Community Policing: University Input Into Campus Police Policy-Making

Robert Trojanowicz
Bruce Benson
Susan Trojanowicz

National Center for Community Policing
School of Criminal Justice
Michigan State University

MSU is an affirmative-action, equal opportunity institution.

(#) denotes endnote numbers

Acknowledgments

Introduction

This booklet reports on a survey done by the School of Criminal Justice and the Department of Public Safety at Michigan State University with funding from the National Neighborhood Foot Patrol Center, School of Criminal Justice at Michigan State University.

Few police departments conduct surveys of the citizens they serve. Of those that have undertaken such efforts, the surveys are usually designed to find out how residents assess police performance. While such "satisfaction" surveys are indeed commendable, not only because of the information they provide but because they foster citizen involvement, these surveys only provide a yardstick of existing police performance -and a yardstick compared to what? In other words, surveys designed to measure satisfaction provide no opportunity for citizens to express their model of the ideal.

Police today, with their increasing reliance on technology, risk being perceived as aloof. All too often, they are viewed as reactive, responding only when problems occur. And this perceived aloofness can provide citizens with an excuse for apathy. What this survey provides is a proactive approach, an outreach that encourages citizens to participate in finding ways to confront their role in solving crime and improving the quality of life in their community.

The survey itself consisted of a questionnaire developed by members of the Department of Public Safety at Michigan State University and the School of Criminal Justice (Appendix A). It was distributed to 3,166 members of the Michigan State University community. A total of 904 (29%) were returned and analyzed. The survey asked residents:

- how much police attention 11 common offenses deserve
- which five of 10 crimes listed require top investigative priority
- which six of 12 community-oriented services police provide should receive top priority
- what citizens feel are their responsibilities in dealing with crime - how six major activity areas of the Department of Public Safety should be ranked
- whether the individuals surveyed have been victims of crime
- to rate the overall service of the Department of Public Safety
- whether respondents personally knew a DPS officer
- what the strengths and weaknesses of DPS are
- for recommendations for improving public safety at Michigan State University.

A Review of Typical Community Surveys

Most surveys ask citizens to rate existing police performance. In many cases, the researchers then analyze the data based on characteristics of the populations surveyed, usually in terms of race, age, income, sex, or victimization - or some combination of these factors.

Other studies tend to focus on police-citizen interaction, assessing satisfaction as a result of police-citizen contact or on the response time of police in citizen-initiated contacts. A few studies focus on other variables, such as whether the perceived professionalism of police influenced satisfaction, or on more specific questions concerning police functions. It should be noted that some of the studies reported below are as old as 1967.

Multi-variable surveys - A number of far-reaching studies attempted to look at citizen satisfaction in relation to a number of individual attributes of the respondents. For example, James Garofalo conducted research in eight large cities participating in the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration's High-Impact Crime Reduction Program: Atlanta, Baltimore, Cleveland, Dallas, Denver, Newark, Portland, and St. Louis. The 1972 US Bureau of the Census survey shows the vast majority (82%) of respondents thought police performance ranged from fair to good, while only 12% rated police performance as poor.

In terms of income, 43% of those with the lowest family income rated police performance as good, compared to 54% of those with the highest income. A weaker correlation was evident concerning victimization. Most studies show victims rate police performance lower than nonvictims, and this study confirmed that 46% of nonvictims rated police performance positively, while only 40% of victims did so.

Besides these personal attributes, the study also analyzed attitudes, specifically whether respondents who believed the crime rate was increasing viewed police performance differently than their counterparts who did not think the crime rate was going up. Though the relationship was somewhat weak, this study did show that those who think crime is on the increase tended to rate police performance lower.

Interestingly, this comprehensive study also asked respondents whether police performance could be improved and how this could be accomplished. While 68% indicated a need for improvement, blacks more often indicated this was true compared to whites. Also, whites favored improving police performance by adding more officers, while blacks felt improving response time was the key. Of note is that age played a role in this question, with respondents 16 through 49 years old consistently indicating police performance needed improvement. This figure dips among those 50 through 64 years old, then it falls substantially among those 65 years old and older.[1]

A survey of more than 5,000 residents of St. Louis in 1977 showed that 92% of the respondents evaluated police positively, while 78% considered police integrity to be fair. Researcher Paul R. Benson again found that, regardless of race, social class, degree of political alienation, or belief in police integrity, those who believe the crime rate is increasing were more critical of police service than those who did not. Benson also found lower socioeconomic respondents tended to rate police negatively more often than those who are in the middle or upper socioeconomic classes, regardless of other factors. Nonwhites also were more likely to be critical of police performance, and this was especially accentuated among nonwhites who also believed police were dishonest or unequal in their treatment of citizens.[2]

More than 3,000 residents of Virginia returned surveys in 1973 and 1974 that showed 78% felt the police were doing an effective job and deserved thanks. Charles W. Thomas and Jeffrey M. Hyman reported that 66% did not feel police were discriminatory and 82% perceived police as respectful. Only 9% thought police were too willing to use force and violence.

This survey showed that residents outside the inner city, whites, older, better educated, males, and the wealthy were more favorable in their responses than their respective counterparts. Fear of crime and victimization were slightly more negative than others in the evaluation.[3]

Ilana Hadar and John R. Snortum surveyed both police officers (52) and suburban residents (202) in communities east of Los Angeles in 1975 and found that white respondents not only rated greater satisfaction with police, but they rated policemen as more active than blacks did. Age also played a role, with younger residents being more critical of police overall and rating them as less active than older residents. Males were

also more positive than females. Of note as well is that whites, older persons, and females also set more stringent standards for Police Performance. [4]

Ethnic surveys. - Many studies also focused specifically on how various ethnic groups rated police performance.[5] Some studies were targeted exclusively toward examining black perceptions of police performance. For instance, Angus Campbell and Howard Schuman in 1970 surveyed more than 5,000 blacks and whites in 15 major cities concerning their perceptions and attitudes toward police. According to their findings, blacks are far more likely than whites to feel their neighborhoods do not receive prompt police attention. Blacks also reported they felt they were more likely to experience incidents of police disrespect. While most whites did not feel police frisked or searched people without good cause, a majority of blacks disagreed. More than a third of blacks reported police unnecessarily rough people up, while fewer than one in 10 whites said so. Reports of unfavorable experiences with police were clearly more numerous among young people of both races.[6]

A 1975 survey attempted to identify differences in perceptions of the police between black street people (117) and black householders (176) in a Midwestern city. Two of five black householders reported police-initiated contact, while black street respondents reported even higher rates. While one of three householders rated police service as poor, this figure rose to 47% among black street respondents. Also of note was that when householders initiated contact by calling police, it tended to increase their negativity toward police. Among street blacks, the reverse was true. [7]

A comprehensive survey by Herbert Jacob compared responses from 73 residents in a black ghetto neighborhood with 74 residents of a white working-class neighborhood and 77 residents of a middle-class suburb in Milwaukee, Wisconsin based on interviews done in 1969. The results showed blacks perceived police as more corrupt, more unfair, more excitable, harsher, tougher, weaker, lazier, less intelligent, less friendly, more cruel, and more bad than good than did whites. Middle-class whites also gave more favorable ratings than working-class whites, though whites ranked closer to each other than to blacks.

The survey also showed two-fifths of blacks had been stopped by the police at least once and had called police for assistance, while among working-class whites, more contacts were initiated by the citizens and fewer had been arrested or stopped. Middle-class whites were more likely to have had police contact as a result of auto accidents, followed by calls for assistance. Ghetto blacks' dissatisfaction with police response was four times higher when compared to residents, of the other areas, and, in regard to arrest, ghetto blacks reported dissatisfaction five times more often. Overall, satisfactory experiences with police did not improve the individual's evaluation of police, but bad experiences increased negativity.[8]

Another survey focusing on combined racial and economic indicators involved surveying 270 black residents of a ghetto in Detroit in 1971. Harlan Hahn found that 81% of the respondents failed to express any favorable assessment of police behavior. Approximately nine of 10 said most Detroit policemen were not totally honest in the performance of their duties. Slightly more than half also said police treated blacks and whites differently. A third said police discriminated between home-owners and renters.[9]

Other surveys that showed a high correlation between race and attitudes toward police were not structured specifically with that focus as the goal, but the results verified the important role race plays in assessing police satisfaction. A major survey of half the 10,000 households contacted by the US Census Bureau in 13 large cities in 1975 done by Wesley G. Skogan found that the strongest individual determinant of how people assess police performance was race; cities with more blacks were routinely less favorable toward police. For instance, 51 % of Chicago's whites but only 14% of blacks rated police favorably. In Los Angeles, the gap was 59% to 24%; St. Louis, 61% versus 29%; Philadelphia, 56% vs. 22%. The other cities reported similar gaps. Therefore, the more blacks in any city, the more likely the overall results showed less satisfaction with police.[10]

Some surveys looked at other minorities. A 1969 study by David R. Bayley and Harold Mendelsohn sampled 806 citizens in Denver, Colorado (336 whites, 234 blacks, and 236 Spanish-named). The survey confirmed that, while 54% of whites felt the reputation of police in their neighborhoods was high, only 22% of blacks and 31% of Spanish-named residents said this was true for their neighborhoods, While only 5% of whites said that cooperating with police was "just asking for trouble," 21% of blacks and 22% of Spanish- named citizens agreed with that statement." [11]

A 1976 survey of 800 local voters in the city and county of Denver confirmed, those findings, with 43% of whites reporting the police did a good job patrolling their neighborhoods, while only 28% of Mexican-Americans and 12% of blacks expressed satisfaction. [12]

The studies also examined attitudes of Hispanics. David L. Carter conducted two surveys in Texas, one in 1983 involving 312 Hispanics and another in 1985 of 500 Hispanics. In essence, the 1983 study showed that Hispanics do not believe that the police can significantly affect criminal incidents. The later study showed that any contact with police tended to lower the rating of police performance. [13,14] In 1981, Alfredo Mirande surveyed 170 residents of a southern California barrio that showed only 1% rated community relations as excellent, with 48% rating relations as poor. In addition, more citizens put the police department performance in the below-average or poor category than in the good or excellent category. [15]

Other individual attribute surveys - A Canadian survey of 1,816 households done in 1977 showed age and sex were both correlated with satisfaction toward police performance, with younger people and males more likely to rate police lower. In addition, the survey also examined personal experience and determined that those who had negative contacts with police or heard about such experiences from others reported less satisfaction with police. [16]

A 1967 survey of 511 randomly selected adults in the District of Columbia not only confirmed a correlation between perceived police performance and race, but the study also determined that pro-police sentiment was more common among females than males. [17]

Victimization surveys - A number of surveys looked exclusively at how victims differed from nonvictims in terms of their perceptions of the police, while other surveys were able to break out this analysis from the overall results. Half the 858 residents of London, England, surveyed in 1979 were victims, while the other half were not. Overall, the survey found that all groups rated police performance high, with 83% checking the very good or good categories. The one-fourth who reported dissatisfaction with local police most often said their primary complaint was that there were not enough police patrolling.

