The Need for Interdepartmental Collaborations among Collegiate Police Departments,

Residential Life Departments, and Counseling Centers

Approved: Dr. Cheryl Banachowski-Fuller
Advisor

Date: April 13, 2011

The Need for Interdepartmental Collaborations among Collegiate Police Departments, Residential Life Departments, and Counseling Centers

A Seminal Research Paper

Presented to

the Graduate Faculty

University of Wisconsin-Platteville

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for the Degree

Master of Science in Criminal Justice

By

Justin D. Parker

2011

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank my wonderful wife, Jen for her continued love and support throughout this journey. Her patience and motivation has helped me achieve me degree with great pride and a sense of accomplishment. I would also like to thank my family and friends, whose continuous love and support have kept me driven and focused on this goal.

I would also like to thank the faculty and the Distance Education staff at the University of Wisconsin-Platteville. I especially want to thank my advisor, Dr. Cheryl-Banachowski Fuller. Her support and guidance helped me realize that this accomplishment was possible.

Abstract

The NEED FOR INTERDEPARTMENTAL COLLABORATIONS AMONG COLLEGIATE POLICE DEPARTMENTS, RESIDENTIAL LIFE DEPARTMENTS, AND COUNSELING CENTERS

Justin Parker

Under the Supervision of Dr. Cheryl Banachowski-Fuller

Collegiate administrators and students alike deal with several issues on a daily basis. While many issues may be easily solved, the issues of student alcohol abuse, sexual assault, and mental health issues require much more attention. These issues not only affect individual students, but the campus community as a whole. Campus police departments, residential life departments, and counseling centers commonly exposed to the seriousness of these issues. However, each department cannot approach these issues alone. Therefore, it is necessary for these departments to develop collaborations which address these issues through building relationship with the students as well as educating them on the seriousness of these three issues.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents continued

I. Introduction

The shootings at Virginia Tech and Northern Illinois University focused attention on the possibilities of sudden violence on college campuses. However, further investigation into these tragedies revealed that the shootings were not "spur of the moment." In the case of the Virginia Tech shootings, the shooter, Seung Hui Cho, had a history of mental issues and even had sessions with Virginia Tech's campus counselors (Schulte & Helderman, 2009). Likewise, the Virginia Tech shooting was also an example of how interdepartmental communication can fail in a tight-knit community such as a college campus.

Communication issues are not uncommon on college campuses. In fact, due to their size and diverse populations, communication issues can be expected. Bromley and Reeves (1998) contend that many college campuses operate as small municipalities, and therefore experience some of the same issues that small municipalities experience. However, due to the condensed size of a college campus, communication issues are often magnified. These communication issues also affect the working relationships between various departments on a college campus. This is magnified if there are poor interdepartmental relationships between those departments who are responsible for campus safety and security.

Many campus administrators recognize campus police departments as the main department that is responsible for campus safety and security. However, following the Virginia Tech shootings, administrators from collegiate student affairs departments realized that their departments had roles in keeping the campus safe. Student affairs departments such as counseling centers and residential life are two departments that student affairs rely on to create a

caring campus community (NASPA, 2008). The individual efforts of student affairs and campus police are noticed throughout many campuses.

A. Statement of problem-Need for an effective working collaboration between campus police, campus counseling, and residential life.

Incidents such as the shootings at Virginia Tech and Northern Illinois University are not the common issues campuses face regarding their student populations. In fact, college campuses face numerous issues daily. Most of these issues are usually minor in scale and are often solved without incident. However, some incidents affect larger areas of the college community and can have lasting effects. Three major issues faced by colleges are underage alcohol abuse, student mental health issues, and sexual assault. Underage alcohol abuse is not a new issue among higher education institutions. It is a complex issue that requires concern, coordination, and cooperation from various departments on a university campus (Underage Drinking Enforcement Training Center, n.d.). College administrators are often faced with the dilemma of allowing the students to develop their problem-solving abilities in an educational setting while protecting the students from the individual harm and social disorder often caused through underage alcohol abuse (UDETC, n.d.).

The influence of the use of alcohol on college campuses stretches beyond the scope of underage drinking. Furthermore, the use of alcohol makes many prone to being the perpetrator or victim of unwanted sex acts, rape, and other crimes of aggression (Nicholson et al., 1998). For example, a study done by Nicholson et al. (1998) found that alcohol influenced the offender of a

rape in 100% of the cases studied. The authors also found that alcohol influenced the offenders in approximately 58% of non-violent sex acts and 76% of unwanted sexual activity.

Regardless of the involvement of alcohol, sexual assaults are a second constant issue for university campuses. Statistics show that college women are more at risk for rape or sexual assault then women in a comparable age group or in the general population (Armstrong, Hamilton, & Sweeney, 2006). Many college administrators know that this issue is not new to higher education. In fact, many colleges and universities have been developing programs to raise awareness and promote prevention of sexual assaults for nearly 20 years (Armstrong et al., 2006). Many administrators are learning that the issue of sexual assault is more widespread than they have realized.

As research on collegiate sexual assault progresses, more researchers are finding how common sexual assault is and how damaging sexual assault can be for the victim. Armstrong et al. (2006) share 1997 figures that state nearly one-third to one-half of all college females are victims of rapes or attempted rapes while in college. Karjane, Fisher, and Cullen expand on this data in their 2005 National Institute of Justice study. The authors state that nearly 3% of female college students are either victims or rape or attempted rape in a nine month academic year. According to the authors, if this was stretched out to a 12 month period, nearly 5% of female college students would become victims of this crime.

Researchers have also discovered some nuances with the crime of sexual assault on campus. In general, the crime of rape is often unreported. Higher education researchers are finding that the same applies on campuses. Karjane et al. (2005) contend that this is likely

because most on-campus rapes are done by acquaintances, which is another nuance of campus sexual assaults that researchers have discovered.

According to Sampson (2002), acquaintance rape, among college students, is more common than stranger rape. In fact, an estimated 90% of victims of rape know the offender (Sampson, 2002). The fact that the offender and the victim know each other often makes the victim afraid to report the rape. The issue of acquaintance rape is serious enough that college administrators are constantly making attempts to increase education and awareness among their students.

