each community and junior college in Mississippi as described by the Campus Safety and Security Data Analysis Cutting Tool?
3. What is the perception of campus police/security pertaining to one rural Northeast Mississippi community college as measured by the student satisfaction surveys from 2007 to 2011?

Variables included in the study are as follows:

1. Number and type of officers hired by each community and junior college (Research Question 1)
2. Annual crime statistics from each community and junior college (Research Question 2)
3. Money allocated to each campus police/security department (Research Question 1)

4. Training opportunities provided to officers by each community and junior college (Research Question 1)

5. Equipment purchased and utilized by each campus police/security department (Research Question 1)

6. Mass notification/emergency alert measures utilized by each campus police/security department (Research Question 1)

7. NIMS compliance by each campus police/security department (Research Question 1)

8. Student satisfaction of campus safety and services provided by campus police at one rural, public community college in the northern region of Mississippi (Research Question 3)

**Data Analysis**

**Research Question One**

Research question one: How do campus police departments vary at each community and junior college in Mississippi?

Descriptive statistics were used to report and analyze the data collected. The survey instrument utilized by Itawamba Community College to collect this information from all Mississippi public community and junior college campus police/security departments was a 5-point Likert scale format with Strongly Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree, and Not Applicable being the answer options. The researcher took the number
of Mississippi public community and junior college campus police/security departments that responded to each survey item and converted the totals to percentages.

Research Question Two

Research question two: What is the current status of the environment at each community and junior college in Mississippi as described by the Campus Safety and Security Data Analysis Cutting Tool?

The data evaluated for this question are the most current data available concerning Mississippi public community and junior college crime statistics, which are for the calendar year 2010. The crime report data were obtained from the Office of Postsecondary Education’s Crime Safety and Security Data Analysis Cutting Tool. For the purpose of this study, the researcher chose to exclude the fire statistics and investigate crime statistics only. Crime statistics are reported in four broad categories, with specific crimes labeled under each category. The crimes in each of the four categories were broken down as to whether they occurred on campus or on-campus student housing. Once the researcher obtained the data from the U.S. Department of Education’s website, the data were aggregated and converted to rates per 1,000 students based on the enrollment data provided in the report. Converting the crime statistics to rates allows for more accurate comparisons because of the wide variation in Mississippi public community and junior college enrollments.
Research Question Three

Research question three: What is the perception of campus police/security pertaining to one rural Northeast Mississippi community college as measured by the student satisfaction surveys from 2007 to 2011?

The survey instrument utilized for this question was developed and administered by Itawamba Community College to its student body. The institution granted the researcher permission to study student responses pertaining to campus police and safety issues from the years 2007 to 2011. The wording of questions in this instrument was identical across all years for the study. However, from 2007 to 2009, the instrument included a 5-point Likert scale with scoring as follows: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, and 5 = Strongly Agree. For years 2010 and 2011, the instrument only included a 4-point scale with 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, and 4 = Strongly Agree. These years were re-coded and scaled to maintain the same range (i.e., 1, 2, 3, and 4 to 1, 2.33, 3.67, and 5.0) so that scores would have the same weight in an additive composite score. The researcher utilized a one-way ANOVA to determine the significance level of student satisfaction concerning campus safety and services provided by campus police. The researcher utilized 2007 as the reference year. Overall student perceptions of campus police/security and safety for years 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011 were compared to the overall student perception in 2007. This was performed in an attempt to investigate how student perceptions of campus police/security and safety issues changed over the course of a five year time period.
CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

During this assessment of Mississippi’s community and junior college campus police/security department, the following three research questions were used to guide the study:

1. How do campus police/security departments vary at each community and junior college in Mississippi?
2. What is the current status of the campus environment at each community and junior college in Mississippi as described by the Campus Safety and Security Data Analysis Cutting Tool?
3. What is the perception of campus police/security pertaining to one rural Northeast Mississippi community college as measured by the student satisfaction surveys from 2007 to 2011?

Specific variables addressed included number and type of officers hired (Research Question 1), annual crime statistics reported (Research Question 2), departmental funding and training (Research Question 1), mass notification/emergency alert measures (Research Question 1), NIMS compliance (Research Question 1), and student satisfaction with campus police/security at one rural community college in the northern region of Mississippi (Research Question 3).
Source of Data

For research question one, the researcher studied existing descriptive information pertaining to the 15 Mississippi public community and junior college campus police departments. The descriptive information was originally gathered by the Itawamba Community College administration as a means to evaluate their current practices concerning their campus police/security department. The researcher was granted permission to utilize this information to investigate number and type of officers hired, departmental funding and training, mass notification/emergency alert measures, and NIMS compliance.

For research question two, the researcher studied existing crime statistics reported by each public community and junior college in Mississippi. This data is reported annually to the Office of Postsecondary Education of the U.S. Department of Education. These statistics are compiled into the Campus Safety and Security Data Analysis Cutting Tool and are available to the public on the U.S. Department of Education website.

For research question three, the researcher studied existing data gathered by the Itawamba Community College administration. The researcher was granted permission to utilize data collected by Itawamba Community College from their students concerning their perception of campus police and safety issues as it relates to their institution. The information is gathered annually by the institution as a means to evaluate their campus police/security department and their job performance.
Answering the Research Questions

Research Question One

Research question one: How do campus police departments vary at each community and junior college in Mississippi?

Data for question one were obtained from the results of a survey instrument administered by Itawamba Community College to all Mississippi public community and junior college campus police/security departments. The information was requested by the institution as a means to evaluate and compare their current practices within their campus police department. The researcher was granted permission from Itawamba Community College to investigate the results of the survey for the purposes of this study.

