

Old Dominion University

ODU Digital Commons

Educational Foundations & Leadership Theses
& Dissertations

Educational Foundations & Leadership

Summer 2010

Student Perceptions of Campus Safety Within the Virginia Community College System

Robert Chad Patton
Old Dominion University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/efl_etds



Part of the [Community College Education Administration Commons](#), [Community College Leadership Commons](#), and the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Patton, Robert C.. "Student Perceptions of Campus Safety Within the Virginia Community College System" (2010). Doctor of Philosophy (PhD), Dissertation, Educational Foundations & Leadership, Old Dominion University, DOI: 10.25777/zass-1j67
https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/efl_etds/155

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Educational Foundations & Leadership at ODU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Educational Foundations & Leadership Theses & Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ODU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@odu.edu.

STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF CAMPUS SAFETY WITHIN THE VIRGINIA COMMUNITY
COLLEGE SYSTEM

by

Robert Chad Patton
B.S. June 1996, Radford University
M.S. December 2003, Longwood University

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of Old Dominion University in
Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEADERSHIP

OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY
August 2010

Approved by:

Dr. Dennis E. Gregory (Chair)

Dr. Kellie C. Sorey (Member)

Dr. Alan M. Schwitzer (Member)

Copyright, 2010, by Robert C. Patton,
All Rights Reserved

Running Head: PERCEPTIONS OF SAFETY

Student Perceptions of Campus Safety within the Virginia

Community College System

Robert Chad Patton

Old Dominion University

Dedication

First and foremost I thank God for the rich and abundant blessings He has bestowed upon me and my family. I am also grateful for the example set by my father whose work ethic and personality continually encourage me to improve myself and my surroundings. I am thankful for my mother for her unwavering support throughout my education making it possible for me, a first generation college student, to achieve all that I have.

I am fortunate to have worked with some of the finest higher education administrators in the business. Dr. Cavan, Dr. Al Roberts, and Mary Jane Elkins have surrounded me with support both personally and professionally. I would be amiss if I did not mention the brilliant members of cohort four of the Community College Leadership Program of Old Dominion University. I am most thankful for a supportive, professional, and responsive dissertation committee.

There are numerous people whom I should thank for their support and encouragement in this pursuit. I have decided, however, to dedicate this dissertation to my young daughters, Ella and Kira. It is my sincere hope that this research helps to create a safer world for them. I can think of no greater purpose for my efforts.

Table of Contents

Chapter I: Introduction	6
Abstract	6
Introduction	7
Background	9
Purpose of Study	10
Significance of Study	11
Research Questions	12
Overview of Methodology	14
Definition of Terms	17
Limitations	20
Chapter II: Review of the Literature	22
Crime in the United States.	22
Crime on College Campuses.	26
Crime on Community College Campuses	27
America's Response to Campus Safety Concerns.	29
Federal Actions Concerning Campus Safety	31
Virginia's Actions Concerning Campus Safety.	35
Virginia's Actions Prior to April 16, 2007	35
Virginia's Actions after April 16, 2007	38
Virginia Com. Coll. Actions Concerning Campus Safety .40	
Factors Affecting Perceptions of Campus Safety	41
Chapter III: Methods	46

Introduction	46
Design	46
Methodology	49
Research Questions	51
Selection of Participants	53
Conclusion	54
Chapter IV: Data Analysis and Findings	55
Introduction	55
Description of Participants.	56
Demographics of Respondents	56
Research Question I	61
Research Question II	63
Research Question III	67
Research Question IV	69
Research Question V	70
Campus Visits	71
Chapter V: Summary and Conclusions	77
Purpose Statement and Research Questions	78
Overview of Methodology	79
Discussion of Findings	81
Recommendations	90
Recommendations for further research	92
Conclusions	94
References	98

Appendix A	111
Appendix B	115
Appendix C	122
Appendix D	133
Appendix E	136
Appendix F	137

**Student Perceptions of Campus Safety within the Virginia
Community College System**

Abstract

This research examined Virginia community college students' perceptions of campus safety. A survey of 11,161 students revealed the crimes students most feared being a victim of while on the community college campus and the areas in which they felt the most and least safe. The research also demonstrated the effect certain variables had on students' overall perception of campus safety. The variables studied included student demographics, the presence and type of security personnel, and the rurality of the campus setting. The campuses with the highest and lowest degrees of perceived safety were then further studied via case studies to gather detailed information, which may assist college administrators and policymakers in improving campus safety on community college campuses.

Introduction

According to a report by the Bureau of Justice Statistics in 2005, American college campuses have lower crime rates than society as a whole and the crime rate on campuses is decreasing (U.S. Department of Justice [USDOJ], 2005). While this may be true, perceptions of the prevalence of crime on college campuses and concerns for student safety have increased in the past two decades (Wilcox, Jordan & Pritchard, 2007). Much of this increase is due to the popular media's fascination with, and portrayal of, criminal acts committed on college campuses (Gregory & Janosik, 2006). Such events include mass shootings at Northern Illinois University in 2008, Virginia Tech in 2007 (Ress, 2008), Shepherd University in 2006 (Haney, 2008), and two tragedies in 2002 at the University of Arizona and the Virginia Appalachian's School of Law (Ciazo & O'Sullivan, 2002).

Compounding these concerns were reports that colleges and universities were minimizing crime on campus and in some cases failing to accurately report criminal events (Gregory & Janosik, 2002). Perhaps the most well cited example of this is the case of Jeanne Clery. In 1986, Ms. Clery, aged 19, was accosted as she slept and assaulted and

murdered in her residence hall at Lehigh University. As her parents began a crusade to increase campus safety they discovered that there had been 38 violent crimes at the university in the three years prior to the incident, which had not been reported to students. This led to legislation, which would become known as the Clery Act (20 U.S.C. § 1092 f), which called for colleges and universities to make substantial reforms in campus safety and the reporting of criminal activity on campus (Cooper, 1998). As a result of the lawsuit filed by Jeanne Clery's parents, the university agreed to make over one million dollars of campus safety improvements including increased lighting, the installation of more emergency call boxes, and the implementation of student shuttle services after dark (Hanchette, 1988).

College and university administrators are faced with a seemingly impossible task. They must provide a safe and secure environment for students, faculty, and staff while maintaining a positive and unrestricted college environment (Cooper, 1997). Creating such an environment often involves the hiring of additional personnel, the instillation of physical security measures, and the procurement of surveillance and notification technology. Unfortunately, these measures are expensive. Administrators must develop

comprehensive strategies to ensure safety and address the concerns of students while considering the resources available to them. For colleges with limited resources this can be a challenging task. Accurate and timely information concerning student perceptions of safety is needed in order to make meaningful decisions concerning campus security.

Background

There have been relatively few empirical studies on students' fear of crime and perceptions of safety despite society's recent interest in campus safety (Warr & Straford, 1983; Willcox, Jordan & Pritchard, 2007). The studies that do exist are primarily focused on four-year colleges and universities (Reisling, 1995; Smith, 1995; Nichols, 1995; Fisher & Nasar, 1995; McConnell, 1997; Day, 1999; Johnson & Bromley, 1999). While research concerning campus crime has increased as public concern has risen, little of the research has been directed towards community colleges, two-year government supported colleges which offer Associate degrees (Costello, 2003). Community college administrators cannot rely on current research involving university students, due to the differences in the student bodies and the differences in the campus environments (Lee,

2000). For these reasons, a need exists for research that focuses solely on the community college student and the community college environment. This research sought to accomplish that, and also investigate whether differences exist between the community colleges within the Virginia Community College System. This system is ideal to study, as the colleges within it are diverse in terms of size, location, and the level of security employed on each campus. For instance, some of the VCCS campuses employ police officers and are located in urban areas while others do not employ any security personnel and exist in very rural areas of Virginia.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate perceptions of campus safety amongst Virginia's public community college students and to determine which variables affect perceptions of campus safety. Doing so filled a gap in current literature concerning college and university campus safety. The extant literature has focused primarily on four-year, residential college students (Day, 1999; Fisher & Nasar, 1995; Wilcox, Jordan & Pritchard, 2007).

The second purpose of this study was to present a a

list of best practices to improve students' perceptions of safety and security at community colleges within the VCCS, using the results of this research. When combined, the VCCS spans 224 buildings, on forty campus locations, which equal 5,718,725 square feet of space scattered among 95 counties. By using a comprehensive statewide best practices, all VCCS institutions would benefit by the ability to draw from a greater pool of resources. Collectively, the VCCS is able to procure software licenses and technology, which may be beyond the financial ability of single institutions. In addition, a centralized model would allow for effective oversight and administrative support, which would aid smaller community colleges that would be logistically unable to devote the necessary resources to support security initiatives.

Significance of Study

Due to the increased concern for campus safety, Kennedy (2005) indicates that more and more college resources are being allocated to the areas of crime prevention and school security. Since colleges operate on a finite budget, it becomes increasingly necessary to

understand how best to apply resources to address crime on campus and improve students' perceptions of safety.

In order to make informed decisions on campus safety matters, it is important for college administrators to gain as much information concerning their individual college needs as possible in order to best allocate resources effectively. One of the best practices identified by the House Joint Resolution (HJR 122, 2006) was for college administrators to work with their institutional research personnel to develop a survey tool that addresses campus safety. It was recommended that the survey be distributed regularly to students, faculty, and staff and for the results to be incorporated into planning. This mirrors statements made by Lenski (1992), who suggested that college administrators must know more about students' perceptions, beliefs, and attitudes concerning campus safety in order to design a comprehensive campus safety plan.

While research concerning campus crime has increased as public concern has risen, little research has been directed towards community colleges (Costello, 2003). Community college administrators cannot rely on past or current research involving four-year college and university students due to the differences in the student bodies and

the differences in the campus environments (Lee, 2000). For example, research conducted in 1991 on 701 American universities and colleges found, among other things, that students were concerned about strangers entering and staying past hours in residential halls (Beeler, 1991). These results have little to no practical application for most community college administrators today as the large majority of two-year colleges do not provide housing on campus. This example demonstrates the present need to study community college students' perceptions of campus safety.

Research Questions

This study sought to answer the following research questions related to students' perceptions of campus safety within the Virginia Community College System:

- What types of crime do community college students most fear being a victim while on campus?
- Does the level of fear of crime on campus vary by student demographic?
- Do student perceptions of campus safety vary by the type of security/police present on their campus?
- Do student perceptions of campus safety vary by the rurality of campus attended? Do students' perceptions

of campus safety vary by the different areas within the community college campus?

Overview of Methodology

The study employed an explanatory sequential mixed methods design. This allowed for a more detailed analysis of the research questions than could be accomplished using either quantitative or qualitative methods alone. Gillham (2002) states that using a purely qualitative or quantitative methodology can be limiting.

The quantitative portion of the study utilized a non-experimental survey research design. Kumar (2005) indicates that cross-sectional designs are best suited for finding out the prevalence of a phenomenon, attitude, or issue by taking a cross-section of the population. Due to the large number of potential respondents within the Virginia Community College System, this study used electronic surveys to collect data on students' perceptions of campus safety. Considering the large geographical service area of the Virginia Community College System, survey research is the preferred data collection method based on convenience, economy, and ease of use (Creswell, 2003).

Statistical analyses were performed using SAS v.9.1 statistical analysis software. General frequencies were

recorded and analyzed to identify the types of crime that community college students fear being victimized the most while on campus. The same statistic was used for determining which areas of the community college campus concern students the most in regards to safety. An independent samples t tests and ANOVAs were used to determine if there is a statistically significant difference between the levels of perceived safety among different demographics. The demographics examined included age, race, and gender. Next, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine if students' perceptions of safety differed significantly among college campuses by the type of security present. Finally, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine if students' perceptions of safety differed significantly in relation to the rurality of the campus.

The qualitative portion of this study utilized a critical instance case study design of the Virginia community colleges which were identified as the most and the least safe based on student responses to the survey. A critical instance case study allows the researcher to examine one or more sites for the purpose of identifying a cause and effect relationship. The purpose of this case study was to identify characteristics, actions, and

policies which may have affected students' perceptions of campus safety. This was accomplished by comparing campus characteristics that coincide with current best practices identified by the literature and recent federal and state taskforce reports concerning campus safety.

A major strength of using a case study in this research was the freedom it allowed the researcher to explore campus specific characteristics which may have influenced students' perceptions of campus safety (Kenny, 1984). These campus characteristics may or may not be included within current campus safety recommendations and therefore could be missed if a pure quantitative approach was taken. A potential weakness of using a case study is criticism from some in the academic community who suggest it lacks objectivity, precision, and rigor (Yin, 1989). The author addressed these concerns by spending sufficient time at each institution to thoroughly assess its characteristics, policies, and actions regarding campus safety, thus ensuring rigor. Precision was accomplished with the use of a template constructed of relevant campus safety recommendations derived from current literature on the topic. This template served as a guide during the onsite case studies but still allowed for exploration of other characteristics which may be unique to the individual

institution. Objectivity was not as great of an issue in this study as it is mainly a consideration when conducting case studies on humans—not places such as college campuses. The researcher shared the results with a colleague who is versed in qualitative research to further ensure quality and objectivity.

Once the case studies of the two community college campuses were completed, the author created a list of apparent best practices in campus safety for the VCCS to consider during future planning and policy making regarding campus safety.

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study, the following terms were defined:

The Clery Act

The *Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act* (1990), otherwise known as the *Clery Act* is a federal statute codified at 20 U.S.C. § 1092(f). The act requires, among other things, that all colleges and universities that participate in federal financial aid programs to collect and publish crime statistics concerning their campuses. The specific criminal activities the *Clery Act* requires disclosure on are

presented in Appendix A.

Campus Police Department

A Department certified by the Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS), employing at least one certified law enforcement officer employed for the purposes of enforcing the law and protecting life and property on the campus of a college. All certified police officers in Virginia carry side arms and are required by the DCJS to regularly demonstrate weapon proficiency to maintain their certification.

Campus Security Department

A department with at least one DCJS certified security officer employed for the purposes of providing uniformed security for a college campus. Security officers may be certified to carry firearms through DCJS.

Campus Safety

For the purposes of this study, campus safety is defined as the establishment of a safe environment for students to work and learn without fear of victimization of a crime while on the campus of a college.

