

Understanding the Connection between Public Colleges with and without Campus Police
Departments and Their Crime Rates Based on Clery Act Reporting

by

Kevin R. Chapel

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Master of Science

in

Criminal Justice

YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY

May, 2023

Understanding the Connection between Public Colleges with and without Campus Police
Departments and Their Crime Rates Based on Clery Act Reporting

Kevin R. Chapel

I hereby release this thesis to the public. I understand that this thesis will be made available from the OhioLINK ETD Center and the Maag Library Circulation Desk for public access. I also authorize the University or other individuals to make copies of this thesis as needed for scholarly research.

Signature:

Kevin R. Chapel, Student Date

Approvals:

Dr. Christopher M. Bellas PhD, Thesis Advisor Date

Dr. John M. Hazy PhD, Committee Member Date

Dr. Charles J. VanDyke EdD, Committee Member Date

Salvatore A. Sanders, PhD, Dean, College of Graduate Studies Date

ABSTRACT

This exploratory study examines the difference in reporting of Clery Act crimes at public institutions of higher education with and without a designated campus police department. This study examines the differences in Clery Act reporting within four categories: criminal offenses, arrests, student disciplinary referrals, and Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) offenses. Secondary data analysis was selected from the U.S. Department of Education's Campus Safety Data Analysis Cutting Tool and College Navigator along with a purposive and random sample comprised of 31 institutions with and 31 institutions without a designated campus police department with student enrollment over 10,000. As anticipated, results showed a statistical difference in criminal offenses, arrests, disciplinary referrals, and VAWA offenses. Additionally, specific institutional characteristics such as, enrollment, student-to-faculty ratio, tuition, minority population, graduation rate, retention rate, and poverty rate, appear to increase higher crime rates on campus. Lastly, the presence of a designated campus police department is not the most significant predictor for criminal offenses, arrests, disciplinary referrals, and VAWA offenses. Further research is recommended, such as a longitudinal study, to further examine the role of a designated campus police department.

Acknowledgements

The purpose of this section is to give special thanks to the individuals who supported and encouraged me throughout the Criminal Justice Master's program. If it weren't for you all, I would not be where I am today.

To my father and mother, Ken and Debra,

You both have supported me since day one and encouraged me to push myself to be the best I can be. Thank you for always believing in me in everything I do and for your continued support in life.

To my brother, Kenny

Your success has always inspired me to challenge myself to be the best version of myself. I am so proud of everything you have accomplished, and I am lucky to call you my brother.

To my thesis advisor, Dr. Christopher Bellas,

Thank you for agreeing to chair my committee. I cannot thank you enough for all of your help and guidance through this thesis. Your knowledge and guidance have helped me create one of my greatest achievements in life.

To my thesis committee members, Dr. John Hazy and Dr. Charles VanDyke,

I have learned so much from you two over the past two years while in the Criminal Justice Master's Program. Thank you for agreeing to be a part of my committee. Your personal and professional knowledge was extremely valuable to me during this journey.

Finally, I want to thank all of my brothers and sisters in law enforcement, especially, those at the Youngstown State University Police Department. It is an honor and privilege to work with such great individuals.

Table of Contents

Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
1. Introduction	1
2. Literature Review	8
3. Methodology	28
4. Results	38
5. Conclusion	46
6. References	57
7. Tables	64
Table 1 – Descriptive Statistics	64
Table 2 – Campus Setting Frequency Table	65
Table 3 – Descriptive Statistics of Institutional Factors	66
Table 4 – Independent T-Tests Results	67
Table 5 – Correlation Matrix	68
Table 6 – Regression Results for Criminal Offenses	69
Table 7 - Regression Results for Arrests	70
Table 8 - Regression Results for Disciplinary Rates	71
Table 9 - Regression Results for VAWA Offenses	72
8. Appendix A – Crime Definitions	73
9. Appendix B – IRB Approval	80

Chapter I

Introduction

Statement of the Problem

Colleges across the United States have seen an increase in crimes committed on college campuses within the last decade. In a 2016 study conducted by the Citizens Crime Commission (CCC) of New York City, there was a 153 percent increase in school shootings on college campuses from the 2001-2002 to 2005-2006 school years compared to 2011-2012 to 2015-2016 school years (Rock, 2019). Furthermore, the CCC found that 64 percent of campus shootings occurred in the southern states of the U.S. This research utilizes statistics from the U.S. Department of Education on Clery Act crimes to examine campus safety by comparing campuses that have a designated police department, as opposed to campuses that do not have a designated police department. Institutions without a designated police department utilize either campus security or their local jurisdiction police department. Campus security departments are defined as, agencies whose members are employed by the Institution of Higher Education (IHE), but whose members are not sworn officers (Ohio School Safety Center, n.d.). Because the members do not have sworn authority, the IHE relies on federal, state, local, and tribal law enforcement for support in criminal matters (Ohio School Safety Center, N.D.).

Now more than ever, campus safety is a concern for parents and students, as well as campus administrators due to a rise in school shootings (Reaves, 2015). In the 2020-2021 school year, there was a total of 93 school shootings with casualties, which was the highest since the 2000-2001 school year (National Center for Education Statistics, 2022). Additionally, since the Virginia Tech campus shootings in April 2007, there have been

122 students killed and 198 students injured in college campus shootings across the United States (Rock, 2019). The Clery Handbook (2016) does not specify that school shootings are a higher priority than other Clery crimes, such as, rape. However, the Clery Handbook ranks each criminal offense with murder being number one and sex offenses listed at number two (U.S. Department of Education, 2016).

Providing security and protection to students and staff is an essential requirement of the college institution. Policing the campus in America is nothing new and has been around since 1894 when Yale University hired two local police officers to secure their campus (Watts, 2019). Prior to Yale University, campuses would hire private night watchmen, who were in charge of protecting the university property and facilities from non-university members (Russell-Brown & Miller, 2022). Since then, additional colleges, both public and private, have established their own campus police departments or have hired private security. Designated campus police departments use both sworn and non-sworn officers to patrol campuses and the surround areas. These officers are mainly armed (94%) and have full arrest powers (86%) (Reaves, 2015). Campus police officers patrol campuses in vehicles and on foot, as well as monitoring security cameras. “During the 2011-12 school year, about two-thirds (68%) of more than 900 U.S. 4-year colleges and universities with 2,500 or more students used sworn police officers” (Reaves, 2015, p. 1). More recently, approximately 96% of public institutions have a designated police department, compared to approximately 38% at private institutions (Reaves, 2015). Campus police share the same responsibility as municipal police departments and enforce laws, investigate crimes, make arrests, and provide security for the institution. (Reaves, 2015).

Purpose of Study

The current research is an exploratory study, which hopefully will develop new ideas and a hypothesis for future research. New ideas such as, the positive or negative impact of a designated campus police department, specifically with Clery crime reporting, and what specific institutional factors that may contribute to campus crime is explored in this study. The research presented here will heavily focus on designated campus police departments when it comes to reporting Clery crime statistics and examine if there are any differences in Clery crime rates for institutions without designated police departments.

The main purpose of the Clery Act is to increase awareness of specific crimes that occur near or on college campuses. The U.S. Department of Education developed a Clery Act handbook that institutions must follow to stay compliant. According to the Clery Handbook:

Since its passage in 1990, the Crime Awareness and Campus Security Act has required federally funded institutions of higher education to (a) report specific crimes that occur on-campus (including murder, manslaughter, forceable sex offenses, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, arson, motor vehicle theft, and hate crimes); (b) declare the number of arrests for alcohol, drugs, and weapons violations; and (c) disclose current crime prevention and security policies in an annual report to the public (Nobles, et al., 2010, p. 1133).

The Clery Act requires campus security authorities to record all Clery data that can be distributed to the institution's students, staff, and parents. Campus security authorities are defined as, "campus police or security department personnel; individuals or organizations

identified in institutional security policies; and individuals with security-related responsibilities” (U.S. Department of Education, n.d.). The Clery Act has a multitude of requirements for crime reporting and specific prevention methods that must be included in the campus’s annual report. Having a designated campus police department ensures these requirements are met and reported to the Department of Education on a yearly basis. Institutions that rely on an outside security firm or local police departments must comply with these requirements if they received any type of Title IV funding from the Department of Education. Additionally, it is not necessary for campuses to have a designated police department to complete these tasks, institutions without police departments can use campus administrators or civilians to fulfill these tasks. Institutions have audits to ensure they are remaining Clery compliant. For example, in 2020, The University of North Georgia was audited by the U.S. Department of Education’s Office of Inspector General and found, “North Georgia did not have effective controls to ensure that it reported complete and accurate Clery Act crime statistics” (U.S. Department of Education, 2020, p. 2).

The Clery Act requires institutions to record crimes by location based on three categories including: on-campus, non-campus building or property, and public property. Each category has specific requirements set by the U.S. Department of Education. On-campus is defined as, “any building or property owned or controlled by an institution within the same contiguous geographic area and used by the institution in direct support of the institution’s educational purposes” (U.S. Department of Education, n.d.). This includes residence halls, food vendors, or buildings and property owned by the institution. Non-campus buildings or property is defined as, “any building or property

owned or controlled by a student organization officially recognized by the institution or any building or property owned or controlled by the institution that is used in direct support of the institution's educational purposes" (U.S. Department of Education, n.d.). Examples of non-campus buildings and property include fraternity or sorority-owned chapters, off-campus bookstores, and off-campus housing that is owned by the institution. The final geographical aspect of the Clery Act includes public property. Public property is defined as, "all public property that is within the same reasonably contiguous geographic area of the institution, such as a sidewalk, street, or parking facility that is adjacent to a facility owned or controlled by the institution" (U.S. Department of Education, n.d.). For "public property" to properly be defined, it must meet three conditions. The property must be public, it must be within or adjacent to the campus, and it must be accessible from the campus. The purpose of the Clery Act is to inform the campus community of crimes (U.S. Department of Education, n.d.). Understanding the Clery Act is important when examining statistics and when determining the importance of having a designated campus police department.

Emergency notifications and timely warnings are a crucial part of the Clery Act for emergency response and evacuation procedures.

The Clery Act requires every Title IV institution, without exception, to have and disclose emergency response and evacuation procedures that would be used in response to a significant emergency or dangerous situation involving an immediate threat to the health or safety of students or employees occurring on the campus (U.S. Department of Education, 2016).

An immediate threat is defined as, “an imminent or impending threat” (U.S. Department of Education, 2016). Examples of an immediate threat are a school shooting, bomb threat, gas leak, approaching tornado or other extreme weather conditions, and terrorist incident. It is important to understand that notifications must be made once the information received is confirmed by institutional officials. Confirmation means, “an institutional official(s) has verified that a legitimate emergency or dangerous situation exists” (U.S. Department of Education, 2016). These notifications are intended to ensure the institution has sufficiently prepared itself for an emergency on campus.

According to the Handbook for Campus Safety and Security (2016), these procedures need to be tested frequently to identify any weaknesses in the testing so they can be improved. Campus security notifications are nothing new. The Virginia Tech shootings in 2007 called for major changes due to a lack of campus notifications. According to Cable News Network (CNN), Virginia Tech was originally fined over \$55,000 due to the failure of emergency notifications that were sent out on the morning of the shootings (2011). However, in 2012, the fines were dismissed due to an Administrative Law Judge citing there was no Clery Act violation regarding timely warnings (CNN, 2012). The Virginia Tech shootings are an example of the importance of how campus safety notifications and alerts are an asset to the institutions safety.

The Clery Act requires each institution to publish an Annual Safety Report by October 1st each year. This report must include multiple categories to include Clery crime data from the previous three years, a geographic location category, hate crime statistics, unfounded crimes, on-campus fires, policy and procedure relating to campus safety, and definitions pertaining to Clery crimes. The annual safety report must be

distributed either by U.S. postal mail, campus mail, email, or a combination of these methods (U.S. Department of Education, n.d.). Additionally, at institutions that have on-campus housing, an Annual Fire Safety Report must be distributed. This report must include fire statistics for all on-campus housing and evacuation plans for these buildings.