A third issue that higher education administrators must recognize are the mental health issues among the institution's students. These issues range from depression, anxiety disorders, issues with self-esteem and self-image, and thoughts of suicide. Research by Potter, Silverman, Connorton, and Posner (2004) show that the amount of students addressing psychological problems has increased 84% over the last five years. The authors also contend that approximately 10% of college men and 16% of college women have been diagnosed with depression at least once in their lives. The increase in mental health issues has also led to an increase in fears and worries, alcohol and substance abuse, and anger and hostility (Potter et al., 2004).

Mental health issues also have far reaching effects. Potter et al. (2004) found that students with mental illnesses in college also have problems in their relationships with their families and friends. The authors also found that these issues affect graduation rates, academic performances, and student retention.

Campus communities are very social in nature. Therefore, students are usually the ones to recognize when another student is having mental health problems (Meunier & Wolf, 2006). However, it is often at this point where students do not know how to approach the troubled student or who to talk to regarding the student's need for help (Meunier & Wolf, 2006). Therefore, it is at this point where education and trust in campus resources will help the students take the next step in helping the troubled student.

B. Purpose of the research

These three issues are common at many collegiate institutions. Those affected by these issues often look toward the institution's police department, residential life department, and counseling center. While these three departments handle the same issues, they often have different approaches. Although they work together, their different views of these issues may lead them to resolve the issues differently. As a result, the relationship between these three departments may end up strained or even nonexistent. The purpose of this study is to show the importance of a healthy working relationship between these departments and provide examples of how collaborative efforts by these departments can benefit the departments, the students, and the institution as a whole.

Relationships between campus departments can be compared to the relationships built through community policing in municipalities across the United States. These relationships are often demanding and require certain conditions to be defined as "effective." The National Crime Prevention Council (1994) defines effective relationships as those in which every member of the

relationship is able to use their skills and talents to contribute to the relationship. The council also stresses that these relationships, like many relationships, are centered on trust and communication.

Campus police departments are used to developing and maintaining partnerships. Many university police departments are included in mutual aid agreements with other police departments surrounding their jurisdiction. A brief survey of many campus police department websites also shows how important these partnerships are to campus police departments.

Likewise, maintaining a partnership with other university departments is not new to campus policing. A yearly report by the campus safety department of the University of North Carolina-Charlotte (UNC-Charlotte, 2008) shares the objectives of forming partnering with university departments such as Student Health, Campus Counseling, Human Resources, and the university's administration department. The University's police department has also adopted a strategy of hiring a case manager to act as a liaison for the University's Counseling Center (UNC-Charlotte, 2008).

Resident hall liaison officers are an example of the benefits that are produced by effective relations between university policing departments and other university departments. The liaison officers at the University of California-Irvine (2009) represent the University's police department during meetings, events, and trainings of their assigned resident halls. Not only do these positions keep the lines of communication open between the police department and the residential life department, but the integration of the officers within the housing communities also places the philosophy of community policing into action.

C. Methods of Approach

This study will consist of large portions of secondary data. This study will use information from accredited journals, information from campus police department websites, and information from groups focused on the prevention of underage drinking, college student mental health issues, and sexual assaults on campus. This study will also use information from the National Institute of Justice and information gathered from the National Criminal Justice Reference Service. The information gathered from these resources will focus on the three issues faced on most higher education institutions and the way the institutions respond to these issues. The information will also show the need for interdepartmental relationships and the implications that may occur if these relationships to not develop and function properly. Information gathered from university policing websites will highlight how these departments have developed and used these relationships.

The secondary data used in this paper will support the need for an effective collaboration between campus police departments, residential life departments, and campus counseling centers. In order to provide a foundation to support the need, there will be a brief overview of the dynamics of campus communities and campus police departments. Then, the three issues common to many colleges will be addressed: the issues of underage consumption of alcohol, sexual assaults on campus, and mental health concerns as well as student suicides. The literature review will also address any potential barriers that may prevent effective collaboration between the three departments. The paper will then provide examples of colleges and universities that

have successfully developed interdepartmental relationships. The paper will then conclude by offering recommendations between campus police and these student services departments.

II. Literature Review

There is a limited amount of literature addressing the importance of effective working relationships between campus police and other collegiate departments. However, there is a large amount of literature that addresses three common problems on many college campuses: underage alcohol abuse, sexual assaults, and mental health issues and student suicides. The potential ripple-effects associated with these problems illustrate the importance of an effective working relationship between the campus police, residential life, and campus counseling centers.

A. Dynamics of Campus Communities

Modern college campuses are quickly becoming a microcosm of large cities. The total student enrollment in 2009 was 21million students (Department of Education, 2011). 62% of these students were enrolled in 4-year institutions (DOE, 2011). Likewise, 15% of the undergraduates enrolled full-time were first-time students (DOE, 2011). These increased enrollments have added to the evolution of many college campuses over the last two decades.

Spitzberg and Thorndike (1992) express how dynamics of college campuses have changed over the past 25 years. In their text, *Creating community on college campuses* (1992), the authors point out that colleges are becoming more diverse, with increased enrollments from Hispanic, Asian, and African-American students, as well as students from other nationalities. The authors also note that the ages of students have increased and that there are more female

enrollments than male enrollments. The authors also add that the American higher educational system is the most diverse higher educational system in the world.

Spitzberg and Thorndike (1992) also note that the faculty has also changed on many college campuses. The authors noted that faculty on these campuses are older and usually remain with the same college due to the limited availability of jobs. The authors also added that larger amounts of faculty are tenured.

The increasing sizes of higher education institutions have also increased their responsibilities. These institutions are finding themselves held accountable by local governments and businesses while attempting to maintain the satisfaction of its students (Spitzberg & Thorndike, 1992). While these responsibilities increase, college administrators have focused on addressing the increased diversity on their campuses.

Many colleges have student affairs departments that are designed to accommodate the growing levels of diversity on their campuses. These student affairs departments, originally introduced as a response to increased college enrollments (UNESCO, 2002), are assigned with the general task of "supporting students in the academic endeavors and enhancing their personal, social, cultural, and cognitive development (UNESCO, 2002, p. 2)." Therefore, many student affairs departments oversee many other departments, organizations, and groups on the campus.