Rurality

Rurality refers to how densely the population is distributed in a specific area. Common categories of

rurality are rural, suburban, and urban. For this study, rurality was determined using the nine distinct Rural-Urban Continuum Codes (U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, 2003). Because some community colleges in Virginia have more than one campus location, it was possible for the same college to have campuses with different rurality ratings. For this reason, each campus was studied individually. A college campus was considered rural if the campus was located in a county coded in the range of 7 to 9 on the Rural-Urban Continuum Code. This designation covers counties that have a city or town population of less than 20,000 and are not adjacent to metro areas in Virginia. A suburban community college was located in a county coded in the range of 4 to 6 on the scale and exhibit a non-metro population of 20,000 or more and is adjacent to a metro area in Virginia, those counties with a population of over 20,000 which were not adjacent to a metro area in Virginia, and to those with a population less than 20,000 but were adjacent to a metro area in Virginia. Finally, an urban community college was located in a county coded in the range of 1 to 3 on the scale. This designation covered metro counties in Virginia from less than 250,000 to over a million in population.

Limitations of the Study

Due to the massive number of students attending community colleges in the Commonwealth of Virginia, and since the researcher sought data from as many students who attend Virginia community colleges as possible, the researcher was limited to using email to notify students of the study and to request their participation. By conducting the research in this manner, students who do not use their VCCS email accounts were not able to participate in the study. This may have limited the response rate for certain student groups who are unlikely to check email regularly.

Another limitation may have occurred since students may have not be aware of the type of security employed on the community college campus they most attend. A uniformed security guard could have been mistaken as a police officer and vice versa. In order to help address this issue, the levels of campus security were described on the survey instrument.

Finally, the author was employed by one of the institutions within the VCCS but his role had no bearing on the results of this study. Although some may be concerned

with potential bias, the scope and design of the study
neutralized this issue.

Chapter II

Literature Review

Sociologists have long argued that crime, more precisely society's reaction to crime, has benefits for society (Warr, 2000). Emile Durkheim (1933, p. 397) and other functionalists believed that the fear of crime strengthens community bonds by unifying those who are concerned about criminal activity. More recent ideology suggests that the reaction to crime does not have a unifying effect. Rather, it deters social interaction (Liska & Warner, 1991). Deterring or disrupting social interaction on college campuses inhibits the formation of a free and positive campus environment (Cooper, 1997).

Before crime and the effects of crime on college campuses can be discussed, one should consider recent crime rates in the United States and their effects on society. Next, crime on college campuses was discussed followed by reactions to the increased concern of crime on college campuses. Finally, student characteristics in which research has linked to the fear of crime and the perception of campus safety was presented.

Crime in the United States

There are a variety of measurements used to report on crime in America. The Federal Bureau of Investigation's (FBI) Uniform Crime Report (UCR) is the oldest dataset in the United States dating back to 1929 (Federal Bureau of Investigations, 2009). The UCR collects incident and arrest statistics from over 17,000 law enforcement agencies throughout the nation (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2009). The FBI publishes UCR statistics annually in a report entitled Crime in the United States (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2009). The UCR reports only officially reported crimes, and thus under-reports the true level of crime, as some crime is undiscovered and/or unreported (Cassino, 2008). This unknown level of crime is called the dark figure of crime (Biderman & Reis, 1967). In order to report on the dark figure of crime, researchers have used surveys to gather data on victimization that was not reported to the police (Block & Block, 1984).

Perhaps the most cited survey of this kind is the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS). This survey collects data on personal and household victimization across America annually (National Archive of Criminal Justice Data 2009). The NCVS studies a nationally representative sample of households by surveying residents

concerning crimes of which they are aware, which were not reported to law enforcement authorities (National Archive of Criminal Justice Data 2009). The NCVS is the nation's second oldest crime dataset dating back to 1973 (National Archive of Criminal Justice Data 2009). Results of the NCVS serve to complement the findings of the UCR to provide a more accurate picture of crime within the United States.

While it is not possible to present a thorough review of U.S. crime rates within this document, the author shall instead focus on violent crime in America in recent history, particularly those of homicide. The homicide rate is an important measure of crime in America as it is almost always reported to the police and therefore, provides more accurate data than other crimes which may not be reported as often (Cook & Laumb, 1998). In addition, the homicide rate is predictive of other crimes including street crimes and non-violent crimes. When homicide rates increase, other crimes rates have been found to follow (Donohue, 1998). Finally, many criminologists tend to use homicide rates more than other violent crime rates when discussing crime trends because of the universally accepted definition of homicide and the fact that the definition has not changed over time (Blumstein, 2000).

Americans experienced a rapid increase in crime rates during the late 1980's and early 1990's (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2005b). In 1985 for example, the homicide rate was 7.9 cases per 100,000 U.S. citizens. This number rose 24% in just six years bringing the rate to 9.8 cases per 100,000 citizens by 1991 (Blumstein, 2000). An analysis of UCR data from this time period indicates that the increase occurred primarily in urban areas of the country (Blumstein, Rivera, & Rosenfield, 2000). Research conducted by Blumstein et al. (2000) indicated that only seven American cities accounted for one quarter of all the homicides in 1991. Other research indicated that America's 77 largest cities accounted for 20% of America's total population and 50% of the homicide rate during this increase (Lattimore, Trudeau, Leiter, & Edwards, 1997). Not only was the increase located in urban centers, it seemed to be unequally divided across age groups. Those aged 18-24 accounted for a greater portion of the overall increase in violent criminal offenders than did any other age group (Cook & Laub, 1999). In fact, crime data indicate that the youth offenders' homicide rate nearly doubled between 1985 and the peak in 1993 (Blumstein 1995,1996; Blumstein and Cork 1996; Bureau of Justice Statistics 2006).

The crime wave of the mid 1980's and early 1990's had an effect on American society. At its peak, Americans ranked crime and violence as the most serious problem (Chiricos, Escholz, & Gertz, 1997). Even as crime rates decreased in the mid 1990's, the media's portrayal of violence increased (Cassino, 2008). Television coverage of violent crime stories doubled between 1992 and 1993 (Dorfman and Schiraldi, 2001) and television and newspaper coverage of violent crimes quadrupled between 1993 and 1994 (Chiricos et al 1997). The increase in violent crime coverage by the media escalated as true crime levels steadily decreased beginning in the mid 1990's to the point of America's lowest crime rates since the mid-1960's (Blumstein, 2000). The increased media attention to violent crime led people to believe violence was increasing when in fact homicide and violent crime fell 32.9% between 1990 and 1998 (Dorfman & Schiraldi, 2001). The result was an unprecedented increase in the amount of fear and concern about violent crime in America (Cassino, 2008).

Crime on College Campuses

A college campus should be a safe environment for both faculty and students. Institutions of higher education have long been regarded as sanctuaries where students can

pursue their goals without concerns and threats often encountered in the real world (Colaner, 2006). For the most part, this seems to be the case. A report from the Office of Postsecondary Education to Congress (2001) indicates that crime rates on college campuses are less than that of the general public surrounding a college. This is even true at institutions that are located in areas of high crime. Fernandez and Lizotte (1995) found that community crime rates do not affect the crime rate of college campuses that exist within them. Additionally, the rate of violent and nonviolent crime on American campuses is decreasing. A special report on campus crime by the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) found that from 1994 to 2004, violent crime decreased by 9% while nonviolent crime decreased by 30%.

Crime on Community College Campuses

To date there has not been a national study on crime statistics on community college campuses. The national studies that have been conducted surveyed four-year colleges and universities (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2008).

While comprehensive studies have not been published, crime statistics involving community college campuses are

available from the Office of Postsecondary Education (OPE) at the U.S. Department of Education through its Campus Security Data Analysis Cutting Tool. This tool uses data drawn from the OPE Campus Security Statistics Website database to which crime statistics are submitted annually, via a Web-based data collection, by all postsecondary institutions that receive Title IV funding as required by the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act (OPE, 2009).

Table 1 summarizes data retrieved using the tool concerning reported crimes on Virginia's public community college campuses from 2001 to 2007.

Table 1

Number and Type of Offenses at Virginia's Community Colleges

Offense Type	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Murder	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Negligent manslaughter	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Forcible sex offenses	1	0	1	0	5	2	1
Robbery	3	0	2	3	5	1	4
Aggravated Assault	6	6	5	7	2	1	4
Burglary	11	9	15	16	20	21	30

Motor Vehicle Theft	7	8	18	10	5	1	0
Arson	0	1	1	2	3	4	0

The data indicate that there were no instances of homicide or negligent manslaughter from 2001 to 2007. The most commonly reported crime during this time frame was that of burglary. Burglaries accounted for 50.6% of the 241 crimes reported within the VCCS during this time period. Burglary is defined as the unlawful entry of a structure to commit a felony or a theft. For reporting purposes this definition includes: unlawful entry with intent to commit a larceny or felony; breaking and entering with intent to commit a larceny; housebreaking; safecracking; and all attempts to commit any of the aforementioned (The Clery Act, 1990). Because none of the public community colleges in Virginia has residential facilities, the victims of the reported burglaries were the colleges themselves and not the students attending.

America's Response to Campus Safety Concerns

Although American college campuses have lower crime rates than society as whole and the crime that is present on campuses is decreasing (Gregory & Janosik, 2006), perceptions of the prevalence of crime on campus and

concerns for student safety have increased in the past two decades. Much of this increase is due to the popular media's fascination and portrayal of criminal acts committed on college campuses (Henson & Stone, 1999; Gregory & Janosik, 2006). Such events include mass shootings at Northern Illinois University in 2008, Virginia Tech in 2007, Shepherd University in 2006 and two additional tragedies in 2002, the University of Arizona and the Virginia Appalachian's School of Law.

Compounding these concerns were reports that colleges and universities were minimizing crime on campus and in some cases failing to accurately report criminal events (Gregory & Janosik, 2002). Kerr (2001) examined different types of universities to determine to what extent each had complied with the *Clery Act's* reporting requirements. Kerr found that "a majority of the institutions did not comply with the content requirements of the *Clery Act* (p. IV). Perhaps even more disturbing was the number of the college law enforcement officials who did not believe that the legally mandated methods of policy and procedure distribution as well as crime statistics were effective ways to improve campus safety (Kerr, 2001). Similarly, McGuire (2002) studied the procedures three public residential universities followed in the collection and

distribution of campus crime statistics and found several potential misapplications of reporting policy by university staff. Similarly, a large, federally funded study of over 2400 institutions conducted in 2002 found that only one third of the institutions were reporting crimes in the correct manner as defined by the Clery Act (Karjane, Fisher & Cullen, 2002).

Because of these and other concerns, a variety of stakeholders, both internal and external, began calling for a review of current campus safety policies and practices. This pressure led to a variety of recent actions taken by both federal and state government agencies. The following review identified legislation and administrative steps taken to address the problem of campus crime in the past and present.

Federal Actions Concerning Campus Safety

Although the *Higher Education Act of 1965* (Pub. L. No. 89-329) did not specifically address campus crime or student safety, it has served as a launching pad for several successive pieces of federal legislation. The main reason for the Act's importance are the conditions it sets for institutions to receive financial aid for students. Many lawmakers have used this as leverage to gain

institutional compliance of subsequent campus safety legislation.

One of the most notable initiatives for change began after the rape and murder of a 19-year old Lehigh University student named Jeanne Clery. The family of the victim publicly called for reform in higher education concerning campus safety and the accurate reporting of criminal activity on college campuses. The result was the passage of the 1990 *Crime Awareness and Campus Security Act* later to become known as *the Clery Act*. Under the law, all private and public universities, among other things, must publish an annual report disclosing campus security policies and three years worth of selected crime statistics. Institutions are also required to make timely warnings to the campus community about crimes that pose an ongoing threat to students and employees. In addition, institutions with a police or security department must maintain a public crime log and make it available to the public. The law also ensures that victims of sexual assault crimes that occur on campus are assured of certain basic rights. Colleges and universities that fail to comply with these regulations can be fined up to \$27,500 per violation by the Department of Education (Keels, 2004). This Act has undergone many revisions, most notably in 1992 and in 1995,

in an effort to increase accuracy in reporting campus crimes (Hoffman, Schuh, & Fenske 1998)

The *Campus Sexual Assault Bill of Rights* (Public Law: 102-325, section 486(c)) was passed in 1991. This law requires colleges and universities to develop and publish policies regarding the prevention and awareness of sex offenses and procedures for responding after a sex offense occurs. One of the major components of this legislation is the responsibility of university officials to inform students of their rights concerning sexual assault, and to give clear information about how and where to report sex offenses (Dripps 1993). The legislation also requires the distribution of information to students concerning the services, including medical, legal, and psychological, available to them in the event of this type of victimization. These provisions became effective in 1993.

On April 21, 2007, President George Bush directed the Secretary of the Department of Education, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and the Attorney General to travel to campuses across the nation and to report back recommendations to improve campus safety. A total of 12 states were visited by the team. At each meeting, representatives from state government, law enforcement, the mental health field, and college administrators shared

concerns and suggestion for improving campus safety nationwide. As a result, *A Report to the President on Issues Raised by the Virginia Tech Tragedy* (2007) was written and detailed a total of five major concerns from this process. The report divided each suggestion into recommended actions for the federal, state and local governments. The five nationwide concerns identified by the report are presented below:

1. Critical information sharing faces substantial obstacles.
2. Accurate and complete information on individuals prohibited from possessing firearms is essential to keep guns out of the wrong hands.
3. Improved awareness and communication are key components to prevention.
4. It is critical to get individuals with mental illnesses the services that they need.
5. Where we know what to do, we have to be better at doing it (United States Department of Health and Human Services, 2007).

The report included a recommendation that the U.S. Secret Service, the U.S. Department of Education, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation explore the issue of

violence at America's colleges and universities. This recommendation culminated in a report entitled *Campus Attacks, Targeted Violence Affecting Institutions of Higher Education* (Drysdale, Modzelsdki & Simons, 2010).

Virginia Actions Concerning Campus Safety

According to the Virginia Crime Commission (2006), the Commonwealth of Virginia has over 140 separate institutions of higher learning within its borders. The State Council of Higher Education reports that a total of 383,462 students enrolled in Virginia colleges and universities in the Fall semester of 2008. Virginia is also home to the single most deadly incident of school violence in America's history (Shapira & Jackman 2007). On April 16, 2007 a Virginia Tech student shot and killed 32 people and wounded 30 more before committing suicide. The offender, Seung-Hui Cho, was a student of Virginia Tech and exhibited mental health concerns prior to the incident. This single event refocused the nation's attention on campus safety. Due to this watershed event, the actions Virginia has taken to increase campus safety can best be illustrated through actions prior to the Virginia Tech massacre and after the event.