The researcher utilized the survey information and found that all 15 community and junior colleges have campus police/security employed at their respective institutions contracted out as college employees. The total number of campus police/security officers utilized at each institution varies, with the highest number employed at one college institution being 54, and the lowest number employed at one institution being 12. On average, Mississippi’s public community and junior colleges employ 18.9 campus police/security officers at each institution. The researcher found that 12 of 15 public community and junior colleges in Mississippi choose to utilize both certified and non-certified officers, while the other 3 institutions utilize only certified officers. A certified officer is one who has completed police academy training, thus having full arrest and law enforcement powers while on college property. Certified officers have the authority to carry and use a certified weapon. A non-certified officer is one who has not completed
police academy training, thus having no arrest powers and very limited law enforcement powers. Non-certified officers do not have the authority to carry or use weapons.

As shown in Table 4.1, the Mississippi community and junior college campus police/security department data revealed two general findings. First, for questions that focused on training and attitudes about jobs, colleges reported higher positive attitudes. Second, when reporting on attitudes about adequate staffing or improvements that required increased budgets, colleges generally reported less positive attitudes. Specific findings by question are reported in the following narrative.

When campus police/security departments were surveyed concerning opportunities to participate in various training opportunities, 10 colleges strongly agreed and 4 agreed that their officers had ample opportunities. Only 1 college reported believing its officers were not given ample opportunities. This is important because campus police/security officers need to have opportunities to update their knowledge and skills pertaining to safety techniques and practices.

When campus police/security departments were surveyed concerning adequate staffing, including support staff and work-study assistance, 1 college strongly agreed and 7 agreed that their department had adequate staffing. A total of 7 colleges reported believing that their departments did not have adequate staffing; 6 colleges disagreed and 1 strongly disagreed. This is important because campus police/security departments need to have an adequate number of employees to provide accurate and efficient services to the college community.

When campus police/security departments were surveyed concerning adequate funding for office supplies, computer software, and so forth, 4 colleges strongly agreed
and 5 agreed that their department had adequate funding for office supplies, computer software, and so forth. Six colleges reported believing that their department did not have adequate funding for these items; 5 disagreed and 1 strongly disagreed. This is important because campus police/security departments need to have the resources to manage an office efficiently on a daily basis.

When campus police/security departments were surveyed concerning adequate funding for staff training, 3 colleges strongly agreed and 8 agreed that their department had adequate funding for staff training. A total of 4 colleges reported believing that their department did not have adequate funding for staff training; 2 disagreed and 2 strongly disagreed. This is important because appropriate professional development and training for campus police/security requires financial obligations.

When campus police/security departments were surveyed concerning adequate funding to purchase equipment, weapons, uniforms, and vehicles, 3 colleges strongly agreed and 3 agreed that their department had adequate funding to purchase equipment, weapons, uniforms, and vehicles. A total of 9 colleges reported believing that their department did not have adequate funding to purchase equipment, weapons, uniforms, and vehicles; 5 disagreed and 4 strongly disagreed. This is important because campus police/security officers need to have the ability to obtain specific purchases in order to maintain a safe campus climate.

When campus police/security departments were surveyed concerning their active involvement in the emergency planning process for their college, 9 colleges strongly agreed and 6 agreed that their officers are actively involved in the emergency process.
This is important because campus police/security departments will be charged with taking the lead role in the event the emergency plan has to be put into action.

When campus police/security departments were surveyed concerning their ability to initiate a mass communication/emergency alert in the event that there is a campus emergency, 9 colleges strongly agreed and 5 agreed that their department had access to initiate a mass communication/emergency alert in the event that there is a campus emergency. Only 1 college reported believing that its department did not have access to initiate a mass communication/emergency alert in the event that there was a campus emergency. This is important because campus police/security will be active participants in determining whether a mass communication/alert needs to be initiated throughout campus.

When campus police/security departments were surveyed concerning their involvement with FEMA in achieving up-to-date compliance with NIMS requirements, 13 colleges strongly agreed and 2 agreed that their officers were involved with FEMA in achieving up-to-date compliance with NIMS requirements. This is important because campus police departments must continue to be active and remain current with the National Incident Management System and Incident Command System in order to achieve full compliance with FEMA standards.

When campus police/security departments were surveyed concerning providing training for faculty, staff, and students on emergency procedures, safety, and security, 2 colleges strongly agreed and 8 agreed that their department provided training for faculty, staff, and students concerning emergency procedures, safety, and security. Four colleges reported believing that their department did not provide training for faculty, staff, and
students concerning emergency procedures, safety, and security. This is important because all students, faculty, and staff within the college community need to be aware of the institution’s emergency procedures/policies and safety protocol.

In studying the existing information, Mississippi public community and junior college campus police/security departments seem to vary in adequate staffing of their respective offices, funding for office supplies, and funding for equipment purchases. Mississippi public community and junior college campus police/security departments reported less positive attitudes concerning improvements that require increased budgets. The researcher found that Mississippi public community and junior college campus police/security departments did not vary much in terms of participating in training exercises, conducting training exercises, or emergency planning. Table 4.1 provides a visual description of the detailed findings from the Mississippi community and junior college campus police departments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rating Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Campus Police/Security Officers are given ample opportunities to participate in various training opportunities.</td>
<td>66.7(10) 26.7(4) 6.7(1) 0(0) 0(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Campus Police/Security Department is adequately staffed, including support staff and work-study assistance.</td>
<td>6.7(1) 46.7(7) 40.0(6) 6.7(1) 0(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Campus Police/Security Department has adequate funding for office supplies, computer software, and so forth.</td>
<td>26.7(4) 33.3(5) 33.3(5) 6.7(1) 0(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Campus Police/Security Department has adequate funding for staff training.</td>
<td>20.0(3) 53.3(8) 13.3(2) 13.3(2) 0(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Campus Police/Security Department has adequate funding to purchase equipment, weapons, uniforms, and vehicles.</td>
<td>20.0(3) 20.0(3) 33.3(5) 26.7(4) 0(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Police/Security Officers are actively involved in the emergency planning process for this community college.</td>
<td>60.0(9) 40.0(6) 0(0) 0(0) 0(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Campus Police/Security Department has access to initiate a mass communication/emergency alert in the event that there is a campus emergency.</td>
<td>60.0(9) 33.3(5) 6.7(1) 0(0) 0(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Police/Security Officers are involved with FEMA in achieving up-to-date compliance with NIMS requirements.</td>
<td>86.7(13) 13.3(2) 0(0) 0(0) 0(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Campus Police/Security Department provides training for faculty, staff, and students concerning emergency procedures, safety, and security.</td>
<td>20.0(2) 53.3(8) 26.7(4) 0(0) 0(0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N = the number of community colleges responding. Mississippi has 15 public community and junior colleges.
Research Question Two

Research question two: What is the current status of the environment at each community and junior college in Mississippi as described by the Campus Safety and Security Data Analysis Cutting Tool?