UNESCO (2002) list many different areas of collegiate life that are under the scope of student affairs departments. Many of these areas involve student diversity, student health, and student activities. Common examples of these areas are groups for LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender) students, campus health services, and intramural sports. Student affairs departments are also responsible for setting and enforcing student conduct and discipline standards and

overseeing campus counseling and residential life departments (UNESCO, 2002). Due to its influence in these three areas, student affairs departments usually work closely with campus police departments. Likewise, as the literature will show, campus counseling and residential life departments should also have a close working relationship with campus police departments.

UNESCO (2002) briefly lists some of the roles of campus counseling and residential life departments. Campus counseling departments are mainly responsible for providing counseling services to the students in order to help the students overcome psychological issues that can affect their academic performance, interpersonal relationships, or their overall adjustment to campus life. According to UNESCO (2002), campus counseling departments also provide education in life skills such as healthy stress relief practices, forming good habits while avoiding dangerous habits, and effective conflict resolution. Campus counseling departments also focus on the overall mental health of students, often working with the campus's student health department in order to prescribe medication when it is necessary. These counseling departments also provide outreach for educators, parents, and friends of students who are suffering from mental health issues (UNESCO, 2002).

Campus residential life departments are also primarily focused on the campus's students. According to UNESCO (2002), residential life departments are responsible for providing "safe, comfortable, well-maintained, and supportive on-campus accommodations for students (p. 47)." Residential life departments are primarily responsible for the community that is developed through resident halls. The department is also responsible for the maintenance and upkeep of the campus's resident halls (UNESCO, 2002). Residential life departments are involved in large amounts of a student's adjustment to collegiate life. These departments are also tasked to

integrate the student's housing community with the student's academic development. They are also responsible for instituting programs and governance opportunities which are used to develop a student's leadership skills (UNESCO, 2002). Residential life departments are also responsible for creating a community in which all of the students will be treated with respect and be taught to treat others with the same amount of respect (UNESCO, 2002). Residential life departments are also responsible for developing a code of conduct and a system for enforcing conduct violations that occur within the resident halls.

B. Dynamics of campus police departments

Campus police departments have evolved over the past few decades. Before the 1960s, law enforcement on many campuses was in the form of security guards. It was during the 1980s that campus police departments began to professionalize, which included law enforcement training comparable to municipal law enforcement officers (Paoline & Sloan, 2003). As of 1996, there were over 700 collegiate police departments in the United States, all of which were granted full arrest powers and authorized to use force when necessary (Paoline & Sloan, 2003).

Today, many campus police departments share the same organizational structure as small municipal police departments. In fact, Bromley and Reaves (1998) found many similarities between campus police departments and municipal police departments. The authors found that many campus police departments share strategies in many areas of operations within the department. According to Bromley and Reaves (1998), like most municipal departments, many campus police departments rely on dispatchers to gather information and assign calls for service. These departments also use 911 systems for emergency calls. The authors found, however, that

many campus departments only use “basic” 911systems as opposed to the “advanced” 911 systems that are used by municipal departments. Bromley and Reaves (1998) also found that many campus police departments, like their municipal counterparts, were responsible for investigating incidents that occurred within their jurisdiction. However, the authors also found that some departments often called in other agencies to assist with larger investigations, such as death investigations. Finally, the authors found that many campus departments relied on written policies and procedures to help define the roles and actions of the department and its officers.

The duties of campus police officers have also been scrutinized in literature. Sloan, Lanier, and Beer (2000) identify three different roles that campus police officers often portray as parts of their duties: the door-shaker, the security guard, and the law enforcer. The role of door-shaker defines the responsibility of the officer to lock and unlock campus buildings. According to the authors, approximately 80% of college police departments are responsible for these “door-shaker” duties. Sloan et al. (2000) specify security guard duties as duties that involve the inspection of fire safety devices and acting as the primary responder to fire emergencies. The authors found that approximately 53% of campus police departments fill these roles as security guards. The final role that campus police officers portray is the role of law enforcer (Sloan et al., 2000). This role characterizes the common duties of the law enforcement profession. Some duties include the enforcement of state, traffic, and even parking laws on campus, traffic accident investigation, and crowd control at campus events (Sloan et al., 2000). The authors also found that some campus police departments are forming specialized teams such as SWAT teams or bomb squads.

Even though many campus police departments are structured and organized like their municipal counterparts, the close-knit atmosphere of a college campus increases the value of community-oriented policing programs (hereafter referred to as "community policing"). The U.S. Department of Justice (n.d.) defines community policing as "a philosophy that promotes organizational strategies, which support the systematic use of partnerships and problem-solving techniques, to proactively address the immediate conditions that give rise to public safety issues such as crime, social disorder, and fear of crime (para. 1)." Since partnerships within a college community can be vital, Sloan et al. (2000) contend that the adoption of community policing practices provide a flexible option for a campus police department when working with other campus departments. The authors state that even though community policing expands the functions of the police department, it also emphasizes the importance of feedback from other campus departments and places a value on an officer's interaction with members of the campus community. Furthermore, many campus police departments are able to establish needed relationships with student affairs departments such as residential life and campus counseling through the use of the philosophy of community policing.

C. Three Issues Affecting College Campuses

Underage Alcohol Consumption

The problem of underage alcohol consumption is not limited to college campuses. The Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC, 2010) reports that alcohol is the most commonly abused drug by individuals under 21 years old. In fact, according to the CDC (2010), 11% of the alcohol consumed in the United States is consumed by individuals between the ages

of 12 and 20 years old. Even though these statistics are not specifically focused on college campuses, they do reflect how common alcohol is in the lives of those who are under the legal drinking age of 21 years old.

The National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAA) does provide some statistics the show how alcohol can affect college communities. According to the NIAA (2010), 25% of college students blame alcohol consumption for academic problems such as missing classes, doing poorly on class assignments, and receiving low overall grades in their classes. The NIAA (2010) also reports that in 2001, 31% of college students could have been clinically diagnosed for alcohol abuse based on self-report questionnaires. Likewise, the NIAA (2010) also reported that according to a 2002 study, 150,000 college students reported alcohol-related health issues.