Virginia Actions Prior to April 16, 2007

The Code of Virginia, Section 30-156 created the Virginia State Crime Commission. This organization is

comprised of citizens, legislators, and state officials. The purpose of the Commission is "to study, report and make recommendations on all areas of public safety and protection" (Virginia Code page 1000). Section 30-158(3) of the Virginia Code authorizes the Commission to "conduct studies and gather information and data in order to accomplish its purposes...and formulate its recommendations to the Governor and the General Assembly". During the 2004 Session of the Virginia General Assembly, the Crime Commission was tasked with studying campus safety at Virginia's public and private colleges and universities.

This initiative, House Joint Resolution 122 (HJR 122), was introduced by Delegate Phillip Hamilton. Hamilton was responding to the request of Virginia 21, a youth action group that expressed concerns about campus security and student safety to politicians across the Commonwealth of Virginia.

The final report produced by HJR 122 made four broad recommendations to improve campus safety. First, the study recommended that the Department of Criminal Justice Services' (DCJS) School Safety Center incorporate a division specializing in postsecondary safety issues. The proposed division would be tasked with providing specialized campus police and security officer training to

colleges and universities in Virginia. The new division would also provide technical support to colleges and universities as they create policies and strategic plans concerning campus safety. Additionally, the division would assist Virginia colleges and universities in creating uniform policies for managing crime record databases and disciplinary records within the Commonwealth. Finally, the division would assist institutions with the management of campus police and security departments, including investigation support, judicial referral assistance, and policy and management support. (HJR 122, p.54.)

The second recommendation proposed by the study was to create an annual campus safety summit involving the new DCJS division and campus safety directors from all Virginia colleges and universities. The purpose of the summit would be to bring together campus safety coordinators, the Virginia Campus Law Enforcement Administrators (VACLEA), the Virginia Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control, and other state agencies dealing with crime in the Commonwealth. The summit would allow all constituents to share innovations and concerns amongst criminal justice professionals and school administrators.

The third recommendation from the task force was for the DCJS to collect and publish model mutual aid agreements

between institutions of higher learning and law enforcement agencies located in concurrent jurisdictions. By providing model policies, colleges without such agreements will have a head start in preparing a beneficial mutual aid policy. These policies are effective tools in emergency and crisis management planning.

The fourth and final recommendation contained in the HJR 122 final report is the development of guidelines which would allow colleges and universities to disseminate findings from their judicial councils. The guidelines were to be developed by the DCJS and the Attorney General's Office.

In addition to these recommendations, the final report developed 30 best practice suggestions to enhance campus safety in the Commonwealth. Of the 30 best practices, the Virginia Crime Commission approved 27 and recommended their incorporation into college and university campus safety plans. These recommendations form the basis of the template used as a guide during the qualitative portion of this study (Appendix B).

Virginia's Actions after April 16, 2007

The Virginia Tech tragedy represents the worst mass shooting event in our nation's history. On April 19, 2007, just three days after the incident, Virginia Governor Tim

Kaine established the Virginia Tech Review Panel (VTRP) by Executive Order 53. The purpose of this panel was to perform an independent review of Virginia's actions in responding to this crime. The Panel issued its final report to the Governor in August of 2007. Among its major findings, the panel identified a need to change Virginia law to accommodate the addition of individuals who are remanded to outpatient treatment of a mental illness to the federal database used to determine if a person can purchase a firearm. The panel also identified Virginia Tech's lack of planning and execution of certain important elements of its response plan. Namely, the student notification system was not used effectively in the incident and the university failed to adequately communicate within its own organization the mental health and behavioral issues of Seung Hui Cho prior to the incident (VTRP Final Report, page IX).

Governor Kaine then hosted the first Governor's Campus Preparedness Conference on August 13, 2007. This annual conference brings representatives from all of Virginia's institutions of higher education together to participate in discussions relevant to campus safety. The conference introduces personnel responsible for campus safety and emergency preparedness to best practices in emergency

planning, coordinating resources, and other new developments in campus safety such as the use of social media.

On January 28, 2009 the U.S. House of Representatives passed H.R. 748, the *CAMPUS Safety Act of 2009*. This act calls for the creation of a National Center for Campus Public Safety, which is administered through the U.S. Department of Justice's Community Oriented Policing Services program. The purpose of the Center is to train campus public safety agency personnel, to encourage research to strengthen college safety and security, and to serve as a clearinghouse for the dissemination of relevant campus public safety information (Virginia Higher Education Preparedness Consortium, 2009).

Virginia Community College System's Actions Concerning Campus Safety

In response to the Virginia Tech shooting, Dr. Glenn DuBois, VCCS Chancellor, formed a panel of community college stakeholders to begin a dialogue concerning campus safety in the VCCS. The panel decided that a comprehensive review of emergency preparedness at all 23 institutions was needed. To accomplish this task, a task force of community college presidents, systems office personnel, and law enforcement officials was created. The Chancellor's

Emergency Preparedness Review Task Force (EPRTF) published a report in January of 2008 detailing emergency preparedness strategies employed by each college in the VCCS. The report, entitled "Focus on Emergency Preparation and Management" also made recommendations to bolster campus safety throughout the system and made budgetary projections for bringing the recommendations to fruition.

As a result of this study, the VCCS purchased an emergency alert notification system for the 23 community colleges to use. The system allows each institution to customize the user interface pages of the software so that it appears to be part of each individual college's website. The system was deployed in the Fall semester of 2008.

Community College Students' Perceptions of Safety

John Kleberg (2004) asserts that not only is actual safety important to college students, but they must also feel safe to get the most from their collegial experience. Research has determined that a multitude of factors influence a person's perceptions of safety and the likelihood they will become a victim of crime (Truman & Jasinski, 2005).

Factors Affecting Student Perceptions of Campus Safety

Age.

Age is often cited as a variable that influences a

person's perception of crime and victimization. Some research indicates that older people tend to have less fear of crime than younger people (Ferrar & LaGrange, 1989, Ferraro, 1995). Other research holds the opposite is true. That is, older persons fear crime more than younger persons. This variable is important for community college administrators as community colleges serve more non-traditional students than universities.

Gender.

The National Crime and Victimization Survey (2003), published by the Bureau of Justice Statistics, found that the annual average victimization rate of female college students was half that of male college students. Yet, both past and current research seems to indicate that perceptions of safety and feelings of potential victimization are more prominent in female students than in male students (Day, 1991; McConnel, 1997). The difference between male and female levels of fear of crime is even greater concerning the crimes of rape and sexual assault (Fisher & Sloan, 2003). Other research indicates that male and female perceptions of safety on campus is similar until the concern of being alone at night is examined. Hilinski (2007) found that while male and female college students reported similar levels of perceived risk and fear of all

non-sexual crimes, female college students had higher levels of perceived risk and fear for sexual crimes on campus.

Female students' concerns about rape and sexual assault on campus may be warranted (Reid & Konrad, 2004; Hale, 1996). According to official crime statistics, women are victimized at a lower rate than men for all crimes except for those of rape and sexual assault (Hilinski, 2007). Research has also demonstrated that sexual assault victimization rates for female college students has not decreased despite the national decrease of this violent crime in America (McMahon, 2008; Carr, 2005). Research by Humphrey and Kahn (2000) indicates that women aged 16 to 24 experience rape and sexual assault at a rate four times greater than the victimization rate of females at all other ages. Recent empirical studies also suggest that women on college campuses are at greater risk of becoming a victim of sexual assault than females in the general population (Quintanilla-Ng, 2006). This makes the late high school and college years the most vulnerable time for females (Donde, 2009; Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000; Koss, 1998).

Ethnicity.

Criminologists and sociologists have long associated ethnicity with certain aspects of criminal activity and

victimization. For example, Lauristen and White (2001) found that Blacks, Whites, and Latino Americans experience different levels of both stranger and non-stranger violence. Official crime statistics would seem to support this finding. Blumstein (2000) reports that the majority of victims during the homicide rate increase of the late 1980's and early 1990's were Black. Victimization of this group raised significantly while the violent crime victimization rates for other races remained steady.

Urbanicity

Research conducted by Fox and Hellman (1985) indicated that a college's location, whether rural, suburban, or urban, had little to no effect on the amount of crime committed on campus. Their study also included variables such as total population in surrounding communities and the unemployment rate within the area the college was located.

However, when one's perceived risk of victimization and perceptions of safety are observed by the location in which the person resides, differences seem to exist. Bankson, Jenkins, Thayer-Doyle, and Thompson (1989) studied how the perceived risk of criminal victimization varies between individuals based upon their residential location. The research studied the fear of victimization of 16 crimes ranging from non-serious property crimes to violent crimes

among respondents who lived in distinct residential areas such as rural farm, rural non-farm, small city, and large city. Results indicated that individuals residing in large cities were more concerned about being a victim of crime than any other group. This was true for every crime except being hit by a drunk driver and being harassed by obscene phone calls.

A recent report to the President from the Department of Education (2007) indicates that "one size-fits-all" solutions to campus safety are inadequate because they fail to address the multitude of factors each college campus possess, including whether the college is situated in a rural or urban environment.

Chapter III

Methodology

Introduction

The primary goal of this study was to investigate student perceptions of campus safety within the Virginia Community College System. The secondary goal was to use the results to construct a list of best practices based on the results. While research on campus safety is not new, few empirical studies have been dedicated to the community college setting (Reisling, 1995; Smith, 1995; Nichols, 1995; Fisher & Nasar, 1995; McConnell, 1997; Day, 1999; Johnson & Bromley, 1999). For this reason, this study shall focus solely on community college student perceptions of campus safety.

Research Design

The study utilized a sequential explanatory mixed methods design. This design had two distinct phases: a quantitative followed by a qualitative (Creswell, Plano Clark, et al., 2003). This provided a more detailed analysis of the research questions than could have been accomplished using either quantitative or qualitative methods alone. Gillham (2002) states that using a purely qualitative or quantitative methodology can be limiting.

The quantitative portion of the study utilized a non-experimental survey research design. Kumar (2005) indicates that cross-sectional designs are best suited for finding out the prevalence of a phenomenon, attitude, or issue. Due to the large number of potential respondents within the Virginia Community College System, this study used electronic surveys to collect data on students' perceptions of campus safety. Survey research is the preferred data collection method based on convenience, economy, and ease of use (Creswell, 2003).

The qualitative portion of this study used a critical instance case study design of the Virginia community colleges perceived as the most and the least safe by student respondents. A critical instance case study allows the researcher to examine one or more sites for the purpose of identifying a cause and effect relationship (Gillham, 2002). The purpose of this case study was to identify characteristics, actions, and policies which may be affecting students' perceptions of campus safety. This was accomplished by comparing campus characteristics that coincide with current best practices identified by the literature and recent federal and state taskforce reports concerning campus safety.

A major strength of using a case study in this research was the freedom it allowed the researcher to explore campus-specific characteristics, which may influence students' perceptions of campus safety (Kenny, 1984). These campus characteristics may or may not be included within current campus safety recommendations and therefore could be missed if a pure quantitative approach was taken. A potential weakness of using a case study is criticism from some in the academic community who suggest it lacks objectivity, precision, and rigor (Yin, 1989). The author addressed these concerns by spending sufficient time at each institution to thoroughly assess its characteristics, policies, and actions regarding campus safety, thus ensuring rigor. Precision was accomplished as the researcher used a template constructed of relevant campus safety recommendations stated in HJR 122 (2004). This template served as a guide during the on-site case studies, but still allow for exploration of other characteristics, which may be unique to the individual institution. Objectivity was not as great of an issue in this study as it is mainly a consideration when conducting case studies on humans—and not places such as college campuses. The researcher shared the results with a

colleague who is versed in qualitative research to further ensure quality and objectivity.

Once the case studies of the two community college campuses were completed, the author created a list of apparent best practices in campus safety for the VCCS to consider during planning and policy-making stages regarding campus safety.

Research Methodology

This research surveyed students enrolled in community colleges within the Commonwealth of Virginia in order to discover their perceptions of campus safety. Every student within the VCCS is automatically designated an email address upon applying for admission to a college. The purpose of this study was explained to each community college president within the VCCS during a meeting at the System office. The researcher asked the presidents for their permission to conduct the study at their respective community college. Once written consent was gained, the researcher sent an invitation email to each college's president's office. The email invitation was mass emailed on behalf of the researcher, to every student enrolled at their college during the Spring semester of 2010. Two reminder emails were sent to elicit higher response rates

from each institution. One \$500 gift card was used as an incentive for participation in the study. A random drawing was made after response collection was terminated to determine the winners.

Instrumentation for the study consisted of a modified questionnaire developed by Bedenbaugh (2003) entitled *The Campus Safety Survey*. Permission was gained from the original author (Appendix E) to modify the Campus Safety Survey for use within the Virginia Community College System (personal communication, July 7, 2009). Originally the 56-item survey (Appendix C), was developed to investigate student perceptions of safety at an urban, four-year institution (Bedenbaugh, 2003). Because of the original intent of the instrument, slight modifications were made to make it more applicable to the collegiate experience of a community college student. For instance, questions concerning dormitories and residency were deleted or replaced with questions concerning on-campus parking lots.

A colleague working at a community college in North Carolina identified a panel of 10 community college students at her institution to examine the modified instrument for applicability, use of language, and clarity of instructions. Additionally, the instrument was

distributed to every campus safety director in the VCCS. The directors were asked to review the instrument for relevance and validity. The modified instrument, entitled the *Community College Campus Safety Survey*, can be viewed in Appendix D.

Research Questions

This study sought to answer the following research questions related to students' perceptions of campus safety within the Virginia Community College System:

- What types of crime do community college students most fear being a victim while on campus?
- Does the level of fear of crime on campus vary by student demographic?
- Do student perceptions of campus safety vary by the type of security/police present on their campus?
- Do student perceptions of campus safety vary by the rurality of campus attended?
- Do students' perceptions of campus safety vary by the different areas within the community college campus?

In order to determine the types of crimes that community college students most fear, general frequencies were tabulated and analyzed. The types of crimes from which

they can choose were the same as those identified in the Clery Act.

Independent samples t tests and Analysis of Variance tests (ANOVA) were used to determine if there were a statistically significant difference between the levels of perceived safety among different demographic characteristics such as age, race, and gender. An independent samples t test was also used to determine if students' perceptions of safety differed significantly by the type of campus security utilized at the community college campuses.

In order to answer the fourth research question, an ANOVA was performed to determine if student perceptions of campus safety vary by the rurality of the campus attended. The designation of rurality was determined using the Rural-Urban Continuum (RUC) developed by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), which classifies areas as rural, suburban or urban.

