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**Abstract**

The purpose of this Masters Thesis is to examine two equally important but very different approaches to law enforcement in the school setting. The first approach to be examined is the utilization of uniformed police officers in the school setting to teach students. The most commonly used programs that fall under this pedagogical approach are the Drug Abuse Resistance Education (D.A.R.E.) and Gang Resistance Education And Training (G.R.E.A.T.). These programs are designed to raise individual student morals, teach the difference between “Right” and “Wrong,” and to heighten levels of student resistance to peer pressure and negative externalities.

The other approach to be examined involves the actual enforcement of the laws by law enforcement officers patrolling the school campuses. There has been only a handful of programs implemented for this purpose and of these programs there has been a minimal amount of information gathered regarding their success. However, literature will be viewed and secondary data will be examined in an effort to make inferences regarding the law enforcement approach and the possible outcomes of such a program.
Chapter I - Setting of the Problem

Section 1 - Problem Statement

Parents are “protectors” and “providers” for their children and when they send their child off to school they expect their boy or girl to experience a similar type of security under the auspices of the school attended. In addition, when a child has been victimized while at school or at any school function, a parent not only expects but demands that school to remedy the problem immediately to assure it does not happen again. Finally, parents expect their children to attend school for the purposes of earning an education. Yet when their children are in constant fear of being victimized or there is an apparent crime problem on the school campus, it is no less than a disruption to the education process and compromises a child’s ability to learn while at that educational facility.

To further develop this paper, we must postulate several assertions: Crime does exist and will continue to exist as long as people co-habitat and interact, crime crosses every demographic, economic, and social barrier, thus, touching all facets of society, and, no matter the amount of efforts we take and the types of approaches utilized, crime has not, cannot and never will be completely abated. These assertions are vital in the development of this paper for several reasons. First, no matter what law enforcement approach is undertaken, it is impossible to completely eliminate crime and its elements. Second, with the implementation of such approaches there still may be an increase in crime but we must evaluate the crime rate while using a “with” and “without” implementation analysis as opposed to a “before” and “after” implementation analysis. Last, with crime studies and
analysis, hard numbers and statistical compilations are very rarely accurate and are often skewed for many reasons. (For example, if a police department assigns twice as many officers to patrol a specific area, studies have shown that although there has been a decrease in crime, there have been more criminal complaints filed because more officers have been allotted the time necessary to follow-up on criminal investigations. Thus, a study that has been hastily completed would conclude that there has been an increase in crime when viewing the increased complaints, irrespective of the actual results yielded from the increased efforts of the policing agency.)

During this project it is important to keep in mind that good parental guidance is tantamount when attempting to curtail juvenile delinquency, disruptive behavior, and criminal activities while on school campuses. Because not all children receive this “Good” parental guidance, we are faced with alternative remedial approaches to this problem and are forced to find ways in which we can better accommodate the children’s parental deprivations by ensuring them the absolute best educational facilities and safest environments possible while using the learning process as the primary impetus for such goals.

Section 2 - Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this paper is to view two separate law-enforcement approaches to dealing with criminal behavior by juveniles at educational facilities. One such approach has been utilized by many law-enforcement agencies for a variety of years and is known as the pedagogical approach. This approach includes the assigning of officers to school building
classrooms with the intent of teaching students about what is “right” or “wrong” and how a student should behave.

The other, somewhat unfamiliar effort to decrease juvenile delinquency, criminal activities, and disruptive behavior by students on school campuses is the enforcing of the law. This approach relates specifically to the assigning of police officers to school campuses to enforce the laws. With the exception of a few large inner-city school districts, law enforcement agencies, school administrators, parents, children, and officers are often unfamiliar with this approach.

How will these very different approaches be identified? This can be a difficult question if one is not familiar with the history of law enforcement and the duties of police officers assigned to school settings. Programs such as Drug Abuse Resistance Education (D.A.R.E.) and Gang Resistance Education And Training (G.R.E.A.T.) place police officers in the school setting for instructional purposes. Officers assigned to these positions do not respond to calls sent out by a 911 dispatcher, nor do they file criminal complaints or take criminal reports.

The law enforcement approach is different. The officer assigned to school duty is required to respond to criminal complaints and report criminal activities on school campuses. This officer’s duties are similar to those of any other officer who patrols the city to enforce the laws, except for being confined to the school or schools in which that officer has been assigned to work.

To further define the differences and “operationalize” the ideas of both approaches,
the different goals of each approach must be identified. The impetus behind the assigning of an officer for a D.A.R.E. program, and other similar type programs, is to teach selected students, to inform them of what is right and wrong and how they should or should not act. A police officer assigned to this position is no more than a teacher who has had different training and life experiences than a normal teacher. This allows for a well-informed and extensively trained person to instruct students in a subject in which he or she is familiar.

The goals of the law enforcement approach differ from the pedagogical approach in that an officer is not on a school campus to teach, but to enforce the laws. Although some officers who are assigned to these law enforcement positions may find the time to instruct a class for good public relations, that officer’s number one responsibility is still to investigate, report, and file criminal charges for those persons involved in criminal activities. Therefore, the goal emphasized in the law enforcement approach is to ultimately charge and prosecute all persons who are violating the laws on school campuses.

This paper’s purpose is to examine these differing approaches, to determine the different effects each approach has on schools, students, parents, and the officers assigned to execute the functions of each approach. Given the many time constraints and the lack of hard data, this paper will not evaluate the two approaches, but instead use the available findings to draw conclusions about what can be anticipated when using one or the other approach.

**Section 3 - Scope of the Paper**

The scope of this paper will be to discuss in depth the two distinctly different
approaches to dealing with crime problems presently facing juveniles while attending educational facilities. Throughout this paper a variety of school districts, policing agencies, communities and the like will be observed in seeking to determine the effects of the two approaches. The analysis relies on secondary data, drawn from studies of school district and law enforcement agencies that have had experience with at least one, if not both, of the approaches.
Chapter II - Literature Review

Crime among juveniles, perceptions toward juvenile crime and delinquency, and the drug problem among youths will be examined in this chapter. A variety of resources will be utilized as secondary data when examining the three areas of concern. Assertions will be made from the secondary data collected and shall act as the primary impetus for the further development of this paper.

Section I - Juveniles and Crime

When viewing juvenile crime and school violence, it can be concluded that such acts of violence indiscriminately affect the children of this nation. As with street crime and other forms of criminal offenses, varying factors that often play a role on susceptibility to these activities can be identified. These criteria are contingent upon socioeconomic groups, gender and national ethnicity background, and geographic areas. However, no one person is immune to being a victim of a crime.

By viewing various reliable statistical compilations conducted by reputable research entities, it can be concluded that crime is a problem and does play a vital role on the education process within our schools and on their campuses. A study published in September of 1991 by the U.S. Department of Justice found that “an estimated 9% of students, ages 12 to 19, were crime victims in or around their school over a 6-month period” (Bastian, p.1). Based on self-reporting, this study also concluded that 15% of the students surveyed had stated that their school had gangs and 16% claimed that a student had attacked or threatened a teacher at their school.
In November, 1996, The Centers for Disease Control published a report summarizing several types of criminal offenses and victimization reports. "Annual rates of firearm homicide for youth 15-19 years of age increased 155% between 1987 and 1994" (p.1). The same study found that in 1990, 4.1% or 1 in 24 students had carried a firearm to school for self-defense or fighting at least once in the previous 30 days. The Centers for Disease Control also conducted studies on youths as perpetrators. "Arrest rates for homicide among youth 14-17 years of age increased 41% between 1989 and 1994" (p.1). However, the same study discovered that homicide arrests for adults over the age of 25 during the same period had experienced a decrease of 19%.

A recent study published in The Journal of the American Medical Association examined school violence and violent deaths among juveniles while on school campuses. The primary conclusion: "School associated violent deaths were more common than previously estimated . . . During the past decade, the number of homicides and suicides among school-aged children more than doubled, even as the rates of childhood deaths from other causes declined" (Kachur et al., June 1996, p. 1729). The authors express concern about the strong detrimental effects that a crime epidemic can have in the learning process for children.

Recent studies and findings regarding criminal activities and victimization reporting were summarized in a publication by the U.S. Department of Justice (1996). The 1995 source book covers crimes committed over a 13-year period while providing separate findings for each year. The following findings were compiled for the 94/95 school year. In
1994-1995, 35.4% of all reporting seniors had property worth less than $50 stolen from them while at school. Nineteen percent had property worth more than $50 stolen from them while at school. Nearly 3 percent of all reporting seniors claimed to have been injured seriously with a weapon (e.g., a knife, gun, or club) over the previous twelve months. More than 3% of reporting seniors had hit an instructor at least once in the past 12 months; one-third of the 3% claimed to have struck teachers five or more times in the previous 12 months. Fourteen percent of reporting seniors claimed to have damaged school property purposefully at least once in the previous 12 months. And nearly 7% of students in the tenth or twelfth grades have carried a gun to school; more than 2% of the respondents report to carrying a gun with them every time they go to school.