Looking only at victims, the survey showed victimization was associated with expressed dissatisfaction with local police. Victims were more likely than nonvictims to think that police did only a fair or poor job, were unfair, and that they should spend more time on serious crimes and community relations.

Most victims said their dissatisfaction was the result of their experience as a victim. The major complaint (41%) was that the police did not take their victimization seriously enough. Approximately 7% said they felt the police had not believed them and 7% also said they were unhappy because the police failed to make an arrest or recover their property. Of 131 respondents who said they had reported a crime, 28%, slightly more than one in .four, expressed dissatisfaction because they never heard from the police again. Dissatisfaction with their specific situation correlated with disapproval of police in general, according to this survey. [18]

Almost 4,000 St. Louis area residents were surveyed in 1976 by Roger B. Parks, and the analysis of victimization again showed this population rated police performance lower. Victims were more likely to believe crime was increasing and less likely to say that police would arrive rapidly when called. Nonvictims gave the most favorable responses to police service, police-community relations, police honesty, police courtesy, and

equal treatment by police. Next most favorable responses came from those who were victimized outside their neighborhoods, and the least favorable response came from those who had been victimized in their own areas.

As in the English survey, victims who were dissatisfied with how police responded to their own situation were much more negative in their evaluations. The survey also showed that response time played a strong role. Even stronger, however, was the relationship between the actions taken by police and the victim's satisfaction. Efforts that enhanced satisfaction included: filling out reports, questioning subjects, checking premises, and recovering property. [19]

Theodore H. Poister and James C. McDavid reported in 1978 on interviews done in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, that targeted 111 incidents that involved interaction between police and victims. The interviews showed that satisfaction levels among victims were higher among those who had suffered the most serious types of crime, Part I (person) crimes. Victims of both Part I (property) crimes and Part II crimes reported demonstrably less satisfaction. -Though not statistically significant, victims reported greater satisfaction when they perceived the police conducted a general investigation or dealt with a suspect (59%), as opposed to when police just talked with victims or asked questions (42%). Making an arrest or providing follow-up also added to satisfaction. Concerning socioeconomic variables, only income was significantly associated with victim satisfaction. The survey showed that satisfaction with the way police handled incidents declined as income rose. Of note as well is that satisfaction with police performance tended to decline beyond the initial contact. In other words, satisfaction was higher concerning the initial investigation than with succeeding efforts. A regression analysis showed that overall satisfaction was directly dependent on the type of crime and perceived response time. [20]

Of interest in the 1970 survey conducted by the National Opinion Research Center was that victims who did not call police expressed the highest levels of dissatisfaction. Those who called police but then police failed to arrive, of course, mostly expressed dissatisfaction. Again, an arrest lowered the dissatisfaction level. [21]

Police contact/response time surveys- Surveys that examined police contact often but not always involved victims. In 1980, Stephen L. Percy surveyed 1,676 citizens who had recent contacts with police and found that the majority reported the police arrived very rapidly when called. The majority rated police service as outstanding or very good, while only 8% rated police service as inadequate or very poor. Percy found that perceived response time correlated with satisfaction. Again, when a suspect was arrested, this tended to increase victim satisfaction.

Of those who had not been victimized but who called police for assistance or because of a disturbance, wealthier citizens reported higher rates of satisfaction. Comforting or reassuring citizens also had a strong, positive impact on satisfaction. [22]

Approximately 4,000 St. Louis residents were interviewed concerning police performance in 1972, and of those who had been victims, there was a negative association with police performance. Quick response time again correlated significantly with increased satisfaction. Citizen evaluation had low association with the clearance rate and with the size of the department. [23]

A specific study of response time gleaned from four surveys done in Kansas City during 1972 and 1973 showed the majority of citizens were satisfied with police response time, with whites more satisfied than blacks and older people more satisfied than the young. In addition, whites and older people overall expressed more general satisfaction with police. [24]

A 1980 survey of 273 citizens in four different kinds of neighborhoods (low-income black; low-income white; racially mixed by predominantly black low-income; and white upper-middle-class) in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, showed that evaluation of service in calls made to police was the single most important determinant of general attitudes toward police. Race was the second most important factor. [25]

Unique or narrow surveys- Other studies examined how police professionalism influenced citizen satisfaction. Of note is a 1973 survey of 284 residents of five cities in Florida that showed professionalism was negatively correlated with citizen satisfaction. Richard Chackerian and Richard F. Barrett found that the more professional jurisdictions fared more poorly in the public eye than less professionalized counterparts. Chackerian and Barrett also found that citizen perception that police rely on force correlated positively with satisfaction.[26] On the other hand, a study of 217 citizens who had called police in 1979 showed that more highly educated officers received better citizen ratings, while number of months in the department or the age of the officer had no effect. The study also showed officers who appeared personally concerned about the citizen's problem also received higher ratings.[27] From 95 questionnaires returned from residents of Youngstown, Ohio, Daniel J. Bell found that citizens said members of the police organization are inadequately trained and that professionally unaware officers are attempting to perform a difficult task without well-defined procedures. The citizens also reported police lack adequate planning and delegation of responsibilities to qualified personnel. While they evaluated police service positively, they indicated personnel development needs attention.[28]

A survey on police honesty and competence conducted in a small college community showed that 82% felt officers were honest in general, yet almost a third said at least some officers would take a bribe on a minor offense. With regard to competence, 84% said most police are competent, but more than half agreed with the statement that criminals go free because police do not do their jobs correctly. About 58% also said the police often use the third degree to get confessions. And more than two of three said that police sometimes frisk and search without good reason. [29]

Another unique study, based on data from the ABC News Poll on crime compiled from a nationwide telephone survey of 2,447 adults in 1982, showed that 57% of respondents said police should respond only to calls for help where the caller says there is a crime or suspected crime. However, a majority of blacks said police should respond to all calls. Also of interest was that respondents with knowledge of a victimization in their neighborhoods during the past year were more favorable toward narrowing the police role to that of crime fighter. [30]

A survey of 418 community leaders from Alma County, California, concerning police policy-making, examined the different kinds of roles they want police to play in the daytime versus the nighttime. During the day, the respondents favored a highly visible, nonmechanical form of patrol and foot patrols. At night, respondents preferred routine business and residential area patrols, with the most experienced officers on duty. The results showed they were neutral concerning use of foot patrols at night. Use of a helicopter, whether during the day or at night, was controversial. The highest priorities overall were on violent crime, juvenile drug abuse, and nighttime crime patrol.[31]

As is evident, while typical surveys most often examine overall satisfaction with police, many surveys take different approaches and examine ,various factors that can influence attitudes toward police performance. Few, however, offer any guidance concerning how to set priorities for future police policy-making.

The Need for Such a Survey

In essence, the major challenge facing police departments today is finding ways to do more with less. This past decade, all public agencies, including the police, have found themselves trapped in a frustrating vise. On the input side, police must cope with declining revenues, which means they must perform their duties with decreased personnel and fewer resources. Yet, on the output side, police face increasing demands from communities to provide more and better services. In addition, many police administrators and political leaders feel that taxpayers do not understand this new dilemma and also that many of today's problems are beyond police control.

For instance, this past decade has marked a whole new era of problems concerning the homeless. Not only has there been a dramatic upsurge in the number of homeless, as funds for government-subsidized housing continue

to decline, but also in the composition of this dispossessed class. A decade ago, most homeless were derelicts - primarily alcoholics and drug addicts. Then, great numbers of "mainstreamed" mental patients joined their ranks, creating chaos on the streets in many communities. Today, a recent study confirms that, in some communities, families constitute half the homeless seeking shelter. Many of this new class came from the ranks of the unemployed. Yet one in five of these families contains a wage-earner who still cannot afford housing.[32] The decline in public-supported housing coincides with the shift still underway from high-paid production jobs that often demanded few skills to lower-paying jobs in the growing service economy that ironically tend to require greater education and more skills.

In addition, many believe that the welfare system fosters dependence and hopelessness among great numbers of recipients. Not only does this situation breed crime, but also disorder. And decreased resources coupled with increased demand have made it necessary for police to involve citizens more intensely in the prevention and solving of crime and the lowered quality-of-life that stems from disorder.

How the Department of Public Safety (DPS) Can Use the Survey

Information is the lifeblood of police work. And information from citizens only flows as the result of a process that begins first with contact. Contact then leads to communication and communication builds trust. Only when trust has been established can information flow.

If the survey had served only to establish contact between the police department and the citizens it serves, it would have been worthwhile in providing that crucial first step that can help foster a climate of trust that leads to sharing information. However, the DPS expects to use the survey in many other ways as well.