To determine whether student concerns about campus safety differ significantly between different areas of the community college campus, general frequencies were tabulated and analyzed. The results of the quantitative portion of the study were used to identify which VCCS

institution students perceived as having the highest and the lowest levels of campus safety. The researcher then conducted a qualitative study of both institutions to determine possible reasons for their perceptions as deemed by the quantitative results.

Selection of Participants

The potential population for this study, was all students enrolled at any of the 23 community colleges making up the Virginia Community College System during the Spring semester of 2010. Each student within the system is automatically assigned an email account upon being accepted into one of Virginia's community colleges. The researcher asked the presidents for their permission to conduct the study at their respective community college. All presidents agreed to allow this study to collect data from the students on their campus. Once written consent was gained, the researcher asked each president's office to send a mass email invitation to the survey to their entire student body. An email invitation was sent to every account registered at the consenting colleges during the Spring semester of 2010. The survey instrument prompted students to identify the college campus they most frequently attended.

Conclusion

This chapter outlined the procedures and design of this study. A mixed method research design was described allowing for a thorough investigation of perceptions among community college students and of individual college practices, which seemingly have an impact on student perceptions of campus safety. The attributes of this study's design were presented along with documentation of the instrument development and validity testing through an expert panel. This chapter included a description of the study's purpose, rationale, research questions, study participants, and data analysis.

Chapter IV

Data Analysis and Findings

Introduction

This study examined the perceptions of campus safety held by community college students enrolled within the Virginia Community College System during the Spring semester of 2010. This study utilized a sequential explanatory mixed methods design. The quantitative portion of the study utilized an electronic survey to evaluate the perceptions of campus safety amongst community college students. Once the data were collected and analyzed, the qualitative portion of the study began. The qualitative component involved visits to two campuses, those campuses that were perceived by respondents as being the most safe and least safe. Campus visits involved observing the presence of campus safety strategies and comparing these strategies against those identified by the Virginia Crime Commission, the Governor's Report on Campus Safety, and current campus safety literature.

The following research questions guided this study:

- What types of crime do community college students most fear being a victim while on campus?
- Does the level of fear of crime on campus vary by student demographic?
- Do student perceptions of campus safety vary by the type of security/police present on their campus?
- Do student perceptions of campus safety vary by the rurality of campus attended?
- Do students' perceptions of campus safety vary by the different areas within the community college campus?

Description of Participants

Every community college student enrolled within the Virginia Community College System during the Spring semester of 2010 was emailed an invitation to participate in the electronic survey. The system encompasses 23 community colleges and operates a total of 40 campuses across Virginia. There were 163,376 students enrolled during the Spring semester of 2010. This figure does not include Dual Enrollment students who often take college courses at their high school. A total of 11,161 surveys were returned giving the study a response rate of 6.8%.

Perceptions of Campus Safety Survey Results

Demographics of the Respondents

Students from each of the 40 community college campuses participated in the study. Of the sample surveyed, 8,173 (74%) were female and 2,822 (26%) were male. Table 4.1 shows the racial/ethnic breakdown of the sample.

Table 4.1

Frequency and Percent by Race

Race	Frequency	Percent
African American	1910	17.11
American Indian	71	0.64
Asian	433	3.88
Hispanic	460	4.12
White	7877	70.58
Other	410	3.67
Total	11,161	100

A total of 6,818 (61%) of the respondents were classified as full-time students, enrolled in at least 12 credits during the Spring semester of 2010. The remaining 4,343 (39%) were classified as part-time students and were enrolled in less than 12 credits. The greatest number of students (36%) were between the ages of 18 and 21. The next most common age group to respond was comprised of individuals aged 30 to 44 (26%).

Due to the low response rate garnered by the electronic survey used in this research, an attempt was made to demonstrate the representativeness of the sample. Data concerning the demographic makeup of all students enrolled within the system during the Spring of 2010 were requested in order to compare it to the study's respondents. Such data are only collected by the system during the Fall semesters. For this reason, data for the Fall semester of 2009 were analyzed and used for comparative purposes.

During the Fall semester of 2009, 109,467 (58%) students were female and 79,808 (42%) were male. During the same semester 118,849 (63%) were White, 39,761 (21%) were African American, 11,012 (6%) were Hispanic, and 10,933 (6%) were Asian. A total of 66,671 (35%) students were considered part-time and 122,604 (65%) were considered full-time. Of all age groups, students in the 18 to 21 age group made up the largest percentage of the population (38%), While there were differences between the demographics of the student body for the Fall semester of 2009 and the respondents in this study during the Spring semester in 2010, the groups were similar. The demographics

were most closely similar with regards to status of enrollment and age group.

Table 4.2 displays demographic data of the respondents for each rural community college campus surveyed. The table also compares the percentage each college contributed to the study and the percentage of enrollment each college contributed to the system's total enrollment for the Spring semester of 2010.

Table 4.2

Demographic Data for Rural Community College Campuses

College	n	% of sample	% of VCCS	male	female	FT	PT
ESCC	174	2	0.6	35	136	103	71
MECC	277	3	1.6	64	209	217	60
PHCC	488	4.4	1.9	116	363	353	135
RCC(WC)	89	0.8	.7	15	71	53	36
SVCC(DC)	279	2.5	1.7	58	211	191	88
SWVCC	48	0.4	1.9	13	32	37	10
Total	1355	13.1	8.4	301	1022	954	400

There were a total of six community college campuses designated as rural within the VCCS. Students from rural college campuses represented 13% of the respondents and 8% of the VCCS' total enrollment.

Table 4.3 displays demographic data of the respondents for each suburban community college campus surveyed. The table also compares the percentage each college contributed to the sample and the percentage of enrollment each college contributed to the system's total enrollment for the Fall semester of 2009.

Table 4.3

Demographic Data for Suburban Community College Campuses

College	n	% of sample	% of VCCS	male	female	FT	PT
BRCC	565	5.1	2.5	179	376	338	226
DSLCC	183	1.6	0.7	49	132	130	52
GCC(LG)	114	1	1.6	18	95	68	46
PDCCC(FC)	109	1	0.9	19	36	73	36
SVCC(CC)	254	2.3	1.7	46	207	151	102
WCC	265	2.4	2.0	50	214	191	73
Total	1490	13.4	9.4	361	1060	951	535

There were a total of six community college campuses designated as suburban within the VCCS. Students from suburban college campuses represented 13% of the sample and 9% of the VCCS' total enrollment.

The majority of Virginia community college campuses (28) were classified as urban. Due to the size of the chart

and the number of urban community colleges the table was included as an appendix. Appendix F displays demographic data of the sample for each urban community college campus surveyed. The appendix also compares the percentage each college contributed to the sample and the percentage of enrollment each college contributed to the system's total enrollment for the Fall semester of 2009. Students from urban community colleges comprised 73% of the sample and 80% of the VCCS total enrollment.

Research Question 1

The purpose of the first research question was to ascertain the crime of which community college students most feared being a victim while attending classes at their campus. The list of crimes from which survey respondents could choose were those that the Clery act requires each college to annually report statistics. The crimes included murder and non-negligent manslaughter, negligent manslaughter, robbery, forcible sex offenses, non-forcible sex offenses, motor vehicle theft, aggravated assault, and arson. Students were given a brief definition of each crime and asked to rate via a 5-point Likert type Scale how likely they felt that it was that they could be a victim of

each crime. The choices were very likely, likely, undecided, unlikely, and very unlikely.

A total of 10,827 students responded to this portion of the survey. Students felt that they were more likely to be a victim of a robbery than a victim of any of the other index crimes. A total of 2,617 (23%) students reported that they felt they were very likely or likely to be a victim of this crime. The crime of motor vehicle theft was next with 2,270 (20%) reporting that they were very likely or likely to be a victim. Students stated that they felt they were the least likely to be a victim of murder, with 590 (5%) reporting that they were very likely or likely to be a victim of this crime while on campus. Table 4.2 shows each crime and the number of students reporting they were very likely or likely to be a victim of on campus.

Table 4.4

Crimes and Perceived Likelihood of Victimization

Crime	Frequency	Percent
Murder/Non-negligent Manslaughter	590	5.45
Negligent Manslaughter	958	8.85
Robbery	2,617	24.17
Forcible Sex Offenses	1,144	10.57
Non-forcible Sex Offenses	754	6.96

Motor Vehicle Theft	2,270	20.97
Aggravated Assault	1,876	17.73
Arson	618	5.71
<hr/>		
Total	10.827	100

Research Question 2

Current literature on victimization suggests that different demographic groups within the population have different levels of fear concerning crime (Bankson et. al., 1989, Ferrar & LaGrange, 1989, Ferraro, 1995, Day, 1991; McConnel, 1997). The second research question was to determine if perceptions of campus safety vary by demographic characteristics. Students were asked a series of demographic questions concerning their gender, race, age, and status of enrollment (i.e. full-time or part-time attendance). Students' perceptions of campus safety were captured via a ten-point Likert type scale with a selection of one indicating the most safe a student could possibly feel on campus and a selection of ten indicating the least safe one could possibly feel. The following sections will report students' perceptions of campus safety by demographic characteristics.

Age.

Students were asked to report their age by selecting one of the following categories: 18-21, 22-24, 25-29, 30-44, 45-59, and 60 and above. Table 4.3 presents each student age group along with the mean average of their corresponding perception of campus safety in response to the ten-point Likert type scale.

The age group that demonstrated the greatest perception of campus safety was the group aged 60 and over ($M=4.85$), followed by those aged 18 to 21 ($M=5.05$). The group that perceived themselves to be the least safe was the one comprised of students aged 22 to 24 (5.49). A single factor ANOVA was used to determine if the differences between these groups and their perceptions of safety were significant. The analysis was significant for age groups, $F(5,10899)=5.90$, $p < .001$. Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for the 18-21 group ($M=5.05, SD=3.08$) was significantly different from the 22-24 group ($M=5.49, SD=3.08$), the 25-29 group ($M=5.34, SD=3.09$), and the 30-44 age group ($M=5.30, SD=3.11$). The same procedure identified significance between the 22-24 age group ($M=5.49, SD=3.08$) and the 45-59 group ($M=5.10, SD=3.14$).

Table 4.5

Age and the Perception of Campus Safety

Age	Perception of Safety
	Mean
18-21	5.05
22-24	5.49
25-29	5.34
30-44	5.30
45-59	5.10
60 and over	4.85

Race.

Student perceptions of safety were also examined in relation to ethnic group. Table 4.6 presents each ethnic group and their corresponding perception of campus safety reported as the mean average on the ten-point Likert type scale. The ethnic group that perceived the highest level of campus safety was American Indians (M=4.52) followed by African Americans (M=5.12). Asian students reported the lowest perceptions of campus safety (M=5.52).

A single factor ANOVA was used to determine if the differences in the means for this measure were significant.

The differences among these groups were not found to be significant at an alpha level of .05, $F(5,10908)=1.81$, $p = 0.11$.

Table 4.6

<i>Race and the Perception of Campus Safety</i>	
Race	Mean Perception of Safety
African American	5.12
American Indian	4.52
Asian	5.52
Hispanic	5.22
White	5.21
Other	5.31

Gender.

Students' perceptions of safety were also studied as they related to gender. The means for this measure for the two genders were compared. The male student group demonstrated a mean of $M=5.14$. The female student group mean for the same measure was $M=5.24$. On average, female students reported feeling less safe while present on their community college campus. An independent samples t-test of the means determined that this difference was not

significant at the .05 confidence level, $t(4590) = -1.31$, $p = 0.19$.

Enrollment status.

Students were asked to report their status of enrollment for the Spring 2010 semester as either full-time (defined as 12 credits or more), or part-time (defined as less than 12 credits). This variable was also studied to determine if there were any significant differences in students' perceptions of campus safety by enrollment status. The mean for the full-time student group was $M=5.15$. The part-time student group had a mean of $M=5.31$ on the same measure. This indicates that part-time students indicated feeling less safe while on campus than their full-time counterparts. An independent samples t-test analysis was used to determine if the differences were significant. There was a significant effect for enrollment status, $t(10,911)=-2.91$, $p < .05$, with part-time students reporting that they felt less safe than full-time students.

Research Question 3

The third research question sought to determine if the presence of police or security departments had a positive impact on the students' perceptions of campus safety. Students were asked to identify the type of security

present on the campus that they attend. The choices offered were police department, uniformed security department, none, and not sure.

Table 4.7

Security Type and the Perception of Campus Safety

Type of Security	Perception of Safety Mean	Percent
Police Department	5.19	24.3
Uniformed Security	5.18	46.1
None	5.47	3.4
Unsure of Type	5.27	26.2

The variable of campus security was examined to determine if there was a significant difference in the perceptions of safety by the type of security present, as reported by the students. Table 4.7 displays the mean score for students' perceptions of campus safety for each category of security reported.

Students attending community college campuses with a uniformed security department perceived feeling the safest ($M=5.18$) followed closely by those which have police departments on campus ($M=5.19$). Students from within the group whose community college did not employ any type of

campus security perceived feeling the least safe (5.47). Interestingly, over one quarter of the sample, (26%) were not sure of which type of campus security their campus employed. A single factor ANOVA was used to determine if the differences among these groups were significant. The differences were not significant, $F(3,10904) = 1.38, p = 0.25$.

Research Question 4

The fourth research question sought to determine if student perceptions of campus safety varied by the rurality of campus attended. To answer this question, a single factor ANOVA was used. The variables were the Rural Urban Continuum Code (RUCC) rating of the campus location as being rural, urban, or suburban and students' reported perception of safety gathered on a 10-point Likert type scale. The results indicated that there was a significant difference in the students' perception of campus safety between rural, suburban, and urban campus settings, $F(2,16154) = 462.18, p < .001$. Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for each level of rurality was significantly different from the other two, rural ($M=2.87, SD=1.02$), suburban ($M=3.05, SD=0.99$), and urban ($M=2.29, SD=1.09$).

Research Question 5

The final research question asked if students' perceptions of campus safety varied by the different areas within the community college campus. A total of ten areas were included on the survey. Students were asked to rate their perceptions of safety while present on the following areas on campus; classrooms, hallways, student lounge, library, parking lot, outdoor recreation area, campus entry alcoves, science labs, walkways, and restrooms. The mean responses varied between 1.40 and 2.43. Students rated science labs as the safest area on campus ($M=1.40$), followed by outdoor recreation areas ($M=1.44$), the library ($M=1.50$), classrooms ($M=1.54$), and the student center or student lounge ($M=1.60$). Respondents reported feeling the least safe on campus when in the parking lot ($M=2.43$) followed by walkways ($M=1.99$) and restrooms ($M=1.84$).