These findings on crime and violence in schools demonstrate that there is a crime problem and safety concern on campuses. The numbers presented in the 1995 Sourcebook illustrates a nationwide decrease in offenses. However, many types of crimes committed by juveniles on school campuses have remained constant or have experienced an increase during the past decade.

Section II - Perceptions of Juvenile Crime and Delinquency

A somewhat less precise and subjective analysis of the present juvenile crime problem facing this nation is an evaluation of perceptions regarding this issue. Although personal perceptions are not always fully accurate, we do find that they often reflect existing problems and do affect how people live their lives. For example, the perception that a school district is infested with crime could have a profound influence on how parents feel
about the school; this may result in their moving to a different school district. Conversely, a school district that parents perceive to be safe would most likely attract families. It must be reiterated that, although such perceptions are not always completely accurate in depicting an existing problem and often may be exaggerated, we must take into account the roles these perceptions play and how vital they are in a person’s decision making process.

Marilyn Sherman (1997), characterizes violence as a problem within this nation’s high schools: “Violence is prevalent in high schools across the United States. Every year, there are almost 3 million incidents of violent crime or theft in or near schools, with gangs, guns, media violence, poverty, drugs, and disintegrating families all contributing to the difficulty” (p.19). R. Starch summarized findings of a 1995 study that reflected how perceptions of crime and violence among high school students have heightened in recent years. The study concluded that crime among teenagers is usually present in all towns and cities. It was also discovered during the study that student perceptions of their school’s safety was not contingent upon the size or location (urban, rural, or suburb) of the school, but instead was more influenced by what types of approaches their school was taking to curtail crime and protect the safety of the students. “Violence among teens in towns of all sizes is prevalent and many students feel that their schools have become more dangerous. ... A more positive finding was that nearly three of four students polled whose schools have attempted to reduce violence believe they have been very or somewhat effective” (p.8).

A 1996 article, “Fear of crime changing youths' lifestyles,” summarized several recent findings by the United States Justice Department. It was determined that people
between the ages of 12 and 15 were, more frequently than any other age group, a victim of a crime. As a result, juveniles within this age bracket experienced severe detrimental effects concerning their education, classroom performance, and school attendance. "According to Justice Department statistics, young people between the ages of 12 and 15 are the victims of crime more than any other group. As a result, fear and violence are affecting their behavior, school performance, and changing expectations" (1996, p.4). The article explains that, in certain high-crime areas, two in five students avoid certain public parks, one in three students reported staying home from school and/or cutting class, and one in three stated that they were getting lower grades because of crime and violence in their area.

Not only are many children and teenagers susceptible to being victims in the school setting, but so are teachers, parents, and visitors to the campuses. "During the 1987-1988 school year, 2,555 incidents occurred in New York City Schools in which teachers and other staff members were victims of crime" (Muir, 1988, p.25). Teachers not only are physically abused, but they are also mentally tormented and psychologically assaulted. It is common for teachers to leave the academic field as an instructor because of the constant assaultive behavior directed toward them from unruly and disruptive students. In 1990, Teacher Magazine discussed the constant abuse teachers experienced during classroom instruction and hallway monitoring. "The ‘psychic violence’ against teachers, the intimidation and verbal abuse is unmeasured, but nevertheless present in the classroom. Some teachers quit after they have been victimized . . . those most likely to give up are teachers who are new to the system and don’t have much invested" (Foley, 1990, abstract). Because teachers are
considered the rudimentary building blocks for our nation’s education system, this condition poses a serious threat to our efforts in providing students the finest in education.

Educators are not law enforcement officers and do not have the training, time, or resources to control serious habitual offenders in a setting designed solely for instructional purposes. It is common for serious criminal offenders to be placed in the classroom only to disrupt other students and distract an instructor while attempting to offer instructional lecture to those students attending school to learn. Bernard James (1995), contends that the juvenile justice system’s failure to adequately address juvenile delinquency has resulted in the placement of children with behavioral problems back into the education system. “Routinely, the most disruptive youth in communities across the nation are purposefully placed in school classrooms instead of in facilities designed for serious habitual offenders with problems far beyond the expertise of the traditional educator” (p.18).

A study in 1993 that surveyed more than 850 students between grades 6 through 9 gathered information on student perceptions regarding violence and safety in their schools. The majority of responding students were not satisfied with school officials and their efforts when addressing the crime issue. “Approximately half the students from both schools were unhappy with the way in which schools were responding to violence, believing that school officials do not take the issue seriously” (Ryan, 1993, p.126). This feeling of school administrators inadequately addressing the problems of crime and violence on school campuses are becoming more prevalent throughout this nation’s education system.

Many of the expressed concerns can be attributed to how the schools are presently
addressing the problems of crime and juvenile delinquency on school campuses. As noted, many students perceive the administrators at their schools to be inadequately addressing the crime problem. It is plausible to believe that many criminal offenses cannot be handled solely by administrative punishment at the school level. Crimes involving weapons, drugs, and violent acts toward others warrant criminal prosecution and not just an “in-school” suspension.

In an article titled “Public school security, yesterday, today, and tomorrow” (1980), many administrators did not feel that crime committed on a school campus is a crime but more of an intra-school disciplinary issue. This may be just one reason that crime and juvenile delinquency has become overwhelming and a disruption to the education system. Arguably, we may conclude that educators and school administrators are not trained in law enforcement and criminal investigations. This has resulted in administrative responses short of what is expected from parents, children, and law enforcement efforts. This same article also concluded that, although studies had proven that “functioning security” programs on school campuses drastically reduced incidents of violence and disruption at school, many administrators were resentful toward the security officers because they handled matters from a law enforcement perspective as opposed to the traditional educator approach.

Questionnaires administered in 1988 to school district superintendents nationwide were designed to explore administrators’ attitudes toward security problems and criminal activities present on school campuses. The findings from the survey were as follows:

Seventy-four percent responded that security was not a major
concern, and 82 percent reported they did not have a crime problem. A third, however, reported burglaries, almost half reported thefts, and approximately 75 percent reported vandalism. Some 60 percent reported a drug problem in their schools, although drugs were not identified as a security or crime problem by the administrators. (Summerhays, 1989, p.69)

There are obvious perceptual distortions when evaluating how administrators view crime problems on school campuses. The apparent contradictions between administrators' perceptions and reality clearly illustrate their rationale for attempting to address most criminal behaviors at the administrative level within the school. In fact, when administrators were asked whether they would like a police presence on their school's campus, 20 percent stated that they would not.

School administrators must begin realizing that school campuses are not exempt from criminal activities and that such activities must be handled accordingly. A child who commits a crime should be turned over to law enforcement authorities. An administrator who fails to do exactly that has breached his or her responsibility as a school administrator.

A guide titled *Law in the School - A Guide for California Teachers, Parents and Students* published in 1980 presents the seriousness of criminal activities on school campuses. The guide attempts to enlighten educators and inform them that, in order for them to maintain safety and order in the schools, they must be willing to accept the fact that they are only educators and not trained law enforcement officers. Therefore, a student who commits a crime on a school campus should be dealt with in accordance with the law and not just through school policy. The guide urges educators to recognize their own limitations in training and powers so that alternative measures can be taken when certain situations
arise. “An examination of the scope and sources of the duty of school staff to protect the health and safety of students focuses on the powers which school staff have to fulfill these duties and the limits of those powers” (Shimomura, abstract).

The numbers presented in this section are not hard statistics but a representation of the heightened concern held by many regarding the safety of our children while attending school. It is apparent that over the past two decades students and parents have been displeased with the crime problem in the schools and dissatisfied with how school administrators have dealt with these criminal activities. The evidence suggests that, more often than not, parents would like to see more pro-active efforts by school administrators and increased involvement by law enforcement officials when dealing with criminal activities on school campuses. Again, we know that we will never be capable of fully eliminating crime among juveniles, but if we can decrease such activities and provide a safer environment for our children, than not doing just that would be negligent.

Section III - Drugs and Juveniles

Any time a juvenile consumes, sells, transports or possesses a drug it is a problem and a violation of the law, thus a criminal offense. In 1988, a questionnaire was administered to school district superintendents nationwide. Ironically enough, it was discovered that approximately 60 percent of school administrators claimed to have a drug problem on their school’s campus. However, 60 percent of these same school administrators viewed the offense as a school disciplinary problem and not a crime or safety problem.