The affects of alcohol on academics has been the focus of other studies as well. Few studies have even implicated that alcohol is responsible for approximately 41% of all academic issues and 28% of all college dropouts (Pascarella et al., 2007). According to Pascarella et al. (2007), longitudinal surveys such as the Core Alcohol and Drug Survey (CORE) and the Student Alcohol Questionnaire (SAQ) have produced similar data that implicates alcohol in a number of academic issues. In one instance, nearly one-fifth of the students surveyed reported a poor academic performance due to alcohol, while approximately 30% of the students surveyed reported that they missed a class due to alcohol or drug use (Pascarella, et al., 2007).

Pascarella et al. (2007) also cite a recent CORE survey to show how alcohol can influence a student's grade. Students with a grade point average of an *A* reported drinking approximately 3.3 drinks per week. Students with a *B* reported drinking approximately 4.8

drinks a week. Students with a *C* reported drinking approximately 6.1 drinks a week and students with grades of a *D* or *F* reported drinking approximately 9.0 drinks a week. Pascarella et al. (2007) further contend that the extent at which alcohol consumption can affect a student's academic performance may also affect the student's future career performance as well.

The influence of alcohol has also contributed to many interactions with law enforcement. In fact, nearly 5% of college students have had contacts with college law enforcement as a result of their drinking (NIAA, 2010). Common contacts with law enforcement include contacts for underage drinking, violation of open container restrictions, and public urination (Perkins, 2003). Additionally, approximately 110,000 students between the ages of 18 and 24 years old have been arrested for alcohol-related crimes, such as driving under the influence (NIAA, 2010). Likewise, many college administrators believe that many property crimes on their campuses are due the influence of alcohol (NIAA, 2010).

Unfortunately, the NIAA (2010) also reported that the influence alcohol has more serious effects besides a student's academic performance or criminal behavior. According to the NIAA (2010), approximately 599,000 students were unintentionally injured due to the influence of alcohol. An additional 696,000 students were the victims of an assault in which the offender was under the influence of alcohol. The NIAA (2010) also reports that the influence of alcohol is responsible for approximately 1,825 unintentional student deaths, including motor vehicle crashes.

However, students are also prone to other alcohol-related illnesses as well. One potential injury, especially to heavy drinkers, is a blackout. According to Perkins (2002), blackouts are periods of memory loss that occur during times of heavy drinking. In a 1998 College Alcohol

Survey (CAS), 22% of the students surveyed reported at least one incident of a blackout within the last year (Perkins, 2003). The students surveyed also reported other temporary physical illnesses such as hangovers, nausea, and vomiting (Perkins, 2003). Perkins (2003) also identifies alcohol poisoning as a familiar illness among college students who abuse alcohol.

The statistics show that underage alcohol consumption is part of the culture of college campuses. College sporting venues are inundated with advertisements promoting the consumption of alcohol; many campuses are near establishments in which alcohol is served; and college students perceive college drinking as a rite of passage (NIAA, 2002). In fact, this culture is so powerful that students are routinely facing peer and outside influences that support pro-drinking behavior.

One aspect of campus alcohol consumption that has gained the attention of researchers is heavy episodic drinking. Often referred to as "binge drinking," heavy episodic drinking is defined as "consuming five or more drinks in one setting for males and four or more drinks for females (Pascarella et al., 2007, p. 715)." Porter and Pryor (2007) add that true heavy episodic drinking usually occurs at least once within a two-week period. Porter and Pryor (2007) also state that heavy episodic drinkers are more prone to blackouts.

However, the simple solution of changing the drinking culture is rather futile. According to the NIAA (2002), most college administrators do not believe that it is possible to change the drinking culture. Attempts to change the culture at many colleges have had limited effects and have not successfully spread throughout the entire campus. Likewise, college administrators often disagree with law enforcement's suggestions to change the culture on campus. Where law enforcement suggest that strengthened enforcement, especially against individuals who provide

alcohol to minors, campus administrators often opt for internal judicial sanctions, alcohol education, and campus-based prevention programs (UDETC, n.d.).

Despite their disagreements, members of campus police departments and campus administrators recognize the far reaching effects of alcohol abuse. Research has also noted that the use of alcohol can lead to other issues involving college students. Perkins (2003) contends that several destructive behaviors can be influenced by the abuse of alcohol. Among them are two other common problems that campuses face: student-involved sexual assault and student suicide.

Sexual Assault

The 1990 enactment of the Cleary Act has raised the awareness of many crimes on campus (Karjane et al., 2005). One crime that stood out was sexual assaults. Through the Cleary Act, campus administrators, criminal justice professionals, researchers, and even the concerned parents of prospective students are gaining an understanding of how common this offense occurs on a campus. According to survey data obtained in 2007, approximately 30 of every 1000 college females were victims of a rape. Additionally, nearly 43 of every 1000 college females were victims of some form of physical assault (Thompson, Sitterle, Clay, & Kingree, 2007). Furthermore, Armstrong et al. (2006) declare that college women are more at risk for these violent offenses than other women of a comparable age group in the general population.

Similar to arguments by Armstrong et al. (2006), Perkins (2003) argues that there is a tight link between this form of violence and the use of alcohol. Research by Perkins (2003) shows that approximately 55% of all female sexual assault victims had been drinking at the time

of the assault. Additionally, 60% of those victims reported that their judgment had been impaired and their behavior had been affected by the influence of alcohol. Perkins (2003) also describes four common ways that women may be affected by the influence of alcohol. The first way is the fact that the influence of alcohol may lead to an increase in consensual sexual activity before the assault occurs. According to Perkins (2003), this may cause confusion between the male and the female regarding further sexual activity. A second way that the influence of alcohol may affect women is the modern stereotype that women who drink are "easy." Once again, men who believe this stereotype may have different thoughts regarding the woman and her desire for sexual activity (Perkins, 2003). The third effect of alcohol is the fact that, while impaired, a woman may be unable to clearly communicate her desire to reject any unwanted sexual advances. This is closely related to the fourth effect of alcohol impairment, which diminishes a woman's ability to physically defend herself from the unwanted sexual advances (Perkins, 2003).