Table 4.6 displays the mean of students' perceptions of safety in the areas researched.

Table 4.8

Campus Location and Perception of Campus Safety

Location	Perception of Safety Average
Classrooms	1.54

Hallways	1.72
Student center/Lounge	1.60
Library	1.50
Parking lot	2.43
Outdoor recreation area	1.44
Entry alcoves	1.80
Science labs	1.40
Walkways	1.99
Restrooms	1.84

Campus Visits

Two campuses were selected based on the results of the quantitative portion of the research. The campuses perceived by the students as the least and most safe were selected for further inquiry. The following summarizes the information gathered through interviews with administrators and personal observations of the campuses.

The Campus Perceived to be the Safest.

The campus that received the highest rating for students' perceptions of campus safety ($M=4.5$) had a RUCCS Scale rating of six on a scale from one to nine. This indicates that the campus is located in a rural setting. The campus was one of the smallest within the VCCS. An

interview with college administrators responsible for student safety revealed the following:

- The college did operate a Threat Assessment Team made up of a cross section of college departments and local mental health and law enforcement professionals as required by state law.
- Members of the threat assessment team had participated in threat assessment training.
- An emergency call box had been purchased and installed in the parking lot.
- The college was seeking grant funding to purchase more call boxes and had plans to improve the lighting in the back of the building.
- The college worked with local and state law enforcement officers to conduct a safety audit and had carried out some of the recommendations of the findings.
- The college did employ a security guard who worked from 4:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. during the week.
- The college had a night-time administrator on call during evening classes; however, since two of the administrators lived a considerable distance from the college they chose to stay on campus until the last class finished.

- A top-level college administrator met with every new student and their family members during their new student orientation sessions to discuss campus safety.
- The college did not survey their students to collect data on campus safety perceptions or opinions.

The Campus Perceived to be the Least Safe.

The campus perceived to be the least safe (M=5.8) had a RUCCS Scale rating of one on a scale from one to nine. This indicates that the campus is situated in an urban setting. An interview with two college administrators responsible for campus safety revealed the following:

- The college did operate a Threat Assessment Team but was only in the initial stages of training and organizing its members.
- The administration was concerned about the amount of lighting in the parking lot and along walkways. The administrators stated that there were currently insufficient funds available to improve the amount of lighting in those areas.
- The college did not employ any type of security on campus. The building and grounds staff handled any

type of security issues until local law enforcement could arrive.

- The college assigned night-time administrators but they were on call and did not remain at the campus during the evenings.
- The college did not survey their students to collect data on campus safety perceptions or opinions.

Information gathered during the interviews was compared to the list of best practices created by the Commonwealth of Virginia's Crime Commission (2004). This list of best practices was chosen as the main comparison standard for this research over other lists. The reason for this decision was due to the fact that many of the reports published after April 16, 2007 deal primarily with policy and procedures in response to campus tragedies rather than with their prevention. In some cases, such as with the practice of implementing student alert systems, reactive measures have become best practices and were included in the comparison. Table 4.9 shows each pertinent best practice and whether or not it was being followed at each campus at the time of this research. Some of the best practices within the

literature deal only with campus police departments which neither college campus had in place and thus, were omitted from the list.

Table 4.9

Best Practices for Campus Safety

Best Practice	Campus 1	Campus 2
Establish a safety committee.	Yes	Yes
Target hardening (CPTED)	No	No
Use orientation to promote safety.	Yes	Yes
Offer rape prevention training	Yes	No
Use students to augment security.	No	No
Use of security policy manual.	Yes	No*
Accreditation of security department.	No	No*
Participate in local and state training.	Yes	Yes
Security works with local officials.	Yes	No*
Security meets with college administration.	Yes	No*
Inclusion in regional disaster plans.	Yes	Yes
Regularly survey students.	No	No
Written policy to track cases.	Yes	Yes
Develop sanctions concerning violations.	Yes	Yes
Develop liaison with local courts.	Yes	Yes
Use professional community resources.	Yes	Yes

Multiple methods of student notification.	Yes	Yes
---	-----	-----

* No security present on campus.

Chapter 5

Summary and Conclusions

There have been relatively few empirical studies on students' perceptions of campus safety, despite society's recent interest in campus safety (Warr & Straford, 1983; Willcox, Jordan & Pritchard, 2007). The studies that do exist are primarily focused on four-year colleges and universities (Reisling, 1995; Smith, 1995; Nichols, 1995; Fisher & Nasar, 1995; McConnell, 1997; Day, 1999; Johnson & Bromley, 1999). While research concerning campus crime has increased as public concern has risen, little of the research has been directed towards community colleges (Costello, 2003). Community college administrators cannot rely on current research involving university students, due to the differences in the student bodies and the differences in the campus environments (Lee, 2000). For these reasons, a need exists for research that focuses solely on the community college student and the community college environment. This research created a first step towards accomplishing that goal, and also investigated whether differences existed between the community colleges within the Virginia Community College System. This system

provided a total of 40 diverse campuses to study, as the colleges within it differed in terms of size, resources, rurality and the level of security employed on each campus. The campus settings were diverse, as some campuses were in very rural communities and some in very urban locations. It is hoped that the results of this research will be used to improve community college students' safety, and thus their perceptions of campus safety within the system.

Purpose Statement and Research Questions

This study sought to answer the following research questions related to students' perceptions of campus safety within the Virginia Community College System:

- What types of crime do community college students most fear being a victim while on campus?
- Does the level of fear of crime on campus vary by student demographic?
- Do student perceptions of campus safety vary by the type of security/police present on their campus?
- Do student perceptions of campus safety vary by the rurality of campus attended?

- Do students' perceptions of campus safety vary by the different areas within the community college campus?

Overview of the Methodology

The study employed an explanatory sequential mixed methods design. This allowed for a more detailed analysis of the research questions than could be accomplished using either quantitative or qualitative methods alone.

The quantitative portion of the study utilized a non-experimental survey research design. Due to the large number of potential respondents within the Virginia Community College System, this study used electronic surveys to collect data on students' perceptions of campus safety. Considering the large geographical service area of the Virginia Community College System, survey research was chosen as primary method of data collection based on convenience, economy, and ease of use (Creswell, 2003).

Statistical analyses were performed using SAS v. 9.1 statistical analysis software. General frequencies were recorded and analyzed to identify the types of crime that community college students fear being victimized the most while on campus. The same statistic was used for determining which areas of the community college campus

concern students the most in regards to safety. An independent samples t tests and ANOVAs were used to determine if there was a statistically significant difference between the levels of perceived safety among different student groups. Next, analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine if students' perceptions of safety differed significantly among college campuses by the type of security present. Finally, analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine if students' perceptions of safety differed significantly in relation to the rurality of the campus setting and areas of campus visited.

The qualitative portion of this study utilized a critical instance case study design of the Virginia community colleges, which were identified as the most and the least safe based on student responses to the survey. The purpose of this case study was to identify characteristics, actions, and policies that may be affecting students' perceptions of campus safety. This was accomplished by comparing campus characteristics that coincide with current best practices identified by the literature and recent federal and state taskforce reports concerning campus safety.

Discussion of the Findings

Invitations to participate in an electronic survey were emailed to 163,678 Virginia community college students enrolled in the Spring semester of 2010. A total of 11,161 surveys were returned giving the study a response rate of 6.8%. While this was a relatively low response rate, a sufficient number of surveys from each of the 40 campuses were received to allow for statistical analysis on and comparisons of the data collected. The following sections provide the findings of each research question and a discussion of the possible implications for community college campus safety planning.

Research Question 1

The purpose of the first research question was to ascertain the crime of which community college students most feared being a victim while attending classes at their campus. Students' perceptions of the likelihood they may be a victim of certain crimes were high compared to the actual occurrences of those crimes. For example, nearly one-quarter of the students (24%) perceived themselves to be likely or very likely a victim of robbery while visiting a community college campus. Since 2001, there have only been 18 reported instances of robberies occurring on a campus

within the system (OPE, 2009). Crime statistics indicated that there were more motor vehicle thefts (49) and aggravated assaults (31) than robberies, yet students rated robbery as the crime of which they were most likely to be a victim (OPE, 2009). Students also demonstrated a concern for the crimes of murder/non-negligent manslaughter (5%) and negligent manslaughter (8%) while there have been no reported occurrences of either crime since 2001 (OPE, 2009).

Due to the fact that students reported fearing robbery more than any other crime, campus administrators should address the concern early on in the students' career at their college. Crime statistics for the campus should be presented to new students during orientation to the college. Providing evidence that these crimes happen rarely on community college campuses may reduce the students' perceived fear of victimization. The same holds true for murder and all forms of manslaughter. By providing crime data to the student body, the college may help alleviate some of the perceived risk students possess. During this orientation phase, students should also be encouraged to report suspicious activity to the administrator on duty or to security employed by the campus.

Research Question 2

Current literature on victimization suggests that different demographics of the population have different levels of fear concerning crime (Bankson et. al., 1989, Ferrar & LaGrange, 1989, Ferraro, 1995, Day, 1991; McConnel, 1997). The second research question was to determine if the different student groups varied in their perceptions of campus safety. While there were no significant differences in perceptions of safety among student groups according to race and gender, there were significant effects for age and enrollment status. This research found younger students, those aged from 18-24, generally felt safer while on campus than their older counterparts with the exception of the group aged 60 and over. This difference in perceptions of safety may be due to the fact that younger students are more traditional in their college attendance. For instance, 80% of the 18-24 group were classified as full time students and only 11% of the group took courses mainly in the evening hours. Conversely, only 47% of those aged 30-44 were full time and 31% of them took classes mainly in the evenings. In other words, traditional students were more likely to attend class during the day and be enrolled full time while

nontraditional students attend part time and 40% of the group attended class only during the evening hours. The fact that the variable of enrollment status was found to be significant, with part time students reporting lower perceptions of campus safety than full time students, would seem to support this theory.

Community college administrators should address the concerns of part-time students in a variety of ways. Information given during regular orientation sessions should also be offered at night to accommodate these students. The same information can be mailed, emailed, or posted on the college's website. Community college administrators should also continue with efforts to improve lighting and remove obstructions within parking areas, which block a students' view of their surroundings. Administrators should make sure there is sufficient lighting to and from buildings on campus, as walkways were an area of concern for students.

Research Question 3

The third research question sought to determine if the presence of police or security departments had a positive impact on the students' perceptions of campus safety. Perceptions of campus safety were collected via a 10-point

Likert type scale with a selection of one indicating the safest the respondent could possibly feel and a selection of ten indicating the least safe the respondent could possible feel while on campus. Students attending colleges that employed a security department or a police department demonstrated similar levels of perceived campus safety. A possible explanation for this could be that some students were unable to differentiate between the two forms of campus security. Students attending a campus with no security or police department were shown to have the greatest concern of campus safety. While such departments seem to positively affect students' perceptions of campus safety, the differences between the perceptions of students' attending a campus with some type of security and those without were not found to be significant.

Employing a security department or a police department on campus requires a considerable investment of resources. Most community colleges in Virginia have made this investment. A total of 19 of the system's 23 community colleges employ either security or police officers. While the differences in students' perceptions of safety were not significant among the colleges with security and those without, the research demonstrated that there was a

difference. That is, students attending a college with no form of security felt less safe than students attending a campus with security.

The campus that was perceived to be the safest employed one part-time security guard during the evening hours. While still an investment, the amount of resources to provide this type of security is small compared to operating a full security or police department. Community colleges should survey their student bodies regarding campus safety regularly and then experiment with providing security, especially in the evening hours to address the concerns of part-time students. This is important as the greatest number (40%) of part-time students take classes mostly during the evening hours according to this research.

It is important to note that over one quarter of the students surveyed were unsure of the type of security on their campus. This group reported perceptions of campus safety that were less than those reporting the presence of some type of security on campus but greater than the students who reported no security at their campus. This would seem to suggest that some students taking the survey were aware that security existed but were unable to report the type. It may also suggests that some students within

this group were unsure if any security was present on their campus which caused the average perception of safety to be less than those students who could identify the type of security on their campus.

Research Question 4

The fourth research question sought to determine if student perceptions of campus safety varied by the rurality of campus attended. Campuses were given a rurality code based on the Department of Agriculture's Rural/Urban Continuum Scale. An ANOVA determined that there were significant differences between students' perceptions of safety considering the rurality of the campus setting. Furthermore, the perception of safety within the different levels of rurality was found to be significantly different from the others when a post hoc Tukey test for significance was applied.

While this information is interesting, one should consider the multitude of variables that also affect students' perceptions of safety at each campus when evaluating these results. The enrollment of part time students, presence of security, and presence of night time administrators vary not only from college to college but also between campuses of the same college and across levels

of rurality. While more research is needed to determine the role rurality plays in the perception of campus safety, it should be noted that the campus that had the highest student perception of campus safety was found to be rural while the campus with the lowest student perception of safety was urban.

Research Question 5

The final research question asked if students' perceptions of campus safety varied by the different areas within the community college campus. Students felt the safest in science labs, followed by the library, classrooms, and the student lounge. Parking lots were found to be the area on campus which student's had the most concern for their safety, followed by walkways, and bathrooms.

It is important to realize that the areas students perceived to be the safest were ones in which they would most likely be in the company of other people. Conversely, parking lots, walkways, and restrooms are places students generally visit alone. Because of this, community colleges should consider the use of security to make students feel safer in these areas. It is also important to make sure there is sufficient lighting along walkways and in the

parking lots on campus considering the fact part-time students felt less safe than full-time students and the fact that the majority of part-time students visit these areas in the evening hours.

Campus Visits

Both campus visits were made during the Spring semester of 2010. Interviews were scheduled with the Vice President of Finance and Administration and an academic dean at each college. After the interview a campus tour was accomplished for the purposes of assessing the implementation of campus safety strategies.

Neither of the campuses had utilized principles of crime prevention through environmental design in the initial design or construction of their facilities as indicated as a best practice by the Virginia Crime Commission (2004). Both were addressing the issue of target hardening through reactive design measures such as improving lighting and installing call boxes in the parking lot. Both colleges had instituted both a Threat Assessment Team and a Safety Committee to address issues of campus safety at their college as suggested by the Crime Commission (2004). Another best practice identified by the Virginia Crime Commission was to regularly survey students

to gain insight into issues pertaining to campus safety on their campus. These data would allow for the efficient allocation of resources that are currently scarce. Neither college had a system to regularly survey their student body concerning issues of campus safety.