In 1994, 19 percent of this nation’s prosecutors’ offices handled criminal cases
involving drug offenses and juveniles who were to be tried as adults. This is the same proportion of prosecutors’ offices that dealt with juveniles criminally charged as an adult for auto theft (19 percent), over twice the number of offices handling juvenile offenses involving larcenies (9 percent), although 13 percent less than those offices handling juveniles being charged for murder (32 percent). These findings were presented in a publication of the Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Juveniles Prosecuted in State Criminal Courts* (1997, March). From these numbers, we see that some juveniles are being criminally charged for drug activities. These numbers would be much higher if more school administrators invited law enforcement officials to assist them upon discovering a youth’s involvement with drugs.

It is important to remember that criminal charging of a juvenile is frequently not the end result when police investigate a drug crime; however, police involvement may bolster investigations that can often lead to the appropriate charging of those persons involved in the distributing of narcotics to the juveniles. The more often this is done the more likely it is that law enforcement efforts would have a more profound impact on a juveniles’ accessibility to these drugs.

In 1996, a series of surveys titled *The National Household Survey on Drug Abuse* by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration yielded results concerning the use of illicit drugs by juveniles ages 12 to 17. From these surveys, it was found that nearly 1 in 5 youths have reported using an illicit drug in the past year and nearly 1 in 4 have reportedly used some form of illicit drug in their lifetime. These findings closely mirror
findings by the National Institute on Drug Abuse.

Reflecting a trend beginning in the early 1990's, drugs have been becoming more readily available to youths. It has also been discovered that youths are using drugs more frequently. Marijuana use among youth is more prevalent than any other form of illicit drug. The National Institute on Drug Abuse has found that in the last few years “annual use of marijuana in a prior twelve month period doubled among eighth graders to 13 percent, increased by two-thirds among tenth graders to 25 percent, and grew by two-fifths among twelfth graders to 31 percent” (Johnston, 1996, p.11). In the same study it was discovered that the following percentages of each grade level has tried alcohol: 56 percent of eight graders, 71 percent of tenth graders, and 80 percent of twelfth graders. Statistics that are found most shocking represent the widespread occurrence of occasions where youths had drunk alcohol in vast quantities. The study defined heavy drinking to be any time over the prior two-week period when five or more drinks in a row had been consumed. The results were as follows, “Among eighth graders this statistic stands at 15 percent, among tenth graders at 24 percent, and among twelfth graders at 28 percent” (p.17). Although the use of other forms of illicit drugs are not as prevalent as marijuana and alcohol, their very use and the trends suggest an increased number of users over the past few years and should heighten concerns among parents and school administrators.

Other areas of concern not only pertain to the use of such illicit drugs and alcohol but their availability. We can assert that the more readily available drugs or alcohol are, the more apt they are to be experimented with and even used regularly. The Bureau of Justice
and Statistics Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics 1995 details, based on a self-reporting study, how readily available certain forms of illicit drugs are by grade level. Surveys were administered to students in grades 6 to 12, who were asked questions about how easy it would be for them to obtain beer, liquor, marijuana, cocaine, and other forms of illicit drugs. The reported ease of obtaining these substances increased with grade level.

As for beer, 23.7 percent of sixth graders reported that it was “fairly easy” to “very easy” to get beer, as opposed to the reported 79.9 percent of twelfth graders. 8.2 percent of sixth graders reported that they could get marijuana easily, as opposed to the 58.5 percent of twelfth graders. Concerning cocaine, including “crack cocaine,” 5.2 percent of sixth graders responded that it was “fairly easy” to “very easy” to get, compared with 25.1 percent of twelfth graders. (P.202).

These numbers, if accurate, are completely unacceptable and something must be done to stop these forms of illegal activities. The presence of drugs and alcohol on a school campus only invites other types of crime and can act as a catalyst for violence in these settings. The selling of drugs often involves the presence of gang related activities and the violence that accompanies these criminal behaviors. As we begin to look toward our children’s futures, we are finding that the problems of violence and drugs on our streets are reaching into our schools and the responsibility to provide a safe school environment has never been more important.
Chapter III - Remedial Approaches

The American public education system plays a vital role in the development of our youth and in their preparation for the future as knowledgeable adults, responsible people, and productive citizens. Except for good parental guidance, the education system has the strongest influence over our children. Therefore, we may assert that the children of this country are products of the education environment and process to which we have subjected them. This may have either good or bad effects, or even both. Because compulsory attendance laws require a child to attend school, it is our responsibility to ensure that educators, parents, and law-enforcement efforts exhaust every opportunity available in guaranteeing our children the absolute best learning environment possible.

It can be expected that an educational facility infested with juvenile delinquents and criminal activities would compromise the learning process. Unruly students involved in disruptive behavior detract from educators’ focus as providers of knowledge and information and enlarges their role as disciplinarians. Students involved in unruly behavior will often divert the attention of an instructor from students who are willing to learn to the students that are often incapable of functioning in a school setting. The National School Safety Center (1996), recently published a pamphlet titled Making a Difference describing the effects of an unsafe school setting.

Unsafe conditions disrupt the learning environment so severely that students and teachers are unable to focus their full attention on academic goals. Serious crime and violence, drug trafficking and abuse, truancy, vandalism and discipline problems are, unfortunately among just a few of such activities and are present in our nation’s schools. (Pamphlet)
It is inconceivable to expect that our nation’s schools can and will be fully free of crime, drugs, and gang related activities. Nevertheless, there are efforts we can make to curtail these disruptions.

From a law enforcement perspective, we can identify two separate but equally important roles for police departments and their officers to perform. The pedagogical role that involves a police officer’s presence in a classroom setting for instructional purposes has been implemented in most every school. The other role that police agencies have recently undertaken is the actual enforcement of the laws and the appropriate handling of criminal matters as defined by the criminal justice system. These roles will be examined in this chapter.

Section I - A Pedagogical Approach to Law enforcement

The two most commonly known pedagogical approaches by law enforcement officers within the school setting are known as the Drug Abuse Resistance Education (D.A.R.E.) program and the Gang Resistance Education And Training (G.R.E.A.T.) program. Both the D.A.R.E. and G.R.E.A.T. programs focus their efforts, through classroom instruction, on youth in the school setting, seeking to increase self-esteem, assertiveness, decision-making skills, and resistance to peer pressure.

G.R.E.A.T. originated in Phoenix, Arizona, in 1991 under a grant from the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (A.T.F.). Within a two-year period, the program expanded to New Mexico and Hawaii. Within the next few years, several other states began the G.R.E.A.T. program in their schools. D.A.R.E., on the other hand, was created in 1983
by the Los Angeles Police Department (L.A.P.D.) and rapidly spread throughout the country as the most widely used pedagogical approach by law enforcement officers. “D.A.R.E. is one of, if not the most, widespread drug prevention program in the United States. In 1989, more than 3 million children in 80,000 classrooms were exposed to D.A.R.E.” (Harmon, 1993, p.223). Since 1989, the D.A.R.E. program has expanded to reach more than 5.5 million students annually and is offered in over half the elementary schools in the United States (Duke, 1995).

Similar in nature, both approaches attempt to inform and teach students by offering a class once a week. The class sessions are approximately 45-60 minutes in length and are given between 8 and 17 weeks a year. During classroom instruction, open forums where students can ask questions directed toward the officer, group discussions, role-playing, and textbook exercises are used. It is believed that these techniques allow the officer to reach pre-adolescents with an anti-drug message and to give them resistance skills before they enter a middle school or junior high.

Initially, the D.A.R.E. program focused only on elementary level children. However, most D.A.R.E. programs have began incorporating the middle school and high school level students into this pro-active effort. Among the goals at the middle school and high school levels are to address violence, the carrying and use of weapons, criminal activities, and other forms of delinquent behavior.

There are several reasons and a rationale for using police officers rather than regular classroom teachers for the instruction of this type of material. The knowledge, experience,
and training that an officer has are just a few reasons to have police officers instruct this type of curriculum. A police officer is typically much more knowledgeable and experienced regarding criminal activities and drug related offenses than are most classroom instructors. From working on the streets, a police officer can share his or her personal experiences relating to juveniles who were involved in crime, the use of illicit drugs, and gang violence. Most teachers would not have the same type of experiences and might not be able to convey the same message as would the officer. By teaching the course, an officer can also abridge previous perceptual distortions held by many youth that view police officers as racists, liars, and unfriendly people out to get youngsters. This approach can build a level of rapport between youth and the police, therefore enhancing future communications between the two.

A book titled *The Prevention of Youth Violence*, published in 1993 by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, focuses on educational approaches pertaining to criminal activities and violent behavior among juveniles. Education is looked upon as a provider of information that teaches new skills; new knowledge and skills can change or even reinforce a person’s attitude and behavior. It may be assumed that, when a child learns new skills and is better equipped for understanding how and why a person should behave a certain way, he or she will eventually adopt these views and lifestyle. This is not always the case, but more often than not it is plausible to recognize a direct correlation between a child’s attitude and the environment to which they have been subjected. If this is true, then an educational approach toward juvenile delinquency may reduce the chances that the person will behave violently. One such educational approach is known as “Conflict
Resolution Education.” “Classes in conflict resolution are designed to provide students with the opportunity to develop empathy with others, learn ways to control impulses, develop problem-solving skills, and manage their anger” (p. 13). Other educational approaches listed in the book are titled “Training in social skills,” “Peer education,” and “Adult mentoring.”