Obviously, of course, the information generated in the survey is of primary importance as a source of valuable input for future policy-making decisions. While some might argue most findings are no more than common sense, the fact is that, when it comes to making tough decisions, defining what constitutes common sense often proves difficult. And even if everyone agrees, common sense cannot prevail without political will.

Department of Public Safety Community Survey

A total of 3,166 questionnaires were distributed to students, faculty, and staff at Michigan State University. There were 904 returned (29%). The purpose of the survey was to solicit direct input from the respondents to see what they felt were important priorities for the Department of Public Safety.

The survey asked students, faculty, and staff such questions as how they would prioritize specific offenses, where they feel the Department should concentrate its investigative efforts, which police services deserve the highest priority, what role citizens should play in assisting police, how they would rank six activities within DPS, and whether the respondent had been a victim of crime. The survey also asked respondents to rate DPS, list its strengths and weaknesses, and make recommendations for improvements.

Results

Sixty-six percent of the respondents were female and 34% male. Thirty two percent were students, 19% faculty, and 49% staff. Sixty-eight percent did not reside on campus, while 32% did. Ninety-one percent were white 6% were black, and 3% Hispanic.

Question 1. Survey question number one asked respondents how much attention should be given to 11 different types of offenses. Results have been ranked beginning with those that respondents most often said required much attention to those respondents felt deserved the least attention.

```
        Much                        Not
      Attention    Some    Little  Checked
```

Sexual Assaults. . . .	95.1	2.2%	.7%	2.0%
Burglaries.	74.9	20.1	.9	4.1
Robberies	76.4	17.5	1.8	4.3
Property Destruction. ..	62.7	32.0	1.9	3.4
Auto Theft	62.2	29.5	3.2	5.1
Office/Residence Theft. .	56.5	35.4	3.4	4.6
Drug/Alcohol Enforcement. . . .	50.6	34.6	11.8	3.0
Theft of Car Parts . .	38.1	46.2	10.3	5.4
Moped/Bicycle Thefts. .	35.0	48.2	12.7	4.1
Traffic Violations . . .	26.0	50.2	19.5	4.3
Loud Parties.	16.9	52.0	27.9	3.2

Discussion: Over-all, the results show that the respondents are very concerned about sexual assaults as well as burglaries and robberies. Respondents did not feel loud parties deserved as much attention.

Subgroups: In terms of subgroup differences, the following offenses had at least a 5% difference between females and males.

	Females (much attention)	Males (much attention)
Property Destruction.	65.5%	59.3%
Auto Theft.	65.3	57.9
Drug and Alcohol Enforcement . . .	53.8	45.7

A greater percentage of females felt much attention should be paid to the above three offenses.

Students, faculty, and staff, were differentiated with at least a 5% difference when asked to categorize the following offenses:

	Students (much attention)	Faculty (much attention)	Staff (much attention)
Burglaries	71.7%	78.4%	77.4%
Property Destruction	57.3	69.8	64.2
Traffic Violations	16.8	34.6	29.8
Robberies	73.8	77.2	79.3
Office/Residential Theft	55.6	62.3	53.5
Theft of Car Parts	36.0	35.8	41.6
Loud Parties	15.0	25.9	15.1
Moped/Bicycle Theft	38.8	39.5	31.3
Drug/Alcohol Enforcement	40.2	53.7	58.2

As would be expected, the various groups that are affected the most have higher percentage ratings for the particular offenses. For example, faculty are more concerned about property destruction, office theft, and loud parties. Students are not as concerned as faculty and staff about property destruction, traffic violations, loud parties, and drug/alcohol enforcement.

Whether respondents reside on campus also makes a difference.

	Resident (much attention)	NonResident (much attention)
Property Destruction	54.6%	67.5%
Traffic Violations	17.1	30.3

Robberies	72.1	79.6
Moped/Bicycle Theft	40.0	33.8
Drug/Alcohol Enforcement	42.5	55.6

Obviously, the vast majority of the on-campus residents are students, and the differences between resident and nonresident responses are reflective of the student age group. Residents, for example, are less concerned about property destruction, traffic violations, and drug/alcohol enforcement but are more concerned about moped/bicycle theft.

Differences were also reflected depending on the respondent's racial/ethnic background.

	Black (much attention)	Hispanic (much attention)	White (much attention)
Burglaries	77.1%	81.0%	75.3%
Property Destruction	60.4	47.6	63.8
Auto Theft	64.6	42.9	62.8
Traffic Violations	16.7	28.6	26.7
Robberies	70.8	81.0	77.7
Office/Residential Theft	56.3	47.6	57.5
Sexual Assault	85.4	95.2	96.8
Theft of Car Parts	39.6	33.3	37.5
Loud Parties	8.3	28.6	16.7
Drug/Alcohol Enforcement	56.3	76.2	50.3

As indicated above, there are variations by race/ethnic background; but it should be noted that there are many more white respondents, thus greatly enlarging the sample of whites.

Question 2: This question asked residents to pick five of 10 crimes as those where the Department of Public Safety should concentrate its investigative efforts. Results show the percentage of residents who picked the specific crime as being among the top five deserving attention:

```
Sexual Assault . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .. . . 98.2%
Assault and Battery . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 89.1
Malicious Destruction of Property. . . . . . .76.4
Child Neglect & Abuse . . . . . . . . . . . . 67.9
Drug/Alcohol Violations . . . . . . . . . . . 51.6
Auto & Auto Parts Thefts . . . . . . . . . . .42.7
Simple Theft . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .22.6
Credit Card Fraud and Check Forgery . . . . . 16.8
Moped/Bicycle Theft. . . . . . . . . . . . . .15.8
Concealing Stolen Property. . . . . . . . . . 11.0
```

DISCUSSION: The above, obviously, shows that respondents are concerned about sexual assaults and assault and battery, with malicious destruction of property and child abuse and neglect being mentioned by over two-thirds of the respondents. Over 50% also mentioned drug/alcohol violations as priorities.

Subgroups: The greatest difference between females and males was in the higher priority given by females to child neglect and abuse.

	Females	Males
Simple Theft.	19.7%	27.7%
Credit Card Fraud and Check Forgery	18.5	13.5
Concealing Stolen Property . .	8.9	15.2

```
Drug/Alcohol Violations . . . . 53.9          46.9
Child Neglect and Abuse. . . . .71.4          61.1
```

There are some differences between students, faculty, and staff with students being more concerned than faculty and staff about moped/bicycle theft and less concerned with drug/alcohol violations.

```
                                 Students    Faculty    Staff

Credit Card Fraud and
     Check Forgery. . . . . . . .  20.2%       9.8%
16.9%
Moped/Bicycle Theft. . . . . . . . 23.6       14.1
9.5
Malicious Destruction
     of Property. . . . . . . . .  73.4       80.4       76.8
Concealing Stolen Property . . . . 13.3        8.0       10.3
Auto and Auto Parts Theft . . . .  39.9       41.1       45.8
Drug/Alcohol Violations. . . . . . 40.6       52.1       58.2
```

There are differences by racial/ethnic background, but again the reader should be cautioned that there are great variations in sample size between the three groups.

```
                          Black      Hispanic    White

Simple Theft              16.7%        9.5%       22.8%
Assault and Battery       85.4        95.2        89.7
Credit Card Fraud and
     Check Forgery        12.5        14.3        17.6
Malicious Destruction
     of Property          72.9        85.7        76.4
Concealing Stolen Property 12.5        4.8        10.4
Auto and Auto Parts Theft 43.8        28.6        42.6
Drug and Alcohol Violations 60.4      66.7        50.8
Child Neglect and Abuse   66.7        81.0        68.4
```

Question 3: This survey question asked residents to choose the six most important types of services of the 12 public-service-oriented services that police departments provide.

```
Investigation of All Vehicle Accidents. . . . . . . . . .78.9%
Assisting Stranded Motorists . . . . . . . . . . . . . .76.4
Teaching Sexual Assault Prevention Programs . . . . . . . 76.0
Office Buildings/Residence Halls Security Inspectors. . .69.9
Teaching Crime Prevention . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .58.5
Checking the Welfare of Residents . . . . . . . . . . . .50.7
Deliver Emergency Messages. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .42.4
Assist People Locked Out of Their Cars. . . . . . . . . .42.4
Assist People Locked Out of Their Homes or Offices. . . .25.7
Home Security Checks for Vacationers. . . . . . . . .. . 24.5
Pick Up Found Property . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .. . .16.4
Vehicle Safety Inspections. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 15.1
```

DISCUSSION: As can be seen from the Prioritization of the service activities, the top four are clustered together, with 70% or more mentioning investigation of vehicle accidents, assisting stranded motorists, teaching sexual assault prevention programs, and providing office buildings and residence halls security inspections. All of the categories except pick up found property and vehicle safety inspection were mentioned by at least 25% of the respondents.

Subgroups: There was very little difference by gender on the prioritization of service activities .

```
                      Female      Male
```

```
Home Security Checks . . . . . . 22.6%
27.8%
Assist People Locked Out
      of Cars . . . . . . . . . . 44.5          38.1
```
There were also not many differences by work status. Only two categories showed much difference; that was when students are compared with faculty on assisting people locked out of their homes or offices and when faculty are compared to staff on teaching crime prevention.

	Students	Faculty	Staff
Pick Up Found Property.	26.8%	11.1%	11.1%
Investigation of Vehicle Accidents.	74.3	81.5	81.7
Teaching Crime Prevention.	58.8	51.2	61.3
Assisting People Locked Out of Their Homes or Offices.	25.0	34.0	22.6
Assisting Stranded Motorists.	76.1	71.6	78.4

Whether a respondent was a resident only made a difference in two categories.

	Residents	Nonresidents
Pick Up Found Property.	28.4%	11.1%
investigation of Vehicle Accidents.	74.1	81.0

Even though there were differences in all of the service activity categories when race/ethnic background was considered, it again should be emphasized that the sample of blacks and Hispanics was very small when compared to white/anglos.