A lack of budgetary resources was cited as a barrier for improving campus safety on both of the campuses visited during this research. While administrators on both campuses indicated that there were plans to improve lighting in specific areas of the campus, the one which was perceived to be the most safe had sought and obtained funding for improvements from grants and private foundations. The employment of a part-time security guard during the evening hours also demonstrated a commitment to improve perceptions of campus safety on this campus. The effect of this commitment to campus safety appears to have had an effect on the students who attend there.

Recommendations

After analyzing both the quantitative and qualitative data collected during this study, the following recommendations regarding campus safety were made:

- Community colleges should regularly survey their students to gain insights into the perceptions of campus safety on the campus they attend.
- Results from such surveys should be analyzed and efforts should be made to address areas and issues students are most concerned about particular to each campus.
- Community colleges should employ some type of security on campus during the evening hours. If a professional security agency cannot be employed due to financial constraints, colleges should explore the best practice of using interns and student volunteers to help maintain a presence in secluded areas during the evening hours. At least one of the colleges that participated in the study used students to form a Campus Safety Department. Students in this program were given radios, flashlights, and wore uniforms, which identified them as campus safety officers.
- Administrators should focus on improving lighting in parking lots and walkways as this was

identified during the research as areas about which students were most concerned.

- Colleges should take into consideration principles of crime prevention through environmental design when planning for the construction of new buildings, parking lots and walkways.
- New student orientation information concerning crime statistics and safety information should be distributed to part-time students. These students may not attend regular orientation sessions during the day due to work and family obligations.
- Colleges which are employing some form of security should direct these services towards the times and locations students report being the most concerned about.

Recommendations for Future Research

This research examined a variety of student variables and the issue of campus safety. Significance was found when considering students' age, enrollment status, and setting of the campus they attend in terms of rurality. Further

research on each of these variables is needed in order to determine exactly how they impact students' perceptions of safety on the community college campus. For instance, this research determined that the oldest age group surveyed demonstrated the greatest perceptions of safety. This seems consistent with current victimization literature (Ferraro & LaGrange, 1989, Ferraro, 1995), however, it would be worthwhile to conduct similar research while controlling for the other variables found to be significant. Such a study may provide insights into the attitudes or behaviors of this group, which may help to improve the perceptions of campus safety for all students.

Because of the amount of resources necessary to operate a security or police department on campus, the effectiveness of utilizing student interns or volunteers to help promote campus safety should be evaluated. If it is determined that such a program positively effects the perceptions of campus safety, colleges could implement and maintain these programs with little financial commitment. Colleges should also explore the possibility of hiring off duty local law enforcement officers to provide security on campus during certain hours.

Part-time students should also be studied in more detail to ascertain their specific concerns regarding campus safety. Once this is accomplished, community college administrators will be more informed as to what strategies can be employed to improve their perceptions of safety while visiting the campus.

Administrators or local officials may be able to garner a better response rate if the study is replicated particular to individual campuses utilizing more effective means of communication with students.

Finally, research similar to this should be conducted within other states to determine if the findings are particular to Virginia or similar to community colleges in other states.

Conclusion

Community college students exhibit concerns for campus safety. A myriad of factors appear to be the cause. The need for more research on this topic is apparent. The variables rurality, student enrollment status and student age were found to be significant variables in the perception of safety while on campus. Until more research is conducted to understand the effects of these variables have on students' perception of campus safety is conducted,

making conclusions concerning them individually is difficult. This research did indicate that part-time students, who were more likely to be older felt less safe than their full-time counterparts. It also determined that part-time students attend classes mainly during the evening hours. This, taken with the fact that students reported being most concerned in areas of the campus they are most likely to visit alone, gives college administrators information concerning variables of the student experience which they need to address to improve perceptions of campus safety.

While many of the strategies and best practices to improve campus safety mentioned in this research require significant funding to employ, others can be implemented with little to no cost to the community college. Each community college's safety committee should make sure they understand the concerns of their respective student body. One of the best methods to accomplish this is to regularly obtain student opinions and perceptions of campus safety through surveys. Once these data are collected, college administrators should work towards addressing the concerns through effective use of available funds, strategic planning, and the use of volunteer students and interns.

Community colleges should also make sure safety information, crime statistics, and other orientation information reaches part-time students who are unlikely to visit the college during the day. This is another example of a campus safety strategy that can be employed internally without dedicating a great deal of financial resources.

Colleges should concentrate available funds on providing security during the evening hours, improving lighting in parking lots and along walkways, and employing principles of crime prevention through environmental design when constructing new facilities on campus.

In conclusion, the best strategy to improve campus safety at Virginia community college campuses is to seek students' concerns at each campus and then apply suggested best practices to address these issues. This process should be ongoing. Until college administrators can establish this cycle of gathering student input and addressing concerns, they should focus their time and energy on areas students are likely to visit alone during the evening hours and work towards making these areas safer. Once an effective cycle of collecting student concerns and addressing them is created, more specific campus safety issues can be

identified and addressed particular to each community college campus.

References

- Bedenbaugh, C. (2003). Measuring fear on campus: A study of an urban university. Unpublished master's thesis, Louisiana State University, Louisiana.
- Beeler, K. J., Duton, S. D., & Wiggins, C. A. (Spring 1991). Campus safety: A survey of administrative perceptions and strategies. Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Inc. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. Ed 336 001).
- Biderman, A. D., & Reiss, A. J., Jr. (1967). On exploring the "dark figure" of crime. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 374, 1-15.
- Block, C. R., & Block, R. L. (1984). Crime definition, crime measurement, and victim surveys. *Journal of Social Issues*, 40, 137-160.
- Blumstein, A., (2000). Disaggregating the violence trend. Pp. 13-44 in *The Crime Drop in America*, edited by Alfred Blumstein and Joel Wallman. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Blumstein, A., & Cork, D., (1996) Linking gun availability to youth gun violence. *Law and Contemporary Problems*. 59:5-24.

- Blumstein, A., Rivara, P., & Rosenfield, R., (2000). The rise and decline of homicide - and why. *Annual Review of Public Health* 21:505-541.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics, (2005). Serious violent crime levels declined since 1993. Washington D.C., Department of Justice - Office of Justice Programs. Retrieved electronically on January 2, 2009 from <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs /glance/cv2.htm>
- Caizo, S. & O'Sullivan (2002, October 29). UA's bloodiest day ever. *Arizona Daily Star*, p. A 11.
- Cassino, Peter P. (2008). A national and a local response to a local problem: How the public, media, government, and local organizations reacted to the crime wave of the late 1980s and early 1990s. Ph.D. dissertation, Northeastern University, United States -- Massachusetts. Retrieved February 8, 2009, from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text database. (Publication No. AAT 3304116).
- Carr, J. L. (2005, February). *American College Health Association campus violence white paper*. Baltimore, MD: American College Health Association.
- Chiricos, T., Eschholz, S., & Gertz, M., (1997). Crime, news and the fear of crime: Towards an identification of audience effects. *Social Problems*. 44:342-357.

- Cook, P. F., and J. H. Laub., (1998). "The unprecedented epidemic in youth violence." *Crime and Justice* 24:27-64.
- Colaner, K. T., (2006) Towards greater campus safety : an examination of student affairs administrators' knowledge of compliance with the clery act. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California.
- Cooper, B. (1997) The relationship of student perceptions and behaviors regarding personal safety: A comparative study of two small, private colleges. Doctoral Dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan.
- Costello, R. (2003) Administrator, faculty, and student perception of crime and implications for policy at a public community college. Doctoral Dissertation, Dowling College, Oakdale, New York.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed approaches* (2nd edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J., Plano Clark, V., Gutmann, M., & Hanson, W. (2003). Advanced mixed methods research designs. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed*

- methods in social and behavioral research* (p. 209-240). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Day, K. (1999). Strangers in the night? Women's fear of sexual assault on urban college campuses. *Journal of Architectural and Planning Research*, 16, 289-312.
- Donde, S.. Investigating acknowledgment of unwanted sexual experiences in college women. Ph.D. dissertation, The George Washington University, United States -- District of Columbia. Retrieved September 7, 2009, from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text. (Publication No. AAT 3331432).
- Donohue, J. J., (1998). "Understanding the time path of crime." *The Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology* 88:1423- 1452.
- Dorfman, L. & Schiraldi, V., (2001). Off balance: Youth, race & crime in the news. *Building Blocks For Youth* April. Retrieved electronically on February 6, 2009 From:<http://www.buildingblocksforyouth.org/media/media.pdf>
- Drysdale, D., Modzeleski, W., and Simons, A. (2010). *Campus Attacks: Targeted Violence Affecting Institutions of Higher Education*. U.S. Secret Service, U.S. Department

of Homeland Security, Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools, U.S. Department of Education, and Federal Bureau of Investigation, U.S. Department of Justice. Washington, D.C., 2010.

Durkheim, Emile. 1933. *The Division of Labor in Society* Translated by George Simpson. New York: The Free Press.

Federal Bureau of Investigation. National Crime Reports. Washington, DC Federal Bureau of Investigation. Retrieved electronically on January 10, 2009 from <http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/ucr.htm>

Fisher, B. S., Cullen, F. T., & Turner, M. G. (2000). *The sexual victimization of college women*. Washington: DC: National Institute of Justice and Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Fisher, B. S., & Nasar, J. L. (1992). Fear of crime in relation to three exterior site features: Prospect, refuge, and escape. *Environment and Behavior*, 24, 35-65.

Fisher, B. S., & Nasar, J. L. (1995). Fear spots in relation to micro level physical cues: Exploring the overlooked. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 32, 214-239.

- Fox, J. A., & Hellman, D. A. (1985) Location and other correlates of campus crime. *Journal of Criminal Justice.*, 13, 429-444.
- Gerhand, K. (2000). University policing: Its origins and development. *Campus Law Enforcement Journal*, July/August, 19-25.
- Gregory, D.E., & Janosik, S.M. (2006). The research on the Clery Act and the impact of the act on higher education administrative practice. *The Journal of College and University Student Housing.* 34(1) 50-57.
- Gregory, D. E., & Janosik, S.M. (2002). The Clery Act: how effective is it? Perceptions from the field - The current state of the research and recommendations for improvement. *Stetson Law Review*, 32 (1) 7-59.
- Gillham, B. (2002). *Case study research methods*. New York: TJ International Ltd.
- Hanchette (1988). The Clerys: Victim's parents push change. *USA Today*, October 4, 1988. p. 6A
- Haney, D. (2008, February 16). Tragedy felt by many area residents: Local NIU students, grandfather of one victim speak out about the slayings. *Perioria Journal Star*, p. A1.

Henson, V., & Stone, W. (1999, July). Campus crime: A victimization study. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 27(4), 295. Retrieved February 26, 2009, from Academic Search Complete database.

Hilinski, C. (2007). Fear of crime among college women: A test of the shadow of sexual assault hypothesis. Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, United States -- Pennsylvania. Retrieved September 7, 2009, from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text. (Publication No. AAT 3267740).

H. J. Rep. No. 122, Doc. #36, Final report: Study on campus safety (2006).

Johnson, R.P. & Bromley, M. (1999). Surveying a university population: Establishing the foundation for a community policing initiative. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 15(2), 133-143.

Karjane, H. M., Fisher, B. S., & Cullen, F. T. (2002). *Campus sexual assault: How America's institutions of higher education respond*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice. Retrieved July 6, 2006 at <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/196676.pdf>

Keels, C. (2004, May 6). The Best-Kept Secret: CRIME ON CAMPUS. *Black Issues in Higher Education*, 21(6), 20-

27. Retrieved February 23, 2009, from Academic Search Complete database.

Kennedy, R. (2005) Campus police v. campus security. M.S. dissertation, Central Missouri State University, United States -- Missouri. Retrieved January 30, 2009, from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text database. (Publication No. AAT14294 97).

Kennedy, M. (2007) Crisis on campus. *American School and University*. 79 (10), 18-25.

Kenny, R. (1984). Making the case for the case study. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 16, (1), 37-51. Kerr, Jr., S.D. (2001). *Disclosure of campus security policies and crime statistics among colleges and universities in the Upper Midwest*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of South Dakota. Retrieved September 05, 2009 at <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=726118801&sid=1&Fmt=2&clientId=3505&RQT=309&VName=PQD>

Kleberg, J. (2004). Campus safety: Reality and perception. *Campus Law Enforcement Journal*, 34(5), 18-38.

Koss, M. P. (1998). Hidden rape: Sexual aggression and victimization in a national sample of students in higher education. In M. E. Odem & J. Clay-Warner

- (Eds.), *Confronting rape and sexual assault* (pp. 35-49). Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources Inc.
- Kumar, R. (2005). *Research methodology: A step-by-step beginners guide*. Frenchs Forest, NSW: Pearson.
- Lattimore, P., Trudeau, J., Leiter, J., & Edwards, S., (1997). A study of homicide in eight U.S. cities: An NIJ intramural research project. National Institute of Justice Research in Brief November 1997.
- Lee, M.R. (2000) Community cohesion and violent predatory victimization: A theoretical extension and cross-national test of opportunity theory. *Social Forces*. 79 (2), 683.
- Lenski, T.J. (1992). Students' perceptions of campus safety and the effect on intended precautionary behavior. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Vermont.
- Liska, A., & Warner, B. (1991, May). Functions of Crime: A Paradoxical Process. *American Journal of Sociology*, 96(6), 1441. Retrieved February 26, 2009, from Academic Search Complete database.
- McConnell, Elizabeth H. (1997). "Fear of Crime on Campus: A Study of a Southern University," *Journal of Security Administration*, Volume 20, Issue 2: pp. 22-46.

- National Archive of Criminal Justice Data. National Crime Victimization Survey Resource Guide. Retrieved electronically on January 10, 2009 from: http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/NACJD/NCVS/#About_NCVS
- Nichols, D. (1995). Community policing for campus residence facilities. In International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators (Ed.), *Community policing on campus* (pp. 9-24). Hartford, CT: International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators.
- Pasky McMahon, P. Assessing college students' readiness to change alcohol use behavior related to perceptions of alcohol effects on sexual assault. Ph.D. dissertation, Duquesne University, United States -- Pennsylvania. Retrieved September 7, 2009, from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text. (Publication No. AAT 3338617).
- Quintanilla-Ng, Doris A. (2006). An ecological model of college campus rape. Psy.D. dissertation, Massachusetts School of Professional Psychology, United States -- Massachusetts. Retrieved September 7, 2009, from Dissertations & Theses: Full text. (Publication No. AAT 3217497).
- Rasmussen, C., Johnson, G., & Compact, M. (2008, May 1). The ripple effect of Virginia Tech: Assessing the

nationwide impact on campus safety and security policy and practice. *Midwestern Higher Education Compact*,

(ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED502232)

Retrieved January 19, 2009, from ERIC database.