In chapter 1, the purpose of this study was introduced along with the essential elements of the Clery Act. Specific definitions can be found in an appendix at the end of this thesis. It is important to understand each of these definitions to fully understand the Clery Act and its requirements with respect to different criminal elements. The next chapter will explore the literature of prior research relative to campus crime, the Clery Act, and campus law enforcement. Each of these topics are essential to the current exploratory study. Each area will focus on the previous research and the affect it has on future research.

Chapter II

Literature Review

This chapter is divided into three sections: campus crime, the Clery Act, and campus law enforcement. Each section will provide the reader with previous studies based on each focus area. This chapter aims to help the reader understand prior research in these three areas.

Campus Crime

Over the years, there has been much research on campus crime and, in particular, what factors may contribute to these crimes. More recently, the topic of campus violence has risen as a result of an increase in school shootings reported in the media, in addition to increased sensitivity to Diversity, Equality, and Inclusion. Researchers have focused on specific characteristics, such as campus location, campus security measures, campus police, student enrollment, etc., to better understand why crime is continuing to happen on college campuses (Makinen, 2019). There have been many studies that focus on campus crime, however, one of the first major studies occurred in 1978 when McPheters (1978) conducted a study on the number of students who lived on campus and whether it contributed to the amount of campus crime. Since McPheters' (1978) study, researchers have focused on specific aspects of criminal activities on campuses such as crime reporting behaviors (Cornell, 2020), institutional safety predictors (Maier et al., 2020), campus location and surrounding neighborhood crime rates (Cundiff, 2020), campus crime and retention rates (Hauer, 2019), and campus crime and ethnicity (Boateng, 2017), among other studies.

McPheters (1978) studied the on-campus student population, the geographic features of the campus, and the level of campus security to determine if any of those factors affect campus crime rates. He concluded that institutions with a larger on campus population have more targeted victims than commuter-oriented colleges, which ultimately increases crime on campus (McPheters, 1978). In addition, McPheters (1978) concluded that off-campus unemployment rates and campuses that are more open and accessible to the public have higher crime rates. Since McPheters' (1978) original study, more recent research has been done on campus crime to determine what policies and safety measures need to be adjusted or enacted to further prevent student victimization. Some of the research has included campus prevention efforts (Jacobson, 2017), understanding student's fear of campus crime (Boateng and Boateng, 2017), campus safety features (Maier and DePrince, 2020), and so on.

Increases in reporting crime to authorities on college campuses have worked in conjunction with campus crime reduction strategies. Campuses continue to emphasize the necessity of students reporting criminal activity that they witnessed or were direct victims. Arney (2020) found, "in spite of their increased efforts, it has remained problematic for administrators to gain a true depiction of crime and victimization rates due to the low crime-reporting practices of students" (p. 401). Educational material and crime prevention programs have been implemented on campuses throughout the United States to help students understand the importance of reporting crimes. Arney (2020) conducted research to determine the influences of student perceptions on crime-reporting behaviors. Additionally, Arney's (2020) study examined students' demographic

characteristics, levels of confidence in law enforcement personnel, experiences in victimization, and feelings of safety while on campus.

Arney's (2020) study concluded that campus culture contributed to the students' likelihood of reporting crimes. Arney (2020) found that 86% of participants stated that their peers were either likely or very likely to report crime or victimization to law enforcement. However, participants advised that they needed more information about the protocol and procedures for reporting crimes (Arney, 2020). The majority of the participants in Arney's (2020) study answered that their peers were likely (58%) or very likely (28%) to report crimes to campus law enforcement. Additionally, the majority of the participants (95%) felt safe or very safe in their daily routine on campus (Arney, 2020). Lastly, students were less likely to report crime and victimization if a friend is the perpetrator or if they perceive possible negative social stigma surrounding reporting the incident (Arney, 2020). His study attempts to understand the reasoning behind why crimes on campuses go unreported. In addition to crime-reporting practices, the influence of personal and institutional prevention measures can affect campus crime rates (Arney, 2020).

The effects of crime and victimization on college students can negatively impact the students' college experiences; including the fear of being victimized. Fear of crime has three components: cognitive (perceived risk of victimization), emotional (feelings about crime), and behavioral (responses to being victimized) (May et. al., 2010). Maier and DePrince (2020), examined college students' fear of crime and safety perceptions of their campus. Their research contributes to previous fear of crime literature conducted by Fox and Hellman (1985). Maier and DePrince (2020) revealed most (55%) of students are

not fearful, (18%) are neutral, while (27%) are fearful of crime on campus. Most respondents (57%) agree that sufficient safety measures on their campus are in place. The safety measures used in Maier and DePrince's (2020) study were ID access into buildings, increased security patrols, and adequate lighting on campus. Based on these findings, it seems that most students recognize crime reduction efforts made by the institution, but do not have a positive perception of the ability of campus safety to prevent crime. Lastly, their study indicated that students felt most safe on campus during the day and felt less safe at night. The most common theme that emerged was that students are afraid on campus when it is dark (Maier and DePrince, 2020).

While safety factors on campus are important to analyze and understand, the surrounding neighborhoods of campuses can also affect crime rates. Previous research from Nobles et al. (2013), and Fox and Hellman (1985), have shown a positive correlation between campus crime and the surrounding community. More recently, Cundiff (2020) analyzed the location of college campuses, and their surrounding neighborhood crime rates to determine what effects it might have on the institution. Property and violent crime have been associated with many of the same lifestyle features typical of college students and the structural characteristics of the neighborhoods where students generally reside (Cundiff, 2020). Crimes that occur in the surrounding neighborhoods to campus may not be considered a Clery crime, due to geographical definitions, and, therefore, not recorded as a campus crime. The neighborhoods many students reside in off-campus possess characteristics predictive of crime such, as younger populations, largely renters, transient, and unoccupied dwellings during the day (Cundiff, 2020).

Cundiff's (2020) study concluded that neighborhoods that surround a college campus are associated with higher rates of property crime, larceny, burglary, and robbery. The characteristics of these neighborhoods and the lifestyle of their residents can attract potential offenders and generate settings conducive to crime (Cundiff, 2020). Many students who do not reside on campus live in the community's surrounding neighborhood and fall victim to these crimes. Campus crime, either on-campus or in the surrounding neighborhoods, affects the students and the institution.

Campus crime can have a negative effect on the institution's retention rate. Retention rates are important for the institution for funding, sporting eligibility, and prestige. "If a school cannot keep its students safe due to crime on campus and if such crime leads to lower retention rates, schools may lose recognition and prestige, diminishing the number of applicants" (Hauer, 2019, p. 5). Hauer (2019) concluded campus crime overall has a negative effect on retention rates. Such results call for an increase in college administrative efforts to combat crime on campus by increasing police presence, improving lighting, and installing other safety measures to prevent crime (Hauer, 2019).

Another critical factor in understanding campus crime is race and what effect it has on the perceptions of fear among college students. There has been a limited amount of research connecting race and fear of crime on college campuses. Previously, Fox et al., (2009) found that minority students were more likely than white students to express higher levels of fear of crime. In a recent study, Boateng and Boateng (2017) examined the role race has on campus crime. The goal of Boateng and Boateng's (2017) study was to assess the level of fear among white and non-white students, determine racial effects

on fear among white and non-white students, and determine the effects of individual characteristics on white and non-white students' fear of crime (Boateng and Boateng, 2017).

Boateng and Boateng's (2017) study revealed that non-white students expressed the greatest level of fear on campus compared to white students. In addition, race significantly affected attitudes toward police and fear of crime. Those who believed that the police were effective were less fearful of crime (Boateng and Boateng, 2017). Also in the study, gender is significantly linked to a student's fear of crime on campus. Female students, irrespective of being white or non-white, are consistently more likely to indicate being fearful of crime than their male counterparts (Boateng and Boateng, 2017). Gender was also seen as a significant indicator of fear of crime in Maier and DePrince's (2020) study. Based on Boateng and Boateng's (2017) study, both race and gender affect a student's perception of fear of crime. Campus administrators and police need to focus their attention on what can be done to reduce this fear, such as increasing on-campus safety measures.

Campus security measures have been shown to have a positive effect on campus crime. To further an older study by Bromley (1995) on campus security measures, Jacobson (2017) examined what effect campus prevention efforts have on both violent and property crime. Jacobson's (2017) study investigates crime on college campuses to understand how the implementation of various safety features, the gender composition of the student body, and other institutional characteristics influence the occurrence of crime on campus. Traditional college students generally start college around the age of 18, which is the beginning of adulthood and their first time away from home. Mrozla (2022)

noted, “because offending peaks around the age adults attend college and the aforementioned prevalence of crime on universities, it is possible that crimes weigh heavily on the minds of college students” (p. 24). The institution is responsible for ensuring it provides students and staff with the highest degree of safety and security.

Jacobson’s (2017) study examined 16 different safety items institutions have to offer to provide better prevention methods. These items included emergency blue light phones, informational materials to increase campus preparedness, victim assistance programs, general crime prevention programs, and student security patrols, etc. (Jacobson, 2017). Jacobson (2017) also examined the student-to-officer ratio to see if the presence of campus police decreases crime. The average student-to-officer ratio is 497 students to 1 campus police officer (Jacobson, 2017). He found that institutions with more students enrolled relative to sworn officers employed tend to have fewer reports of violent crime on campus. Institutions that are larger in geographic size are associated with more reports of violent crime. Additionally, institutions with more females enrolled than males and more security features report 3.4 percent fewer on-campus violent incidents (Jacobson, 2017).

Jacobson (2017) found that campuses with more females enrolled than males report 22% percent fewer property crimes. Also, campuses with higher student enrollment have fewer reports of property crime than campuses with fewer students (Jacobson, 2017). Regarding security measures on campus, only violent crime is significantly associated with these measures, not property crimes. Jacobson’s (2017) study has questioned what security measures are necessary and the deployment of campus police.

As seen in prior studies from Jacobson (2017) and Fox and Hellman (1985), property crimes are one of the most prominent occurrences on a college campus. In a current study, Mrozla (2022) examined the fear of crime both on and off campus in rural college towns. He focused his research on property crimes and violent crimes on campuses. Mrozla (2022) included variables of class status, traditional or non-traditional students, gender, and place of residence within his study. Campus setting, which includes rural, suburban, and urban, has been an area of concern for many years regarding its effect on campus crime. He found that males were more likely to be fearful of property crimes on rural campuses than females. This can be attributed to the rural physical environment where the study took place. The rural physical environment largely revolves around owning, maintaining, and protecting property whether it be land or material goods (Mrozla, 2022). Students who felt safer walking both on and off campus during the evening were less likely to be fearful of property crimes on campus. Lastly, as respondents' perception of crime control by the police improved, the fear of property crime on campus decreased (Mrozla, 2022). In relation to violent crime on campus, Mrozla (2022) found that students who reside on campus were more likely to be fearful of violent crime on campus. His study indicates that males are less likely to be fearful of violent crimes on campus than females. These findings on police and perception of fear of crime are related to another study conducted by Bolger and Bolger (2019). These scholars concluded that satisfaction and confidence in the police decreased fear of crime. Both Bolger and Bolger (2019) and Mrozla (2022) indicate awareness of personal safety as a critical element in becoming a victim of campus crime. Personal safety and campus

security measures must flow together to provide a better sense of security on college campuses.

Other than property crimes, sexual assaults are a pervasive problem on the college campus. Sexual assaults that occur on college campuses can have long-lasting effects on their victims. “The health consequences of sexual violence are well documented and include both short-term and long-term health problems such as depression, anxiety, eating disorders, post-traumatic stress disorder, and suicidal ideation” (Black et al., 2011, p.1). In 2014, the Obama Administration launched public awareness campaigns entitled “It’s on Us” and “Alone.” These campaigns were designed to focus on the prevention and response to sexual assault on campuses in the U.S. There have been many studies on sexual assaults on college campuses. Still, no studies have systemically reviewed prevalence findings on college-based sexual victimization. Fedina et al. (2016) conducted a systematic review of sexual assaults on college campuses from 2000 to 2015. The purpose of their research was to address the gap in previous research, propose research questions for future studies, and present programmatic considerations and recommendations for campus prevention and response strategies (Fedina et al., 2016).