Question 4: The fourth survey question asked residents to check as many of the seven items listed that they felt were their responsibility as a citizen in dealing with crime.

Reporting Crime 98.1%
Reporting Suspicious Activity 94.2
Assisting Victims Needing Help 93.3
Assisting Police Officers Needing Help 81.2
Participation in Community Policing Programs 51.5
Avoiding Involvement with Victims 4.6
Avoiding Involvement with Police 2.2

DISCUSSION: As would be expected, the vast majority of respondents would report crime and suspicious activity as well as assist victims and police. Over 50% would also participate in community policing programs.

Subgroups: There were no differences by gender, only two by work status (students, 90.5% on reporting suspicious activity vs. staff 96.6%, and participating in community policing programs, students 43.3% vs. faculty, 52.1%, and staff 56.4%), and two differences by whether the person was a resident.

	Resident	Nonresident
Reporting Suspicious Activity.	90.0%	96.4%
Participating in Community Policing Program.	45.5	54.0

Students and residents (which are basically one in the same) are less willing to participate in community policing programs. When comparisons are made by ethnic background, there are differences, but this, may be due to the variations in sample size.

Obviously it can be seen that most respondents feel it is their responsibility to report crime and suspicious activity as well as assist victims and police officers needing help. There is less commitment to participating in a community policing program.

Question 5: This question asked respondents to rank the following services:

Motor Vehicle Patrols
Community Policing Foot Patrols
Investigation of Complaints by Detectives
Crime Prevention Program
Drug and Alcohol Education and Enforcement
Canine Patrols

First priority was given to the following police functions:

	Frequency of Response	Percent
Motor Patrol 305		33.7
Community Policing 202		22.3
Investigation 155		17.1
Crime Prevention 99		11.0
Drug/Alcohol Education/		
Enforcement. 61		6.7
Canine Patrols. 34		3.8
No Response. 48		5.3
TOTAL 904		100.0

Discussion: Motor patrol ranks the highest, as would be expected in the first priority ranking. This does not, however, mean that the bottom two categories are unimportant or of little concern to the respondents. Obviously, in a forced choice situation, there will always be a first and a last choice.

Subgroups: When subgroups, i.e., by gender, role, residence, and racial/ethnic background, were asked to give their first priority, the rankings were not appreciably different from the total sample rankings.

Question 6: Question six asked respondents whether they had been a victim of crime on campus.

There were 26 different crimes reported, with the following being reported at least twice:

Crime	*Number*
Stolen Property (Theft)	97
Burglary (Office Work Area)	11
Malicious Property Damage	9
Theft of Auto Parts	7

Breaking and Entering of Auto	5
Robbery	4
Assault	4
Vandalism	4
Rape	3
Assault with Attempt to Do Bodily Harm	2
Hit and Run of a Parked Vehicle	2
Conversion	2
Auto Theft	2
Attempted Assault	2
Hit and Run Accident	2
Peeping Tom	2
Harassment	2

Discussion: Of the 904 respondents, 19.8% had been a victim of crime on campus. Seventy-nine percent of this group reported the crime to DPS.

Subgroups: A greater percentage of males (23.5%) than females (18.0%) were victims. Staff had the least victimization rate (16.9%) when compared to students (22.4%) and faculty (23.4%).

Respondents living on campus had a higher rate of victimization (26.3%) than nonresidents (16.6%) which makes sense because they would generally be on campus more hours of the day.

The victimization rate for blacks (20.8%) and whites (20.7%) is almost identical, while 4.8% of the small Hispanic sample reports being victimized.

Question 7: This question asked the respondents to rate the overall service of the MSU Department of Public Safety compared to other police departments they were familiar with.

Frequency	of response	Percent
No Answer. 94		10.4
Better. 225		24.9
Same 501		55.4
Worse 84		9.3
TOTAL. 904		100.0

Discussion: As the above indicates, almost 25% of the respondents rated DPS better, while 9.3% rated it worse.

Subgroups: Males, by 36.6% to 19.0%, rated DPS better while students rated DPS better by 19.2% versus faculty, 25. 1 % and staff 28.4%. Students also rated it worse by 16. 1 % compared to 7.2% for faculty and 5.7% for staff.

Noncampus residents (which are mainly staff and faculty) rated DPS better by 26.1% to 21.4% than did residents.

Whites (24.8%) and blacks (20.8%) were close in rating DPS better while the Hispanics said DPS was better by a 38.1%.

Question 8: Question eight asked respondents how well they personally knew a campus police officer.

Frequency	Percent

No Answer.	12	1.3
Very Well.	78	8.6
Moderately Well	50	5.5
Acquaintance Only	131	14.5
Do Not Know Any.	633	70.0
TOTAL	904	100.0

Discussion: The vast majority of respondents did not know any police officers.

Subgroups: Females knew officers less often (74.5%) than did males (60.8%). Students knew officers less often (81.5%) than did faculty (74.3%) and staff (60.9%). Residents of campus knew officers less often (78.3%) as compared to nonresidents (66.4%). Hispanics are the most unfamiliar with officers (81.0%) when compared to blacks (64.6%) and whites (69.8%).

In addition to the eight forced choice questions, respondents were given the opportunity to respond to open-ended questions.

Question 9: **What are the greatest *strengths* of the Department of Public Safety?**

There was a total of 632 responses to this question. Some of the 904 respondents did not make comments; others made several comments.

The comments have been placed in 18 categories, with the category having the most comments being number one and the rest appearing in descending order.

There was some arbitrariness in placing comments in a particular category, but the narrative illustrates areas of overlap.

1. *Response*

    A total of 117 comments related to good response; with statements like, "quickness to respond, efficient, prompt, easily accessible, speedy, ready to act anytime, rapid, dependable, available, easy to locate," being typical. "They always seem to be there in emergency situations."

2. *Attributes/Qualities of the Personnel*

    Eighty-seven (87) comments related to the positive attributes and qualities of the personnel. They were described as being fair, diplomatic, caring, dedicated, patient, polite, honest, nonthreatening, friendly, available, concerned, dependable, professional, exuding pride. courteous, committed to the job, accessible, patient, firm but fair, cooperative, presentable appearance, kind, and efficient. It was also mentioned that they take minor complaints seriously and are interested in doing a good job while using good judgment.

3. *Visibility*

    There were 63 comments about the visibility of DPS officers. "They are present at all times; they are everywhere, always available." Also, their visibility was not perceived as limited to public streets; comments like "we see them everywhere including events" were common.

4. *Programs and Activities*

Sixty (60) of the comments related to the programs and activities that DPS has instituted. In particular, three programs were mentioned many times: Dial-a-Ride, Traffic Control, and Assault/Crime Prevention Programs. DPS is perceived as very efficient in directing traffic during events and in giving traffic citations to persons speeding and endangering others. Their work in preventing assaults through education as well as undercover operations was also mentioned several times. Their effectiveness in dealing with special events ranging from concerts to Cedarfest was mentioned in the positive vein many times. "They are more in touch with their community than other police forces."

5. *Competency, Knowledge and Education*

There were 60 comments in this category and some of the statements overlapped with category 2, Attributes/Qualities of the Personnel. Mentioned the most times was the high education of the DPS officers. Also mentioned was their intelligence, thoroughness, reliability, reasoning, communication skills, competency, and ability to handle a wide variety of situations. Of special note were the several positive comments made about the officers handling of Cedarfest.

6. *Ticketing Parking Violators*

Fifty (50) comments were made that related to ticketing parking violators. Although some of the comments were negative, i.e., "they sure are a lot better at giving out parking tickets than catching rapists," there was appreciation for the need to control illegal parkers so that those with proper stickers are not disadvantaged.

7. *Service and Helpfulness*

Forty-one (41) comments complimented DPS on its service and helpfulness. Helping people in all types of situations was mentioned: emergencies, locked out of residence, locked out of car, retrieving stolen property, following up on complaints, policing accidents, and dealing with victims. "They have a service attitude."

8. *Patrols*

Thirty-nine (39) comments related to the DPS strength of patrol, motor, foot, and canine. Seventeen were positive about canine patrols, 13 were positive comments about motor patrol, and 9 were positive comments about foot patrol.

9. *Campus Location*

There were 31 positive comments about the campus location and the fact that DPS only has to deal with university problems and not other city or county problems. Also, it was mentioned that the campus unlike an inner city, is a nice place to live and police; the community is generally cooperative as well as affluent. Because of the relative small size of the university community, it was felt that the service can be more, effectively personalized.

10. *Professionalizing*

Twenty-eight (28) comments related to the high professionalism ethics of DPS employees. Obviously, there is overlap between this category and categories 2, 5, and 7. Comments were made that related to the professional operation of the department and the employees' dedication to high quality service.

11. *Public Relations*

There were 15 comments that focused on the positive relations between the DPS and the University community, with a special emphasis on the positive communication and public relations approaches that DPS uses.

12. *Resources*

Fifteen (15) comments pointed out that DPS is fortunate to have adequate number of staff as well as the support and resources needed to deliver services.

13. *Emergency Telephones*

Seven (7) comments related to the emergency telephones. "They are readily available, easy to use, convenient, and effective, especially in emergencies."

14. *Drunk Drivers*

The effectiveness in handling drunk drivers was commented on (5) times. Also related was the effective controlling of drunks at various events.

15. *New Director*

Four (4) positive comments were made about the new director of DPS stating that he was a positive force in providing leadership to the department.

16. *Low Profile*

Four (4) commentors thought it was positive that DPS takes a low profile, avoiding controversy.

17. *The Survey*

Four (4) comments related to the positive step the DPS took by conducting the survey. They felt it showed concern for the people in the university community.

18. *Female/Minority Officers*

Two (2) comments mentioned that it is positive that the DPS has female and minority officers.