A program known as the Student Crime Prevention Mobilization began in high schools in 1993. The program prescribes the use of a police officer to teach from a textbook from the National Institute for Citizen Education and the National Crime Prevention Council. The approach focuses on classroom lectures, instruction, and a student project selected by the student to meet a community need. The author claims that the program “has taught students the consequences of irresponsible behavior and demonstrated that they can contribute constructively to society” (Austin, 1994, p. 81).

It is believed that a strong educational approach toward crime, violence, and the use of drugs is often effective in influencing a child to do the “Right” thing. A 1995 article by Debra Williams, “Security efforts cut Chicago-school violence” examined school reform within the Chicago Public School system and described a dramatic decrease in violence among these schools. She stated that the consistent decrease of violence within the schools over the previous four years would be attributed to an increase in the amount of funding and types of programs designed to change students’ behavior. These programs have been created to provide classroom instruction by police and security personnel regarding crime and violence, and also peer mediation and conflict resolution sessions.

Another approach for which facilitators claim success involves a state level program
in Colorado. The program is designed to place police officers in classrooms for instructional purposes and to change the students' attitudes and perceptions toward police. In fact, the author believes that the most effective advance in lowering the amount of juvenile delinquency over the past decade involved the use of police officers as instructors in the classroom.

The most effective advance in juvenile delinquency prevention in the last 10 years has been to improve communications between justice system representatives and adolescents. Since 1982, a Colorado program has put police officers trained in instructional techniques and pro-active classroom management into the classroom along with teachers. The results have indicated that these programs can change the almost inevitable attitudes of youths toward the police. (Hunter, 1993, abstract)

Hunter states that the reduction in stolen cars alone has surpassed the total costs of running the program. He also states that there have been an overall decrease of property crimes committed and violent juvenile acts against another person. In addition to these effects, there have been better lines of communication between law enforcement authorities and juveniles who are highly susceptible to these types of behavior.

Although claims have been made regarding the positive effects of instructional approaches by police to curtail crime and violent behavior among juveniles, there is still criticism and doubt as to its effectiveness. A variety of studies have discovered that instructional approaches, similar to that of D.A.R.E. or G.R.E.A.T., only temporarily influence juveniles and the increased levels of resistance are only short-lived. "Research that has examined the effectiveness of D.A.R.E. over the longer term has produced inconsistent results, with most results indicating very little effect of D.A.R.E." (Duke, 1996,
However, many participants of the D.A.R.E. program surveyed within one year of the program did experience some measurable changes. Some results were as follows, “In one early study, at a one-year follow-up, Dejong (1987) found that junior high students reported less use of alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs than students who had not received the program” (Duke, 1996, p.50). During this study, it was also discovered that D.A.R.E. students were capable of demonstrating higher levels of resistance to peer pressure than those students who had not been exposed to the program. Other studies showed that immediately after D.A.R.E., students who were exposed to the program reported greater self-esteem, more resistance to peer pressure, and more positive attitudes toward police. These same behavior characteristics could not be seen after one year of having gone through the program, Clayton et al. (1991).

The findings of the G.R.E.A.T. program are similar to those of the D.A.R.E. program. Although the findings do reveal that the G.R.E.A.T. program does have some positive influences on potential gang members, the effects are minimal and have no significant value, except when regarding tobacco. “We believe that the impact of G.R.E.A.T. is similar to that of D.A.R.E. There is a slight increase in the desired attitude about gangs, but not much, if any, in actual gang behavior” (Palumbo, 1995, p.617). In studies evaluating the effectiveness of the G.R.E.A.T. program, it was discovered that the students did develop a much more positive feeling toward the police officers. However, some students did not agree with the message the officers had presented about gang related activities.
Duke (1996), conducted his examination of the D.A.R.E. program with the use of surveys. The self-reporting survey inquired as to how the feelings or behaviors of the children who had gone through the D.A.R.E. program differed from those students who had not attended the program. The final evaluation of the D.A.R.E. program was as follows:

When existing research on D.A.R.E. has shown effects, the effects have been immediate for the most part. For example, Dukes, Ullman, and Stein (1995) reported significant effects of D.A.R.E. in a 6-month longitudinal study. . . . Research that has examined the effectiveness of D.A.R.E. over the longer term has produced inconsistent results, with most results indicating very little effect of D.A.R.E. (p. 50)

Palumbo (1995), also conducted extensive studies to examine the overall effectiveness of D.A.R.E. and G.R.E.A.T. The results of the study were similar to that of the Duke study. It was discovered that some students were temporarily influenced by the programs, however, there were no statistically significant findings after a one-year period. The findings suggested that students did experience higher self-esteem and greater resistance levels toward peer pressure immediately upon completing the program. It was also discovered that a program’s influence on a student was temporary, and drastically decreased as time passed. It is believed that there is almost no influence on a student approximately one-year after having gone through a D.A.R.E. or G.R.E.A.T. program (p. 603).

Many sources support a pedagogical approach to law enforcement when working with juveniles who are highly susceptible to crime, drugs, and gang related activities, even when the results are minuscule. Quite often the efforts are noticed and can be weighed, but are often too small to be statistically significant or have any real influence on the choices
these youths make in the future. However, we must view what little impact the programs do have and determine whether the benefits gained are worth the invested efforts.

Because the program embodies goals and objectives that are nearly unassailable and attacks a problem that is widely viewed as a major threat to the society, it is laced with powerful symbolic qualities and thus has significant political, practical, and public relations utility for its stakeholders. (P. 741)

It is also possible that the better lines of communication between youth and the police can have many positive attributes for the future. Exposing juveniles to police officers in a nonthreatening situation may have benefits felt elsewhere in law enforcement. Although these efforts may not be successful in fulfilling all of the goals they were meant to accomplish, they will continue to persevere because, in most circumstances, no other effective alternatives have been identified.

Section II - Enforcing the Laws

Schools now face threats that were never imaginable a decade or two ago. The threats of gang and drug related activities have placed students and school faculty members in constant fear of being victimized. In California, the National School Safety Center (1992) states that the most feared juvenile offenses are violent crimes involving the use of guns and other weapons by juveniles who often are gang affiliates. As a result, the center has prescribed “bullet drills” to the day-to-day precautionary measures taken by school administrators within the public schools. The drills require students, upon hearing gunfire, to lie down face first in the center of the field until the “all-clear” sign is given.

The following question must be posed: Is a juvenile with a gun any less dangerous
than an adult? Most respondents would probably say “No.” Lieutenant Wayne Torok of the Cleveland Police Department would concur with this response. In fact, he advises police officers to “not treat an armed juvenile any differently than an armed adult. They are just as dangerous, and customary procedures for the lawful use of force should apply” (Bruce, 1994, p.62).

A 1988 Evaluation Review article compared juvenile offenses to crimes committed by adults. Although the focus of the article primarily addresses juvenile sentencing and reform, the impetus for such reform stems from the seriousness of juvenile offenses. The author believes that crimes committed by juveniles that are comparable in seriousness to crimes committed by adults should be handled accordingly. In other words, a juvenile who commits an offense similar to that of an offense committed by an adult, given that the seriousness of each offense is commensurable, should receive the same degree of punishment and sentencing as would the adult perpetrator.

One impetus for juvenile sentence reform that route greater numbers of youths to the criminal court or to criminal court-like dispositions is that the crimes committed by juveniles are comparable in seriousness to the crimes committed by adults, and so are deserving of similar punishments. (Harris, 1988, p.656)

How can we address the problems of juvenile violence, illicit drug use, gang related activities, and other forms of juvenile delinquency within our schools? Police officers and law enforcement efforts address problems identical to these on the city streets, so, why not take this approach when similar type problems are present in our schools. An article titled “Taking Back Our Schools” focuses on what often occurs when a school administration fails
to address this issue. Marilyn Rose contends, "Schools' failure to provide safe, disciplined, and an orderly environment is a major cause of efforts to dismantle public education through vouchers, tuition, tax credits, and privatization" (1995, p.8). Rose maintains that one primary reason for this stems from school officials' and their unwillingness to notify police regarding students that violate laws while on campus.

There are many law enforcement and education publications addressing how keeping schools safe can no longer be an autonomous process by a school administrator, but instead requires a concerted effort involving school administrators and some form of campus law enforcement. In fact, some schools have established their own police forces to bolster school security. "Sometimes, schools must upgrade security. Some school boards have had to bolster school security with police patrols" (Stover, 1987, p.31). According to an article titled "Law enforcement responds to crime on campus," it is the responsibility of school administrators and campus law enforcement, together, to ensure that our schools remain safe and conducive to the learning process.