Fedina et al. (2016) reviewed 34 studies on sexual assaults on college campuses to understand what is common among these studies and to recommend future research. Fedina et al. (2016) found that attempted rape of college women ranged from 1.1% to 3.8% of all sexual assault crimes on campus. Unwanted sexual contact ranged from 1.8% to 34% of college women. Incapacitated rape accounted for 1.8% to 14.2% of college women. Incapacitated rape is when the victim is too intoxicated, either on alcohol and/or drugs, to give consent to sexual activity. Lastly, sexual coercion accounted for 1.7% to

32% (Fedina et al., 2016). Findings from this systematic review suggest that unwanted sexual contact appears to be the most prevalent form of sexual assault on college campuses (including sexual coercion) (Fedina et al., 2016). These findings suggest colleges must improve prevention methods for unwanted sexual contact and coercion. As in many sexual assault studies, reported numbers tend to be low (Fedina et al., 2016). Students are less likely to report victimization if they perceive a negative social stigma surrounding the incident. Many college females do not report sexual assault offenses due to embarrassment and being unaware of the incident due to intoxication or being drugged by offenders (Arney, 2020).

Many of the studies already mentioned have focused on campus crime characteristics, victimization effects, and specific crimes. An important factor that also needs to be considered is what effect crime has on student success, measured by graduation rates. Schuck (2017) researched what effect crime has on graduation rates in higher education. Scholars have identified important psychological, sociological, economic, and organizational factors associated with undergraduates' academic achievement. Throughout Schuck's (2017) research, there is an emphasis on campus police and their response to campus crime, as opposed to, the student conduct system. Her findings show that institutions with lower violent crime rates reported higher 4-year graduation rates. Institutions that made more referrals to the student conduct system also reported higher 4-year graduation rates. Additionally, institutions that use the student conduct system, as opposed to, making a referral to campus police have a reported higher 4-year graduation rate (Schuck, 2017). These findings suggest that violent crime is associated with lower 4-year graduation rates. Additionally, victimization and fear of

crime may negatively affect students' participation in educationally productive activities. Students who are referred to the student conduct system, rather than the criminal justice system, are more successful for several reasons. First, student conduct officials are better trained to address young people's incivilities than campus police (Schuck, 2017). Another reason is that campus police may be directed to more serious incidents, while student conduct officials handle everything else. More research is needed to better understand the connection between campus police and the student conduct system. Based on Schuck's (2017) research it is clear there is a connection between violent crime on campus and graduation rates. Institutions must focus more on victimization programs to help these individuals complete their educational goals.

Crime statistics involving campuses can be challenging due to a lack of reporting by students, institutions underreporting crimes, and crimes being referred to the student conduct system instead of the criminal justice system. All these factors need to be considered when examining prior research and when conducting future research. Students and staff need to be aware of what crimes are happening on their campus. These awareness and prevention methods are all described in the Clery Act. The next section discusses the Clery Act.

Clery Act

Among others, Shariati and Guerette (2020), Beverage (2019), Makinen (2019), and Jee (2016) conducted studies on the Clery Act since its implementation in 1990. Research has focused on implementation strategies, the Clery Act's effect on crime, proper reporting methods, and Clery Act awareness. Much of the existing research has indicated the need for improvement on the Clery Act (Beverage, 2019). Compliance is a

collaborative effort from the institution, the students, law enforcement, and campus staff. The studies in this section will examine the importance of Clery reporting, Clery compliance, Clery awareness, and Clery implementation strategies and the effect they have on college campuses.

An important element of the Clery Act is the implementation of policies and procedures regarding campus safety and prevention. Many institutions have adopted the method of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED). “Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design is a proactive perspective that refers to strategies that focus on reducing criminal opportunities by manipulating the physical and social qualities of the environment” (Shariati & Guerette, 2020, p. 397). CPTED is an inexpensive and simple tactic that leads to long-lasting deterrent outcomes (McCormick, 2011). Shariati and Guerette (2020), conducted a study to examine what Clery Act reports say about CPTED and crime on college campuses. Their study focused on natural surveillance, access control, maintenance, territoriality, and activity support.

The goal of Shariati and Guerette’s (2020) study was to examine to what extent universities are employing CPTED strategies, and how the use of CPTED strategies are related to campus crime rates. The results of Shariati and Guerette’s (2020) study indicated that universities with higher crime rates are more likely to use CPTED strategies. Specifically, the presence of patrol and community-oriented programs are positively correlated with Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) crimes due to its relevance in victim assistance programs, such as sexual assault awareness, domestic violence assistance, and assistance with women’s shelters (Shariati & Guerette, 2020). Additionally, Shariati and Guerette (2020) found that awareness programs and

emergency callboxes are significantly correlated with all crimes that were tested. Lastly, student escort services were correlated with violent crime, VAWA, and other violations (Shariati & Guerette, 2020). One of the Clery Act's goals is to create a safe and sustainable college campus, which requires an evidence-based understanding of campus safety issues. Creating a safe and sustainable college campus is done by implementing strategies on Clery Act policy and procedures.

In another study, Beverage (2019) researched Clery Act policy and implementation strategies to explore how higher education administrators implement strategies to facilitate Clery Act compliance. The focus area of her study is important to ensure campuses remain Clery compliant to reduce the risk of fines. Non-compliance penalties include monetary fines and the threat of losing access to financial aid programs. Clery Act violations impose a hefty fine per violation on the institution. "In 2017, the U.S. Department of Education increased the penalty for significant noncompliance to \$54,789 per violation" (Beverage, 2019, p. 5). To illustrate these numbers, in 2016, the U.S. Department of Education fined Penn State University almost 2.4 million dollars for Clery Act violations (Beverage, 2019). These violations included failure to retain records related to campus crime statistics from 2008-2010, which is a Clery Act violation. In addition, for failing to report the sexual abuse crimes committed by Jerry Sandusky which several university officials were aware of that occurred 15 years ago (New, 2016). Jerry Sandusky, a former assistant football coach for Penn State University, was convicted in 2012 of sexually abusing 10 boys, many of which occurred in Penn State locker rooms (CNN, 2012). Beverage (2019) focused her study on campus police,

student life, human resources, and athletics, all of which have different roles in Clery Act policy implementations.

Beverage (2019) found that all the survey participants had the same goal to promote campus safety and ensure their institution remained Clery compliant. Beverage's (2019) study found that the participants primarily focused on strategies that support the Clery Act's reporting requirement and safety training. Beverage (2019) also found that both staff and campus community training was crucial so everyone at the institution was on the same page. Beverage (2019) concluded that Clery Act policy must be reviewed regularly, so institutions remain compliant. This would reduce the institution's risk of receiving fines from the U.S. Department of Education and a possible loss in financial aid programs for students. Clery Act policy implementation must coordinate with designated campus police departments to ensure fluent communication between the police and administrators.

A study by Makinen (2019) researched the connection between having a designated campus police department and Clery crime reporting. Makinen's (2019) study compared college institutions with a designated campus police department as opposed to those that still use security and their municipality police departments. In Makinen's (2019) study, 15 college institutions with a designated campus police department were compared against 15 college institutions without a designated campus police department to determine if there is a difference in Clery crime reporting. Makinen (2019) also examined what the most prevalent crimes are at these institutions.

Makinen's (2019) results indicated that the most prevalent Clery reportable crime is disciplinary actions (which include weapon, drug, and liquor violations), followed by

overall arrests and reportable Clery criminal offenses, which were the second and third most prevalent reportable crimes. The results also reported a higher number of crimes, specifically all crimes that are defined as reportable Clery Act offenses, at institutions with a designated police department as opposed to institutions without designated police departments (Makinen, 2019). A designated police force is held to a higher standard, which is more favorable to compliance with legal requirements (Makinen, 2019). Makinen (2019) suggests campus police departments provide an environment conducive to compliance and is welcoming to relationship-building with students. Institutions with designated police departments typically have higher standards in reporting and responses to crime (Makinen, 2019).

Even with the mandated distribution of the Clery Annual Safety and Security Report, many students are unaware of the Clery Act and its purpose within the institution (Jee, 2016). It is alarming to hear this since there is an entire section of the Annual Safety and Security Report on awareness and the proper procedures to handle specific safety incidents. Jee (2016) researched the importance of the Clery Act and its connection with student awareness and its effectiveness at public and private universities in east Tennessee. Jee (2016) concluded several key points from his research. First, student awareness of the Clery Act is directly related to its effectiveness. Jee suggests that for the Clery Act to be effective, students must have an understanding of the Act and its purpose. Also noteworthy in his research was the fact that gender did not have a significant influence in the awareness of Clery Act crime statistics. Lastly, students became primarily aware of the Clery Act at their institution because of the university's website (29%), followed by an orientation session (21%) (Jee, 2016). Jee's (2016) study showed

the importance of the Clery Act from a student's perspective and what changes need to be made for better awareness.

Many universities are moving towards having a Clery Compliance Officer, who are either police officers or civilians, handle all Clery Act reporting, communication, and preparation. According to Campus Safety Magazine, 77% of colleges and universities have a designated Clery Compliance Officer to study the Clery Act reporting requirements and coordinate the university's compliance efforts (Jee, 2016). With the complexity of Clery requirements, it is essential to have a Clery Compliance Officer handle all the reporting, so no information is missed from being recorded. Clery Compliance Officers work closely with campus police and campus administrators to ensure a positive flow of communication (Jee, 2016).

Since its implementation, Shariati and Guerette (2020), Beverage (2019), Makinen (2019), Jee (2016), and many others have conducted research on the Clery Act and its implementation on campuses. The Clery Act deals with student and staff safety, so it is imperative to fully understand the role of the Clery Act. These studies have shown the importance of the Clery Act and its effectiveness in college institutions. However, only Makinen's (2019) study connected the importance of having a designated campus police department to ensure better reporting. Makinen's (2019) study used a smaller sample size, in which this study expands on. Additionally, Makinen's (2019) study only focused on Clery crimes, whereas this study introduces institutional factors on the scholarship in this area.

Campus Law Enforcement

There is a lack of research on institutions with a designated campus police department versus campuses without a designated campus police department. Over the years, the increase in school shootings on college campuses, such as Virginia Tech, has increased the demand for designated campus police departments. “Legal, social, and international events in the 1960s and early 1970s dramatically changed the need for security and policing on postsecondary campuses in the United States” (Peak et al., 2008, p. 239). During the 1970s, many campuses began developing their own police departments and had the authority for full arrest powers. Since then, approximately 96% of public institutions with a student population of at least 10,000 use their own police force (Reaves, 2015).

Campus police departments share the same roles and responsibilities as local and state law enforcement agencies. Their primary duties consist of providing a safe and secure campus environment, investigating criminal acts, effecting arrests, and engaging in community policing. Youstin and Kopp (2021) studied the role variations and perceptions of campus police versus local and state law enforcement. The purpose of their study was to better understand campus police by examining students’ perceptions of campus police officer’s roles and behaviors compared with local and state law enforcement (Youstin and Kopp, 2021).

Youstin and Kopp’s (2021) study concludes several critical findings in the comparison between campus police and local and state police agencies. Campus police officers were more likely to engage in positive behaviors (i.e., being friendly) while being rated less likely to engage in corrupt behaviors. Campus police were also favored to handle incidents without an arrest or citation issued. Finally, males had a higher positive

outlook on both campus police and local law enforcement (Youstin and Kopp, 2021). This study further concluded campus police departments' share the same roles and responsibilities as local law enforcement agencies, such as community policing, enforcing traffic laws, and investigating crimes. All of the institutions used in this study, without a designated police department, have access to a local jurisdiction police department.

Barker (2016) suggests it is important for students on a college campus to develop a positive relationship with their campus police department to decrease fear of victimization. "For students to feel safe and decrease fear of victimization, there must be a cooperative relationship between students and campus law enforcement agencies" (Barker, 2016, p. 21). In a study by Barker (2016), the relationship between student perceptions of the university police and the student fear of crime on campus were examined. The goal of Barker's study was to identify what characteristics may affect the levels of fear of crime and perceptions of police legitimacy in university students.