Armstrong et al. (2006) acknowledge three prominent perspectives that are used to explain sexual assaults on college campuses. The first perspective contends that individual attributes such as attitudes regarding gender roles, family backgrounds, and personality types are responsible for both the offending and the victimization of sexual assaults. The authors conclude the amount of sexual activity is common in both the offenders and victims of sexual assault. The second perspective is described as the "rape culture." According to Armstrong et al. (2006), this culture is developed through ideas that sexual assaults occur due to the perpetuation of common myths about rape. Although the authors acknowledge that myths, such as the notion that women naturally "ask for" sexual assault, alone cannot explain the sexually violent offenses, they

contend that a culture developed on the myths can make sexual assaults more likely. The final perspective acknowledged by Armstrong et al. (2006) is the perspective that sexual assaults can be explained by the interactions between men and women. Not only do the authors take into account the normal societal interactions that take place between the genders on college campuses, they also take into account the cultural diversity that may also occur in a campus community. For example, individuals from different cultures may have differing views on gender roles and sexual assaults. These views may not necessarily coincide with the dominant opinions on those subjects.

As many campuses attempt to implement prevention efforts to lower the rate of sexual assault victimization, campus administrators are finding that there are many barriers to prevention. These barriers can affect how administrators approach the issue of sexual assault and how members of the campus community approach and perceive the issue. These barriers include the different definitions of "sexual assault", the different forms of sexual assault, and the lack of reporting.

In research conducted through the National Institute of Justice, Karjane et al. (2005) found that the definitions of "rape" and "sexual assault" varied among many college campuses. The authors found three factors that often lead to confusion from campus to campus. The authors found variations in the criminal codes of neighboring states. For example, what may be considered "sexual misconduct" in one state may merely be considered "sexual misconduct" in a neighboring state (Karjane et al., 2005). The authors also found that different campuses, within a state, also have different definitions for sexually violent crimes. This not only leads to confusion about what is being reported, but also different possible sanctions from campus to campus. The

authors also found that only a few campuses acknowledged the different forms of sexual assault, specifically "party-rape" and "acquaintance- rape."

Common research of sexual assault on campus distinguishes the differences between party-rapes and acquaintance-rapes. Party-rape is a form of rape that occurs in a party situation such as at a fraternity or sorority party (Armstrong et al., 2006). This form of rape usually occurs due to the consumption of alcohol. According to Armstrong et al. (2006), the U.S. Department of Justice distinguishes party-rape as a distinct form of rape, separate from acquaintance rape. The authors also explain that party-rape generally occurs off-campus in party settings. Sampson (2002) acknowledges that party-rape (often associated with stranger-rape) occurs, but not as often as acquaintance rape.

According to Sampson (2002), 90% of rape victims on a college campus are victims of acquaintance rape, in which the assailant is known by the victim. Sampson (2002) also clarifies that acquaintance rape is not always date rape, but the attacker can range from being a classmate to a significant other or even an ex-significant lover. In fact, Sampson (2002) contends that "date-rape" should not be used interchangeably with "acquaintance rape" since date rapes are only approximately 13% of all college rapes.

A major issue stemming from research on college sexual assaults is the amount of offenses that go unreported. Karjane et al. (2005) report that less than 5% of completed rapes on college campuses go unreported. According to Thompson et al. (2007), this figure is closer to 2%. The data on unreported sexual assaults is disturbing to the point that researchers are attempting to discover why these crimes go unreported.

Research by Thompson et al. (2007) contends that there are several factors that are influential in the decision to not report the crime. The authors contend that the nature of the incident, the involvement of alcohol, the amount of injuries, the relationship between the victim and the offender, and whether or not any weapons were used often influence the victim's decision to report the crime. Fears of reprisals may also contribute to the decision to not report the crime (Sampson, 2002). Other factors, according to Sampson (2002) include embarrassment from the publicity, self-blaming, and fears that the legal system will not work.

Unfortunately, many victims have reasons for their distrust in the legal system. Sampson (2002) found that many police officers consider rape complaints to be unfounded if there is a relationship between the victim and the offender. Sampson (2002) also found that officers may disregard these claims if the victim consumed alcohol, if there were no injuries, or if the victim immediately blamed herself. Additionally, Karjane et al. (2005) also contend that many victims feel blamed for allowing the incidents to occur since many campuses imply that victims should avoid situations that could potentially result in a form of sexual assault.

Student Mental Health Issues and Suicides

Recent increases in enrollment have correlated to a recent increase in college students with mental health issues. This recent increase has raised the concerns of many counseling center directors. In fact, 90% of all campus counseling center directors has recently admitted that there were growing concerns over the recent influx of students needing mental health treatment (Meunier & Wolf, 2006). Likewise, Meunier and Wolf (2006) also claim that the need for campus mental health services have increased steadily in recent years. The authors also contend

that, on some campuses, this demand has increased dramatically. Unfortunately, due to limited resources and funding, many campus counseling centers must face this increased demand with limited resources (Drum, Brownson, Denmark, & Smith, 2009). These modern counseling centers are currently focusing their resources on two types of students: students who are having difficulties adapting to college life and students how have been diagnosed with mental health issues.

Many students who have trouble adapting to college life are incoming freshmen (Meunier & Wolf, 2006). According to Meunier and Wolf (2006), these students are entering college at a transitional period in their lives. They are challenged to adapt to the new freedoms that college life offers while adapting to living outside of the comfort of their homes. The students also quickly find that new responsibilities come with new their new freedoms. They are soon faced with increased academic demands, new social controls, and adjusting to the autonomy of college life (Meunier & Wolf, 2006). These new transitions often both excite and confuse the students on a daily basis (Owen & Rodolfa, 2009).

Researchers are finding that the personalities of this current generation of college students may also add to their mental distresses. Named the "Millennial Generation," this generation of students is described as sheltered, confident, and team-oriented. They are also pressured, achievement-focused, and conventional. Many individuals within this generation view themselves as "special" and are focused on their feelings (Owen & Rodolfa, 2009). Despite having ambiguous relationships, this generation is interested in learning about who they are as individuals, how their individuality will affect the bonds they form with others, and how their individuality will affect their future lives (Owen & Rodolfa, 2009). According to Owen

and Rodolfa (2009), Millennial students often enter college with high ambitions and strong hopes for personal growth and intellect. These strong ambitions often leave Millennial students prone to mental distress, especially if they are not used to dealing with the challenges and potential rejections that may occur within their academic or personal lives (Owen & Rodolfa, 2009). Owen and Rodolfa (2009) state that approximately 90% of today's Millennial students have reported being stressed and approximately 40% of those students are distressed to the level that it is affecting their routine social and academic activities.