Riseling, S. (1995). Problem-solving policing at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. In International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators (Ed.), *Community policing on campus* (pp. 68-75). Hartford, CT: International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators.

Ress, D. (2008, October 19). Virginia Tech Massacre.

Richmond Times-Dispatch, p. A2.

Smith, M. (1995). Vexatious victims of campus crime. In B.S. Bisher & J.S. Sloan (Eds.), *Campus crime: Legal, social and policy perspectives* (pp. 25-37). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2007) Report to the President on issues raised by the Virginia Tech tragedy. Retrieved November 12, 2008 from: <http://www.hhs.gov/vtreport.html>

U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs Bureau of Justice Statistics. Special Report: Violent

victimization of college students, 1995-2002. January 2005, NCJS 206836.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Center.
Measuring Rurality. Updated October 3, 2007. Retrieved March 10, 2008 from: <http://www.ers.usda.gov/Briefing/Rurality/>

Virginia Community College System (2008), *Fast Facts*.
Retrieved March 11, 2008, from: <http://www.vccs.edu/WhoWeAre/FastFacts/tabid/79/Default.aspx>.

The Virginia Office of Commonwealth Preparedness
(2009), *Virginia Higher Education Preparedness Consortium*. Retrieved July 6, 2009, from:
<http://www.ocp.virginia.gov/vhepc/index.htm>

Virginia Tech Review Panel (2007) *Final Report*. Retrieved July 6, 2009 from: <http://www.vtreviewpanel.org/report/Index.html>

Wada, James Christopher (2007) *Betwixt and between: The perceived legitimacy of campus police*. Ph.D. dissertation, Washington State University, United States -- Washington. Retrieved January 30, 2009, from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text database.
(Publication No. AAT 3277070).

- Warr, M. (2000). Fear of crime in the United States: Avenues for research and policy. In D. Duffee (Ed.), *Measurement and analysis of crime and justice: Criminal justice 2000* (pp. 451-489). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Warr, M. & Stafford, M., (1983). Fear of victimization: a look at the proximate causes. ,*Social Forces*, 61(4), 1033-43.
- Wilcox, P., Jordan, C. E., & Pritchard, A. J. (2007). A multidimensional examination of campus safety: Victimization, perceptions of danger, worry about crime, and precautionary behaviors among college women in the post-clery era. *Crime & Delinquency*, 53(2), 219-254.
- Yin, R. K. (1993). Advancing Rigorous Methodologies: A Review of 'Towards Rigor in Reviews of Multivocal Literatures.' *Review of Educational Research*, 61, (3).

Appendix A

Aggravated Assault

An unlawful attack by one person upon another for the purpose of inflicting severe or aggravated bodily injury. This type of assault is usually accompanied by the use of a weapon or by means likely to produce death or great bodily harm. It is not necessary for an injury to result when a gun, knife or other weapon is used in the commission of the crime (The Clery Act, 1990).

Arson

Any willful or malicious burning or attempt to burn, with or without intent to defraud, a dwelling house, public building, motor vehicle or aircraft, personal property of another, etc (The Clery Act, 1990).

Burglary

The unlawful entry of a structure to commit a felony or a theft. For reporting purposes this definition includes: unlawful entry with intent to commit a larceny or felony; breaking and entering with intent to commit a larceny; housebreaking; safecracking; and all attempts to commit any of the aforementioned (The Clery Act, 1990).

Drug Law Violation

Violations of State and local laws related to the possession, sale, use, growing, manufacturing, and making of narcotic drugs. The relevant substances include; opium or cocaine and their derivatives (morphine, heroin, codeine); marijuana; synthetic narcotics (Demerol, methadone(s); and dangerous non-narcotic drugs (barbiturates, Benzedrine) (The Clery Act, 1990).

Hate Crimes

Any crime that manifests evidence that the victim was intentionally selected because of the victim's actual or perceived race; religion; gender; sexual orientation; ethnicity or physical/mental disabilities (The Clery Act, 1990).

Liquor Law Violation

The violation of laws or ordinances prohibiting: the manufacture, sale, transporting, furnishing, possessing of intoxicating liquor; maintaining unlawful drinking places; bootlegging; operating a still, furnishing liquor to a minor or intemperate person; using a vehicle for illegal transportation of liquor; drinking on a train or public conveyance; or any attempts to commit any of the foregoing violations (The Clery Act, 1990).

Motor Vehicle Theft

The theft or attempted theft of a motor vehicle (The Clery Act, 1990).

Murder and Non-negligent Manslaughter

The willful (non-negligent) killing of one human being by another.

Negligent Manslaughter

The killing of another person through gross negligence.

Robbery

The taking or attempting to take anything of value from the care, custody, or control of a person or persons by force or threat of force or violence and/or by putting the victim in fear (The Clery Act, 1990).

Sex Offense Forcible

Any sexual act directed against another person, forcibly and/or against that person's will; or not forcibly or against the person's will where the victim is incapable of giving consent: forcible rape; forcible sodomy; sexual assault with an object; and forcible fondling (The Clery Act, 1990).

Sex Offense Non-Forcible

Unlawful, non-forcible sexual intercourse: incest; statutory rape (The Clery Act, 1990).

Simple Assault

Assaults and attempted assaults where no weapon was used and which did not result in a serious or aggravated injury to the victim (The Clery Act, 1990).

Weapon Law Violation

The violation of laws or ordinances regulating weapons (The Clery Act, 1990).

Appendix B

Best Practice Recommendations for Campus Safety

Best Practice #1

Each college and university should establish a Safety and Security Committee(s) to determine the necessary mechanisms to ensure campus safety and the prevention of crime. The purpose of the Committee is to encourage communication and collaboration across the campus community, as well as provide an advisory role in protocol development, such as appropriate educational programming for its campus. The Committee should meet, at a minimum, quarterly and should report to the President or his designee.

Best Practice #2

Colleges and universities should apply Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) in planning and maintaining facilities and grounds. Smaller colleges and universities should partner with other law enforcement agencies in implementing CPTED.

Police and security personnel should be actively involved in the review of plans for new buildings and building renovations to ensure that security concerns are addressed. Security concerns should include: landscape, access and key control systems, interior and exterior lighting, windows

and doors, traffic safety (reflective tape for crosswalks, etc.) and electronic detection systems.

Best Practice #3

When developing new student orientation curriculum, institutions should work with campus police/security departments, SGA and other groups to establish the appropriate framework in addressing inappropriate/illegal student behavior. There should be multiple approaches to present the immediate and long-term effects of being arrested to both students and their parents. Approaches should include a mandatory overview at student orientation followed by supplemental meetings with residence life, student groups (i.e., Greek Life), and other organizations.

Best Practice #4

Each college and university should offer multiple courses/training sessions of Rape Aggression Defense (RAD) with certified instructors.

Best Practice #5

Each college and university should consider establishing trained and supervised student employees as an augmentation to security services. At a minimum, such students should receive 32 hours of training.

Best Practice #6

Each college and university with a police department should consider establishing a student police academy to give the campus community a working knowledge of the campus police department's personnel, policies, goals and objectives.

Best Practice #7

Each college and university should embrace the community policing philosophy and establish several programmatic initiatives in order to establish better relationships with the campus community. (Examples include: Adopt-A-Hall, "park, walk, and talk," bicycle patrols, satellite offices, and silent witness programs).

Best Practice #8

Each campus police and security department should have a written policy and procedure manual, which gives consideration to the standards set forth by the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA), the Virginia Law Enforcement Professional Standards Commission (VLEPSC) and/or the International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators (IACLEA).

Best Practice #9

Campus police departments should seek accreditation by an appropriate accrediting agency, such as CALEA, VLEPSC or IACLEA.

Best Practice #10

Campus security departments should seek accreditation by an appropriate accrediting agency, such as the International Association for Campus Law Enforcement Administrators (IACLEA).

Best Practice #11

Each college and university should encourage and participate in professional development provided by regional, state (VACLEA), national, and/or other organizations.

Best Practice #12

The Chief of Police or Director of Security and senior staff as deemed appropriate should belong to one or more professional organizations or associations to stay up-to-date with current practices. (Examples: VACLEA, IACLEA, VACP, IACP, IAHS, ASIS).

Best Practice #13

Campus police and security departments should meet annually with their local community officials, such as Fire Chiefs, Police Chiefs or designees, building officials, Emergency Medical Services representatives, Commonwealth's Attorney, ABC Regional Supervisor, City/County Manager or designee, City/County public relations representative, and other representatives as deemed appropriate.

Best Practice #14

Campus police and security departments should meet annually with their college's or university's officials including Vice-Presidents for Student and Business Affairs, Housing Directors, Judicial Affairs head administrator, college public relations person and other representatives as deemed appropriate.

Best Practice #15

Each college and university should seek inclusion in regional disaster plans consistent with the National Incident Management System (NIMS) and other regional and local plans.

Best Practice #16

Campus police departments should consider seeking concurrent jurisdiction with their surrounding locality.

Best Practice #17

Colleges and universities should consider working with their institutional research personnel to develop a survey tool that addresses campus safety. This survey should be administered on a regular basis to students, faculty and staff.

Best Practice #18

Every police department should have written procedures for the investigation of crimes.

Best Practice #19

Every police department should have written protocols for dealing with victims, including referrals for victim services.

Best Practice #20

Each school should develop a mechanism to identify each case involving actions by a student that could be considered criminal in a court of law that has occurred and be able to track the outcome of that case both on the campus level of disciplinary process and the court disciplinary process, if this so occurs.

Best Practice #21

Each college and university should develop and adopt a set of written sanctions that are available to address actions that would be violations of the law, including alcohol and drug violations. Responses to violations could include strong or progressive sanctions. (Examples: "Three Strikes You're Out," removal from residence halls, publicizing to students and parents, and/or expulsion).

Best Practice #22

Campus police and security departments should receive institutional support for their alcohol control and enforcement programs.

Best Practice #23

Commonwealth campus police and security departments should develop a system for sharing information regarding violations occurring on their campus that are committed by students from other Commonwealth colleges and universities. This system will allow for student conduct on other colleges and universities to be acknowledged and dealt with by that student's college or university, as well as the campus or local law enforcement where the incident took place.

Best Practice #24

Institutions should designate a liaison between the Commonwealth's Attorney office and campus police or security departments regarding criminal investigations.

Best Practice #25

Whenever there is any crime on campus, the student victim should be informed of his or her right to bring their case to the magistrate.

Best Practice #26

Campus police and security departments should consult with the Commonwealth Attorney as soon as possible regarding any violent felonious crimes. Colleges and universities may consider establishing protocols addressing student interaction between all involved parties after a criminal action is alleged.

Appendix C

FEAR OF CRIME ON CAMPUS SURVEY

Participation in this survey is **VOLUNTARY**, and information gathered will be completely **ANONYMOUS**. You cannot be identified as a result of filling out this survey, and

you can stop at any point. Please do not put any identifying marks on the survey. Your input is

appreciated and will be a vital part of this research.

Please tell us a little about yourself by answering the following questions:

1. Sex: (Please circle): Male Female
2. Age: (Please specify) _____
3. Race (Please circle): African American Asian Hispanic White
Other (Please specify) _____
4. Are you an international student? (Please circle) Yes No
5. Marital Status (Please circle): Single Married Divorced Widowed
Separated Living with significant other
6. Your Classification (Please circle): Freshman Sophomore Junior Senior
Graduate Student Other
7. Your Major (Please specify): _____
8. Where do you live? (Please circle) On-Campus in a dormitory
On-Campus in a Fraternity/sorority house Off-Campus with a roommate
Off-Campus with family Off-Campus Alone Other (Please specify) _____
9. What types of classes did you take last semester? (Please circle) Daytime Night Both

10. Did you take any night classes during the last year? (Please circle) Yes No

If yes, how many nights a week were you in class? (Please specify) _____

48

11. How many credit hours are you currently taking? (Please specify)

How many days a week do you attend classes? _____

12. How many hours do you normally work in a week (Please circle): 0-9 10-19 20-29

30-39 40 Greater than 40

13. Do you work on campus or off campus? (Please circle): On campus Off campus Both

14. Do you work during the day or at night? (Please circle) During the day At night Both

15. What is your current GPA? (Please specify) _____

16. How do you usually get from one place to another on campus? Walk Bus

Drive your own vehicle Ride with friend Ride a bike

Other (Please specify) _____

17. Do you walk alone on campus during the day? (Please circle) Yes No

18. Do you walk alone at night on campus? (Please circle) Yes No

If yes, how many nights a week do you walk alone? (Please specify) _____

19. How often do you avoid going out alone on campus out of fear of being the victim of
crime? (Please Circle) Never Sometimes Always

20. What activities are you involved in on campus? (Please circle all that apply)

Athletics Band Fraternity/Sorority Theatre Campus Club/Organization

Other (Please specify) _____

21. About how many hours do you spend **per day** at the following on-campus places:

Classes (Please specify) _____

The Student Union (Please circle) 0 1 2 3 4 More than 4

The Library (Please circle) 0 1 2 3 4 More than 4

Fraternity/Sorority Houses (Please circle) 0 1 2 3 4 More than 4

49

On-Campus Office (Please circle) 0 1 2 3 4 More than 4

22. Do you attend (Circle all that apply):

Athletic Events Department Meetings LSU Theatre

Talks by Guest Speakers On-Campus Concerts

23. Do you attend them during the day or at night (Please circle) During the day At night

Both

24. Have you ever been the victim of the following crimes?

A. Being raped/sexually assaulted/attempted rape (Please circle) Yes No

B. Being beaten up (Please circle) Yes No

C. Having someone break into your dorm or apartment while you are there (Please circle)

Yes No

D. Having someone break into your dorm or apartment while you are gone (Please circle)

Yes No

E. Having something taken from you by force/mugged (Please circle) Yes No

F. Having something stolen from you while in class (Please circle) Yes No

G. Having something stolen from you while in the library (Please circle) Yes No

H. Having your car stolen while on campus (Please circle) Yes No

I. Having your car vandalized while on campus (Please circle) Yes No

J. Being threatened with a knife, club or gun (Please circle) Yes No

K. Other (Please specify) _____

25. If you have been the victim of any of the above crimes, did any of the crime(s) occur on campus? (Please circle) Yes No