Barker (2016) concluded several key findings in her study. Most participants agreed that campus police officers are equal in authority to other police officers. Students who perceive campus police as being more legitimate are less fearful of crime. Gender was a significant factor in fear of crime, and females reported a higher fear of crime than male students. Finally, there was a general lack of knowledge reported by respondents about the authority granted to university law enforcement officers (Barker, 2016). Many postsecondary students are unaware of the role of their campus's police department and even how to reach them other than dialing 911. As seen in Barker's study, improvements must be made to strengthen the relationship between campus police officers and students.

“This strengthening process should start with ensuring that all students are made aware of the efforts towards ensuring safety” (Barker, 2016, p. 37). The main goal of a campus police department is to ensure the safety of the entire institution, followed by other practical duties (Travis III & Coon, 2005).

The U.S. Department of Justice, in conjunction with the Bureau of Justice Statistics, coordinates with campus police departments to gather specific statistics on their agencies. In a study conducted by Reaves (2015), he explored these specific characteristics of campus law enforcement agencies. Reaves’s (2015) study focused on both public and private institutions with police departments. Between the 2004–2005 and 2011–2012 school years, there was an overall increase in campus police officers (16%). Most campus police departments (7 in 10) had a memorandum of understanding or other formal agreement with an outside law enforcement agency (Reaves, 2015). Reaves (2015) focused his study on institutions having a student population of at least 2,500 students. He found positive findings regarding campus police departments. About 9 in 10 (92%) public campuses use their own police officers. Most of these officers (94%) were authorized to use a firearm and 86% of them had arrest powers. Of the agencies studied, most had designated personnel assigned to address general crime prevention (91%), rape prevention (86%), drug education (79%), alcohol education (78%), and victim assistance (72%). Campus police in public institutions met regularly with special interest groups as opposed to private institutions. Finally, nearly all campuses had a mass notification system that used email, text messages, or other methods to alert students and staff of emergency situations (Reaves, 2015). Reaves’s (2015) study provided an extensive amount of information on campus police departments. To further Reaves’s (2015)

research, a future study should be conducted to see what has changed, if anything, since the 2011-2012 school year.

In this chapter, a review of the literature was conducted to obtain a better understanding of prior research. Research on campus crime, the Clery Act, and campus police departments were examined for this current study's purpose. In the next chapter, the methodology for the present study will be presented. .

Chapter III

Methodology

According to Swedberg (2010), an exploratory study can be examined on a topic that has not been researched before, or an already existing topic is explored in order to produce new ideas and hypotheses. Even though there's a lot of research on campus crime, there is very little on designated campus police departments. Since the topic of colleges without a designated police department has not been researched extensively, this type of research will attempt to create a framework for other researchers to create new ideas. This study uses a quantitative research design that utilizes secondary data analysis to evaluate Clery Act crimes at institutions with and without designated campus police departments. Secondary data is an empirical exercise that is carried out on data that has already been gathered or compiled (Dale et. al. 1988). Secondary data was chosen for two reasons. First, using secondary data ensures a consistency among similar studies. Second, secondary data is time-saving that uses modern data that has been collected in a manner in which an analysis can be easily conducted . The research uses both purposive and random sampling.

Data History and Collection

To complete this research, two main datasets were analyzed in addition to one separate website to fill in the gaps of missing data. First, the data set, *Campus Safety and Security Data Analysis Cutting Tool* is utilized by the Office of Postsecondary Education of the U.S. Department of Education. This dataset has been used in previous studies, such as one by Makinen (2019), who studied campuses with and without designated police departments. The data are drawn from the Office of Postsecondary Campus Safety and

Security Statistics website database to which crime statistics and fire statistics are submitted annually, via a web-based data collection, by all postsecondary institutions that receive Title IV funding (Clery Act) (U.S. Department of Education, n.d.). The purpose of the *Campus Safety and Security Data Analysis Cutting Tool* is to provide rapid customized reports of public inquiries relating to campus crime and fire data (U.S. Department of Education, n.d.).

The inclusion criteria for this sample that is used is four-year public institutions of higher education with a population of 10,000 students or more. The data generated with these specific criteria found a total of 300 institutions within the United States, of which 269 institutions have a designated campus police department. The data revealed a total of 31 institutions that do not have a designated campus police department. The institutions without a designated campus police department use campus security or their local jurisdiction police department. Of these numbers, a total of 62 institutions will be chosen to research and compare statistics, 31 institutions with a designated campus police department and all 31 without. The 31 institutions with designated police departments were selected based on enrollment sizes of 10,000-14,999 students, 15,000-19,999 students, 20,000-29,999 students, and over 30,000 students. Purposive sampling was used on the 31 institutions without a designated campus police department and random sampling was used to select from the 269 schools down to 31 who have a designated campus police department.

This research looked at over 300 institutions to see which ones did and did not have a designated police department. This was done by conducting an internet search on each institution's website. Very few of the institutions lacked that information and when

that occurred, an Internet search was completed to retrieve such information. This study examines reported crime categories of criminal offenses, violence against women, arrests, and student disciplinary referrals. This data set includes all reportable Clery crime statistics from the years 2018, 2019, and 2020. A three-year average was used for each institution given a single year often reflects a rare occurrence. Crime rates used with each Clery category is based on the institution's population multiplied by 100,000 which is the national average for crime rates.

The next data set used in this research is information gathered from the source College Navigator. College Navigator consists of the latest data from the *Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System*, the core postsecondary education data collection program for the NCES (National Center of Education Statistics) (College Navigator, n.d.). College Navigator was used to find data on the nine additional institutional factors, which were evaluated in prior studies, and important to examine when studying campus crime. Those factors include campus setting, enrollment, student-to-faculty ratio, tuition, percentage of students who receive financial aid, percentage of students who are minorities, graduation rates, and retention rates. The last factor, poverty rate, was collected from the U.S. Census Bureau (United States Census, 2022). For each of these factors, data from the latest year will be used which included the 2021-2022 school year. The U.S. Census Bureau uses an average poverty rate between the years of 2017-2021.

Campus setting means the type of area surrounding the institution. For purposes of this research, the campus setting is classified into five different settings. 1 = suburb, 2 = small city, 3 = midsize city, 4 = large city, and 5 = rural area. Each institution will be assigned 1-5 based on its surrounding area. Both Merianos et. al. (2017) and Cundiff

(2020) studied the importance of the geographic setting of the campus and how it affects campus crime rates. Student enrollment is the total number of both full-time and part-time students enrolled in the institution. In an older study, Bromley (1985) indicated the importance of the institution's student enrollment related to campus crime. The student-to-faculty ratio is the number of students enrolled at the college per 1 full-time professor. This is an important figure since the more faculty an institution has can have a positive effect on graduation rates and campus crime, and have a can be mentors for students. Tuition is the cost per student to attend the institution. For purposes of this research, the tuition rate used is only for in-state students and excludes any added extras such as student housing and meals. Institutions with lower tuition may attract more students which could increase student enrollment and target more crime due to a higher student population.

The percentage of students who receive financial aid will be used in this study to determine if more money awarded to the student causes more crime. More financial aid means students are paying less of their own money, at the time, for college and could ultimately increase the student enrollment. The percentage of minorities at the institution has been linked in prior studies to race and campus crime. Boateng et. al. (2017) studied the factors of race and how it relates to campus crime. For purposes of this study, minorities were classified by the percentage of all students enrolled as African American and Latinx. For this study, the graduation rate is defined as the rate from when a student starts at the institution and finishes at the same institution. In addition, this figure does not include transfer students. Schuck (2017) studied the importance of graduation rates and the effect it has on college crime victimization. The retention rate used in this study

is defined as the rate at which students complete an academic year at the institution and return the following year. This rate is important because if campus crime is too high, students may choose to leave that institution to attend another. The last factor in this study, poverty rate, was taken from the U.S. Census Bureau source since College Navigator didn't provide that data.

The poverty rate of the surrounding town to the campus is an important figure since higher poverty rates could lead to higher crime rates (Fox & Hellman, 1985). For purposes of this study, the town is the city, township, or village in which the institution is located. Poverty rates for this study were gathered from the United States Census Bureau. The United States Census Bureau collects data from the American Community Survey, census of governments, decennial census of population and housing, and economic censuses. The U.S. Census Bureau uses its data to make planning decisions about community services, to distribute more than \$675 billion in federal funds to local, state, and tribal governments each year, and to determine the distribution of congressional seats to states (U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.). In this research, the poverty rate means the surrounding area of the institution and what effect it may have on campus crime.

The 62 college institutions selected for this study were chosen by purposive sampling. Purposive sampling is defined as a group of non-probability sampling techniques in which units are selected because they have special characteristics that are needed in the sample (Nikolopoulou, 2022). The student enrollment was a determining factor in selecting institutions to ensure there was a broad variety of student enrollments within the research. All 31 institutions without a designated campus police department were selected and 31 institutions with designated campus police were chosen with

comparable student enrollments. Institutions without a designated campus police department for this study are: Antelope Valley College (11,105), Auburn University (31,526), Bellevue College (11,546), Boise State University (25,794), Broward College (30,947), College of Staten Island (11,793), Cypress College (13,406), Daytona State College (11,613), Eastern Florida State College (12,677), Florida State College at Jacksonville (20,717), Front Range Community College (18,537), Henry Ford College (11,397), Idaho State University (12,135), Indian River State College (14,461), Lorain County Community College (9,520), Madison Area Technical College (12,152), Metropolitan State University of Denver (17,687), Miami Dade College (44,002), Missouri State University Springfield (22,925), Modesto Junior College (14,642), Palm Beach State College (24,151), Rio Hondo College (15,593), Santa Ana College (23,936), Seminole State College of Florida (15,315), St. Petersburg College (24,543), Thomas Edison University (10,000), University of Hawaii at Manoa (19,098), University of Idaho (11,303), University of Puerto Rico-Mayaguez (12,126), University of Southern Indiana (10,000) and Valencia College (43,599).

The institutions used in this research with a designated campus police department are: Ball State University (20,319), California State Polytechnic University (29,456), California State University (15,702), Coastal Carolina University (10,473), Eastern Washington University (10,892), Ferris State University (10,361), Florida State University (45,130), Georgia Southern University (27,076), Iowa State University (30,708), James Madison University (22,166), Kent State University (25,567), Louisiana State University Agricultural (35,912), MiraCosta College (11,125), Oakland University (17,170), Ohio State University (61,677), Rowan University (19,052), Santa Monica

College (23,408), South Dakota State University (11,465), South Texas College (28,962), Temple University (35,626), University of Texas at Austin (51,991), Troy University (14,901), University of Arkansas (29,068), University of Delaware (23,996), University of Illinois Chicago (34,199), University of Memphis (21,622), University of Mississippi (21,203), University of Toledo (16,979), Utah State University (27,426), Western Carolina University (11,877), and Youngstown State University (11,298).

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Campus administrators are continuously discussing ways to improve campus safety and update policies and procedures. Crime on campus has a multitude of factors to consider. With many institutional factors to choose from, only nine of the most common were used for purposes of this research. Although the general crime trend was down for a ten-year span (2009-2019), the number of reported on-campus crimes increased by eight percent between 2014 and 2017 (National Center for Education Statistics, n.d.). This exploratory study contains six research questions that examine the relationship among several campus institution variables. The variables chosen pertained to campus information such as Clery crime rates and whether the institution has a designated police department or not. Additionally, there are six hypotheses, specifically, the six research questions are:

1. Is there a difference in Clery crime offenses when comparing institutions with and without a designated campus police department?

Hypothesis 1: There is a difference in Clery crime statistics when comparing institutions with and without a designated campus police department.

2. Is there a difference in arrests reported at institutions with a designated campus police department than those without a designated campus police department?

Hypothesis 2: There are more arrests reported at institutions with a designated campus police department than those without a designated campus police department.

3. Is there a difference in student referrals for discipline within the institution at institutions with a designated campus police department than those without a designated campus police department?

Hypothesis 3: There are higher rates of student referrals for discipline at institutions with a designated campus police department than those without a designated campus police department.

4. Is there a difference in VAWA offenses when comparing institutions with and without a designated police department?

Hypothesis 4: There are more VAWA offenses at institutions with a designated campus police department than those without a designated campus police department.