Data for question two were obtained from the Office of Postsecondary Education’s Campus Safety and Security Data Analysis Cutting Tool (Office of Postsecondary Education, 2011). Postsecondary institutions that receive Title IV funding are required to submit crime and fire statistics to the Office of Postsecondary Education annually. The reporting of these statistics is also required by the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act and the Higher Education Opportunity Act.

The data evaluated for this question were the most current data available concerning Mississippi public community and junior college crime statistics, which are for calendar year 2010. For the purpose of this study, the researcher chose to investigate the crime statistics only, excluding the fire statistics. Crime statistics are reported in four broad categories. Specific crimes included in each category are listed as follows:

Criminal Offenses

- Murder/Non-negligent manslaughter
- Negligent manslaughter
- Sex offenses – Forcible
- Sex offenses – Non-forcible
- Robbery
- Aggravated assault
• Burglary
• Motor vehicle theft
• Arson

Hate Crimes
• Murder/Non-negligent manslaughter
• Sex offenses – Forcible
• Sex offenses – Non-forcible
• Robbery
• Aggravated assault
• Burglary
• Motor vehicle theft
• Arson
• Simple assault
• Larceny-theft
• Intimidation
• Destruction/Damage/Vandalism of property

Arrests
• Weapons: Carrying, possessing, and so forth
• Drug abuse violations
• Liquor law violations

Disciplinary Actions
• Weapons: Carrying, possessing, and so forth
• Drug abuse violations
• Liquor law violations

Within each of the four categories, the researcher examined crimes reported on campus and on-campus student housing separately. Crimes reported on campus represent the total occurrences that took place on campus. Crimes reported on-campus student housing represent total occurrences that took place in on-campus student housing facilities. Once the data were obtained, aggregated, and converted to rates, they were placed in tables 4.2 and 4.3 for visual representation.

Table 4.2 provides a visual representation of crime statistics reported by each Mississippi public community and junior college on campus. Table 4.3 provides a visual representation of crime statistics reported by each Mississippi public community and junior college on-campus student housing. Both tables indicate the 2010 enrollment for each community and junior college as reported by each institution upon submitting its respective crime report. The researcher found the enrollment data reported by each community and junior college to be varied among the 15 Mississippi institutions. The highest enrollment figure reported was 11,752, with the lowest being reported at 2,119. In order to allow for comparisons across all community and junior colleges, the researcher aggregated all crime statistics by category for each community or junior college, and converted the aggregate number of crimes for each category by dividing the aggregated total by the enrollment and multiplying by 1,000. This conversion results in a rate per 1,000 students. Rates such as these allow accurate comparisons because of the wide variation in enrollments.
In examining both Table 4.2 and Table 4.3, the researcher found that each community and junior college is unique to its surroundings and it would be difficult to make a general statement about one specific community or junior college. The data show that crime appears to be a rare event throughout all Mississippi community and junior colleges. Notably, no hate crimes were submitted by any of the 15 community and junior colleges for the calendar year 2010; therefore, no hate crime data are listed on either Table 4.2 or Table 4.3.

The researcher found, as shown in Table 4.2, that community and junior colleges reported more disciplinary actions than arrests and criminal offenses on campus. Overall, the crime rate per 1,000 students was 3.19 for disciplinary actions on campus. The rate of criminal offenses on campus was 0.82 per 1,000 students, the lowest of the three categories in Table 4.2. Holmes Community College reported the lowest crime rate out of all Mississippi community and junior colleges per 1,000 students for each of the three categories in Table 4.2. Southwest Mississippi Community College reported the highest arrest rate on campus at 9.44 per 1,000 students and the highest criminal offense rate on campus at 2.83 per 1,000 students. Meridian Community College reported the highest disciplinary actions on campus at 12.15 per 1,000 students. The researcher did find that a few community and junior colleges reported no crimes, as shown in Table 4.2, with Coahoma Community College reporting no crimes for all three categories.

Table 4.3 reported arrests on-campus student housing at 2.13 per 1,000 students, the highest among the three categories on this table. This is a different finding compared to the reported statistics in Table 4.2. Disciplinary actions for on-campus student housing had the lowest rate, 1.39 per 1,000 students. Itawamba Community College reported the
lowest arrest rate on-campus student housing at 0.26 per 1,000 students, while Holmes Community College reported the lowest criminal offense and disciplinary action rate on-campus student housing at 0.15 per 1,000 students in both categories. Northeast Mississippi Community College reported the highest arrest crime rate on-campus student housing at 7.16 per 1,000 students. East Central Community College reported the highest criminal offense rate on-campus student housing at 6.82 per 1,000 students. Meridian Community College reported the highest disciplinary action crime rate on-campus student housing at 12.15 per 1,000 students.