The Strengths of the Department of Public Safety*

Category	No. of comments	% of Total
1. Response Time	117	18.5
2. Attributes/Qualities of Personnel	87	13.8
3. Visibility	63	10.0
4. Programs and Activities	60	9.5
5. Competency, Knowledge, and Education	60	9.5
6. Ticketing Parking Violators	50	8.0
7. Service and Helpfulness	41	6.5
8. Patrols	39	6.2
9. Campus Location	31	4.9
10. Professionalism	28	4.4
11. Public Relations	15	2.4
12. Resources	15	2.4
13. Emergency Telephones	7	1.1
14. Drunk Drivers	5	.7
15. New Director	4	.6
16. Low Profile	4	.6
17. The Survey	4	.6
18. Female/Minority Officers	2	.3
TOTAL	632	100.0

 * From the 904 respondents. there were 632 comments. Note: Some person made more than one comment. All comments were included.

Question l0: **What do you consider the greatest *weaknesses* of the Department of Public Safety?**
There was a total of 661 responses to this question. Some of the 904 respondents did not make comments, others made several comments.

The comments have been placed in 17 categories with the category having the most comments being number 1 and the rest appearing descending order.

There was some arbitrariness in placing comments in a particular category, but the narrative illustrates areas of overlap.

1. *Parking Tickets*

    The greatest number of negative comments, 176, were in this category. There was the general concern that there is overzealous enforcement of parking tickets, thus taking time away from other areas like personal safety, dorm thefts, drugs and alcohol in dorms, dorm destruction, speeding, and other serious moving violations. Commentors said concern should be with more serious matters and that too much time is spent on "busy work" and not enough on apprehending criminals crime prevention.
    Within this category there was also mention of towing as it relates to parking tickets.

2. *Resources - Personnel and Equipment*

The second most often mentioned weakness of DPS (103) is its lack of people power to perform all the tasks necessary in the diverse campus environment. Areas mentioned related to the lack of funding were the need for more training of staff and streamlined administrative procedures, especially as they relate to the vehicle office.

3. *Visibility*

The next most often mentioned concern was visibility of the officers (74). Many commentors mentioned that they seldom see an officer; thus, they don't have personal contact with them. It was mentioned that students don't see "the positive side" of the officers. Lack of evening patrols was also mentioned several times.

4. *Attitudes of Motor Vehicle Office Personnel*

Negative comments relative to the motor vehicle office totaled 61. The comments ranged from they are impolite, not helpful, overly authoritative, and inconsistent information given, to they are outright rude and intimidating. Also mentioned were long lines and insufficient staff.

5. *Public Relations/Public Opinion*

There were 55 comments made about negative public relations or a negative public opinion about DPS.
This category relates to categories number 1 and number 4 in that several comments focused on the vehicle office and parking enforcement.
There was the feeling that a more positive image should be projected for DPS, emphasizing the good things it does. The reputation of DPS is often based on parking ticket enforcement. It was felt there should be greater rapport and interaction with the media. In the same vein, it was felt that there should be more public education of the role, functions, and programs of DPS.

6. *Sexual Assaults*

There was concern expressed in 46 responses that sexual assaults are a serious problem. Suggestions included initiating rape prevention programs, more patrolling, and more resources focused on preventing sexual assaults. Also mentioned was the need for more investigation and apprehension of offenders, and more sensitivity to the issue from the females' perspective. Also, more assistance to women walking after dark was mentioned.

7. *Traffic Control*

Category 1 mentioned overzealous parking enforcement, whereas there were 36 comments about the lack of traffic control as it relates to more serious offenses like speeding, running red lights, and other offenses that endanger people. In addition, mention was also made of bicycles endangering people, "drivers and bikers get away with too much on campus." Speeding was the most often mentioned problem.
Related to traffic control were six comments that focused specifically on the need to enforce the pedestrians' right-of-way ordinance.

8. *Foot Patrol*

There were 31 comments related to the lack of foot patrol. It was felt that foot people could go in areas where autos cannot go. It was felt that foot patrols would also be useful in preventing or thwarting sexual assaults.

9. *Communication*

A total of 27 comments related to poor communication between DPS personnel and the public. There was a feeling that personnel don't want to talk to students; and hence, there is minimal positive personal contact. The feeling is that the DPS desires to stay aloof and removed from the community. There is even the perception that the relationship between students and DPS officers is adversarial, an "us versus them" attitude. Some DPS personnel give the impression that they don't want to listen. "They jump to hasty conclusions without having the facts."

10. *Response Time*

Twenty (20) comments related to poor response time. There is the feeling too much time elapses before there is a response. The lack of a perceived quick response indicates to some people that there is lack of caring and commitment to the job.

11. *Theft on Campus*

Eight (8) comments related to thefts and DPS's lack of ability to prevent them.

12. *Community Support*

Eight (8) comments said DPS needs more support from the community students, staff, faculty, and the administration. Support, it was felt would improve department morale.

13. *Drug and Alcohol Enforcement and Education*

There were five (5) comments that related to the need for more alcohol and drug enforcement and education.

14. *Minorities and Women Representation*

Three (3) comments related to the need for more minorities and women as DPS officers.

15. *Lighting*

Three (3) comments emphasized the need for better lighting on campus "Replacing burned out lights on the bridge, for example, appears to be slow" (Campus lighting is not a DPS function.)

16. *Prejudice*

Three (3) comments mentioned prejudice on the part of DPS personnel.

17. *Emergency Telephones*

Two (2) commentors said that there are not enough emergency telephones on campus.

The Weaknesses of the Department of Public Safety*

	Category	No. of Comments	% of total
1.	Parking Tickets	176	26.6
2.	Resources/Personnel Equipment	103	15.6
3.	Visibility	74	11.2
4.	Negative Attitudes of Motor Vehicle Officer	61	9.2
5.	Public Relations/Public Opinion	55	8.3
6.	Sexual Assaults	46	7.0
7.	Traffic Control	36	5.4
8.	Foot Patrol	31	4.7
9.	Communication	27	4.0
10.	Response Time	20	3.0
11.	Theft on Campus	8	1.2
12.	Community Support	8	1.2
13.	Drugs & Alcohol	5	.8
14.	Minorities & Women	3	.5
15.	Lighting	3	.5
16.	Prejudice	3	.5
17.	Emergency Phones	2	.3
	TOTAL	661	100.0

* From the 904 respondents, there were 611 comments.
Note: Some persons made more than one comment. All comments were included.

Question 11: What changes would you recommend to the Department of Public Safety in order to improve the public safety of the University community?

There were a total of 692 responses to this question. Some of the 904 respondents did not make comments; others gave several comments.

The comments have been placed in 17 categories with the category having the most comments being number 1 and the rest appearing in descending order.

There was some arbitrariness in placing comments in a particular category, but the narrative illustrates areas of overlap.

1. *Foot Patrols*

   The use of foot patrols was mentioned 130 times. Many of the comments related to having foot patrols at night, especially around classroom buildings and in areas where there is not good lighting. It was also mentioned that foot officers can navigate areas where automobiles cannot go. In addition, foot officers have better control of errant bicyclists; and they can better interact with students, staff, and faculty.

2. *Crime Prevention/Education*

   There were 96 comments concerning emphasizing crime prevention and education. Workshops, seminars, and other presentations were felt to be useful in educating people on how to protect themselves. Specific topics mentioned were sexual assault, self-defense, alcohol and drug abuse, party control, bicycle safety, property theft, and vandalism. In addition, it was felt that more education should be done in the dormitories and with all incoming students. The role of DPS should also be enunciated. Commentors felt the focus of DPS should be on serious crime, involving input from all segments of the community. Controlling "outsiders" access to buildings, especially dormitories, was also mentioned relative to improving campus safety.

   Also mentioned was putting burglar alarms in buildings and DPS selling items such as whistles which could be used for crime prevention and control. The distribution of written material was also felt to be useful.

3. *Patrol*

   Eighty-eight (88) comments related to increasing patrol other than foot patrol. Automobile, scooter, bike, canine, and horse patrols were mentioned. Areas and time of patrol included special events, the laundries in areas of high crime at night, isolated campus areas, areas poor lighting, dorms, parking lots, night classrooms, areas where "outsiders" congregate weekends, inside buildings, and parking ramps. The types of patrols, canine, horse, foot, bike, etc., should be matched to the particular problem area, for example, the use of horses in crowd control situations. The use of more unmarked cars was also mentioned as was more frequent and varied bus routes and schedules so people would be less likely to walk alone.

4. *Parking*

   There were 77 suggestions for improving parking. Many of the comments related to "lightening up" on minor parking infractions. Other suggestions were: increasing parking spaces, reducing fines, more focus on serious crimes and less on parking and more emphasis on "wild" bicycle riders, and vandalism. A typical comment was "spend less time on parking tickets and more time on more serious matters."

   [Note: Sworn officers generally do not write parking tickets, therefore a shift in manpower to more serious crimes is not possible.) It was also suggested that innovative ways be developed to deal with parking, such as allowing female students to park closer to the classroom buildings at night.

5. *Visibility*

   Comments related to increasing police visibility totaled 76. Obviously, this category relates to some of the already mentioned categories. Comments on visibility related to greater officer interaction with people, patrolling at night and in high crime areas, and being alert to "outsiders" who may be oriented toward deviant behavior.

6. *Resources*

Increasing resources was mentioned 45 times. Most of the comments related to increasing people power so that both existing services could be expanded and new services could be initiated. Other comments related to more equipment and additional funds for training personnel. An auxiliary core of volunteers who could fill in at peak times was also suggested.

7. *Public Relations*

Improving public relations was felt important as reflected by 44 comments. The comments ranged from officers interacting more with students, to the use of media to inform the public of both problems and services to merely communicating more with the various campus groups. An "open house" at DPS was also mentioned. As stated in another category (Crime Prevention/Education) the use of written materials like brochures and flyers would also be useful. Open forums and a campuswide committee were also suggested.