Arguably, a police officer's presence on a school campus will not abate crime completely, but it can have an extremely positive influence on the school and its students. "A strong police presence around schools helps students to feel more secure, such that they do not believe they need a gun to protect themselves" (Bruce, 1994, abstract). As early as 1978, the Fort Lauderdale Public Schools in Broward County, Florida were witness to the benefits of having a police officer present at their schools. The school administration believed that placing a 24-hour police substation on the school campus, where police
officers would go periodically for shift changes and administrative duties, would be advantageous. It was maintained that the mere presence of a police officer on the school’s campus discouraged vandalism and crime, and improved relations between the police, students, and school staff (Grealy, 1980, abstract).

In the early 70's, the first four school districts to place full-time police officers in the schools to patrol the halls were the Detroit (MI) Public Schools, the Atlanta (GA) Public Schools, the San Diego (CA) Public Schools, and the Chicago (Ill) Public Schools. Although this approach was initially frowned upon by most administrators, with the passage of time the police officers’ presence became accepted and even welcomed by students and faculty (Krajick, 1978). The assertions made by Grealy and Krajick are not supported by evidence; however, they are worth noting because they reflect early efforts to control the crime problem on school campuses with police officers assigned to patrol these schools.

Except for a few large urban inner-city school districts (San Diego, Los Angeles, Detroit, etc.), assigning police officers to school campuses for the purposes of law enforcement is somewhat of a new approach to ridding our schools of crime, gang violence, and the use of illicit drugs. For some school administrators, the placement of police officers on their school’s campus for patrolling purposes has been optional and not a matter of survival, as it is for some schools. Under these circumstances, school administrators have often been witness to the gained benefits of having a police presence at a school. On the other hand, some schools have been so overrun by drugs, gang violence, and other forms of juvenile criminal behavior that a police officer’s presence is the only way the school can
continue to operate.

The San Antonio School District in Texas illustrates just one of many districts that have formed their own police agency for patrol purposes on the school district’s campuses. In 1992, the district had an estimated 72 uniformed officers who worked within the schools and patrolled the school grounds. As with many inner school police agencies, the San Antonio Police Administrators emphasize a “community policing” approach. This allows an officer to address criminal activities and other forms of juvenile delinquent behavior in a unique way. Officers are encouraged to use all resources available to them to ensure the schools are safe. “The police officers hold assemblies, outlining the rules and procedures that will be enforced to keep their school safe . . . Police officers also work individually with students as mentors, counselors . . . and are fully uniformed and armed, providing a deterrence to criminal behavior” (Murphy, 1992, abstract). However, the community policing approach should not detract from an officer’s number one priority of enforcing the laws and responding to criminal complaints while on the a school campus. Although supporting evidence is not offered, Murphy claims that the San Antonio School Police program has been accepted and fully supported by parents and teachers when addressing the drug and gang problems within the schools.

The community policing approach to law enforcement by police officers on school campuses was considered a success in the mid 70's. In 1975, when the San Diego Public Schools had begun placing police officers in the schools for law enforcement purposes, they too were advised to take the community policing type approach and to only take action when
an obvious violation was committed (Hoobler, 1975, p.2). To improve relations with the students, officers were also encouraged to make informal contacts, to hold open forums where questions could be asked, and to conduct classroom presentations. As a result of the program, officers claim that its implementation has been a success and has resulted in improved student attitudes and increased levels of respect toward the patrol officers.

The Providence Rhode Island Public Schools have also been among the scores of public schools that have enacted or utilized police officers to reduce crime and violence on their school campuses. Along with most every other school policing approach, the officers attempt to create a non-adversarial atmosphere by promoting positive relationships with the students, while still enforcing the laws and executing their duties as police officers when necessary. The Providence Police Department distributes a brochure titled *School/Community Gang Intervention Team* that states “The objective is to maintain safety and order in and about school properties, to create an atmosphere of cooperation, and to encourage positive relationships between and among the student body, police, and school administration” (brochure).

The Park Forest Public School System in Illinois is one of many non-urban, middle-class school districts to have police officers in the school halls for law enforcement purposes. The program began with only a few officers and has now evolved into a fully operational division of the Park Forest City Police Department sustaining 12 police officers to patrol the school district’s campuses. Initially, when the program was developed the police officers were supposed to be on the campuses solely for protection and security.
However, not only have the officers been successful and effective in reducing serious incidents and improving school security, they have also become involved in school activities and have established positive working relationships with the students (Moriarty, 1989). Some of the school activities the officers have become involved in include the coaching or assisting of students who need help in after school sports, acting as chaperons during field-trips and dances, and attending other school activities such as award ceremonies on their scheduled days of work.

Section III - Summary

It is apparent that the D.A.R.E. and G.R.E.A.T. programs have not been as successful as initially thought. Although it has been discovered that students are influenced by the programs, it has also been found that these changes are only temporary and there is no lasting influence that extends past a one year period. This is why many long-term studies have found that the results yielded from the program after a one year period are inconsistent with those finding immediately after the program has been offered to a child.

Most of the works cited within section two were not supported by evidence and what claims were made appeared to be merely opinionated observations made by the authors. Only a few of the works cited had supporting evidence, most of which were untested surveys administered to an undetermined number of respondents. This does not mean that the works cited were not accurate in their assertions. As previously noted, this approach had not been thoroughly examined and documented and as a result, much of the findings discussed will be circumstantial and not well tested.
Chapter IV - Examining the Alternatives

This chapter will offer a more subjective response to the issue of crime on school campuses and will examine further the different approaches school officials and law enforcement officers have taken to curtail such activities. Much of the information and data collected in examining the literature review is summarized here. This and the secondary data presented in the two preceding chapters are the underpinning for the assertions made in the final chapter.

Section 1 - Crime is a Problem

Crime has become a major problem within the schools and among the juveniles who attend them. Under the heading of “Crime,” criminal activities are categorized by the nature and type of threat each offense poses. The most serious and obvious offenses involve crimes committed against another person. Among these crimes are robberies, assaults, rapes, and even homicide. The primary element in identifying such an offense is the immediate and imminent threat of injury, serious injury, or death to the victim of these crimes.

Another type offense commonly committed at a school by a juvenile involves property crime. These crimes usually involve the loss or damage of property by a victim. In the commission of these crimes, rarely is there contact between the violator and the victim. Two types of property crimes that occur most often on a school campus involve the damaging or stealing of property by a violator. In either case, the property may belong to a faculty member, another student, or the school.

The third most commonly committed offense on a school campus is known as a
victimless crime. These offenses usually involve some form of distribution, consumption, or delivery of an illicit narcotic. Crimes of this nature are considered victimless because the criminal charging process usually does not involve a citizen who would testify in a court hearing or criminal trial as a victim. In these matters, the state is considered the victim and the arresting or investigating officer would then act as a representative for the state. However, it should be noted that many persons involved in either the consumption or distribution of a narcotic are commonly involved in other illegal activities to sustain their addiction or to protect themselves from other persons involved in the same type of activities.

Why does this all matter and why is it important to know the difference between the three separate types of crime? When viewing a topic of this nature, there are several reasons a person should know the difference between the three types of offenses. First and foremost, a person whether it is a parent, juvenile, teacher, or principal, should realize that these activities are criminal and there are existing laws for every one of these offenses. In addition, for each of the above offenses, the government can prescribe a certain amount of jail time for a person who violates these laws. It is also common for a person to be fined by the courts and ordered to pay restitution if he or she is found guilty of breaking the law.

So, if this is true, then such activities are no longer a matter to be handled solely by a school’s administration, but also by a law enforcement agency. This alone negates any prior assumption by educators, parents, and students who previously believed that criminal acts committed on a school’s campus is not a criminal matter but rather an administrative concern to be handled solely by a school’s administration.
It is clear that these activities are criminal and we have concluded from the literature review that these offenses do exist at are schools, we must now pose the following question. What or how do we attempt to stop these criminal activities at the schools our children attend? Abating crime completely is absolutely impossible. Crime will continue to perpetuate as long as people are brought together and interact. However, this does not mean that we, meaning police officers, teachers, principals, parents, and concerned citizens, cannot implement some type of approach to lessen the amount of crime occurring at or around the schools.

Section II - The Pedagogical Approach

As noted in Chapter Three, the D.A.R.E. and G.R.E.A.T. programs are the most widely used pedagogical approaches by law enforcement efforts. The primary goals of these two programs are to decrease the number of criminal incidents committed by juveniles, and also lessen the seriousness of incidents. It is believed that these goals can be met by having uniformed police officers instruct students from a didactic curriculum. From this arrangement and the substance of the dialogue maintained among the police officer and the students, it is believed that students will have increased self-esteem, better decision-making skills, and heightened resistance to peer pressure.