Owen and Rodolfa (2009) and Meunier and Wolf (2006) report an increase in the number of incoming students that are currently being treated for mental illnesses. The treatment is often considered effective since it is making higher education an option for students who would have had trouble getting through high school with sufficient grades in the past (Meunier & Wolf, 2006). These large amounts of students being treated have turned campus counselors from discussing roommate issues and challenges of academic living to offering continuous treatment to the students with the diagnosed illnesses (Meunier & Wolf, 2006). While Meunier & Wolf (2006) acknowledge that many campus counselors accept their changing roles, they also acknowledge that the increased amounts of students with mental illnesses may endanger other students on campus.

According to Potter et al. (2004), many campus counseling centers are seeing an increase in mental illnesses that are common to college students. Issues such as anxiety, fears, worries, eating disorders, and anger are becoming more prevalent among college students. While Perkins (2003) contends that alcohol and substance abuse is not a common factor in suicidal behavior, Potter et al. (2004) argues that alcohol and substance abuse is also becoming more commonly

treated in campus counseling centers. Furthermore, college students are also experiencing increases in depression, changes in family dynamics, and bipolar disorders (Potter et al., 2004). Based on a 13-year study by Kansas State University, there has been an increase in students who suffer from depression, stress, and anxiety (Potter et al., 2004).

Owen and Rodolfa (2009) contend that increased enrollment of students with illnesses have also changed the nature of many campus counseling departments. According to the authors, many campus counseling departments are now focused on creating a campus culture that provides positive support for those students. This includes developing peer support groups, methods of early identification, and increasing student self-awareness. The authors also state that these counseling centers are focusing on teaching the dangers of negative behaviors such as alcohol and other substance abuse, large amounts of sexual activity, and other risk behaviors.

Despite all of the prevention efforts in place, counseling centers have not been able to help all students. Drum et al. (2009) contend that only 26% of a campus's students are aware of the resources offered by the campus counseling center. Furthermore, Owen and Roldolfa (2009) state that nearly 10 percent of college students have seriously contemplated suicide. Using a 2000-2001 survey, Francis (2003) observes that 30% of colleges and universities had at least one student commit suicide during that time frame. 9.7% of those campuses reported that the student was seeking treatment at the campus's counseling center (Francis, 2003). Even though the rate of college student suicide is lower than that of nonstudents, it is the second leading cause of death among college students (Francis, 2003).

According to Potter et al. (2004), suicide is the last link on a chain that begins with suicidal ideation, which advances to suicide planning and preparation, which then culminates in

suicidal threats, attempts, and ultimately completion. While many suicidal attempts may seem like a unique event, separate from suicide, many counselors consider those attempts when looking at a student's risk factors (Potter et al., 2004). These attempts are statistically tracked and considered for the possibility of future attempts. Counselors also consider these attempts when determining treatment for suicidal individuals (Potter et al., 2004).

Research has also identified depression as a risk factor for suicide. While feelings of hopelessness and depression alone do not immediately assume that the student will be suicidal, these feelings, as well as the inability to function are often associated with suicidal tendencies (Potter et al., 2004). In fact, according to a 2000 National Collegiate Health Assessment survey, 94% of the students who considered suicide in the last year felt depressed to the point that they were unable to function and felt extremely hopeless (Potter et al, 2004).

Student suicides, whether successful or unsuccessful, affects many on the student's campus. Not only do student suicides affect the lives of the student's acquaintances, but academic lifestyles as well (Francis, 2003). Francis (2003) also contends that college administrators and counselors are continuously questioned about student safety following these events. Drum et al. (2009) also contend that much of the media's attention to student health and well-being occurs after high-profile suicides. Campus administrators are also finding themselves restrained by confidentiality policies when attempting to explain the student's actions to the grieving parents. Many of these parents often question the administrators why they were not informed of their student's mental concerns (Francis, 2003). The fear of legal consequences has led many administrators adopt "forced leave" policies in which students who have attempted suicide are forced to withdraw from the campus (Drum et al., 2009). Unfortunately, the

enactment of these policies often hinders the student's academic success as well as the progression of the student's mental health treatment. Furthermore, despite efforts to assess and improve the prevention of suicide, campus counseling centers will constantly be scrutinized when this tragic event occurs.

D. Barriers Affecting Interdepartmental Collaboration

Many campuses attempt to develop interdepartmental relationships in order to prevent student alcohol abuse, sexual assaults, and suicide. Many times, that collaboration involves the campus police, resident life, and campus counseling departments. Walton, Dutton, and Cafferty (1969) contend that common interdepartmental relationships are characterized by how responsive one department is toward the other departments involved in the relationship. According to Walton et al. (1969), in order for these relationships to succeed, it is important for each department to respect the needs of each department involved, the accuracy and importance of the information exchanged between departments, and the attitudes of the employees toward the other departments. As these departments strive to work together, they encounter barriers that are common with many interdepartmental relationships. Walton et al. (1969) contend that these barriers, and the subsequent interdepartmental conflicts, occur when one department fails to respect the needs of the other departments involved.

Common myths regarding interdepartmental conflicts fall under two common theories. According to Seiler (1963) these two theories involve personality clashes between the departments and conflicting ideas between the departments. Even though clashing personalities may explain periods of ineffectiveness by blaming prejudices and stereotypes, it presumes that

everyone within a specific department share the same personality (Seiler, 1963). Seiler (1963) adds that due to the lack of a single-group personality, it is inappropriate to classify interdepartmental conflicts as personality clashes. Furthermore, Seiler (1963) is also able to discredit the claims that conflicting ideas can hinder the efforts of interdepartmental relationships. Seiler (1963) explains that many groups are able to work around a majority of conflicting ideas without letting them affect the relationship between the departments.

Following the debunking of two common myths of interdepartmental conflict, Seiler (1963) suggests different reasons that interdepartmental conflict exists. The first reason that is introduced is illegitimate authority. According to Seiler (1963), illegitimate authority occurs when one department exercises nonexistent authority over another department in order to flaunt mistakes made by the second department. Seiler (1963) uses an example of errors on an interdepartmental memo in which the department making the errors was ridiculed and antagonized by the department who discovered the errors. This exercise in illegitimate authority can lead to conflict between the departments. Seiler (1963) also introduces conflicts that begin with value and authority clashes. These clashes occur when the values held by the participating departments are challenged. If there is no attempt to resolve these classes, more energy will be spent in conflict between the departments, rendering the relationship useless (Seiler, 1963).