Based on the data reported by Mississippi public community and junior college campus police/security departments in the Office of Postsecondary Education’s Campus Safety and Security Data Analysis Cutting Tool, the total crime rate per 1,000 students reveals low numbers. The data indicated that the environment on Mississippi public community and junior college campuses seems to be one that is safe for all students, faculty, and staff.
Table 4.2  Mississippi Public Community and Junior College 2010 Crime Statistics: On Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community and Junior Colleges</th>
<th>2010 Enrollment</th>
<th>Arrests On Campus (Rate*)</th>
<th>Criminal Offenses On Campus (Rate*)</th>
<th>Disciplinary Actions On Campus (Rate*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coahoma Community College</td>
<td>2,565</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copiah-Lincoln Community College</td>
<td>4,590</td>
<td>12(2.61)</td>
<td>3(0.65)</td>
<td>24(5.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Central Community College</td>
<td>2,639</td>
<td>4(1.52)</td>
<td>4(1.52)</td>
<td>22(8.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Mississippi Community College</td>
<td>4,993</td>
<td>4(0.81)</td>
<td>4(0.80)</td>
<td>2(0.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinds Community College</td>
<td>11,752</td>
<td>15(1.28)</td>
<td>6(0.51)</td>
<td>24(2.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes Community College</td>
<td>6,466</td>
<td>2(0.31)</td>
<td>1(0.15)</td>
<td>2(0.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itawamba Community College</td>
<td>7,596</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>28(3.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones County Junior College</td>
<td>5,250</td>
<td>9(1.71)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>9(1.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian Community College</td>
<td>3,949</td>
<td>10(2.53)</td>
<td>8(2.03)</td>
<td>48(12.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi Delta Community College</td>
<td>3,502</td>
<td>5(1.43)</td>
<td>5(1.42)</td>
<td>5(1.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi Gulf Coast Community College</td>
<td>10,064</td>
<td>11(0.99)</td>
<td>10(0.99)</td>
<td>9(0.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Mississippi Community College</td>
<td>3,633</td>
<td>4(1.10)</td>
<td>1(0.28)</td>
<td>14(3.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Mississippi Community College</td>
<td>8,211</td>
<td>32(3.90)</td>
<td>11(1.34)</td>
<td>43(5.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearl River Community College</td>
<td>5,519</td>
<td>11(1.99)</td>
<td>9(1.63)</td>
<td>14(2.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Mississippi Community College</td>
<td>2,119</td>
<td>20(9.44)</td>
<td>6(2.83)</td>
<td>20(9.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrollment</td>
<td>82,848</td>
<td>139(1.68)</td>
<td>68(0.82)</td>
<td>264(3.19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rate = per 1,000 students.
Table 4.3  Mississippi Public Community and Junior College 2010 Crime Statistics: On-Campus Student Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community and Junior Colleges</th>
<th>2010 Enrollment</th>
<th>Arrests On-Campus Student Housing (Rate*)</th>
<th>Criminal Offenses On-Campus Student Housing (Rate*)</th>
<th>Disciplinary Actions On-Campus Student Housing (Rate*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coahoma Community College</td>
<td>2,565</td>
<td>4(1.56)</td>
<td>4(1.56)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copiah-Lincoln Community College</td>
<td>4,590</td>
<td>7(1.52)</td>
<td>4(0.87)</td>
<td>10(2.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Central Community College</td>
<td>2,639</td>
<td>18(6.82)</td>
<td>18(6.82)</td>
<td>16(6.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Mississippi Community College</td>
<td>4,993</td>
<td>8(1.60)</td>
<td>8(1.60)</td>
<td>2(0.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinds Community College</td>
<td>11,752</td>
<td>34(2.89)</td>
<td>17(1.44)</td>
<td>7(0.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes Community College</td>
<td>6,466</td>
<td>4(0.62)</td>
<td>1(0.15)</td>
<td>1(0.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itawamba Community College</td>
<td>7,596</td>
<td>2(0.26)</td>
<td>2(0.26)</td>
<td>2(0.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones County Junior College</td>
<td>5,250</td>
<td>12(2.29)</td>
<td>6(1.14)</td>
<td>2(0.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian Community College</td>
<td>3,949</td>
<td>5(1.27)</td>
<td>3(0.76)</td>
<td>48(12.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi Delta Community College</td>
<td>3,502</td>
<td>6(1.71)</td>
<td>6(1.71)</td>
<td>5(1.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi Gulf Coast Community College</td>
<td>10,064</td>
<td>32(3.18)</td>
<td>31(3.08)</td>
<td>6(0.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Mississippi Community College</td>
<td>3,633</td>
<td>26(7.16)</td>
<td>11(3.02)</td>
<td>8(2.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Mississippi Community College</td>
<td>8,211</td>
<td>10(1.21)</td>
<td>2(0.24)</td>
<td>33(4.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearl River Community College</td>
<td>5,519</td>
<td>7(1.26)</td>
<td>4(0.72)</td>
<td>11(1.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Mississippi Community College</td>
<td>2,119</td>
<td>2(0.94)</td>
<td>1(0.47)</td>
<td>6(2.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrollment</td>
<td>82,848</td>
<td>177(2.13)</td>
<td>118(1.42)</td>
<td>115(1.39)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rate = per 1,000 students.
Research Question Three

Research question three: What is the perception of campus police/security pertaining to one rural Northeast Mississippi community college as measured by the student satisfaction surveys from 2007 to 2011?

Data for question three were obtained from one rural, public community college in the northern region of Mississippi. The researcher examined surveys administered by a rural Northeast Mississippi community college that gathered feedback from its students regarding their satisfaction level with campus police. The researcher investigated surveys from 2007 to 2011 and utilized 2007 as the reference year. Overall student perception of campus police/security and safety for years 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011 were compared to student perception in 2007. This was performed in an attempt to investigate how student perceptions of campus police/security and safety issues changed over the course of a five year time period. The survey instrument utilized identical questions across all years for the study. However, for years 2007–2009, a 5-point Likert scale was utilized, and for years 2010 and 2011, a 4-point Likert scale was utilized. As reported earlier, the researcher re-coded years 2010 and 2011 and scaled them to maintain the same scoring range as years 2007–2009. This re-code procedure created 2010 and 2011 survey responses with the same weight as 2007–2009 survey responses in an additive composite score.