5. What relationships, if any, exists among the items under investigation?

Hypothesis 5: There are individual characteristics within the institution that influence higher crime rates at institutions with and without a designated police department.

6. Is the presence of a designated campus police department the most significant predictor of campus crime?

Hypothesis 6: The presence of a designated campus police department is the most significant predictor of campus crime.

Variables for Analysis

The primary independent variable in this study is whether the institution has a designated campus police department or not. The dependent variable for this research includes the reportable Clery crimes in four different categories at each institution. These categories are criminal offenses which include murder/non-negligent manslaughter, negligent manslaughter, rape, fondling, incest, statutory rape, aggravated assault, robbery, burglary, motor vehicle theft, and arson. The second dependent variable is arrests, which include weapon offenses, drug abuse violations, and liquor law violations. The third dependent variable is Violence Against Women Act crimes, which include domestic violence, stalking, and dating violence. Finally, the fourth dependent variable is disciplinary actions, which include weapons offenses, drug abuse violence, and liquor law violations.

The nine institutional factors are campus setting, enrollment, student-to-faculty ratio, tuition, percentage of students receiving financial aid, percentage of students who are minorities, graduation rates, retention rates, surrounding areas poverty rates, and if the institution has a designated police department. Pearson correlation coefficients were used to examine institutional factors and Clery crime data outcomes.

Analytic Strategy

The analysis was conducted using a computer program licensed by International Business Machines Corporation (IBM). The software program is called Statistical

Package for the Social Sciences, version 29, (SPSS), and provides capabilities to analyze data using a variety of methods.

The analysis was conducted in three stages. Stage one included running descriptive statistics on my dependent and independent variables, and the campus factors listed above. These variables were examined using frequencies, percentages, rates, ratios, means, medians, ranges, standard deviations, and presented in a table form. The second stage tested used an independent sample t-test to compare the means of two independent groups to compare statistical evidence under examination. The third stage tested the research questions by performing a correlations matrix and Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression, which showed the relationship among the variables. The alpha value (p-value) used throughout this research is set at .10 for determining statistical significance, due to a small sample size. Research questions 1-4 will examine the descriptive statistics, run an independent t-test comparing institutions with and without police departments and their criminal offense rate, arrest rate, VAWA rate, and disciplinary rate, and lastly use a correlation matrix and an OLS regression to determine the specific relationships among the variables. Research question 5 will examine the descriptive statistics and use a correlation matrix to understand the relationship the tested institutional factors have with the criminal offense rate, arrest rate, VAWA rate, and disciplinary rate. Lastly, question 6 will test four separate regressions based on the criminal offense rate, arrest rate, VAWA rate, and disciplinary rate along with the institutional factor with the highest positively correlated value in the correlations matrix. In the next chapter, the findings will be presented of this exploratory study.

Chapter IV

Results

The purpose of this chapter is to present the findings relative to each research question. The results are divided into three sections, each reflecting a stage in the analysis. Stage one contains the overview of the descriptive statistics of the sample. Stage two includes the results from the comparison investigation highlighting schools with and without a designated campus police department. Stage three shows the results of the relationship and explanatory analyses.

Stage 1 – Descriptive Statistics Overview

The average three-year reported criminal offense rate for the institutions used in this study is 197 offenses per 100,000 students enrolled at the institution (Table 1). The average three-year arrest rate for the institutions used in this survey is 335 arrests per 100,000 students enrolled at the institution. The average three-year VAWA rate for institutions used in this survey is 115 violations per 100,000 students enrolled at the institution. Lastly, the average three-year disciplinary rate for institutions used in this survey is 1,508 hearings per 100,000 students enrolled at the institution.

The campus setting used in this research includes suburbs, cities (small, medium, and large), and rural areas. The frequencies show that 26% of the institutions (16) surround a large city (Table 2). Additionally, the campus setting least used in the sample was rural at 11% (7). The student population ranges from 9,520 to 61,677 students, averaging 21,378. The student-to-faculty ratio ranges from 10:1 to 30:1, with an average of 20:1. The in-state tuition cost per year ranges from \$1,124 to \$17,378, with an average of \$7,299. The percentage of students who receive financial aid ranges from 0% to 100%,

with an average of 82%. The percentage of African Americans and Latinx, ranges from 5% to 95%, with an average of 32%. The graduation rate ranges from 0% to 88%, averaging 50%, and the retention rate averages from 0% to 100%, with an average of 51%. Lastly, the poverty rate for the community in which the institution is located ranges from 5% to 53%, with an average of 20%.

Stage 2 – Comparisons

Phase 2 of the analysis represents a comparative look at variables in order to test the research questions. Dependent variables in the analysis include criminal offense rate, arrest, VAWA, and disciplinary referral rates. These were compared by whether or not the institution had a designated campus police department. An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the means of these two groups.

Research Question 1

The initial observation showed the mean value for Clery crime offenses at institutions with designated police departments was triple, compared to institutions without a police department. The results indicated Clery crime at institutions with a police department (M=303) were greater than the mean for institutions without a designated campus police department (M=91). (Table 4). The significance (two-sided p-value) of <.01 is less than the alpha value of <.10, making this result statistically significant. The hypothesis that there is a difference in reported Clery crimes when comparing institutions with and without a designated campus police department is supported with at least 90% confidence (used in all the analyses), thus concluding that more Clery crime offenses are reported at institutions with a designated campus police department.

Research Question 2

The initial observation showed the mean value for arrests at institutions with designated police departments was again almost triple compared to institutions without a police department. The results indicated arrests at institutions with a police department (M=526) were greater than the mean for institutions without a designated campus police department (M=144) (Table 4). The significance (two-sided p-value) of .02 is less than the alpha value of $<.10$, making this result statistically significant. The hypothesis that there are more arrests at institutions with a designated campus police department is supported with at least 90% confidence.

Research Question 3

The initial observation showed the mean value for student referrals at institutions with designated police departments was more than six times compared to institutions without a police department. Specifically, results indicated student referrals at institutions with a police department (M=3,467) were greater than the mean for institutions without a designated campus police department (M=549) (Table 4). The significance (two-sided p-value) of $<.01$ is less than the alpha value of $<.10$, making this result statistically significant. The hypothesis that there are more student referrals at institutions with a designated campus police department is supported with at least 90% confidence, thus concluding that more student referrals are reported at institutions with a designated campus police department.

Research Question 4

The initial observation showed the mean value for VAWA offenses at institutions with designated police departments was nearly triple, compared to institutions without a

police department. The results indicated VAWA offenses at institutions with a police department (M=168) were greater than the mean for institutions without a designated campus police department (M=61) (Table 4). The significance (two-sided p-value) of .01 is less than the alpha value of $<.10$, making this result statistically significant. The hypothesis that there are more VAWA offenses at institutions with a designated campus police department is supported with at least 90% confidence, thus concluding that more VAWA offenses are reported at institutions with a designated campus police department.

Stage 3

The purpose of the third stage is to examine the relationships among the variables in the analysis and the explanatory power of designated police department status in predicting each of the Clery-related measures.

Research Question 5

The results showed student enrollment has a significant relationship with the criminal offense rate ($r = .39, p = <.01$) (Table 5). The student-to-faculty ratio has a significant relationship with the VAWA rate ($r = .24, p = .06$) and the student disciplinary rate ($r = -.29, p = .02$). Tuition has a significant relationship with the criminal offense rate ($r = .39, p = <.01$), the arrest rate ($r = .30, p = .02$), the VAWA rate ($r = .49, p = <.01$), and the student disciplinary rate ($r = .46, p = <.01$). The percentage of students who receive financial aid does not have a significant relationship the criminal offense rate, the arrest rate, the VAWA rate, and the student disciplinary rate. The Black/Latinx population has a significant relationship with the criminal offense rate ($r = -.32, p = .02$), the arrest rate ($r = -.38, p = <.01$), the VAWA rate ($r = -.28, p = .03$), and the student disciplinary rate ($r = -.37, p = <.01$)

The graduation rate has a significant relationship with the criminal offense rate ($r = .48, p < .01$), the arrest rate ($r = .26, p = .04$), the VAWA rate ($r = .36, p < .01$), and the student disciplinary rate ($r = .38, p < .01$). The retention rate has a significant relationship with the criminal offense rate ($r = .40, p < .01$), the arrest rate ($r = .33, p < .01$), the VAWA rate ($r = .40, p < .01$), and the student disciplinary rate ($r = .41, p < .01$). The poverty rate only has a significant relationship with the VAWA rate ($r = .25, p = .05$). Lastly, the campus setting couldn't be tested reliably due to the low sample size. Campus setting did not differ by police designation status and was spread out the same way (Table 5). The hypothesis that there are individual characteristics within the institution that influence higher crime rates at institutions with and without a designated police department has mixed support. Therefore, it can be concluded that there are individual characteristics within the institution that influences higher crime rates at institutions with and without a designated campus police department.

Research Question 6

A linear regression was needed to examine if the presence of a designated campus police department was the most significant predictor of Clery related measures. Four separate regressions were tested based on the criminal offense rate, the arrest rate, the student disciplinary rate, and the VAWA rate. The standardized beta, which is the explanatory power, determined the effect of having designated campus police departments. The first regression tested the criminal offense rate against institutions with a designated campus police department (Table 6). The results indicated that having a designated campus police department was not the most significant predictor ($B = .07, p = .61$) compared to the graduation rate ($B = .43, p < .01$), which had the highest correlation

value in the correlation matrix. The second regression tested the arrest rate against institutions with a designated campus police department (Table 7). The results indicated that having a designated campus police department was not the most significant predictor ($B = .21, p = .09$) compared to the Black/Latinx population ($B = -.32, p = .01$), which had the highest correlation value in the correlation matrix.

The third regression tested the student disciplinary rate against institutions with a designated campus police department (Table 8). The results indicated that having a designated campus police department was not the most significant predictor ($B = .14, p = .35$) compared to tuition ($B = .38, p = <.01$), which had the highest correlation value in the correlation matrix. The final regression tested the VAWA rate against institutions with a designated campus police department (Table 9). The results indicated that having a designated campus police department was not the most significant predictor ($B = .08, p = .59$) compared to tuition ($B = .46, p = <.01$), which had the highest correlation value in the correlation matrix. The hypothesis that the presence of a designated campus police department is the most significant factor is not supported since the regressions revealed having a designated campus police department is not the most significant predictor in all the tested variables.

Summary

The results were divided into three sections, each reflecting a stage in the analysis. Stage one contained the overview of the descriptive statistics of the sample. Stage two included the results from the comparison investigation highlighting schools with and without a designated campus police department. Stage three showed the results of the relationship analyses.

In Research question 1, the hypothesis that there is a difference in reported Clery crimes when comparing institutions with and without a designated campus police department. This was supported with at least 90% confidence, thus concluding that more Clery crime offenses are reported at institutions with a designated campus police department. In research question 2, the hypothesis that there is a difference in arrests reported at institutions with a designated campus police department was supported with at least 90% confidence, thus concluding that more arrests occur at institutions with a designated campus police department. In research question 3, the hypothesis that there is a difference in student referrals reported at institutions with a designated campus police department was supported with at least 90% percent confidence, thus concluding that more student disciplinary referrals occur at institutions with a designated campus police department. In research question 4, the hypothesis that more VAWA offenses are reported at institutions with a designated campus police department was supported with at least 90% confidence thus concluding that more VAWA offenses occur at institutions with a designated campus police department.

Research question 5 revealed enrollment, tuition, the Black/Latinx population, the graduation rate, the retention rate, and poverty all contribute to increased crime rates at institutions. The hypothesis that there are individual characteristics within the institution that influenced higher crime rates at institutions with and without a designated police department showed mixed support. Finally, research question 6 revealed that the presence of a designated campus police department is not the most significant predictor for the criminal offense, arrest ,student disciplinary, and VAWA rates. The hypothesis that the presence of a designated campus police department was the most significant factor is not

supported since the regressions revealed having a designated campus police department is not the most significant predictor in all the tested variables.