Ultimately, it is believed that if a student does experience these changes, he or she will be less likely to commit a crime or become involved in other forms of illegal activities. It is axiomatic to believe that a person who has high levels of self-confidence and self-esteem will be less likely to become involved in crime and drug use. Still, we must ask
whether this law-enforcement approach affects the students in a manner consistent with what it was intended to accomplish.

Unfortunately, as documented in Chapter Three, the approach does not accomplish its intended goals. A variety of studies have discovered that an instructional approach toward law enforcement only temporarily influence juveniles and their effects often are unmeasurable after one year. The only positive results that were significant involved overall perceptions and attitudes by students toward the police. Many of these studies found that students who interacted with the police on a regular basis and in a nonthreatening situation began to develop more positive attitudes toward the police department and its officers.

When we view how the programs were evaluated, we find that a subjective process eliciting responses on a survey were used to determine each program’s effectiveness. Maybe the D.A.R.E. and G.R.E.A.T. programs are effective but he have used the wrong tools to examine their influence on students. What if the subjectivity was eliminated from the evaluation process and only hard numbers were used to examine the two programs.

One way of eliminating the subjectivity of the evaluation process is by viewing only the objective measurable elements such as the amount of crimes and seriousness of each crime committed. By doing this, you would then compare the present findings to the crime rate before the implementation of the program. Although many people would agree that this would seemingly be an excellent way of measuring a program’s effectiveness, it too has many flaws and can also be very inaccurate.

Most people who are familiar with the criminal justice field know that when viewing
statistical compilations pertaining to the number of criminal offenses committed, there are many factors that can effect the final outcome. A lack of police officers for a particular area or school may result in a substantially lower number of reported incidents then would an area or school that may have an overabundance of officers.

Another way the reported crime rate can be influenced is by a simple procedural change in how certain types of criminal incidents are reported. A perfect example of how a procedural change can influence the overall number of criminal incidents reported was identified in 1995 in the State of Michigan. Before 1995, an officer used what was known as a UTC, or Uniformed Traffic Citation when issuing tickets for traffic violations. On the UTC there was space for only one offense, therefore an officer was required to fill out another UTC in its entirety if the officer wished to issue more than one citation. It was a very time consuming process for an officer who happened to stumble upon a motorist that had committed several offenses. After 1995, the State of Michigan created what is known as the ULC, or Uniformed Law Citation. On the ULC there are spaces for three separate citations. Therefore, an officer wishing to issue up to three citations would only needed to fill-in the blank for each violation, a process that would only require an additional ten to twenty seconds. From this procedural change, there have been a substantial increase in the amount of traffic infractions issued by police officers since the onset of the new tickets. Does this mean that more people have been committing traffic violations. Probably not.

As you can see, the process of evaluating the effectiveness of a particular law enforcement approach is a very inaccurate and difficult responsibility. As a result, deciding
whether a program should be negated or continued can be even more difficult than the evaluation process itself. However, as mentioned in Chapter Three, the pedagogical approach will be perpetuated until it can be proven as an ineffective tool that yields no results, or another program is introduced that displays a level of effectiveness that no longer require programs such as D.A.R.E. and G.R.E.A.T.

**Section III - Law Enforcement**

The same problems one must face when evaluating the effectiveness of the pedagogical approach are encountered when viewing the law enforcement approach. In fact, there are two additional problems confronted when evaluating the effectiveness of a law enforcement approach. The first problem is that most of these programs have been initiated within the last few years and it is much too early to evaluate a program’s effectiveness. Further, only a handful of schools have implemented the law enforcement approach, most of which have not conducted any form of research or administered any type of survey to measure the program’s effectiveness within their school.

Let us begin by identifying the goals of the law enforcement approach. The ultimate goal of this program is to maintain a safe environment so that students, teachers, and visitors are not in constant fear of being victimized while on a school’s campus. How does the law enforcement approach on a school campus accomplish this? There are several procedures undertaken to increase the overall safety of a school’s campus.

With almost every criminal activity, an officer’s presence on a school campus can have a strong influence on how a criminal behaves and often result as a deterrent to criminal
behavior. The simple assertion can be made that, as the odds of being caught for committing a crime increase, the likelihood of that same person committing a crime decrease.

Consider this. You are driving down the freeway and you see a police officer in a patrol car on the average of once every two hours. If you are like most motorists on the road, you probably travel an average of five to eight miles per hour above the speed limit. Now suppose you begin seeing an officer on the same freeway once every fifteen minutes. The odds for being caught speeding have obviously increased. Your natural response would be to slow down and drive the actual speed limit because it is no longer worth the chance of being ticketed for traveling faster than the posted speed limit. The same theory can be applied to the students and persons most likely to break the laws on a school’s campus. If a common thief knows that he will encounter a police officer approximately every fifteen minutes if he continues to loiter in the halls during class, it is less likely that same student will continue to loiter in the halls, let alone break into a locker or a car. In this scenario, the goal has been fulfilled and the program is considered a success.

This is very different from the pedagogical approach for having an officer on a school campus. With the pedagogical approach, an officer is placed in a classroom for the entire school day and seldom walks the halls or patrols the outer campus area to seek out those persons committing crimes. In fact, D.A.R.E. and G.R.E.A.T. officers are encouraged not to involve themselves in any form of law enforcement activity, again, because it places the students and the officer in an adversarial type relationship and the program is designed to avoid such conflicts.
What about those students willing to risk being caught breaking the law. If there is no officer assigned to patrol the school and as a result no formal investigation is conducted, then nothing has been solved. The child will continue to break the law and will probably never be caught. What if we view the same scenario but with a different approach. Let us examine what may happen if there is an officer on the school campus for the purposes of patrolling the halls. If the officer is successful in solving a criminal act 20% of the time, then it is possible that the criminal he or she catches will not commit the same offense again. And, if a student receives some form of punishment and is put through the court system, the chances that other perspective criminals will see the outcome of such activities and it may prevent them from committing a crime similar in nature.

Community policing is another vital function and duty of an officer assigned to patrol a school campus. As you will read in Chapter Five regarding the North Carolina School Resource Officer (S.R.O.) program, a position of this nature requires a unique person with exceptional communication skills and an amiableness that can charm the most difficult students. An officer assigned to this duty must have a great ardor and desire for such a role and be capable of building remarkable lines of communication that allow for a mutual transferring of information from the students to the officer and vice versa. If the right person has been selected for this position, then the likelihood of the law enforcement approach being just as successful as the pedagogical approach in building a rapport between the students and police is very high.

This leads to the next area of concern when placing police officers in a school setting
for the purpose of enforcing the laws. From personal experience, the most common concern regarding this approach is an overly aggressive officer who often becomes very physical with the students while working on a school campus. First and foremost, this type of behavior by a police officer is not acceptable by officers who work the streets of a city or town, so, these same actions would definitely be unacceptable inside the school setting. Under most circumstances, officers are very kind and will only utilize physical force as an absolute last resort. However, it must be understood that an officer does have the power and authority to use physical force where situations warrant that level of intervention in accordance to the force continuum as laid out by state and federal guidelines.

I have had an opportunity to work as an officer in a school setting for several years. During these years of service, another common belief held by many parents and educators is that a police officer cannot touch a child under the age of seventeen unless the person is in possession of some type of weapon and is threatening to injure another person with that weapon. Before placing an officer in a school setting, it should be made clear to educators, students, and parents that a police officer is not restricted by age guidelines and can exhaust all means of authority and force when executing an arrest, detaining a subject, restraining an uncontrollable student, or apprehending a fleeing suspect. It is only after a person under the age of seventeen has been placed under arrest that he or she is treated differently than an adult. Again, this matter should be reviewed with all appropriate persons at the school level before the placement of the officer. Failure to do exactly this will only aggravate the officer/educator relationship and can ultimately destroy all lines of communication.
The law enforcement approach to school crime serves several purposes. It should act as a deterrent for persons who are highly susceptible to commit criminal activities. The second purpose for having a police officer on a school’s campus for law enforcement purposes is to actually enforce the laws. This means investigating criminal activities and sending the completed reports to the prosecutor for the appropriate handling and charging of subjects involved in criminal activities. Finally, an officer working in a school setting should attempt to build a rapport with the students there at the school.

It must be understood that not all schools need police officers on their campuses. In fact, most schools do not need this type of service. Nevertheless, it is those schools that have an on going problem with crime, drugs, and gang activities who need this type of approach to curtail crime. Nor is it being suggested that every elementary student who may steal a pen from their teacher or every middle school student who pushes another student during gym class be criminally charged for such behavior. There must be diligent levels of discretion demonstrated by the officer assigned to the schools. Just as most minor offenses committed on the streets are not criminally prosecuted, the same approach would occur in the school setting.