Communication is also a barrier that affects interdepartmental relationships. Boyd (1966) offers several types of communication barriers that can affect interdepartmental relationships. Among those barriers, the lack of understanding of the other department's needs, values, and problems is a more common barrier. Even though interdepartmental relationships require much attention from the individual departments, the individual departments still have their own issues,

complications, and barriers that need to be overcome in order for the department to function successfully (Boyd, 1966). While the needs of other departments exist to each department in the relationship, these needs may not be constantly at the forefront of the partnering departments. Therefore, as Boyd (1966) suggests, interdepartmental communication must take into account the issues that the other departments face on a day-to-day basis.

Two other types of communication barriers that occur in interdepartmental relationships are differences in jargon and semantics and different education levels among the departments (Boyd, 1966). While every department develops its own jargon, many departments fail to realize that the differing jargon is developed in other departments. Conflicts often arise when the departments cannot understand the jargon of the other departments. Boyd (1966) contends that communication must involve words and phrases that are known by all of the departments involved. Boyd (1966) also points out that the education levels between the departments often differ due to the nature of the work done by the departments. This is often associated with the jargon and semantics of the specific departments. Likewise, conflicts between the departments can be magnified if there are differences in education levels (Boyd, 1966). Once again, Boyd (1966) stresses the use of terminology and phrases that all departments can understand.

Research has also identified actions, done by departments, which can lead to potential interdepartmental conflict. Walton, et al. (1969) identifies some actions and nuances that can result in interdepartmental conflict. According to the authors, *interference* enacted by one department towards another department is a source of conflict. This type of interference results from the misuse or abuse of interdependent resources by one department that directly affects the operations of another department. In the context of a relationship between a campus's police and

residential life departments, interference may occur when the campus police department purposefully refuses to assist a member of the residential life staff with confronting a room full of loud students in order to protect a potential informant from punishment.

A second source of conflict, similar to interference is the *withholding of information*. This occurs when one department refuses to volunteer useful information to another department (Walton et al., 1969). In the context of a relationship between a campus's police department and counseling center, this type of interference can occur when one department purposely fails to share information about a student, which will affect how the second department communicates with the student.

Another source of conflict, as identified by Walton et al. (1969) is *overstatement*. According to the authors, overstatement occurs when on department continuously stresses its needs in order to influence the other departments. For example, overstatement occurs when a department constantly stresses its lack of resources when determining the roles of each department within the relationship.

Two final sources of conflict identified by Walton et al. (1969) are *annoyance* and *distrust*. According to the authors, annoyance occurs when one the members of one department simply become annoyed with the members of the other departments involved in the relationship. Walton et al. (1969) contend that the annoyance is usually targeted toward the manager of the other department instead of the department's employees. Distrust occurs when the members of one department do not trust the members of another department. For example, a campus police department may tend to distrust a counseling department because of the stereotype that campus

counseling departments would rather "analyze everything" instead of protecting the safety of others.

College students face a variety of challenges daily. They experience the challenges of adapting to life outside of their homes, academic challenges, and the challenges of developing and maintaining a social life. Research shows that these students are also facing challenges in the areas of alcohol misuse and abuse, becoming victims of sexual assaults, and adapting to college life while being challenged with mental illnesses. Subsequently, these three issues also affect the campus community as a whole. Therefore, it is important to develop and maintain a working relationship between a college's police department, residential life department, and counseling center. Even though each working relationship faces some barriers, it is possible for a relationship to exist, which not only positively affects the community, the students, but also the departments involved. Therefore, time and effort should be placed into developing these relationships and overcoming the barriers that can hinder the progress of these relationships.

III. Examples of Successful Relationships

Seiler (1963) contends that all departments are designed to function well with each other. However, according to the author, these day-to-day activities do not demand the strain, influences, and internal needs that exist within interdepartmental relationships. According to Seiler (1963) interdepartmental relationships will be successful if the departments involved feel like their results meet the needs of the individual departments. Even though many interdepartmental relationships may struggle, there are successful interdepartmental relationships that occur on many college campuses. These relationships are beneficial for the campus

community as a whole, as well as the departments involved. Common interdepartmental relationships include community liaisons, residence hall liaisons, and behavior intervention teams.

A. Community Liaison

Harvard University

Harvard University's Community Liaison program offers a broad example of how a college police department can function within a community (HUPD, 2010). The Harvard University Police Department (HUPD) is staffed by approximately 85 sworn officers and 25 civilians (HUPD, 2010). The officers of the police department have full arrest authority and perform many law enforcement functions around the University, including the investigation of crimes, providing safety escorts, and protecting the well-being of students, faculty, and staff (HUPD, 2010). The mission of the HUPD is to "maintain a safe and secure campus by providing quality policing in partnership with the community (HUPD, 2010, p.2)."

HUPD's Community Liaison Program supports its mission to maintain an open and communicative relationship between the police department and the University community (HUPD, 2010). The liaison is responsible for developing a relationship between the department and the University's different communities. According to HUPD (2010), these communities may be defined by sexual orientation, culture, language, and other diverse interests.

Due to these vast interests throughout the University community, the liaison officer has many functions. As a representative of the police department, the liaison is responsible for reaching out to these communities and working with these communities to encounter any

problems that can strain the relationship between the communities and the police department (HUPD, 2010). These problems include any dispelling any stereotypes toward the police department or to the specific communities. The liaison officer is also responsible for mediating any conflicts between the police department and the University communities (HUPD, 2010).

North Carolina State University

The North Carolina State University Police Department (NCSUPD) employs the use of a community liaison officer as well. This accredited police department is made up of approximately 50 sworn police officers with full arrest authority (NCSUPD, n.d.). The NCSUPD functions according to its mission to provide effective law enforcement and emergency response services and outreach and education to the North Carolina State University community (NCSUPD, n.d.). In order to fulfill this mission, the department is comprised of foot, bicycle, vehicle, and mounted patrol units as well as a criminal investigations division (NCSUPD, n.d.).