Chapter V

Discussion and Conclusion

Summary of Major Findings

The purpose of this exploratory study was to analyze Clery Act statistics at public institutions of higher education both with and without a designated campus police department. The literature has revealed the importance of Clery Act reporting, particularly the reporting differences at institutions with and without a designated campus police department. This research focused on whether there were any differences in Clery reporting at institutions with and without designated campus police departments. The six following hypotheses were tested in this study.

1. There is a difference in Clery crime statistics when comparing institutions with and without a designated campus police department.
2. There are more arrests reported at institutions with a designated campus police department than those without a designated campus police department.
3. There are higher rates of student referrals for discipline at institutions with a designated campus police department than those without a designated campus police department.
4. There are more VAWA offenses at institutions with a designated campus police department than those without a designated campus police department.
5. There are individual characteristics within the institution that influence higher crime rates at institutions with and without a designated police department.
6. The presence of a designated campus police department is the most significant predictor of campus crime.

Hypothesis 1 resulted in a statistically significant difference in reported Clery crimes when comparing institutions with and without a designated campus police department. The results were more than triple in differences ($M = 303$, $M = 91$), favoring institutions with a designated campus police department having more Clery crime offenses reported. Based on prior research from Arney (2020) and Makinen (2019), I expected a positive difference in reported Clery crimes at institutions with and without a designated police department. Makinen (2019) found a higher number of Clery crimes reported at institutions with a designated police department. Additionally, Makinen (2019) suggested that campus police departments provide an environment conducive to compliance and is welcoming to relationship-building with students. When students have a positive relationship with their campus police department, they are more likely to report criminal activity, which ultimately increases crime that get reported. Arney (2020) found that over 58% were likely and 28% very likely to report crimes to their campus police department. Combined, that's approximately 86% of students who were likely to report crimes to campus police. These prior studies support the hypothesis that more crimes are reported at institutions with a designated campus police department.

Hypothesis 2 resulted in a statistically significant difference in reported arrests when comparing institutions with and without a designated campus police department. The results were almost triple in differences ($M = 525$, $M = 144$), favoring institutions with a designated campus police department having more arrests. Based on prior research from Makinen (2019), I expected a significant difference in reported arrests at institutions with and without a designated police department. Makinen (2019) found higher arrests reported at institutions with designated police departments. Furthermore, Makinen (2019)

reported a difference in arrests as the second most prevalent reportable Clery statistic. Makinen's (2019) study supports the hypothesis indicating more arrests are reported at institutions with a designated campus police department.

Hypothesis 3 resulted in a statistically significant difference in reported student referrals when comparing institutions with and without a designated campus police department. The results were almost quadruple in differences ($M = 2,467$, $M = 549$), favoring institutions with a designated campus police department having more disciplinary actions reported. Based on prior research from both Schuck (2017) and Makinen (2019), I expected there to be a significant difference in student referrals at institutions with and without a designated police department. Schuck (2017) reported that institutions that utilize the student conduct system rather than campus police report a higher four-year graduation rate. Additionally, Schuck (2017) found that institutions that made more student referrals had a higher four-year graduation rate. Furthermore, Makinen (2019) reported that student referrals were the most prevalent Clery reportable category in his study. As a campus police officer, I see firsthand how student referrals are the preferred method when handling student conduct issues, when applicable. These prior studies support the hypothesis that more student referrals are reported at institutions with a designated campus police department.

Hypothesis 4 resulted in a statistically significant difference in reported VAWA offenses when comparing institutions with and without a designated campus police department. The results were almost triple in differences ($M = 168$, $M = 62$), favoring institutions with a designated campus police department having more VAWA offenses reported. Based on prior research from Fedina et al. (2016), I expected there to be a

positive difference in reported VAWA offenses at institutions with and without a designated police department. Fedina et al. (2016) reviewed 34 studies on sexual assaults on college campuses. They found that, even though they are overall underreported, sexual assaults are still being reported to their campus police departments. Fedina et al. (2016) study supports the hypothesis indicating more sexual assault crimes are reported at institutions with a designated campus police department.

Hypothesis 5 revealed individual characteristics within the institution influence higher crime rates at schools with and without a designated campus police department. Based on prior literature, I expected there to be certain characteristics that increase crime on college campuses. The only characteristic that did not appear to increase higher crime rates was the percentage of students who receive financial aid. Students applying for financial aid are subject to credit checks and criminal background checks. Certain crime convictions, such as sex offenses, might affect a student from receiving aid (Federal Student Aid, n.d.). Since this initial step “background check” is done when students apply for any federal aid, this could potentially result in why financial aid doesn’t influence crime in this study. More research needs to be done on this factor and its influence on campus crime to better understand the results.

As for student enrollment, I expected it to influence higher crime rates based on a prior study from Bromley (1985), who suggested institutions with high enrollment resulted in higher campus crime. Additionally, Jacobson (2017) found that larger institutions, thus bigger student populations, are associated with more violent crime. Tuition was also found to impact campus crime. With lower tuition costs, institutions gain more students, contributing to higher student enrollment. I suspected the

Black/Latinx population to influence campus crime based on Boateng and Boateng's (2017) study. Boateng and Boateng (2017) found that race significantly affected attitudes toward police and fear of crime. Furthermore, Fox et al. (2009) found that minority students were more likely to express higher levels of fear of crime.

I also anticipated the graduation rate to influence campus crime based on Schuck's (2017) study. Schuck found that campuses with lower violent crime rates reported higher four-year graduation rates. Furthermore, Schuck (2017) suggested victimization and students' fear of crime affect graduation rates. I expected the retention rate to influence campus crime based on the work by Hauer's (2019). Hauer (2019) concluded that overall, campus crime negatively affects retention rates. When students are victimized by crime, they explore their options to leave that institution and go elsewhere or even drop out of school. Lastly, I assumed the characteristic of poverty, in the town where the institution is located, to impact campus crime based on McPheters' (1978) and Cundiff's (2020) study. McPheters (1978) suggested that off-campus unemployment rates contribute to higher campus crime rates. Additionally, Cundiff (2020) concluded that neighborhoods surrounding a college campus are associated with higher rates of property crime, larceny, burglary, and robbery rates. The various studies used in this exploratory study support specific institutional characteristics that influence campus crime.

Finally, hypothesis 6 revealed that the presence of a designated campus police department is not the most significant factor in criminal offenses, arrests, disciplinary referrals, and VAWA offenses. I expected the presence of a designated campus police department to be the most significant factor in all four tested variables since I have been a campus police officer for more than 10 years. Working at a campus police department

has shown me their significance in the campus community. There is limited research available on the effects of campus police with little to no evidence to support this hypothesis. Additionally, only the direct effects of Clery reporting were tested to measure the effectiveness of a campus police department. This isn't a good measurement of effectiveness of policing. This method was used since it was easily available. There are many indirect effects of having a designated campus police department, such as a police department working well with others, they team up with administration, and they have good policies and programs, all of which were not measured in this study.

Contributions

The results from this research are beneficial and relevant to the understanding of Clery crime reporting at institutions with and without a designated campus police department. There are several contributions from this study that stand out. First, this research has the potential to expand on the existing literature regarding the importance of reporting Clery Act measures on college campuses. While examining prior studies, this current study may help improve awareness of Clery Act crime statistics at institutions for prospective incoming students.

Another contribution is to increase awareness of campus crime. As seen in this study, campus crime happens at institutions across the U.S. Some institutions have higher crime rates than others and this study can help recognize the factors that contribute to that crime. Institutional leaders may find this study useful when seeking ways to reduce campus crime.

This study also contributes to the literature by supporting Makinen's (2019) study on the role, in general, of a designated campus police department. Makinen's (2019) study

also examined the differences in Clery crime reporting at institutions with and without designated campus police departments, and the work here lends credence to his findings. Results from this research may help make university officials and campus community members become aware of the benefits of having a designated campus police department.

Lastly, this study may also make a difference in the way institutions of higher education examine what institutional factors contribute to campus crime. For instance, based on this study, institutions with higher student enrollment report a higher number of criminal offenses.

Limitations

Before recommending steps for future research, it is important to acknowledge the limitations of this study. First, the sample size is relatively small for this research. The small sample is due to the small number of public four-year institutions without a designated campus police department used in the sample size. Of the 300 institutions that fit the criteria of 10,000 students and above student enrollment, only 31 institutions do not have a designated campus police department.

In addition, this study has skewed data, as illustrated by the standard deviation being bigger than the mean for the four dependent variables. The data were not normally distributed for criminal offense rate, arrest rate, disciplinary rate, and VAWA rate. One way to improve this limitation is to conduct a more sophisticated statistical analysis by expanding on the evidence presented in the research.

Another limitation worth considering is this study was cross-sectional and only focused on a specific period of time. The data gathered used a three-year average and specifically focused on that time period. Ideally, a study would examine crime statistics

from institutions before they had a designated police department and again after one was implemented to acquire if there were significant differences in Clery reporting between the two. This type of research would require longitudinal data since it would be focusing on more than one time period.

Finally, the last limitation is the fact that this study mainly focuses on Clery crime reporting. It is important to understand that not all crimes are Clery Act reportable and not all crimes are reported to the appropriate authorities. Many crimes on college campuses go unreported for many reasons, such as embarrassment or being afraid of re-victimization (Gardella et. al., 2014). Additionally, there is no guarantee that these institutions report their data to the U.S. Department of Education in a trustworthy manner. However, if not reported properly, the institutions risk institutional fines and jeopardize funding.

This research was not intended to show that campuses with a designated campus police department are safer and have less crime than those without a designated campus police department. The purpose of this exploratory study was to depict Clery Act statistics at public institutions of higher education both with and without a designated campus police department. Formal campus police departments are held to a higher standard, which provides an environment that is conducive to compliance and is welcoming to relationship-building with students (Makinen, 2019).

Recommendations for Future Research

There are several recommendations for future research. The first recommendation is to conduct this study by expanding the sample size to include schools with lower student enrollment to attempt to find more institutions without a designated campus police department. A future study that includes this would allow for more statistical analysis on

both institutions with and without designated police departments. It would be interesting to see if the results of that study would change any of the outcomes of this current study.

The second recommendation is to take this research further and include additional or different institutional factors. A future study that would include more institutional factors would provide additional insight into the comparison of institutions with and without a designated campus police department and such additional factors. For example, it would be interesting to see if on-campus housing has an effect on campus crime versus off-campus housing. Another factor to consider would be determining if gender has any correlation with reportable Clery crime statistics.

The last recommendation would be to conduct this study using data before institutions had a designated police department and again after one was implemented. The results from this type of study would show if campus police departments made a significant difference regarding reporting Clery data. This type of study would require longitudinal data, which involves more in-depth research.

Final Thoughts

As seen in this study and previous studies, campus police departments have a major role in providing safety and security to students and staff at the institution. In my personal and professional opinion as a campus police officer, I believe every institution should have a designed campus police department. Having a designated campus police department indicates the commitment to campus safety within the institution. In addition, designated campus police departments abide by professional standards and are typically nationally accredited agencies by commissions, such as The Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies Inc (CALEA).

As seen in this research and prior studies, Clery Act awareness is lacking across many institutions across the U.S (Jee, 2016). Many students and staff are unfamiliar with the importance of the Clery Act and how it affects their campus. One way to improve Clery awareness is to implement a program that mandates all incoming first-year students, and new students to attend a session on the Clery Act during orientation. Also, to conduct required training sessions for all faculty and staff. By doing these two tasks, everyone at the institution would be familiar with the Clery Act and the importance of reporting crimes to their campus police. A major component of the Clery Act is the *Annual Safety Report*, which is published annually. Due to its length, many people fail to read the report and are unfamiliar with criminal activities at their institution. One way to improve this would be to post specific crime stats in buildings throughout campus, including the police station. This would ensure more people are familiar with the crimes that occur on campus. These Clery recommendations would take time and money but are important to increase awareness throughout campus.