Table 4.4 shows the descriptive statistics for each question by year. N represents the number of surveys utilized and evaluated. In years 2010 and 2011, the college used an electronic survey, which provided an opportunity to reach a larger population. The mean score for each question is provided by year, while the standard deviation shows that the
data have similar variances. Because the general trend reveals increasing student satisfaction on a majority of individual items, a composite score was created, which is discussed in the following section and in Table 4.5.
### Table 4.4  Student Satisfaction Survey Descriptive Statistics Question by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus Police are viewed by me as real police rather than security.</td>
<td>N 789, Mean 3.30, SD 1.28</td>
<td>N 952, Mean 3.31, SD 1.26</td>
<td>N 950, Mean 3.45, SD 1.24</td>
<td>N 1,672, Mean 3.90, SD 1.16</td>
<td>N 1,606, Mean 3.86, SD 1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Police are knowledgeable of the law.</td>
<td>N 760, Mean 3.64, SD 1.26</td>
<td>N 880, Mean 3.68, SD 1.04</td>
<td>N 860, Mean 3.87, SD 0.95</td>
<td>N 1,672, Mean 4.12, SD 0.94</td>
<td>N 1,549, Mean 4.15, SD 0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Police are available when needed.</td>
<td>N 759, Mean 3.66, SD 1.10</td>
<td>N 884, Mean 3.76, SD 1.04</td>
<td>N 845, Mean 3.85, SD 1.02</td>
<td>N 1,672, Mean 4.11, SD 0.99</td>
<td>N 1,573, Mean 4.09, SD 1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Police are visible on Campus.</td>
<td>N 804, Mean 4.18, SD 0.80</td>
<td>N 1,003, Mean 4.22, SD 0.81</td>
<td>N 961, Mean 4.26, SD 0.79</td>
<td>N 1,672, Mean 4.36, SD 0.84</td>
<td>N 1,621, Mean 4.32, SD 0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Police are sensitive to students' needs.</td>
<td>N 742, Mean 3.41, SD 1.13</td>
<td>N 880, Mean 3.47, SD 1.12</td>
<td>N 835, Mean 3.60, SD 1.15</td>
<td>N 1,672, Mean 3.94, SD 1.11</td>
<td>N 1,545, Mean 3.98, SD 1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Police prevent unsafe conditions by promoting safety.</td>
<td>N 764, Mean 3.71, SD 0.97</td>
<td>N 906, Mean 3.76, SD 0.99</td>
<td>N 866, Mean 3.92, SD 0.92</td>
<td>N 1,672, Mean 4.13, SD 0.97</td>
<td>N 1,545, Mean 4.16, SD 0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Police enforce laws and regulations.</td>
<td>N 776, Mean 3.93, SD 0.89</td>
<td>N 933, Mean 3.96, SD 0.93</td>
<td>N 897, Mean 4.13, SD 0.86</td>
<td>N 1,672, Mean 4.24, SD 0.91</td>
<td>N 1,591, Mean 4.23, SD 0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Police provide helpful services.</td>
<td>N 765, Mean 3.70, SD 1.01</td>
<td>N 914, Mean 3.80, SD 1.00</td>
<td>N 876, Mean 3.89, SD 0.94</td>
<td>N 1,672, Mean 4.15, SD 0.99</td>
<td>N 1,585, Mean 4.14, SD 1.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.4 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Police are professional.</th>
<th>775</th>
<th>3.58</th>
<th>1.07</th>
<th>921</th>
<th>3.76</th>
<th>1.01</th>
<th>889</th>
<th>3.78</th>
<th>0.97</th>
<th>1,672</th>
<th>4.13</th>
<th>1.01</th>
<th>1,595</th>
<th>4.12</th>
<th>1.04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus Police are courteous.</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1,672</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1,593</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel safe and secure on our campus.</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1,015</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1,672</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1,598</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computed Score</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td>1,672</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>9.45</td>
<td>1,382</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>8.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N = number of responses; Mean = average score
The college has used identically worded questions on the satisfaction survey for a number of years, and the questionnaire appears to be reliable and valid. However, to document the usability of combined measure of satisfaction, the researcher conducted a reliability analysis to determine if all the items in the survey could be combined to create a composite measure of student satisfaction, thus allowing for the ANOVA to test for significant differences across years. The reliability analysis revealed no years with unacceptable levels of missing data and revealed no years with less than 70% of items retained in the analyses, and no unacceptable variances were discovered. Standard deviations were within the expected levels when comparing each year. All Cronbach’s alpha levels were statistically significant and above .93, indicating that all items for all years could be combined to create a composite score. Table 4.5 provides a visual representation of the results of the reliability analysis performed.

Table 4.5  Reliability Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% Included</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>40.99</td>
<td>81.11</td>
<td>9.01</td>
<td>.937*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>41.84</td>
<td>79.98</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>.942*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>43.38</td>
<td>75.38</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td>.947*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,672</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>45.36</td>
<td>89.326</td>
<td>9.45</td>
<td>.964*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1,481</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>45.76</td>
<td>91.76</td>
<td>9.57</td>
<td>.971*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.001.
To test for significant changes in composite satisfaction score, the researcher conducted four one-way ANOVAs, using 2007 as the reference year to examine how student perceptions had changed in recent years. A one-way between-subjects ANOVA was conducted to compare changes in the overall student perception of campus police/security and safety issues between 2007 and 2008. This was performed in order to test student perception changes over a five year time frame. There was no statistically significant difference ($p > .05$) in overall student satisfaction between 2007 and 2008 ($F(1, 1412) = 3.125, p = .077$). There was a mean difference of .9 (2007: $M = 40.9$; 2008: $M = 41.8$). This indicates that while the composite satisfaction score increases, the increase could have occurred by chance.

A second one-way between-subjects ANOVA was conducted to compare changes in the overall student perception of campus police/security and safety issues between 2007 and 2009. This was performed in order to test student perception changes over a five year time frame. There was a statistically significant difference ($p < .05$) in overall student satisfaction between 2007 and 2009 ($F(1, 1352) = 21.267, p = .000$). There was a mean difference of 2.3 (2007: $M = 40.9$; 2009: $M = 43.2$). This indicates that the composite satisfaction score increase was unlikely to have occurred by chance. The percentage increase in composite score increased 5.67% from 2007 to 2009.