8. *Traffic*

Recommendations to improve traffic conditions were mentioned 38 times. Suggestions included dealing more effectively with rush hour traffic, curtailing students from driving on campus, eliminating mopeds, monitoring the speed limit, enforcing bicycle infractions, cracking down" on moving violations, and having student driver awareness programs.

9. *Attitude/Demeanor*

Twenty-nine (29) comments related to improving the attitude and demeanor o DPS personnel. Specifically, it was felt that DPS personnel should treat people in an unbiased fashion and that students should be treated as "real people." Improved courtesy from the vehicle office was mentioned several times. Better telephone courtesy was also suggested.

10. *Lighting*

Improved lighting was of such a concern that 25 comments were made about it. Improved lighting was suggested especially for sidewalks.

11. *Dial-a-Ride*

Dial-a-Ride was mentioned in 12 comments. It was felt that there should be more information distributed about Dial-a-Ride. More emergency telephones were also suggested.

12. *Pedestrian Rights*

Ten (10) comments were made for improving the safety of pedestrians **on** campus. The most often mentioned improvement was enforcing pedestrian right- of-ways at crosswalks.

13. *Drug/Alcohol Activities*

Seven (7) comments were made focusing on investigating drug and alcohol violations and the need for more alcohol/drug education.

14. *Females and Minorities*

Seven (7) comments related to increasing the numbers of females and minorities in DPS, especially as officers.

15. *Survey*

There were 3 comments about the survey. Two were positive. One comment criticized the construction of the questionnaire.

16. *Eliminating DPS*

Three (3) comments suggested eliminating DPS, and having the law enforcement functions assumed by adjoining police departments.

17. *Less Drug/Alcohol Education*

Two (2) commentors stated that there is too much emphasis on drug and alcohol education; and if there are such programs persons other than DPS officers should be the educators.

Recommended Changes to DPS to Improve Safety*

Category	No. of Comments	% of Total
1. Foot Patrols	130	19.0
2. Crime Prevention/Education	96	14.0
3. Patrol	88	13.0
4. Parking	77	11.2
5. Visibility	76	11.1
6. Resources	45	6.5
7. Public Relations	44	4.4
8. Traffic	38	5.5
9. Attitudes/Demeanor	29	4.2
10. Lighting	25	3.7
11. Dial-a-Ride	12	1.8
12. Pedestrian Rights	10	1.5
13. Drug/Alcohol Activities	7	1.0
14. Females and Minorities	7	1.0
15. Survey	3	.04
16. Eliminate DPS	3	.04
17. Less Drug/Alcohol Education	2	.02
TOTAL	692	100.0

Community Team Policing at Michigan State University

The survey has already served to support some recent decisions made even before the findings were available.

Successful community policing programs in various police departments have generated tremendous community support in their assigned neighborhoods, and have developed strong two-way ownership between officer and community. Recent studies have emphasized that "...the central feature of community policing - that of encouraging direct cooperation between citizens and the police - has the widest applications. Direct contact leads to better police/community relations, increased information exchange, and a more realistic assessment of and solution to community problems."[33]

It has occurred, however, that as some officers within a police department have prospered in their specialized community policing assignments, frictions have developed with other generalist officers working routine response and patrol. In Flint, Michigan, for example, the citywide Neighborhood Police Foot Patrol program was extremely popular and well- publicized, and accomplished worthwhile objectives for communities and police. Motorized patrol officers, however, began to view themselves as the overworked "real cops" burdened with traditional police response, while they saw foot patrol officers as prima donnas reaping all the public glory. At one point, motorized patrol officers referred to foot patrol officers as the "Wave and Grin Squad." Foot patrol officers, in turn, viewed themselves as the really concerned officers solving crime and tough long-range problems, and looked at motorized officers as "truck drivers" who merely respond to a mechanized radio voice eight hours per day. Both units perform valuable police services, but the friction and division between them only serve to detract from optimum performance.

At Michigan State University, the Department of Public Safety recently began the implementation of a new Community Team Policing Program. This program emphasizes an orientation toward "community-based policing" and its benefits. It combines this approach, however, with a "team policing" concept, where all sworn police officers are involved. This integration of community-based policing and team policing concepts provides for a very workable model with less opportunity for internal divisiveness.

Adding the "team" dimension to the community policing approach was an idea that was generated by operational officers at the street level. The Department of Public Safety is a smaller law enforcement agency, with 37 sworn officers assigned to its Police Division. The Department provides for the safety of 42,000 students, almost 8,000 faculty and staff, and numerous visitors. For police assignment purposes, the MSU campus is divided into three districts or beats. During one of the three eight-hour shifts, in the spring of 1987, Lt. Rick Boyd implemented a "district sharing" 10-week experiment with the officers on his shift. Teams of officers, organized on a volunteer basis, were assigned to each of the three campus districts. The teams were encouraged to meet with various community leaders and to work with them more closely. The teams began to actively interact with residence hall staff personnel, university apartment community aides, and other community representatives. Officer teams began to develop an ownership of their district, and district representatives in turn began to know and feel an ownership of their team officers. Officers choosing not to participate were assigned as "floaters," handling routine police response and filling in where needed. The district sharing program showed some very positive results for affected communities, and also for the participating officers.

In September 1987, the full Community Team Policing program was implemented involving all Department of Public Safety officers. The MSU campus continues to be divided into three geographical districts as indicated by the map in Appendix B. Each of the three districts is staffed by a team, whose members will remain in that

district for the full academic year, from September through June. Each district team is composed of personnel as follows:

A.   One Sergeant who, as part of his duties, coordinates activity between shift lines for that district.

B.   Lieutenant and Sergeant supervisors on all shifts (rotating shifts with their team throughout the year as appropriate).

C.   One officer assigned as Community Team Policing Specialist for each district team. This officer works flexible days and shift hours and helps to focus community-related aspects of the team's work. For example, this officer develops and staffs (with volunteer help) a mini station office for all team members in the district, concentrates on organizing community resources, develops resource and referral material, and works to introduce all officer team members to the district community. Appendix C is an example of a letter of introduction which the Community Team Policing Specialist prepares and distributes. It provides an example of the work. This officer coordinates the crime prevention and police-community relations activities for that district. The Community Team Policing Specialist works primarily on foot in his/her main functions of organizing, promoting, coordinating, and interacting.

D. A number of full-service police officers (Public Safety Officers). These officers rotate shifts in teams throughout the year, but remain in the same district of the campus. They share in the planning, police operations, community activities, and responsibility for their district. They are commonly referred to as Team Officers.

E. One detective investigator.

F. One police radio dispatcher (Service Officer).

In addition, a program coordinator, Lt. Rick Boyd, is assigned to constantly monitor and oversee the program. It is his job to ensure that Community Team Policing performs at its maximum effectiveness, under the direction of the Police Division Commander, Inspector James Dunlap.

Overall, each team has the responsibility for resolving police-related matters within their assigned district, and providing appropriate service to their community. A new departmental value statement, "Committed to Courtesy and Excellence," provides an element of focus. To the extent possible, each team is expected to plan, coordinate, and initiate actions directed toward existing and anticipated problems within the district. The Action Plan form in Appendix D provides an M.B.O.-type method of consolidating and directing team activity. Problem identification and problem solving take place in an atmosphere of interaction of team members with the students, staff, and faculty who reside or work in the district. The organization of community volunteers and resources is emphasized. Flexibility and innovation applied toward problem resolution are encouraged.

Appendix E provides the *General Guidelines for Community Team Policing Specialists.* These guidelines were developed by Lt. Boyd and participating officers, and will be further refined as the program progresses.

In conclusion, it must be emphasized that Community Team Policing at Michigan State University is a pilot program. Its current form was planned and discussed by many DPS employees over a one-year period, and just recently implemented. In June of 1988, the Department as a whole will evaluate the programs strengths and weaknesses, and make adjustments as necessary. It is intended that Community Team Policing will provide a strong base for the direction for Department of Public Safety performance for years to come.

Summary

The survey serves as a way to educate citizens about today's harsh realities. First, it demonstrates the wide variety of services that police provide. All too often, citizens think of the police only in terms of solving crimes, and even in that regard, the survey reminds respondents how many kinds of crimes the police must cope with. But, in addition, simply filling out the survey shows how people rely on their police for everything from helping persons locked out of their cars to investigating thefts from dormitories. The survey vividly demonstrates that the police do more than fight crime; they remain the only 24-hour-a-day public agency on call to help maintain a decent quality of life in our communities.

The survey also educates how tough it can be to prioritize police services in this era of dwindling resources. Even those who never returned the survey learned a lot if they only finished the questions, which asks them to make decisions concerning which crimes constitute the highest priority. That question alone served as an illustration of the kinds of decisions that police officials today must face when allocating resources and deploying personnel.

The survey process also encourages citizens to recognize that police cannot be all things to all groups and all people. If students want an officer to patrol dormitories, that officer cannot at the same time patrol streets to protect them from drunk drivers. Ideally, this realization concerning the limitations on what police can do will be generalized to all University services. It's a compelling reminder that paying tuition and taxes means paying for services rendered.

The hope as well is that the survey will also induce citizens to take additional responsibility. Filling out the survey may be the crucial first step in helping citizens see the value in working with the police to provide the broad range of services that people say they want and need. It can assist them in understanding that not only their input, but their outright participation as well, is required if certain services they deem vital are to be maintained.

How Others Can Use This Survey

First, it is hoped that other police departments nationwide will use this survey as one model for surveys of their own. Appendix A consists of a copy of the actual survey questionnaire.