Finally, I wanted to mention that the results of this research may appear to some that institutions with a designated campus police department have a higher number of criminal offenses, arrests, disciplinary referrals, and VAWA offenses. Campus police departments reflect their performance effectiveness in several ways, besides crime rates. Other measures used are response times on calls for service, clearance rates, community and campus satisfaction feedback, and measures in enforcement productivity, which include proactive traffic stops and arrests. In this study, only Clery Act reporting was used to measure the performance of campus police departments. This alone is not a good measurement of campus police effectiveness. Having a designated campus police

department influences other factors which were not taken into consideration in this research. Indirect effects of campus police departments include the ability to work well with others, they team up with administration, and they have good policies and programs. In order to fully examine the effectiveness of a campus police department, both direct and indirect effects should be examined.

Institutions without a designated campus police department can still do a good job with Clery Act reporting. Institutions that use security or their local jurisdiction police department use a Clery Compliance Officer. These individuals are civilians who receive the same training and have to abide by the same guidelines as campus police departments have to. The main drawback to institutions without a designated campus police department is the quality of service it provides. These quality-of-service issues include slower response times, not the same level of investigations or delayed investigations, and not the same level of service from a neighboring jurisdiction. Campus crime will continue at institutions with and without a designated campus police department. Regardless of whether or not an institution has a designated police department, the institution must ensure that campus safety is its number one priority.

References:

- Arney, K. (2020). Examining victimization on campus: The influence of student's perceptions in crime-reporting behaviors. *College Student Journal*, 54(4), 401–412.
- Barker, C. (2016). Policing in postsecondary education: University police legitimacy and fear of crime on campus. (Publication No. 3169) [Master's thesis, East Tennessee State University].
<https://dc.etsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=4548&context=etd>
- Beverage, S. (2019). A case study: Clery Act policy and implementation strategies (Thesis, Concordia University, St. Paul). https://digitalcommons.csp.edu/cup_commons_grad_edd/275
- Black, M., Basile, K., Breiding, M., Smith, S., Walters, M., Merrick, M., & Stephens, M. (2011). National intimate partner and sexual violence survey (NISVS): Summary of findings for 2010. *The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey: 2010 Summary Report*.
https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/nisvs_report2010-a.pdf
- Boateng, F. D., & Adjekum-Boateng, N. S. (2017). Differential perceptions of fear of crime among college students: The race factor. *Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice*, 15(2), 138–159. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15377938.2017.1310683>
- Bolger, M. A., & Bolger, P. C. (2019). Predicting fear of crime: Results from a community survey of a small city. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 44(2), 334–351. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-018-9450->

- Bromley, M. L. (1995). Factors associated with college crimes: Implications for campus police. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology, 10*(3), 13–19.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02811058>
- Clery Center (2007). The Jeanne Clery Act. Retrieved June 5, 2022, from
<http://www.clerycenter.org>
- Cable News Network. (2012). Judge overturns fine against Virginia Tech over 2007 shooting. CNN. Retrieved January 14, 2023, from
<https://www.cnn.com/2012/03/30/us/virginia-tech-fine/index.html>
- College Navigator (n.d.). Retrieved November 2, 2022, from
<https://nces.ed.gov/collegenavigator/>
- Cornell, D. (2010). Threat assessment in college settings. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 42*(1), 8–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00091380903448997>
- Cundiff, K. (2020). Colleges and community crime: An analysis of campus proximity and neighborhood crime rates. *Crime & Delinquency, 67*(3), 431–448.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128720974312>
- Dale, A., Arber, S., & Procter, M. (1988). Doing secondary analysis. London, England: Unwin Hyman.
- Federal Student Aid. (n.d.). Retrieved March 14, 2023, from
<https://studentaid.gov/understand-aid/eligibility/requirements/criminal-convictions#what-other-convictions-might-affect-my-aid>

- Fedina, L., Holmes, J. L., & Backes, B. L. (2016). Campus sexual assault: A systematic review of prevalence research from 2000 to 2015. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 19*(1), 76–93. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838016631129>
- Fox, J. A., & Hellman, D. A. (1985). Location and other correlates of campus crime. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 13*(5), 429–444. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0047-2352\(85\)90043-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0047-2352(85)90043-1)
- Fox, K. A., Nobles, M. R., & Piquero, A. R. (2009). Gender, Crime Victimization and Fear of Crime. *Security Journal, 22*(1), 24–39. <https://doi.org/10.1057/sj.2008.13>
- Gardella, J. H., Nichols-Hadeed, C. A., Mastrocinque, J. M., Stone, J.T., Coates, C. A., Sly, C. J., & Cerulli, C. (2014). Beyond Clery Act statistics: A closer look at college victimization based on self-report data. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 1*–19. doi:10.1177/0886260514535257
- Hauer, A., R (2019). College crime and retention rates. Student Publications. 718
- Jacobsen, S. K. (2017). Examining crime on campus: The influence of institutional factors on reports of crime at colleges and Universities. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 28*(4), 559–579. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10511253.2017.1282799>
- Jee, Jeffrey. (2016). The Clery Act: Student awareness and perceptions of effectiveness at a public university and a private college in east Tennessee. (Publication No. 3019). [Doctoral dissertation, East Tennessee State University]. <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd/3019>
- Laerd Statistics. (2022). Pearson's Correlation. Retrieved December 22, 2022, from <https://statistics.laerd.com/>

- Le, T. D., Dobele, A. R., & Robinson, L. J. (2018). Information sought by prospective students from social media electronic word-of-mouth during the university choice process. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 41(1), 18–34. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080x.2018.1538595>
- Maier, S. L., & DePrince, B. (2020). The influence of prior victimization and other factors on college students' fear of crime and perception of safety. *The Social Science Journal*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03623319.2020.1745518>
- Makinen, Bryan. (2019). An examination of Clery crime statistics at four-year public institutions of higher education served by or without dedicated university police departments. (Publication No. 632). [Master's thesis, Eastern Kentucky University]. <https://encompass.eku.edu/etd/632>
- May, D. C., Rader, N. E., & Goodrum, S. (2009). A gendered assessment of the “threat of victimization”: Examining gender differences in fear of crime, Perceived risk, avoidance, and defensive behaviors. *Criminal Justice Review*, 35(2), 159–182. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734016809349166>
- McCormick, J.G. (2011). National evaluation of crime prevention strategies in urban parks: Using rational choice theory to understand decisions of park directors and professors. Doctoral dissertation. University of Florida, Gainesville, FL.
- McPheters, L. R. (1978). Econometric analysis of factors influencing crime on the campus. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 6(1), 47–52. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0047-2352\(78\)90038-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0047-2352(78)90038-7)

- Merianos, A. L., King, K. A., & Vidourek, R. A. (2017). Student perceptions of safety and helpfulness of resources. *American Journal of Health Studies, 32*(2).
<https://doi.org/10.47779/ajhs.2017.90>
- Miller, V., & Russell-Brown, K. (2022). Policing the college campus: History, race, and law. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4227943>
- Mrozla, T. (2022). On and off campus: Examining fear of crime in a Rural College Town. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 33*(1), 23–40.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10511253.2021.1948085>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2018). Fast facts on college crime. Retrieved June 5, 2022, from <https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=804>
- New, J. (2016). Education department's historic sanction against Penn State for Clery violations, Sandusky's abuse. Retrieved January 14, 2023, from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2016/11/04/education-departments-historic-sanction-against-penn-state-clery-violations>
- Nikolopoulou, K. (2022, October 10). What is purposive sampling? Definition & examples. Scribbr. Retrieved November 24, 2022, from <https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/purposive-sampling/#:~:text=Published%20on%20August%2011%2C%202022,you%20need%20in%20your%20sample.>
- Nobles, M. R., Fox, K. A., Khey, D. N., & Lizotte, A. J. (2010). Community and campus crime: A geospatial examination of the Clery Act. *Crime and Delinquency, 59*(8), 1131–1156. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128710372188>

- Ohio School Safety Center: Security Police. (n.d.). Retrieved March 4, 2023, from <https://ohioschoolsafetycenter.ohio.gov/college-and-universities/resources/security-police>
- Peak, K. J., Barthe, E. P., & Garcia, A. (2008). Campus policing in America. *Police Quarterly, 11*(2), 239–260. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098611107306840>
- Reaves, B. (2015). Campus law enforcement, 2011–2012. U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved April 10, 2022, from <https://bjs.ojp.gov/content/pub/pdf/cle1112.pdf>
- Rock, A. (2019). College campus shooting statistics you should know. *Campus Safety Magazine*. Retrieved January 14, 2023, from <https://www.campussafetymagazine.com/university/college-campus-shooting-statistics/>
- Schuck, A. M. (2017). Evaluating the impact of crime and discipline on student success in postsecondary education. *Research in Higher Education, 58*(1), 77–97. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-016-9419-x>
- Shariati, A., & Guerette, R. T. (2020). The forgotten (practical) side of school safety: What do clery reports say about CPTED and crime on college campuses? *Planning Practice & Research, 35*(4), 396–417. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02697459.2020.1740417>
- Swedberg, R. (2010). Exploratory research (Chapter 2) - the production of knowledge. Cambridge Core. Retrieved November 8, 2022, from <https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/production-of-knowledge/exploratory-research/FD2ABFAD9DE34B44D015606C962A1AF0>

- Travis III, L. F., & Coon, J. K. (2008). Role of law enforcement in public school safety in the United States, 2002. *Center for Criminal Justice Research*.
<https://doi.org/10.3886/icpsr04457>
- United States Census. (2022). United State Census Bureau. Retrieved November 8, 2022, from <https://www.census.gov/>
- U.S. Department of Education. (n.d.). Campus safety and security, campus safety and security data analysis cutting tool. Retrieved April 10, 2022, from <https://ope.ed.gov/campussafety/#/>
- U.S. Department of Education. (2020, September 11). University of North Georgia's Controls Over Reporting Clery Act Crime. Retrieved March 4, 2023, from <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig/auditreports/fy2020/a09t0006.pdf>
- U.S. Department of Education. (2016). The Handbook for Campus Safety and Security Reporting 2016 Edition. Retrieved January 14, 2023, from <https://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/safety/campus.html>
- U.S. Department of Education (2006). Clery Act Handbook. Retrieved April 10, 2022, from <https://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/safety/cleryappendixfinal.pdf>
- Watts, J. H. (2019). *Policing America's Educational Systems*. Routledge.
- Youstin, T. J., & Kopp, P. M. (2020). Role variations and perceptions of campus police versus local and state law enforcement. *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice*, 15(2), 1491–1506. <https://doi.org/10.1093/police/paaa054>

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics of all tested variables

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Police Depts (1=yes)	0	1	.50	.50
Criminal Off Rate	.00	23378	197	315
Arrest Rate	.00	4326	335	645
VAWA Rate	.00	1160	115	167
Disciplinary Rate	.00	9223	1508	2693
Enrollment	9520	61677	21388	11284
StudFaculty	10	30	19	4
Tuition	1124	17378	7299	4301
Fin Aid	0	100	82	17
BlackLatinx	5	95	32	22
Graduation	0	88	50	20
Retention	0	100	51	39
Poverty	5	53	20	10

Note: All rates are per 100,000 students. Criminal Off = Criminal Offenses

Table 2

Campus Setting Frequency Table

Setting	Police	Frequency	Percent
Suburbs	1	7	11
	0	6	10
Small City	1	8	13
	0	7	11
Midsize City	1	4	6
	0	7	11
Large City	1	7	11
	0	9	15
Rural	1	6	10
	0	1	2
Total		62	100.0

1=with designated police department, 0=without designated police department

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics of Institutional Factors by School Police Status

Variable	With Police		Without Police	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Enrollment	24,445	12453	18,330	9192
StudFaculty	19	4	20	5
Tuition	9771	3790	4827	3260
Fin Aid	87	10	78	20
BlackLatinx	26	18	38	24
Graduation	62	16	38	16
Retention	78	17	24	36
Poverty	24	8	17	9

Table 4

Independent t-tests results

	Police	Two-Sided P-Value	Mean	Std. Dev
CO Rate	1		303	410
	0	.008	91	103
Arrest Rate	1		526	818
	0	.020	144	318
VAWA Rate	1		168	213
	0	.013	62	73
Disciplinary Rate	1		2467	3409
	0	.005	549	1103

1 = with designated police department, 0 = without designated police department. CO Rate = criminal offense rate