A third one-way between-subjects ANOVA was conducted to compare changes in the overall student perception of campus police/security and safety issues between 2007 and 2010. This was performed in order to test student perception changes over a five year time frame. There was a statistically significant difference ($p < .05$) in overall student satisfaction between 2007 and 2010 ($F(1, 2326) = 103.531, p = .000$). There was a mean
difference of 4.4 (2007: $M = 40.9$; 2010: $M = 45.3$). This indicates that the composite satisfaction score increase was unlikely to have occurred by chance. The percentage increase in composite score increased 10.75% from 2007 to 2010.

A fourth one-way between-subjects ANOVA was conducted to compare changes in the overall student perception of campus police/security and safety issues between 2007 and 2011. This was performed in order to test student perception changes over a five year time frame. There was a statistically significant difference ($p < .05$) in overall student satisfaction between 2007 and 2011 ($F(1, 2036) = 18.056, p = .000$). There was a mean difference of 1.9 (2007: $M = 40.9$; 2011: $M = 42.8$). This indicates that the composite satisfaction score increase was unlikely to have occurred by chance. The percentage increase in composite score was 4.64% from 2007 to 2011.

Based on the findings, overall student perception of campus police/security improved from 2007 to 2011. Since this study provided no information as to why student perception changed, the researcher cannot provide specific reasons that influenced students’ attitudes. The study indicated that student perceive campus police/security positively as they reported more positive attitudes for 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011 as compared to 2007. Although there was no statistically significant difference in overall student satisfaction between 2007 and 2008, the composite satisfaction score did increase. Table 4.6 provides a visual representation of the summary ANOVA table by year.
Table 4.6 Summary ANOVA Table by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007 vs. 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>251.55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>251.55</td>
<td>3.125</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>113,667.312</td>
<td>1412</td>
<td>80.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>113,918.86</td>
<td>1413</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 vs. 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.662.11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1662.11</td>
<td>21.267</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>105,663.22</td>
<td>1352</td>
<td>78.153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107,325.34</td>
<td>1353</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 vs. 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>9,008.428</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9008.428</td>
<td>103.531</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>202,3888.98</td>
<td>2326</td>
<td>87.012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>211,397.41</td>
<td>2327</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 vs. 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1,397.89</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1397.89</td>
<td>18.056</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>157624.61</td>
<td>2036</td>
<td>77.419</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>159,022.501</td>
<td>2037</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p< .05.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents the summary, conclusions, and recommendations of the study. The purpose of this study was to provide an assessment of campus police departments throughout the 15 public community and junior colleges in Mississippi. Safety on college campuses is not an issue that can afford to be addressed in a reactive manner. Variables studied included location(s), number and types of officers utilized at each location, money allocated, equipment purchased and utilized, training opportunities, emergency planning, and annual crime reports. The researcher gathered information on the extent to which departments worked with FEMA to achieve NIMS compliance. A portion of the study examined a random sample of student satisfaction survey results concerning campus police from one rural, public community college in the northern region of Mississippi. Three research questions were used to guide this study. The first question was “How do campus police/security departments vary at each community and junior college in Mississippi?” The second question was “What is the current status of the campus environment at each community and junior college in Mississippi as described by the Campus Safety and Security Data Analysis Cutting Tool?” The third question was “What is the perception of campus police/security pertaining to one rural Northeast Mississippi community college as measured by the student satisfaction surveys from 2007 to 2011?”
Summary

Chapter I provided the statement of the problem, purpose of the study, significance of the study, limitations and delimitations, and definition of terms. The purpose of this study was to analyze data that pertained to Mississippi’s public community and junior college campus police/security departments. This study is significant considering a thorough assessment of campus police departments throughout Mississippi’s community and junior colleges has not been completed. The study will provide Mississippi community and junior college administrators the opportunity to observe all public community and junior college campus police/security departments in the state of Mississippi, giving them the opportunity to evaluate the overall safety of their respective campuses.

Chapter II provided the review of the related literature. The terms safety and security were defined and discussed as they pertain to Abraham Maslow’s hierarchy of five needs. The researcher chose to review the development of private security and history of law enforcement in the United States. This review further expanded into the structure of the various law enforcement agencies and the responsibilities of the police. The history of Mississippi’s public community and junior colleges was discussed along with a brief examination of the community college mission. Lastly, the researcher reviewed literature pertaining specifically to community college campus safety and current issues affecting safe campus climates.

Chapter III provided the research methodology, population, description of instrument, data collection, and data analysis information. This chapter also provided the
research question and variables included in the study. The researcher chose to utilize a mixed-methods research design, involving both quantitative and qualitative methods.

Chapter IV analyzed the data and answered the three research questions. For research question one, the researcher found that all 15 Mississippi community and junior colleges employ campus police/security at their respective institutions. The average number of campus police/security officers employed at each institution is 18.9 campus police/security officers. Twelve of 15 Mississippi community and junior colleges utilize the services of certified and non-certified officers. Mississippi community and junior college campus police/security reported positive attitudes pertaining to their ability to attend and provide training opportunities, as well as their involvement with emergency planning and FEMA in meeting NIMS requirements. Mississippi community and junior college campus police/security reported less favorable attitudes pertaining to funding and staffing their respective departments. Adequate departmental staffing and the ability to purchase equipment, weapons, uniforms, and vehicles were two areas that reported least favorable attitudes.

For research question two, the researcher converted the crime statistics reported by each Mississippi community and junior college to a rate per 1,000 students. In examining all four categories of crimes, the data reveal that crime appears to be a rare event throughout Mississippi community and junior colleges. A few colleges reported no crime statistics in one or multiple crime categories. Obviously, those community and junior colleges reporting higher enrollments could have more crimes to report because those institutions are serving a larger student body. One major finding was that none of
the 15 community and junior colleges in Mississippi reported any hate crimes for calendar year 2010.