Second, we hope this will encourage departments who decide to make similar or related efforts to share their findings. One of the objectives of the National Neighborhood Foot Patrol Center is to serve as a clearinghouse for community policing research and programs. Please call or write, using the information provided on the back page of this publication, to share information on tactics, strategies, programs, or research that pertains to the goal of involving citizens in the policing process.

Third, the data itself may prove useful as documentation for decisions others must make elsewhere. For example, a university police official or city official can cite the findings as supporting evidence for policy decisions that have been made or will be made. The DPS results may be generalized to other communities that have similar characteristics.

Appendix A
Community Questionnaire

In an effort to implement a Community Policing program, the School of Criminal Justice and the Department of Public Safety are conducting an anonymous survey of University residents and employees. The information you provide by completing this survey will be used to design a comprehensive Community Policing program for the University. Therefore, your views concerning the following questions are of utmost importance. Remember,

your responses are completely anonymous. Please answer each question carefully and return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed envelope through *interdepartmental campus mail by JUNE 5, 1987.*

For analysis purposes, please answer the following:
Are you:
[ ] female
[ ] male

What is your *primary* role at MSU? (Choose only one)
☐ [ ] student
☐ [ ] faculty
☐ [ ] staff
☐ [ ] other, specify

Do you reside on campus?
[ ] Yes
[ ] No

What is your racial/ethnic background?
[ ] Black
[ ] Hispanic
[ ] White/Anglo
[ ] Other, specify

It is generally recognized that the police through random patrol can discourage the following types of criminal activities from being committed. Which would you like to see your police concentrate their efforts on?

Check one answer only for each item:

	1 Much Attention	2 Sometimes	3 Little Attention
1. How much priority should the police give to:			
Burglaries	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Property Destruction	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Auto Theft	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Traffic Law Violations. . . .	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Robberies.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Office/Residence Theft . . .	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Sexual Assaults.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Theft of Car Parts	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Loud Parties.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Moped/Bicycle Theft	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Drug/Alcohol Enforcement.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

2. On which of the following crimes that are committed do you think the Department of Public Safety should concentrate their investigative efforts toward solving? Choose only five (5).
[ ] Simple Theft
[ ] Assault and Battery
[ ] Credit Card Fraud and Check Forgery
[ ] Sexual Assault

[ ] Moped/Bicycle Theft
[ ] Malicious Destruction of Property
[ ] Concealing Stolen Property
[ ] Auto and Auto Parts Theft
[ ] Drug/Alcohol Law Violations
[ ] Child Neglect and Abuse

3. The following is a list of service types of activities performed by the Department of Public Safety. Which of these do you feel are the *most important?* Choose only six (6).
[ ] Pick up found property
[ ] Home Security checks for vacationers
[ ] Assist people locked out of their cars
[ ] Investigation of all vehicle accidents
[ ] Deliver emergency messages
[ ] Vehicle safety inspections
[ ] Office building/residence halls security inspections
[ ] Teaching crime prevention
[ ] Teaching sexual assault prevention programs
[ ] Checking the welfare of residents
[ ] Assisting people locked out of their homes or office
[ ] Assisting stranded motorists

4. What is your responsibility as a citizen in relation to dealing with crime? Check all that apply.
[ ] Avoiding involvement with victim
[ ] Assist victim needing help
[ ] Report suspicious activity
[ ] Avoiding involvement with police
[ ] Reporting crime
[ ] Assisting Police Officers needing help
[ ] Participating in Community Policing programs

5. Keeping in mind that there are limited resources, please rank the following services. (1 will be your top priority and 6 will be your lowest priority.)
[ ] Motor vehicle patrols
[ ] Community Policing foot patrols
[ ] Investigation of citizen's complaints by detectives
[ ] Crime prevention programs
[ ] Drug and alcohol education and enforcement
[ ] Canine patrols

6. Were you a victim of crime on campus?
[ ] Yes
[ ] No
If yes, what was the crime?

Did you report it to the Department of Public Safety?
[ ] Yes
[ ] No

7. How would you rate the overall service of the MSU Department of Public Safety compared to other police departments you know?

[ ] Better
[ ] Same
[ ] Worse

8. How well do you **personally** know a campus police officer?
    [ ] Very well, on a first-name basis
    [ ] Moderately well
    [ ] Acquaintance only
    [ ] Do not know any

9. What do you consider the *greatest strengths* of the Department of Public Safety?

10. What do you consider the *greatest weaknesses* of the Department of Public Safety?

11. What changes would you recommend to the Department of Public Safety in order to improve the public safety of the University community?

Now that you have completed this questionnaire, please enclose it in the envelope and mail it by *interdepartmental mail by JUNE 5, 1987.*

When the questionnaires have been tallied up the results will be announced publicly by the School of Criminal Justice and Department of Public Safety. Your responses will be helpful in setting police priorities and policies.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Appendix B
District Map

Appendix C
Letter of Introduction

COMMITTED TO COURTESY AND EXCELLENCE
HELLO MSU COMMUNITY! My name is Maureen Hall, and I'm pleased to introduce myself as your new Community Team Police Officer. During the upcoming school year, I will be working closely with you in an effort to provide and organize resources that will help make our community a better and safer place to attend school, work and live.

The Police Division of the Department of Public Safety is implementing a new concept of community policing, and your input and assistance are vital to the success of the program.

I will be working with a team of officers from DPS. Let me introduce them: Sergeants George Groll and Dale Metts, Officers Paul Schofield, Dan Zolnai, Maureen Kennedy, Ron Weesies and Paul Kuchek. We will be here during the entire school year to assist you in any way we can.

You can reach me at my office in C111A Holden. My telephone number is 353-5544. If I am not in, please leave your name, your telephone number, the date and a message, and I will get back with you as soon as possible. If you cannot reach me and need to talk to another team officer, please call 355-2221 and leave a message.

All Police, Fire or Medical emergencies should be reported by dialing 9-1-1.

On behalf of myself and fellow team members, we look forward to meeting each of you and having you join our team.

Sincerely,

Appendix D
Action Plan Form

REPORT FOR TEAM#_____ COVERING DATES FROM _____ TO_____

GENERAL ACTIVITY (Synopsis of action taken in district regarding community meetings, enforcement efforts, security efforts, special concerns, etc.)

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

ACTION PLANS/NEEDS/COMMENTS/COMPLAINTS (Projected problem areas identified along with team plans for resolving, resources needs by the team, and anything else).

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Appendix E
General Guidelines for Community Team Policing Specialists

Community Team Policing Guidelines
General Guidelines for Community Team Policing Specialists

The hours and pass days of Community Team Policing Specialists (CTPS) will remain flexible to meet the needs of the Community Team Policing program

CTPS bear primary responsibility for initiating and maintaining police-citizen contacts for those buildings indicated. To the extent possible, CTPS will assist other team members in becoming familiar with those contacts.

CTPS will be responsible for initiating crime prevention activities within their assigned areas and will share with other team members the responsibility to perform various "PR Talks."

CTPS will be responsible for the initial setup and maintenance of a satellite office within their assigned areas. The office will be made available to other team members to use for business meetings, clerical, etc.

When on duty, CTPS are responsible for handling police calls inside of their assigned buildings. As a secondary responsibility, CTPS are encouraged to assist other team members in responding to problems in other areas of their district.

Each CTPS will fall under the direct supervision of the on-duty supervisor, and will have secondary reporting responsibilities to the designated, supervising Lieutenant, who coordinates the overall program. Fifteen minutes prior to the beginning of their tour of duty, the CTPS will contact the on-duty supervisor in order that pertinent information can be relayed. The CTPS will provide dispatch with a written list of scheduled meetings for that day, and a radio log entry will be made indicating their start time. CTPS may be assigned patrol cars at the discretion of the on- duty supervisor.

It is the responsibility of the individual CTPS to keep supervisors briefed as to activity within their area. CTPS will be required to keep a detailed log of their daily activity and, at the end of their tour of duty, will submit their log to the supervising Lieutenant. Incident reports written by CTPS will be submitted to the platoon commander for the shift the incident was reported.

Scheduling of CTPS will be the responsibility of the supervising Lieutenant. CTPS may be utilized at the discretion of the on-duty supervisor when an emergency or illness impairs the operation of the shift. CTPS will not be utilized to fill vacation slots unless approved by the police commander.

General Guidelines for Team Police Officers Assigned to Shift

Team Officers assigned to shift are responsible for initiating and maintaining police-citizen contacts within their district. Primary emphasis should be for those areas within the district not covered by a CTPS. Team Officers will share the responsibility to perform "PR Information Talks." Satellite offices established by CTPS will be opened for use of Team Officers.

Team Officers bear Primary responsibility for motorized patrol within their districts, but should not be strictly limited to patrolling within one area only.

Team Officers are responsible for handling police calls within their assigned areas, to include all calls not covered by an on-duty CTPS, emergency calls, calls requiring immediate response within a CTPS's area when the CTPS is not able to quickly respond, and calls within a CTPS's area when no CTPS is on-duty.

Team Officers are encouraged to work closely with all other team personnel in addressing problems in their respective districts.

Each Team Officer will fall under the direct supervision of the on-duty supervisor, and will have secondary reporting responsibilities to a Sergeant designated to monitor and coordinate activity within the district.

General Guidelines for Investigative Team Members
Investigative Team Member will bear primary responsibility for follow-up criminal investigation within their assigned district.

Investigators will share with other team members information on open complaint reports of mutual concern, and are encouraged to work closely with all other team personnel in addressing problems within their respective districts.

General Guidelines for Dispatch Personnel
In order to allow for a more structured work environment, Dispatch will employ a "Call-Stacking" routine for calls that do not require an immediate response. For calls that fall under this category, Dispatch will take down the information from the caller that is necessary for the radio log, place the caller on "hold," and then contact the appropriate CTPS or team Officer and advise them of the call holding. It is the responsibility of the receiving officer to then advise Dispatch as to what arrangements should be made with the caller, i.e., "have the complainant meet me in the lobby of the dorm in ten minutes," or "advise the complainant that I will call her back in approximately 30 minutes," etc. Dispatch will then be responsible to relay that information to the caller and make a radio log entry. If there is some question as to whether or not a number need actually be assigned, a follow-up log entry can be made after the complaint has been investigated referenced to the time the call was originally received, e.g., "Officer X requests this # reference 1345 log entry."