50

26. If any of the crime(s) listed in question 24 occurred on campus, please specify where:

27. If the crime(s) listed in question 24 occurred off campus, how far from campus did it occur?

(Please circle) 1 mile or less more than a mile not in Baton Rouge

28. If you were the victim of any of the crimes listed in question 24, were you a student at the time?(Please circle) Yes No

29. When did the crime(s) occur? (Please circle) Within the last 6 months

Within the last year Within the last 2 years Within the last 5 years

Longer than 5 years ago

30. Have you known someone who has been the victim of the following crimes?

A. Being raped/sexually assaulted/attempted rape (Please circle) Yes No

B. Being beaten up (Please circle) Yes No

C. Having someone break into your dorm or apartment while you are there (Please circle)

Yes No

D. Having someone break into your dorm or apartment while you are gone (Please circle)

Yes No

E. Having something taken from you by force/mugged (Please circle) Yes No

F. Having something stolen from you while in class (Please circle) Yes No

G. Having something stolen from you while in the library (Please circle) Yes No

H. Having your car stolen while on campus (Please circle) Yes No

I. Having your car vandalized while on campus (Please circle) Yes No

J. Being threatened with a knife, club or gun (Please circle) Yes No

K. Other (Please specify) _____

51

31. If yes, what was your relationship with that person? (Please circle)

Acquaintance Friend Immediate Family Distant Relative

32. If you have known someone who was the victim of any of the crimes listed in question 30,

did any of the crime(s) occur on campus? (Please circle) Yes No

33. If the any of the crime(s) listed in question 30 occurred on campus, please specify where: _____

34. How often do you read a daily newspaper? (Please circle) Daily Almost Daily

Three times a week Twice a week Occasionally Almost Never Never

35. How often do you watch the news on television? (Please circle) More than once a day

Once a day Three times a week Twice a week Occasionally Almost Never

Never

Please answer the following questions by giving a ranking of 1 to 10, with 10 being the strongest answer.

36. Please indicate on scale of 1 to 10 **how afraid** you are of being a victim of crime **on campus**

during the day (Please circle)

Not afraid at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Afraid

37. Please indicate on scale of 1 to 10 **how afraid** you are of being a victim of crime **on campus**

at night (Please circle)

Not afraid at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Afraid

38. Please indicate on a scale of 1 to 10 **how afraid** you are of being a victim of the following

crimes on campus :

A. Being raped/sexually assaulted (Please circle)

Not afraid at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Afraid

52

B. Being beaten up (Please circle)

Not afraid at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Afraid

C. Having someone break into your dorm or apartment while you are there (Please circle)

Not afraid at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Afraid

D. Having someone break into your dorm or apartment while you are gone (Please circle)

Not afraid at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Afraid

E. Having something taken from you by force/mugged (Please circle)

Not afraid at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Afraid

F. Having something stolen from you while in class (Please circle)

Not afraid at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Afraid

G. Having something stolen from you while in the library (Please circle)

Not afraid at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Afraid

H. Having your car stolen while on campus (Please circle)

Not afraid at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Afraid

I. Having your car vandalized while on campus (Please circle)

Not afraid at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Afraid

J. Being threatened with a knife, club or gun (Please circle)

Not afraid at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Afraid

K. Being murdered (Please circle)

Not afraid at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Afraid

39. Please indicate on a scale of 1 to 10 **how likely** it is, in your opinion, that you will be a victim of the following crimes **on campus**:

A. Being raped/sexually assaulted (Please circle)

53

Not likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very likely

B. Being beaten up (Please circle)

Not likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very likely

C. Having someone break into your dorm or apartment while you are there (Please circle)

Not likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very likely

D. Having someone break into your dorm or apartment while you are gone (Please circle)

Not likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very likely

E. Having something taken from you by force/mugged (Please circle)

Not likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very likely

F. Having something stolen from you while in class (Please circle)

Not likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very likely

G. Having something stolen from you while in the library (Please circle)

Not likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very likely

H. Having your car stolen while on campus (Please circle)

Not likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very likely

I. Having your car vandalized while on campus (Please circle)

Not likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very likely

J. Being threatened with a knife, club or gun (Please circle)

Not likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very likely

K. Being murdered (Please circle)

Not likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very likely

40. In your opinion, on a scale of 1 to 10, how **serious** would it be to be a victim of the following crimes **on campus**?

54

A. Being raped/sexually assaulted (Please circle)

Not serious at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very serious

B. Being beaten up (Please circle)

Not serious at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very serious

C. Having someone break into your dorm or apartment while you are there (Please circle)

Not serious at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very serious

D. Having someone break into your dorm or apartment while you are gone (Please circle)

Not serious at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very serious

E. Having something taken from you by force/mugged (Please circle)

Not serious at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very serious

F. Having something stolen from you while in class (Please circle)

Not serious at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very serious

G. Having something stolen from you while in the library (Please circle)

Not serious at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very serious

H. Having your car stolen while on campus (Please circle)

Not serious at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very serious

I. Having your car vandalized while on campus (Please circle)

Not serious at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very serious

J. Being threatened with a knife, club or gun (Please circle)

Not serious at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very serious

K. Being murdered (Please circle)

Not serious at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very serious

41. Please indicate on a scale of 1 to 10 how afraid you are of being out alone **on campus**

55

during the day. (Please circle)

Not afraid at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Afraid

42. Please indicate on a scale of 1 to 10 how afraid you are of going out alone **on campus**

at night. (Please circle)

Not afraid at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Afraid

43. Please indicate on a scale of 1 to 10 how afraid you are of walking from the library to the parking lot at night. (Please circle)

Not afraid at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Afraid

44. Please indicate on a scale of 1 to 10 how afraid you are of walking from your classroom to the parking lot alone at night. (Please circle)

Not afraid at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Afraid

45. Please indicate on a scale of 1 to 10 how afraid you are of studying at the library alone at night. (Please circle)

Not afraid at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Afraid

46. Please indicate on a scale of 1 to 10 how afraid you are of being victimized **off campus**

during the day. (Please circle)

Not afraid at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Afraid

47. Please indicate on a scale of 1 to 10 how afraid you are of being victimized **off**

campus at night. (Please circle)

Not afraid at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Afraid

48. Please indicate on a scale of 1 to 10 whether you are afraid of being the victim of a hate crime, a crime committed against you because of your race, ethnicity or sexual orientation? (Please circle)

56

Not afraid at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Afraid

49. Please indicate on a scale of 1 to 10 how media reports affect your fear of crime on campus.

(Please circle)

Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Much

50. Did you check campus crime statistics before deciding to attend LSU? (Please circle)

Yes No

51. Did you check city crime statistics before deciding to attend LSU? (Please circle)

Yes No

52. Was crime statistics a consideration when you were deciding which university to attend?

(Please circle) Yes No

53. What kind of self protection devices do you carry on your person while on campus?

(Please circle) None Gun Knife Mace Pepper Spray Club

Other (Please specify) _____

54. Do you have a car on campus? (Please circle) Yes No

If yes, what kind of self protection devices do you carry in your car? (Please circle)

None Gun Knife Mace Pepper Spray Club Other (Please specify) _____

55. How often do you go out **off campus** at night? (Please circle)

Never Once a Week Twice a Week Almost Nightly Every Night

56. How often do you avoid going out alone **off campus** out of fear of being the victim of a crime? (Please circle) Never Sometimes Always

57. Do you avoid areas on campus that have poor lighting? (Please circle) Yes No

If yes, which areas of campus do you avoid? (Please specify) _____

58. Do you avoid areas on campus that have a lot of shrubbery? (Please circle) Yes No

57

If yes, which areas of campus do you avoid? (Please specify) _____

59. Have the terrorist attacks of Sept. 11 and the events that have followed made you more afraid

of being a victim of crime on campus? (Please circle) Yes No

If yes, please indicate on a scale of 1 to 10 how much it has increased your fear.

(Please circle) Not much 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Much

Appendix D

The Community College
Campus Safety Survey

Directions: Please take a few moments to answer this survey regarding your perceptions of crime and safety at the community college you attend. This is an ANONYMOUS survey and no identifying information will be asked on this form. If you are interested in entering the drawing for a \$500 gift card, you will be directed to another short survey to collect your entry information. If you have any questions or concerns regarding this survey or if you would like a copy of the results, please contact Chad Patton at chad.patton@southside.edu. Thank you for your participation in this research.

1. Please tell us about your college campus.

I. Which community college do you attend?

Blue Ridge Community College
 Patrick Henry Community College
 Central Virginia Community College
 Paul D. Camp Community College - Franklin Campus
 Paul D. Camp Community College - Suffolk Campus
 Dabney S. Lancaster Community College
 Piedmont Virginia Community College
 Danville Community College
 Rappahannock Community College - Warsaw Campus
 Rappahannock Community College - Glens campus
 Eastern Shore Community College
 Southside Virginia Community College - Christanna Campus
 Southside Virginia Community College - Daniel Campus
 Germanna Community College - Locust Grove Campus
 Germanna Community College - Fredericksburg Campus
 Southwest Virginia Community College
 J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College - Downtown Campus
 J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College - Parham Road Campus
 J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College - Western Campus
 Thomas Nelson Community College - Hampton Campus

Thomas Nelson Community College - Historic Triangle Campus
 John Tyler Community College - Midlothian Campus
 John Tyler Community College - Chester Campus
 Tidewater Community College - Chesapeake Campus
 Tidewater Community College - Norfolk Campus
 Tidewater Community College - Portsmouth Campus
 Tidewater Community College - Virginia Beach Campus
 Lord Fairfax Community College - Middletown Campus
 Lord Fairfax Community College - Fauquier Campus
 Virginia Highlands Community College
 Mountain Empire Community College
 Virginia Western Community College
 New River Community College
 Wytheville Community College
 Northern Virginia Community College - Alexandria Campus
 Northern Virginia Community College - Annandale Campus
 Northern Virginia Community College - Loudoun Campus
 Northern Virginia Community College - Manassas Campus
 Northern Virginia Community College - Medical Education Center
 Northern Virginia Community College - Woodbridge Campus

2. Please tell us about yourself.

Age: a) 18 - 24, b) 25 - 32, c) 33 - 40, d) 41 - 48, e) 49 - 56, f) 57 or over

Race: a) African American, b) American Indian, c) White, d) Hispanic, e) Asian, f) Other

College Attendance: a) Full Time (12 credits or over), b) Part Time (Less than 12 credits)

3. Please select the time of day you most often attend class: a) mostly in the day, b) mostly during the evening c) both day and evening, d) I only take online courses this semester and therefore I do not attend class on campus.

4. Which of the following best describes the security on your community college campus? a) My campus has a campus police department, b) My campus has a uniformed

security department, c) My campus has neither a police department nor a security department, d) I am not sure what type of security my campus has.

5. On a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 being the safest you could possibly feel and 1 being the least safe you could possibly feel, please indicate how safe you feel when attending class on campus: 10,9,8,7,6,5,4,3,2,1
6. Please indicate how safe you feel in the following areas while on campus.
 - I. **Classroom:** Very Safe, Safe, Undecided, Unsafe, Very Unsafe
 - II. **Hallways:** Very Safe, Safe, Undecided, Unsafe, Very Unsafe
 - III. **Student Union/Lounge:** Very Safe, Safe, Undecided, Unsafe, Very Unsafe
 - IV. **Library:** Very Safe, Safe, Undecided, Unsafe, Very Unsafe
 - V. **Parking Lot:** Very Safe, Safe, Undecided, Unsafe, Very Unsafe

Appendix E

Permission Letter for the use of the Campus Safety Survey

103 Bitternut Ln
Lafayette, LA 70507

September 14, 2009

Dear Mr. Patton,

Thank you for your interest in the research I conducted on campus safety during my studies at Louisiana State University. I am pleased that you have chosen to contribute to campus safety literature by studying community college students in Virginia. I am sure you will find this a rewarding and enlightening venture. You have my permission to use the survey instrument entitled Fear of Crime on Campus Survey that I created to investigate students' perceptions of crime victimization risk and safety at an urban university.

I am sure you will need to modify the instrument to fit the characteristics of a community college campus. If I can be of any assistance with this process, please feel free to contact me. I look forward to reading the results of your study.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Bedenbaugh

Appendix F

Demographic Data for Urban Community College Campuses

College	n	% of sample	% of VCCS	male	female	FT	PT
CVCC	525	4.7	2.6	144	367	289	236
DCC	179	1.6	2.6	37	138	136	42
GCC (FC)	306	2.7	2	69	235	184	121
JSRCC (DC)	368	3.3	6.8	57	303	214	154
JSRCC (PR)	499	4.5	*	139	348	275	224
JSRCC (WC)	12	0.1	*	4	7	5	7
JTCC (CC)	351	3.1	5.2	71	273	178	173
JTCC (MC)	366	3.3	*	95	264	199	167
LFCC (FC)	220	2	3.3	53	166	124	95
LFCC (MC)	623	5.6	*	137	478	324	298
NRCC	302	2.7	2.9	96	203	218	83
NVCC (AC)	323	2.9	25.1	105	212	174	149
NVCC (N.C)	400	3.6	*	154	237	272	126
NVCC (LC)	187	1.7	*	59	126	111	75
NVCC (MC)	162	1.4	*	40	119	100	62
NVCC (MD)	74	0.7	*	9	64	51	23
NVCC (WC)	218	2	*	54	156	127	91
PDCCC (SC)	82	0.7	*	11	70	39	43
PVCC	244	2.2	2.8	77	163	117	127
RCC (GC)	112	1	1	21	91	61	51
TNCC (HC)	625	5.6	5.4	124	489	336	287
TNCC (HTC)	159	1.4	*	32	126	79	80
TCC (CC)	266	2.4	16.9	66	195	144	121
TCC (NC)	246	2.2	*	54	179	149	96
TCC (PC)	213		*	57	151	130	83
TCC (VB)	612	5.5	*	207	394	387	223
VHCC	396	3.5	1.3	103	289	277	119
VWCC	259	2.3	4.6	78	179	153	106
Total:	8329	72.7	79.5	2096	5871	4853	3462

* Enrollment figures are combined into the first campus shown.