Community and junior colleges reported more disciplinary actions than arrests and criminal offenses on campus. The crime rate per 1,000 students was 3.19 for disciplinary actions on campus. The rate of criminal offenses on campus was 0.82 per 1,000 students, the lowest of the three categories. The arrest rate for on-campus student housing was 2.13 per 1,000 students, the highest among the three categories. Disciplinary actions on-campus student housing had the lowest rate, 1.39 per 1,000 students.

For research question three, the researcher investigated student satisfaction surveys administered by a rural Northeast Mississippi community college from 2007 to 2011 regarding students’ perception of campus police and safety issues. This was performed in order to study student perception changes over a five year time frame. There was no statistically significant difference in overall student perception of campus police/security and safety issues between 2007 and 2008. Although the composite satisfaction score increased 2.2 % from 2007 to 2008, the increase could have occurred by chance. For years 2009, 2010, and 2011, there was a statistically significant difference in overall student perception of campus police/security and safety issues in comparison to 2007 overall student perception. Also, the composite mean score increased in years 2009 (5.67%), 2010 (10.75%), and 2011 (4.64%), in comparison to the composite mean score in 2007.
Conclusions

Research question one: How do campus police/security departments vary at each community and junior college in Mississippi?

Mississippi community and junior college campus police/security reported positive attitudes pertaining to their ability to attend and provide training opportunities, as well as their involvement with emergency planning and FEMA in meeting NIMS requirements. Mississippi community and junior college campus police/security reported less favorable attitudes pertaining to funding and staffing their respective departments. Adequate departmental staffing and the ability to purchase equipment, weapons, uniforms, and vehicles were two areas that reported least favorable attitudes.

Based on the findings, the researcher concludes that due to financial constraints Mississippi community and junior college campus police/security departments could encounter issues providing adequate police/security coverage due to staffing limitations. The financial constraints will also have a negative impact on maintaining and purchasing equipment, weapons, uniforms, and vehicles needed. This could result in a negative effect on daily campus police/security operations and could pose safety issues for officers, students, and employees. Mississippi community and junior college campus police/security departments seem to be staying current with NIMS and FEMA standards, which could lead to additional funding through grants. This will assist departments in providing more resources and acquiring more training.

Research question two: What is the current status of the environment at each community and junior college in Mississippi as described by the Campus Safety and Security Data Analysis Cutting Tool?
In examining all four categories of crimes, the data reveal that crime appears to be a rare event throughout Mississippi community and junior colleges. A few colleges reported no crime statistics in one or multiple crime categories. Obviously, those community and junior colleges reporting higher enrollments could have more crimes to report because those institutions are serving a larger student body and have campus locations close to higher populated regions in Mississippi. One major finding was that none of the 15 community and junior colleges in Mississippi reported any hate crimes for calendar year 2010.

Based on the findings, the researcher concludes that the current status of the environment at Mississippi community and junior college campuses seems to be safe. Crime statistics are reported annually to the Campus Safety and Security Data Analysis Cutting Tool for all Mississippi public community and junior colleges which gives the general public the opportunity to keep track of their status. According to the 2010 statistics reported for Mississippi public community and junior colleges, the actual crime rate per 1,000 students is low. The statistics imply that campus police/security officers are providing essential services that deter campus crime.

Research question three: What is the perception of campus police/security pertaining to one rural Northeast Mississippi community college as measured by the student satisfaction surveys from 2007 to 2011?

Student satisfaction surveys administered by a rural Northeast Mississippi community college from 2007 to 2011 were examined regarding the students’ perception of campus police and safety issues. This was performed in order to study student perception changes over a five year time frame. There was no statistically significant
difference in overall student satisfaction between 2007 and 2008. Although the composite satisfaction score increased 2.2% from 2007 to 2008, the increase could have occurred by chance. For years 2009, 2010, and 2011, there was a statistically significant difference in overall student perception as compared to 2007 overall student perception. The data indicates that student perception of campus police and safety issues improved for years 2009, 2010, and 2011 in comparison to 2007. Also, the composite mean score increased in years 2009, 2010, and 2011, in comparison to the composite mean score in 2007.

Based on these findings, the researcher concludes that the administration of one rural Northeast Mississippi community college understands the important role campus police play and the value in obtaining feedback from students. The college utilizes the data obtained each year to improve the campus police department and services they provide. The data implies that the campus police officers employed for this community college in Northeast Mississippi review the results of the survey each year and seek to implement changes to better serve their student body. The changes and improvements made each year by campus police reflect positively in the student responses.

**Recommendations**

The following recommendations are provided based on the results from the study:

1. The crime statistics compiled for this study were for calendar year 2010. The researcher recommends conducting this study over a 5-year period.
2. Annual crime statistics are reported by calendar years. Community colleges report enrollment numbers by academic years. The researcher recommends
reporting annual crime statistics by academic year to provide a better comparison.

3. The researcher recommends further studies be done to determine how unique events or characteristics influence crime on community and junior college campuses.

4. The student satisfaction survey results were from one rural Northern Mississippi community college. The researcher recommends examining consistent survey results from students concerning campus police/security from all 15 Mississippi community and junior colleges.

The information provided from this study will be helpful for all campus police/security departments and administrators in Mississippi’s public community and junior colleges. Administrators can now appraise the overall safety of their respective campuses in comparison to safety practices of the other public community and junior colleges in Mississippi. Because there is no thorough assessment of campus police departments in Mississippi’s public community and junior colleges available, this study can serve as a point of reference for other Mississippi public community and junior colleges. The recommendations for further research will assist administrators of Mississippi’s public community and junior colleges with annual and long-range planning efforts.
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APPENDIX A

CAMPUS POLICE STUDENT SATISFACTION SURVEY
# Student Survey of Campus Police

This survey is conducted each spring semester to give you the opportunity to express anonymously your opinions about Campus Police. Use the options listed below to complete this survey.