Further, a "Call Center" has been established to screen incoming telephone calls Monday through Friday, 0730 to 1700. Calls believed to require a police response will be forwarded to Dispatch and answered "University Police, may we help you?" During the indicated hours of operation, the following incident reports will be forwarded directly to the Records Office for completion: simple and grand larceny bicycle, theft of MSU parking permits, damage to vehicles caused by gate arms, and larceny involving IMC equipment.

Dispatch falls under the direct supervision of the on-duty supervisor, with secondary reporting responsibilities to a Lieutenant to be designated to monitor and coordinate the dispatch functions in order that the position be integrated with the Community Team Policing concept.

General Guidelines for Supervisors
Because the CTPS concept calls for officers to "plan, coordinate, and initiate," supervisors must be willing to delegate much of their authority in these areas and stand ready to support attempts made by officers who are confronted by new responsibilities. To that end, supervisors should take on more of a consulting role - suggesting possible solutions as opposed to dictating them. Further, supervisors must be flexible in managing employees, allowing them to make good use of their discretion.

It will be the responsibility of the Lieutenants assigned to the program to work together in managing the day-to-day operational aspects of CTP, as well as working through the Police Commander to supplement and reshape the program as needed.

It is also the Lieutenants' responsibility to closely monitor the progress of individuals under their respective areas of command. As such, Lieutenants may, at their discretion, make use of intermittent team reports. To assist in integration of the newly implemented Field Training Officer program, a CTP Lieutenant will be assigned, to administer that project.

Sergeants especially assigned to coordinate team activity within a district will be responsible to monitor overall events within that district and should also be responsible for identifying problems within a district requiring a coordinated response from all team members within that district or the formulation of an "action plan" to address a particular problem experienced beyond one particular shift (e.g., the "sexual assault" problem in District 2 Spring Term '87).

Finally, individual performance will be evaluated on different standards than those previously applied. Attempts will be made to insure that the standards are a reflection of the CTP priorities, job specific, and put to good use.

FOOTNOTES

1. Garofalo, James, "Public Opinion About Crime: The Attitudes of Victims and Non-Victims in Selected Cities," Dept. of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, 1977. U.S. GPO, National CJ Information and Statistics Service.
2. Benson, Paul R., "Political Alienation and Public Satisfaction With Police Services," *Pacific Sociological Review,* 1981, 24(1):45-64.
3. Thomas, Charles W., and Hyman, Jeffrey M., "Perceptions of Crime, Fear of Victimization, and Public Perceptions of Police Performance," *Journal of Police Science and Administration,* 5(3):305-317.
4. Hadar, Ilana, and Snortum, John R., "The Eye of the Beholder: Differential Perceptions of Police by the Police and the Public," *Criminal Justice and Behavior,* 1975, 2(1)37-54.
5. Apple, Nancy, and O'Brien, David J., "Neighborhood Racial Composition and Residents' Evaluation of Police Performance," *Journal of Police Science and Administration,* 1983, 11(1):76-84.
6. Campbell, Angus, and Schuman, Howard, in Paul Lehrman (editor) *Delinquency and Social Policy (*New York: Praeger Publishing, 1970) pp. 378-382.
7. Boggs, Sarah C., and Galliher, John R., "Evaluating the Police: A Comparison of Black Street and Household Respondents,"*Social Problems,* 1975, 22(3):393-406.
8. Jacob, Herbert, "Black and White Perceptions of Justice in the City," *Law and Society Review,*1971, 6(1):69-89.
9. Hahn, Harlan, "Ghetto Assessments of Police Protection and Authority," *Law and Society Review,* 1971, 6(2):183-194.
10. Skogan, Wesley G., "Citizen Satisfaction With Police Services," pp. 29-42 Ralph Baker and Fred A. Meyer, Jr, (editors) *Evaluating Alternative Law Enforcement Policies* (Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1979).
11. Bayley, David H.,and Mendelsohn, Harold, *Minorities and the Police: Confrontation in America* (New York: The Free Press, 1969).
12. Lovrich, Nocholas P, Jr., and Taylor, G. Thomas, Jr., "'Neighborhood Evaluation of Local Govemment Services: A Citizen Survey Approach," *Urban Affairs Quarterly,* 1976, 12(2):197-222.
13. Carter, David L., "Hispanic Perception of Police Performance: An Empirical Assessment," *Journal of Criminal Justice,* 1985, 13(6):487-*500.*
14. Carter, David L., "Hispanic Interaction With the Criminal Justice System in Texas: Experiences, Attitudes, and Perceptions," *Journal of Criminal Justice,* 1983, 11(3):213-227.
15. Mirande, Alfredo, "The Chicano and the Law: An Analysis of Community-Police Conflict in an Urban Barrio, *Pacific Sociological Review,* 1981, 24(1):65-86.
16. Klein, John F.; Webb, Jim R.; and DiSanto, J.E., "Experience With the Police and Attitude Toward the Police," *Canadian Journal of Sociology,* 1978, 3(4):441-456.

17. Biderman, Albert D.; Johnson, Louise A.; Mcinty, Jennie; and Weir, Adrianne W., Report on a Pilot Study in the District of Columbia on Victimization and Attitudes Toward Law Enforcement, Submitted to the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1967, U.S. GPO.
18. Sparks, Richard E; Genn, Hazel G.; and Dodd, David J., *Surveying Victims* (New York: John Wiley Z Sons, 1977).
19. Parks, Roger B., "Police Response to Victimization: Effects on Citizen Attitudes and Perceptions," in Wesley G. Skogan (editor) *Sample Surveys of the Victims of crime* (Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Company, 1976), pp. 89-104.
20. Poister, Theodore H., and McDavid, James C., "Victims Evaluation of Police Performance," *Journal Of Criminal Justice,* 1978, 6(2):133149.
21. Ennis, Philip H., "Crime, Victims, and the Police," in Michael Lipsky (editor) *Law and Order: Police Encounters* (Aldine Publishing Company, 1970), pp. 85-101.
22. Percy, Stephen L., "Response Time and Citizen Evaluation of Police," *Journal of Police Science and Administration,* 1980, 8(l):75-86.
23. Parks, Roger B. "Complementary Measure of Police Performance," in Kenneth M. Dolbear (editor) *Public Policy Evaluation* (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publishing, 1975), pp. 185-218.
24. Pate, Tony; Ferrara, Amy; Bowers, Robert A.; and Lorence, Jon, *Police Response Time: Its Determinants and Effects* (Washington, DC: Police Foundation, 1976).
25. Scaglion, Richard, and Condon, Richard G., "Determinants of Attitudes Toward City Police," *Criminology,* 1980, 17(40:485494.
26. Chackerian, Richard, and Barrett, Richard E, "Police Professionalism and Citizen Evaluation," *Urban Affairs Quarterly,* 1973, 8(3):345-349.
27. Carlson, Helena M., and Sutton, Markley, S., "Some Factors in Community Evaluation of Police Street Performance," *American Journal of Community Psychology,* 1979, 7(6):583-591.
28. Bell, Daniel J.,"Police and Public 0pinion," *Journal of Police Science and Administration,* 1979, 7(2):196-205.
29. White, Mervin F.S., and Menke, Ben A., "On Assessing the Mood of the Public Toward the Police: Some Conceptual Issues," *Journal of Criminal Justice,* 1982, 10(3):211-230.
30. Flanagan, Timothy J., "Consumer Perspectives on Police Operational Strategy," *Journal of Police Science* and Administration, 1985, 13(l):10-21.
31. Carte, Gene E., "Changes in Public Attitudes Toward the Police: A Comparison of 1938 and 1971 Surveys," *Journal of Police Science and Administration,* 1(2):182-200.
32. "A Family Down and Out," Newsweek, January l2,187,p.9,44-46.
33. Trojanowicz, Robert C. and Harden, Hazel, *The Status of Contemporary Community Policing Programs,* (East Lansing, MI: National Neighborhood Foot Patrol Center, Michigan State Universiy, School of Criminal Justice, 1985), p. 23.

NATIONAL NEIGHBORHOOD FOOT PATROL CENTER

Publications

Books
An Evaluation of the Neighborhood Foot Patrol Program in Flint, Michigan
A Manual for the Establishment and Operation of a Foot Patrol Program

Articles
Perceptions of Safety: A Comparison of Foot Patrol Versus Motor Patrol Officers
Job Satisfaction: A Comparison of Foot Patrol Versus Motor Patrol Officers
The Status of Contemporary Community Policing Programs
The Impact of Foot Patrol on Black and White Perceptions of Policing
Uniform Crime Reporting and Community Policing: An Historical Perspective

Performance Profiles Of Foot Versus Motor Officers
Community Policing: A Taxpayer's Perspective
Implementing a Community Policing Model for Work with Juveniles: An Exploratory Study
Community Policing: Training Issues
Community Policing Programs: A Twenty-Year View
The Foot Patrol Officer, the Community, and the School: A Coalition Against Crime
Community Policing: Defining the Officer's Role
Foot Patrol: Some Problem Areas
An Evaluation of a Neighborhood Foot Patrol Program
Community Policing: The Line Officer's Perspective
Community Policing: Community Input into Police Policy Making
The Philosophy and Role of Community Policing

If you wish to receive a copy of a Center Publication, please contact us by writing or calling:

National Center for Community Policing
School of Criminal Justice
Michigan State University
560 Baker Hall
East Lansing, Michigan 48824-1118
(800)892-9051 or in Michigan (517) 355-9648