**Section IV - Summary**

This chapter summarizes many of the ideas and concepts presented in Chapter Two and Chapter Three of this project. It has served to present some of the different benefits and negative effects of each remedial approach. In addition, many of the author’s own ideas have been interjected in accordance with the issues as they have been examined. The next
chapter will examine, in detail, the North Carolina State level School Resource Program.
Chapter V - An Ideological Approach

In the State of North Carolina, a program has attempted to fulfill the roles of both the pedagogical and the law enforcement approaches. The North Carolina approach surpassed the efforts and accomplishments of all other programs and is seemingly on track in reaching the goals it set out to meet. The program is recognized as the SRO approach, otherwise known as the School Resource Officer program.

Section 1 - History of the Program

Klopovic (1995) presents a brief history of the SRO program. In the late 1980's and early 1990's, the State of North Carolina was feeling the tremendous flux and increase of both the number of criminal activities and the severity of the criminal acts occurring on the campuses of the public schools within the state. In 1993, the North Carolina Task Force on School Violence conducted a series of public hearings throughout the state. These hearings were meant to address the increasing problem of violence in the public schools.

During these hearings, it was discovered that the State of North Carolina was experiencing the same problems as were most of the other states. Among these problems was an overall increase in the number of criminal offenses committed and the seriousness of criminal offenses occurring within the school setting. However, it was decided that the Task Force was not going to allow these activities to continue and decided that action must be taken to stop the crime epidemic in the public schools of North Carolina.

Upon completing these public hearings, the primary recommendation of the Task Force was to take steps to address the problem of school crime by creating the North
Carolina Center for the Prevention of School Violence. Originally, the center was a component of the Governor’s Crime Commission in the Department of Crime Control and Public Safety. The Center eventually became and still remains a concerted partnership with the North Carolina State University’s College of Education and Psychology and receives continued support from the Governor’s Crime Commission.

Working closely with the Public Schools of North Carolina, the Department of Crime Control and Public Safety, the Attorney General’s Office, and the University of North Carolina system, the Center aids local school boards, law enforcement agencies, and other community leaders in their efforts to prevent violence in schools by offering information about both violence prevention and intervention strategies. (Internet Accessed, 1997.)

After the development of the North Carolina Center for the Prevention of School Violence, it was decided that the best approach to curtail crime in the schools was to place law enforcement officers on the school campuses. The Center did not stop there, they then designed a program known as the School Resource Officer Program which required a law enforcement officer to fill several roles while working in the school setting.

**Section II - The SRO Program Design**

Once the decision was made to implement the SRO program, other questions were raised. How will the SRO program be funded? Will officers from the local municipalities be used or will it be a branch of the State Police? Who will ultimately be responsible for accountability of the officers and their actions? And the questions go on.

In May of 1996, there were approximately 243 SRO’s working in some type of school setting in the State of North Carolina. Less than one year later, there were an
estimated 363 SRO’s providing services to more than 91 different school districts.

All of the SRO’s are sworn law enforcement officers and are paid by a variety of sources. Contingent upon the arrangement between the school district, the local municipality, and the Center for the Prevention of School Violence, some officers are paid with state monies, federal grants, the Governor’s Crime Commission, local monies, and occasionally a combination of two or more of the funding sources.

A SRO is still considered a police officer for the department in which he or she is employed; the only difference is that a SRO is assigned to a certain school or several schools as opposed to a neighborhood or city district. However, because most SRO’s are funded by the Governor’s Crime Commission or other outside regulatory agency, SRO’s are required to follow specific guidelines and regulations placed on them while filling this position. Most of these guidelines regulate procedural type activities for the SRO and often require a much more extensive form of reporting of incidents for informational purposes. This information is later used by the Center for the Prevention of School Violence in formulating different approaches to better address specific problems the schools are presently facing.

Section III - Goals of the SRO Program

A School Resource Officer (SRO) program places police officers or resource officers in the school setting with the goal of creating and maintaining a safe educational environment for students, teachers, staff, and guests to the school campuses. In addition, the SRO program is developing comprehensive activity logs that require a SRO to extensively report all activities he or she may be involved in on a daily basis. This information is later
turned over to the Center and becomes statistical information to be evaluated.

Some of the information a SRO is required to submit to the Center includes how much time was spent on specific activities. These activities include the actual enforcement of the laws, random foot patrol, time spent lecturing or counseling students on a number of issues, or even time the SRO may have spent in building a rapport with the students by accompanying a class on a field-trip or coaching extracurricular events. All of these activities are considered to play an intricate part of the SRO program and are encouraged by the Center. Obviously, a SRO must prioritize his activities. If there is a serious problem of criminal activities occurring on a school’s campus, the SRO should first focus on addressing this crime problem as opposed to going on a field trip.

Other information SRO’s are required to report involves the amount and type of criminal incidents occurring on a school’s campus, plus any weapons that the SRO may have confiscated. A SRO is also responsible for reporting the disposition of each offense and whether or not criminal prosecution resulted, a suspension was handed down by the school administration, or a simple verbal warning was given.

From the information obtained, the Center utilizes this data for three different purposes. The first purpose is to establish a clearinghouse of information so problems are more clearly identified and solutions are developed. The second purpose is to provide program development and implementation expertise so that schools, law enforcement agencies, and local communities can have violence prevention programs that are more likely to succeed. Finally, this information is researched and evaluated so that schools, law
enforcement agencies, and local communities can more effectively address their needs.

Section IV - SRO Functions

The very first role of any School Resource Officer is identified as a law enforcement officer. Once this role has been met and the SRO is no longer faced with an overwhelming crime problem, he or she is also responsible for two other roles which involve being a law-related counselor and a law-related educator. In a recent brochure titled *What North Carolina School Resource Officers do in the Schools* (1997), it was reported that “SRO’s spend 50% of their time on law enforcement duties . . . they spend 17% of their time on the law related education teaching role . . . and they spend approximately 33% percent of their time fulfilling their law-related counseling role” (p. 1).

The Center strongly emphasizes that the impetus behind the placement of an SRO in a school is law enforcement and this takes precedence over all other responsibilities. This becomes an issue because many school administrators desire an SRO’s presence on a school campus but are reluctant to allow the SRO to carry a firearm or even enforce the laws. The issue regarding the enforcement of laws is a closed issue and is undebatable. In order for SRO’s to be placed in a school setting, officers must first be allowed to execute their responsibilities as law enforcement officers.

On the other hand, the issue of whether a SRO should carry a firearm on a school campus is always up for debate. Many people believe that by having a SRO armed with a firearm, another gun is being brought into the school setting that may possible be taken from the SRO and used against the officer or another person on the school campus. SRO’s
disagree with this view and most feel that police officers responding to a crime in a school building are not required to surrender their firearm to school authorities upon entering the building. Therefore, SRO’s should not be restricted from wearing a firearm while on duty in a school. Although this issue is constantly being debated, out of the 363 SRO’s working in a school setting, there has been only one reported incident where a SRO has been prohibited from carrying his firearm while at school.

Another area of concern is whether a SRO should be fully uniformed or in civilian clothes. This decision is left up to the school, police department, and the individual officer. The Center suggests that, in those circumstances where crime is a major problem and most of the SRO’s daily activities involve the enforcement of the laws, then the SRO should be fully uniformed. It is felt that a SRO who is fully uniformed will be approached with more respect than would a SRO wearing civilian clothing. The Center believes that a uniform will also serve as a better deterrent to trespassers and persons who are committing crimes while at school.

As you will recall, SRO’s spend a substantially large block of their time counseling law-related issues. Although SRO’s are not licensed in the area of counseling, they often perform this role. Ultimately, this role is described as an “active listener.” Because all SRO’s reportedly maintain an “open-door” policy, they are continually approached by students who need sound advice or someone who is willing to listen to their concerns. As a result, many students often come to know the SRO’s very well and will often confide in them.
Regarding a SRO as a law-related education teacher, it is important to keep in mind that the SRO is not in the school to replace the teachers, but to act as another well-informed resource. A SRO is often very successful in helping to get a message across to students when concerning consequences for unacceptable actions. Because SRO’s are thoroughly trained in the law, they often draw upon personal experiences and their expertise when conveying a message to a student or even a teacher. Additional roles SRO’s are responsible for will be discussed in Section Five of this chapter.

**Section V - Shared Responsibilities and Creating a Partnership**

When a SRO is brought into a school setting, he or she should not be viewed as an outside officer who is there only to protect the schools, but instead a part of the administration team. Because SRO’s are trained to recognize problem areas, they are often successful in assessing a school’s structure and determining where potential problems may exist. In a publication titled *School Resource Officers and Safe School Planning* (1997), issues are raised regarding all of the decision making roles a SRO should be included in on when school administrators assess potential problems and attempt to address law-related concerns. “SRO’s can contribute to plans which address the academic environment of a school. Through their roles as law-related counselors and law-related education teachers, SRO’s can supplement programs and curriculums offered by counselors and teachers” (p.1).