## Choose a response for each of the following questions regarding Campus Police.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a Strongly agree</th>
<th>b Agree</th>
<th>c Disagree</th>
<th>d Strongly disagree</th>
<th>e Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus Police are viewed by me as real police rather than security.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Police are knowledgeable of the law.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Police are available when needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Police are visible on campus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Police are sensitive to students' needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Police prevent unsafe conditions by promoting safety.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Police enforce laws and regulations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Police provide helpful services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Police are professional.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Police are courteous.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel safe and secure on campus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. How many different campus locations (including alternate campuses) are served by your community college?

B. How many total Campus Police/Security Officers are employed by your community college (including alternate campuses)?

1. What type of officers do you utilize on your respective campuses?
   - Only officers certified through the Police Academy
   - Only non-certified officers as security guards
   - Both

2. All Campus Police/Security Officers are given ample opportunities to participate in various training opportunities.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree
   - NA

3. The Campus Police/Security Department is adequately staffed, including support staff and work-study students.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree
   - NA

4. The Campus Police/Security Department has adequate funding for office supplies, computer software, etc.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree
   - NA

5. The Campus Police/Security Department has adequate funding for staff training.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree
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6. The Campus Police/Security Department has adequate funding to purchase equipment, weapons, uniforms, and vehicles.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree
   - NA

7. Campus Police/Security Officers are actively involved in the emergency planning process for this community college.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree
   - NA

8. The Campus Police/Security Department has access to initiate a mass communication/emergency alert in the event there is a campus emergency.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree
   - NA

9. The Campus Police/Security Officers are involved with FEMA in achieving up-to-date compliance with NIMS requirements.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree
   - NA

10. The Campus Police/Security Department provides training for faculty, staff, and students concerning emergency procedures, safety, and security.
    - Strongly Agree
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly Disagree
    - NA
APPENDIX C

APPROVAL LETTER FROM ITAWAMBA COMMUNITY COLLEGE
March 9, 2012

Institutional Research Board
Mississippi State University
P.O. Box 6223
Mississippi State, MS 39762

To Whom It May Concern:

Itawamba Community College has granted Brad D. Boggs permission to utilize existing data that our institution collected over the past 5 years for research purposes concerning his dissertation. We annually survey our student body using a Likert Scale format, requesting their feedback as it pertains to student services. A portion of this survey asks for feedback concerning campus police and safety issues – Mr. Boggs will be specifically reviewing this portion. The annual student services survey that we administer does not collect any information to identify students – it is strictly anonymous. With that said, Mr. Boggs will have no means of identifying any students, directly or through identifiers linked to our students.

I have also given Mr. Boggs permission to utilize existing information that I requested and collected from other community colleges in Mississippi. This information was utilized by Itawamba Community College to evaluating our current practices concerning our campus police department.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (662) 862-8271 or bacollins@iccms.edu.

Sincerely,

Buddy Collins
Vice President of Student Services
APPENDIX D

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL LETTER
May 3, 2012

Brad Boggs
2176 Southesson Blvd
Tupelo, MS 38804

RE: IRB Study #12-137: An Assessment of Campus Police Departments Across Mississippi's Public Community and Junior Colleges

Dear Mr. Boggs:

This email serves as official documentation that the above referenced project was reviewed and approved via administrative review on 5/3/2012 in accordance with 45 CFR 46.101(b)(4). Continuing review is not necessary for this project. However, any modification to the project must be reviewed and approved by the IRB prior to implementation. Any failure to adhere to the approved protocol could result in suspension or termination of your project. The IRB reserves the right, at anytime during the project period, to observe you and the additional researchers on this project.

Please note that the MSU IRB is in the process of seeking accreditation for our human subjects protection program. As a result of these efforts, you will likely notice many changes in the IRB’s policies and procedures in the coming months. These changes will be posted online at http://www orc.msstate.edu/human/aahrrp.php.

Please refer to your IRB number (#12-137) when contacting our office regarding this application.

Thank you for your cooperation and good luck to you in conducting this research project. If you have questions or concerns, please contact me at nmorse@research.msstate.edu or call 662-325-3994. In addition, we would greatly appreciate your feedback on the IRB approval process. Please take a few minutes to complete our survey at http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/YZC7Q9D.

Sincerely,

Nicole Morse
Assistant Compliance Administrator

cc: James E. Davis (Advisor)
APPENDIX E

MISSISSIPPI COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGE WEBSITES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Name</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coahoma Community College</td>
<td><a href="http://www.coahomacc.edu">http://www.coahomacc.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copiah-Lincoln Community College</td>
<td><a href="http://www.colin.edu">http://www.colin.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Central Community College</td>
<td><a href="http://www.eccc.edu">http://www.eccc.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Mississippi Community College</td>
<td><a href="http://www.eastms.edu">http://www.eastms.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinds Community College</td>
<td><a href="http://www.hindssc.edu">http://www.hindssc.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes Community College</td>
<td><a href="http://www.holmescc.edu">http://www.holmescc.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itawamba Community College</td>
<td><a href="http://www.iccms.edu">http://www.iccms.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones County Junior College</td>
<td><a href="http://www.jcjc.edu">http://www.jcjc.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian Community College</td>
<td><a href="http://www.meridianancc.edu">http://www.meridianancc.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi Delta Community College</td>
<td><a href="http://www.msdelta.edu">http://www.msdelta.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi Gulf Coast Community College</td>
<td><a href="http://www.mgccc.edu">http://www.mgccc.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Mississippi Community College</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nemcc.edu">http://www.nemcc.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Mississippi Community College</td>
<td><a href="http://www.northwestms.edu">http://www.northwestms.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearl River Community College</td>
<td><a href="http://www.prcc.edu/">http://www.prcc.edu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Mississippi Community College</td>
<td><a href="http://www.smcc.edu">http://www.smcc.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>