Table 5

Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Police	--				
2. Criminal Offense Rate	.340* 0.01	--			
3. Arrest Rate	.299* 0.02	0.229 0.07	--		
4. VAWA Rate	.321* 0.01	.396* 0.00	.337* 0.00	--	
5. Disciplinary Rate	.359* <.00	.410* <.00	.520* <0.00	.342* 0.00	--
Enrollment	.273* 0.00	.391* 0.00	-0.161 0.21	-0.015 0.91	-0.039 0.77
StudFaculty	0.16* 0.00	-0.213 0.10	-0.214 0.10	-0.238 0.06	-.292* 0.02
Tuition	.579* 0.00	.394* 0.00	.303* 0.02	.494* <0.00	.460* <0.00
Fin Aid	.283* 0.00	0.125 0.33	0.122 0.34	0.150 0.25	0.174 0.18
BlackLatinx	.282* 0.00	-.318* 0.01	-.377* 0.00	-.283* 0.03	-.367* 0.00
Graduation	.613* 0.00	.479* <.00	.261* 0.04	.360* 0.00	.379* 0.00
Retention	.693* 0.00	.404* 0.00	.328* 0.00	.402* 0.00	.408* 0.00
Poverty	.398* 0.00	0.175 0.17	0.180 0.16	.250* 0.05	0.139 0.28

* Correlation is significant at the <0.10 level (2-tailed)

Top number is Pearson's coefficient ("r"), bottom number is p-value

Table 6

Regression results predicting criminal offenses with police and graduation rate

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-173.57	101.38		-1.71	.092
	Police	46.11	90.21	.07	.51	.611
	Graduation	6.95	2.31	.43	3.00	.004

Model Summary

Mode	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics		
					R Square Change	F Change	df1
1	.48 ^a	.23	.20	280.65	.23	8.95	2

Table 7

Regression results predicting arrests with the variables police and Black/Latinx

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Coefficients		
1	(Constant)	498.841	173.551		2.874	.006
	Police	267.419	156.953	.209	1.704	.094
	BlackLatinx	-9.246	3.570	-.318	-2.590	.012

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics		
					R Square Change	F Change	df1
1	.43 ^a	.18	.15	592.89	.18	6.57	2

Table 8

Regression results predicting disciplinary rates with the variables of police and tuition

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Coefficients		
1	(Constant)	-598.346	606.676		-.986	.328
	Police	743.502	751.318	.139	.990	.326
	Tuition	.238	.088	.380	2.699	.009

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics		
					R Square Change	F Change	df1
1	.47 ^a	.22	.20	2410.69	.225	8.552	2

Table 9

Regression results predicting VAWA with the variables police and tuition

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Coefficients Beta		
1	(Constant)	-9.382	8.696		-1.079	.285
	Police	5.894	10.769	.075	.547	.586
	Tuition	.004	.001	.460	3.341	.001

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics		
					R Square Change	F Change	df1
1	.507 ^a	.257	.232	34.555	.257	10.222	2

Appendix A: Crime Definitions

Crimes Defined

The Clery Act references the definitions of all reportable crimes based on the Federal Bureau of Investigation's (FBI) Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program.

Criminal Homicide

- A) **Murder and Non-negligent Manslaughter:** the willful (non-negligent) killing of one human being by another. Included is any death caused by injuries sustained from a fight, argument, quarrel, assault, or the commission of a crime. Excluded in this section are suicides, traffic fatalities, accidental deaths, fetal deaths, and justifiable homicide.
- B) **Manslaughter by Negligence:** the killing of another person through gross negligence. Includes any death caused by the gross negligence of another. Excluded are deaths due to their own negligence, accidental deaths not resulting from gross negligence, and traffic fatalities.

Sexual Assault

Any sexual act directed against another person without consent from the victim including instances where the victim is incapable of giving consent.

- A) **Rape:** the penetration, no matter how slight, of the vagina or anus, with any body part or object, or oral penetration by a sex organ of another person, without consent of the victim. This includes both males and females. Rape is considered regardless of the age of the victim; if the victim didn't give consent or incapable of giving consent; if consent was given and the offender threatened the victim.

- B) **Fondling**: the touching of the private body parts of another person for the purpose of sexual gratification, without the consent of the victim, including instances where the victim is incapable of giving consent because his/her age or because of his/her temporary or permanent mental incapacity.
- C) **Incest**: sexual intercourse between persons who are related to each other within the degrees wherein marriage is prohibited by law.
- D) **Statutory Rape**: sexual intercourse with a person who is under the statutory age of consent. The statutory age of consent differs by state so it's important to know the age for your state.

Other Crimes

Robbery: the taking or attempting to take anything of value from the care, custody, or control of a person or persons by force or threat of force or violence and/or by putting the victim in fear. The essential elements of robbery are committed in the presence of a victim, victim is directly confronted by the perpetrator, victim is threatened with force or put in fear, must involve a theft or larceny.

Aggravated Assault: an unlawful attack by one person upon another for the purpose of inflicting severe or aggravated bodily injury. This type of assault usually is accompanied by the use of a weapon or by means likely to produce death or great bodily harm. Aggravated assaults include assaults or attempt to kill, poisoning (including date rape drugs), assault with a dangerous weapon, maiming, mayhem, assaults with explosives, assaults with disease (HIV).

Burglary: the unlawful entry of a structure to commit a felony or a theft.

Burglary doesn't include thefts from automobiles, shoplifting, thefts from open access areas, and robbery. Burglary includes:

- A) Forcible entry – all offenses where force of any kind is used to unlawfully enter a structure with the purpose of committing a theft or felony.
- B) Unlawful entry – The entry of a structure is achieved using an unlocked door or window. The element of trespass is essential in this category.
- C) Attempted forcible entry – where a forcible entry into a locked structure is attempted but not completed.

The three conditions of burglary include evidence of a unlawful entry (trespass), the unlawful entry must occur within a structure (having four walls, a roof, and a door), and the structure was unlawfully entered to commit a felony or a theft.

Motor Vehicle Theft: the theft or attempted theft of a motor vehicle. This includes automobiles, sports utility vehicles, trucks, buses, motorcycles, motor scooters, trail bikes, mopeds, all-terrain vehicles, motor homes, snowmobiles, golf carts, and motorized wheelchairs. This does not include theft of farm equipment, watercrafts, and airplanes. Also not included are thefts from motor vehicles, taking a vehicle for temporary use (unauthorized use), and a unlawful entry of a building to steal a motor vehicle (burglary).

Arson: any willful or malicious burning or attempt to burn, with or without intent to defraud, a dwelling house, public building, motor vehicle or aircraft, personal property of another, etc. This includes fires that are willfully or maliciously set, attempts to burn,

incidents of burning own property willfully or maliciously. Arson does not include suspicious fires and fires from unknown origin.

Hate Crimes

Hate crimes is any criminal offense that manifests evidence that the victim was intentionally selected because of the perpetrators' bias against the victim. The eight categories that involve hate crimes are race, religion, sexual orientation, gender, gender identity, ethnicity, national origin, and disability. Hate crimes include any of crimes defined above (criminal homicide, sexual assault, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, motor vehicle theft, and arson). Additionally, larceny-theft, simple assault, intimidation, and destruction/damage/vandalism of property are only included if they are deemed a hate crime.

Larceny-Theft: the unlawful taking, carrying, leading, or riding away of property from the possession or constructive possession of another. Constructive possession is which a person does not have physical custody or possession. This includes shoplifting, pick-pocketing, stealing that is not by threat or force, attempted theft. This does not include motor vehicle theft, embezzlement, forgery, and confidence games.

Simple Assault: an unlawful physical attack by one person upon another where neither the offender displays a weapon, nor the victim suffers obvious severe or aggravated bodily injury involving apparent broken bones, loss of teeth, possible internal injury, severe laceration, or loss of consciousness. Included are all assaults that do not involve the use of a firearm, knife, cutting instrument, or other dangerous weapon.

Intimidation: to unlawfully place another person in reasonable fear of bodily harm through the use of threatening words and/or other conduct, but without displaying a

weapon or subjecting the victim to actual physical violence. “Reasonable fear” is considered is assumed when the victim reports threatening words or other conduct to law enforcement officials.

Destruction/Damage/Vandalism of Property: to willfully or maliciously destroy, damage, deface, or otherwise injure real or personal property without the consent of the owner or the person having custody or control of it. This includes slashing tires, smashing windows, drawing obscene pictures, destroying records, and defacing library books. This does not include any incidents of burning as that would be classified as arson.

Violence Against Women Act

These criminal offenses include dating violence, domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

Dating Violence: violence committed by a person who is or has been in a social relationship of a romantic or intimate nature with the victim. The existence of such relationship shall be determined based on the reporting party’s statement and with consideration of length of the relationship, the type of relationship, and the frequency of interaction between the persons involved in the relationship. Dating violence includes sexual or physical abuse by threat or force but does not include domestic violence.

Domestic Violence: defined as a felony or misdemeanor crime of violence committed: (1) by a current or former spouse or intimate partner, (2) a person who shares a child in common, (3) by a person who is cohabitating with or has cohabited with, (4) by a person similarly situated to a spouse of the victim under the domestic or family

violence laws, and (5) by any other person against an adult or youth victim who is protected from that person's act under the domestic or family violence laws of the jurisdiction in which the crime of violence occurred.

Stalking: engaging in a course of conduct directed at a specific person that would cause a reasonable person to (1) fear for the person's safety or the safety of others and (2) suffer substantial emotional distress. For the purpose of this definition, course of conduct includes two or more acts in which the stalker directly, indirectly, or through third parties follows, monitors, observes, surveils, threatens, or communicates to or about a person.

Arrests and Disciplinary Referrals for Violation of Weapons, Drug Abuse, and Liquor Laws

Arrest: for the Clery Act purposes, and arrest is defined as a person(s) processed by arrest, citation, or summons. An arrest is classified as (1) those persons(s) arrested and released without a formal charged being placed against them, (2) juveniles taken into custody or arrested but merely warned and released without being charged, and (3) any situation where a person is summoned or cited to appear in court in lieu of going to jail.

Referred for Disciplinary Action: the referral of any person to any official who initiates a disciplinary action of which a record is established, and which may result in the imposition of a sanction. For a disciplinary action to occur, an official must initiate a disciplinary action process, a record must be established, and the action may result in a sanction.

Classifying law violations

Weapons: Carrying, Possessing, etc.: the violation of laws or ordinances prohibiting the manufacture, sale, purchase, transportation, possession, concealment, or

use of firearm, cutting instruments, explosives, incendiary devices or other deadly weapons.

Drug Abuse Violations: the violations of laws prohibiting the production, distribution and/or use of certain controlled substances and the equipment or devices utilized in their preparation and/or use. The unlawful cultivation, manufacture, distribution, sale, purchase, use possession, transportation, or importation of any controlled drug or narcotic substance.

Liquor Law Violations: the violation of state or local laws or ordinances prohibiting their manufacture, sale, purchase, transportation, possession, or use of alcoholic beverages, not including driving under the influence and drunkenness.

Appendix B: IRB Approval



Oct 18, 2022 9:16:06 AM EDT

Christopher Bellas
Cr Just & Cons Sciences 141212

Re: Exempt - Initial - 2023-48 Understanding the Connection Between Public Colleges with and without Campus Police Departments and their Crime Rates based on Clery Act Reporting

Dear Dr. Christopher Bellas:

Youngstown State University Human Subjects Review Board has rendered the decision below for Understanding the Connection Between Public Colleges with and without Campus Police Departments and their Crime Rates based on Clery Act Reporting

Decision: Exempt

Any changes in your research activity should be promptly reported to the Institutional Review Board and may not be initiated without IRB approval except where necessary to eliminate hazard to human subjects. Any unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects should also be promptly reported to the IRB.

Findings: This is a study of post-secondary institutions and their crime rate based on whether or not they have a dedicated police department. The researchers are using Clery Act data which they provided a link for and is available on the internet. This meets the parameters of an exempt study using pre-existing data.

The IRB would like to extend its best wishes to you in the conduct of this study.

Sincerely,
Youngstown State University Human Subjects Review Board

Appendix C: Conceptual Model

Conceptual Model