Because a SRO adopts a community policing approach when patrolling the schools, a SRO can be an invaluable resource in the creation of partnerships between law enforcement and members of the community. They can be successful in creating links to
the community regarding their children’s safety and security when on a school’s campus. By interacting with the community near a school, a SRO can assist in the execution of strategies that can often create a sense of community ownership of the school and will quite possibly increase overall community involvement in the school setting.

As it has been very clearly laid out, a SRO is not just a regular “beat” officer who patrols the schools for the purpose of catching “bad” people. Instead, a SRO can play an intricate role in the overall operation of any school. However, a partnership between both the school administrators and the SRO must first be accomplished.

A brochure titled Principals and School Resource Officers: Sharing a common vision (1997), presents the concept of a dual partnership between SRO’s and school principals. “The Center for the Prevention of School Violence has determined that the relationship between the principals and School Resource Officers (SRO’s) is of critical importance to the successful implementation of the SRO approach in schools” (p.1). Along with this relationship, there must be communication of the expectation of all parties. By setting the guidelines of what is expected of both the SRO and the principal, the framework will be set for the day-to-day operation of the school. Inappropriately addressing these issues and the failure to lay a solid foundation for the expectations previously established for both parties will only result in the eventual demise of the SRO program within that school.

Section VI - Conclusion to the SRO Program

As with other law enforcement approaches previously examined, we are faced with
the same problems and dilemmas when determining the SRO program effectiveness. “The effectiveness of such a program is difficult to measure. Much of the approach’s impact is preventive. Measuring what does not occur, or what is prevented from occurring, is quite difficult” (Klopovic, 1995, p.13).

To summarily dismiss North Carolina’s SRO program merely because it is almost impossible to weigh its effectiveness would be a disservice to the people, students, and schools in which the program serves. We cannot always fully understand the positive influences a program may have on a school, student, or community until we begin to examine all of its parts. Throughout this chapter this is what has been done. The program, its goals and how it operates have all been thoroughly examined.

The examination does conclude that North Carolina has identified a crime problem in its local school systems. After identifying the problem, a plan was devised and initiative was taken to address the crime problem at hand. Once implemented we can conclude that there is an ongoing process to continue to identify problems and seek out better ways of providing law enforcement services on the school campuses. These efforts alone clearly demonstrate a level of success that most other states have not accomplished. Therefore, it can be concluded that the North Carolina School Resource Program is an innovative approach to law enforcement that should yield good results. With a little more time and continued documentation we should be able to determine whether the SRO program has been a success.
Section VI - Summary and Conclusions

Throughout this paper two very different approaches to law enforcement have been examined. One approach involved police officers working as instructors in educational facilities who taught students about what is right or wrong and how a student should behave. We have also viewed the traditional approach of law enforcement where officers have been placed in the school setting to investigate crime and enforce the laws.

From this examination, it was our goal to identify the effects each approach has on a school, its students and the community. As you will recall, because of time constraints and lack of statistical data with regards to the law enforcement approach, this was not an evaluation of the two approaches but instead a presentation and comparison of existing data. A substantial amount of the data used was collected from various school districts, law enforcement agencies, and other governmental efforts designed to address school crime and juvenile delinquency.

Section I - Crime

The question, "Is crime a problem?" is a somewhat subjective question and the response to this question will vary in as many ways as there are people who answer it. All people endure various life experiences and interpret them differently than most other people. As a result, we find that similar type criminal acts will be responded to with answers that are independent and different than another person’s response.

For example, a teacher who has left a small rural community to work in a large inner-city school district would likely feel that crime in that setting is a major problem. A person
who may have attended and now works in the same inner-city school district as the teacher above may perceive crime as a common occurrence and may even expect some degree of crime and criminal acts to exist in the school.

Because of the different responses and interpretations of how crime is perceived, we find that some school districts and communities consider criminal justice intervention as an immediate concern. We also find that other schools and communities do not consider law enforcement efforts a priority, even when they may have a much higher crime rate than other schools. The difference in perceptions alone can account for the discrepancies in how a school may address crime in or around their school campus.

Although we know that individual perceptions play a substantial role in determining whether crime is a problem, a review of the literature demonstrated that more violent criminal acts and the seriousness of the criminal acts being committed among juveniles are rising annually. Even if crime among juveniles was not increasing, we know that this problem will almost always remain at the forefront of American politics, government legislation, school district concerns, and law enforcement efforts.

Section II - Comparing the two Law Enforcement Approaches

A pedagogical approach to law enforcement is considered a preventive measure to future problems whereas the actual enforcement of the law is more of an intervention that addresses a presently existing crime problem. Therefore, it is my belief that the two approaches presented in this paper cannot be compared to one another. The results yielded from each approach can be viewed, but the two approaches alone are so different that to
compare them would be “Comparing apples to oranges.”

In examining an instructional approach to law enforcement, we find that it would be more appropriate to compare it to a counselor’s role inside a school setting, as opposed to a police officer’s role. It is the officer’s role who is instructing a D.A.R.E. or G.R.E.A.T. program to interact with the children and teach them, as would a counselor or motivational speaker. The lectures these officers have with the children are didactically motivated and attempt to shed light on how a student should act, as well as bolster levels of self-esteem and moral values a student may or may not already posses. More often than not we find that these are the same values and guidance most children would receive at home, but for one reason or another have not.

But how effective is a pedagogical approach to a child that is already involved heavily in criminal activities and associated with gangs. If there are no repercussions for criminal behavior, counseling a student or young adult on why it is wrong to steal or rob will most likely have no results. Quite often a child is reared by a parent or other relative to act this way and to break the law as a way of life. It is unrealistic to think that a uniformed officer who may interact with this child for no more than an hour a week will change this child’s lifestyle.

What about police officers who are placed in a school setting to enforce the laws, investigate criminal activities, and criminally charge those persons involved in illegal acts. Even if this approach does not deter a person from committing a crime in the future, we can assume that those persons who are caught committing crimes will be either placed in jail or
receive some other form of punishment that will remove them from the school setting for at least a short while so that they do not do it again. Once a juvenile has been placed in the court system, attending some form of extensive counseling program is a condition juveniles must frequently fulfill in order to get out and remain out of jail. Often these programs are held with trained psychiatrists or other counselor oriented professionals who have received specialized training to assist juveniles overcome a lifestyle of crime.

The ability to address presently existing problems in a school is probably the most salient difference between the two examined approaches. The traditional approach to law enforcement will often address this problem, whereas the pedagogical approach does not. If crime is a problem in a school setting and these incidents are not investigated, it is likely these activities will continue to perpetuate. With the assistance of traditional law enforcement efforts in a school, these incidents can be investigated and hopefully solved. Once this happens, the juveniles who need counseling the most will receive it and specific problems as they relate to them will be discussed and hopefully resolved.

**Section III - Conclusion**

The two approaches are very different and nearly impossible to compare to one another. They attempt to accomplish common goals by two separate means. In addition, one approach addresses problems that the other does not and vice versa. Therefore, we can assume that one approach may be appropriate for one school setting but not for another. For example, a small rural community that has very minimal amounts of crime committed may not need full-time police services on its campus to investigate criminal activities. In this
setting a pedagogical approach would probably be more sufficient and accomplish more than the traditional approach.

This also applies in the reverse. If you look at some of the large inner-city urban type school settings, anything less than several full-time police officers enforcing the laws during school hours would be negligent and would compromise the students’ and faculty members’ well-being. In this setting, a pedagogical approach would probably not sufficiently address the crime problem.

There must be a “happy-medium” to the efforts and approaches of law enforcement. In Chapter Five, we examined the North Carolina School Resource Program and some excellent examples were drawn upon as to how a program should be designed. A law enforcement program within the school setting must investigate crime and serve as a deterrent of crime, but should also afford students an opportunity to have positive interaction with the police. The North Carolina SRO program does exactly this.

The primary impetus for the placement of SRO’s in the school setting is to protect all of those persons on the school campuses and to investigate crime, but they are also encouraged to adopt a “Community policing” type role. They are not only responsible for the enforcement of laws but also community building and the school setting is considered their community. This type of approach addresses most of the problems facing our educational facilities from various angles.

Finally, schools are undoubtedly unique establishments that pose problems and situations that no other community, facility, or business possess. Because of this uniqueness,
law enforcement efforts must also be unique and innovative when addressing these problems and creating resolutions.

Each school and school district possess individual characteristics that must first be evaluated before any law enforcement action is taken. Some schools may need law enforcement measures taken to address crime and catch criminals, whereas other schools may only need a police officer to offer motivational speeches and counsel students to be considered a success. No matter the circumstances, each school must be approached only after identifying presently existing problems and deciding what goals are to be accomplished.
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