Similar to Harvard's community liaison, the community liaison for the NCSUPD is responsible for maintaining the relationship between the campus community and the police department (NCSUPD, n.d.). The community liaison uses education opportunities to focus on crime prevention and community safety. Many of these opportunities exist in the areas of educational programs and free department services (NCSUPD, n.d.). Some of the services that the department officers include bicycle registration and property registration. Some of the educational programs conducted by the liaison are rape and sexual assault awareness, self defense, and alcohol and drug law awareness (NCSUPD, n.d.).

B. ResCop Program-Tufts University

The Tufts University Police Department (TUPD) ResCop program offers another example of how a relationship between a campus's police and resident life departments can be successful. Tufts University is spread out among three campuses in Massachusetts: Medford/Somerville, Boston, and Grafton (TUPD, 2011). The police department is stationed at the Medford/Somerville campus, with substations at the Boston and Grafton campuses (TUPD, 2011). According to the TUPD (2011), the police department is made up of 58 sworn officers, with full arrest authority. The TUPD values its strong relationship with the University community as well as with state and local law enforcement (TUPD, 2011). One aspect of that relationship is the ResCop program.

TUPD's ResCop program was developed in 1996 (TUPD, 2011). It is a partnership between the TUPD and the University's Residential Life Department. In order for this relationship to function, the police department provides a liaison to each of the ten Residential Life's "duty teams" who are assigned to resolve the quality of life issues in the resident halls (TUPD, 2011). Therefore, the ResCop is assigned to maintain the relationship between the police department and the residential life department. TUPD's ResCops focus on safety and awareness within the resident halls (TUPD, 2011). They do this through education, training, and basic communication. TUPD's ResCops also focus on the relationship with Residential Life by acting as consultants to issues that residential life may face with individual students, as well as work at strengthening their relationships in order for it to function during emergency situations

(TUPD, 2011). According to the TUPD (2011), there are ResCop programs on two of Tufts three campuses.

C. Housing Liaison-University of California-Irvine

The housing liaison officer at the University of California-Irvine also provides an example of a successful relationship between a college's police and residential life departments. The UC-Irvine Police Department (UCIPD) is a fully functioning police department that is focused on the safety of the students, faculty, and staff of UC Irvine (UCIPD, 2009). Even though this is a smaller department, having only eight uniformed officers, it operates under that mission that it is committed to providing a safe and secure environment while in partnership with the University community (UCIPD, 2009). The UCIPD shares values that are consistent with the UC-Irvine community as well as a vision statement that focuses on the community, such as the use of community-oriented policing and crime prevention and awareness (UCIPD, 2009).

The UCIPD's housing liaison officer reflects the department's mission, values, and vision. The liaison officer is responsible for maintaining open lines of communication between the UCIPD and the University's graduate and undergraduate housing communities (UCIPD, 2009). According to UCIPD (2009), there are four officers that act as housing liaisons: two for graduate students and two for undergraduate students. The housing liaison officers are assigned various duties that help maintain the open lines of communication between the department and the housing communities as well as serve as a way to educate the students regarding various issues of safety on the campus. Some of these duties include conducting various presentations, informing the communities of relevant safety information, and attending housing staff meetings

(UCIPD, 2009). The housing liaison officers also seek any input and information on how the police department can operate to better serve the community (UCIPD, 2009). Since communication is important for the success of the housing liaison program, the housing liaison officers attempt to meet with the various communities at least once a month. According to UCIPD (2009), the officers also take available opportunities to get to know the residents of their assigned communities.

D. Behavior Intervention Teams

University of Wisconsin- River Falls

Many interdepartmental relationships are publicly known for improving the safety and awareness of the students on campus. However, there are also interdepartmental relationships, outside of the community's knowledge, that are focused on assessing the behavior of individual students while ensuring the safety of the members of the campus community. The Behavior Intervention Team (BIT) at the University of Wisconsin-River Falls is an example of this type of interdepartmental relationship.

The Behavior Intervention Team at UW-River Falls is chaired by the University's Assistant Director of Student's Rights and Responsibilities and is comprised of various members of the UW-River Falls community, including the University's Director of Police, Director of Resident Life, Vice Chancellor, and Director of Counseling and Health Services. There are also four university counselors on the BIT, as well as a liaison for the River Falls Police Department (UWRF, 2010). The mission of the BIT is three-fold: to promote complete student success, to identify at-risk students (students whose behaviors place them at the risk of harming themselves

or others) and determine the appropriate actions to protect those students and the University community, and develop proactive treatments to patterns that develop in student behavior (UWRF, 2010). Weekly meetings allow these members to introduce new students to the intervention process, discuss the progress of current students within the process, and identify and review the methods of intervention that are most effective within the intervention process (UWRF, 2010).

The purpose of the BIT is to identify at-risk students, investigate the behaviors of at-risk students, assess the risk of those students toward the rest of the community, and develop ways to manage the student in a way that will benefit both the student and the community (UWRF, 2010). Some examples of behaviors that the BIT identifies as at-risk behaviors are aggressive or hostile behavior toward other students, overt discussions of suicide or homicide, self-harming behavior, and comments idolizing school shooters (UWRF, 2010).

University of South Carolina

The University of South Carolina (USC) also utilizes an assessment team entitled the Behavioral Intervention Team (BIT). Although its title is slightly different, USC's BIT shares the same responsibilities as the team at the University of Wisconsin-River Falls (USC, n.d.). USC's BIT is composed of ten core members and operates through the University's Student Affairs Division (USC, n.d.). Members of USC's BIT include administrators from the University's residential life, police, health services, and counseling departments.

USC students can be referred to the BIT for self-harming actions or suicide ideation or attempts, any erratic acts that disrupt the normal functions of the campus, such as threats of bringing a weapon to the university, and the hospitalization for alcohol or drug abuse (USC,

n.d.). Once a student is introduced to the intervention process, the student is contacted to participate in a minimum of 4 assessments through the University's counseling center. These assessments are a way for the student to avoid the student conduct process. However, if the student fails to complete the assessments, the student is entered into the conduct process (USC, n.d.). Similar to UW-River Falls, USC's BIT urges community cooperation in reporting any threatening student behavior.

E. Student of Concern Assessment Team-University of Wisconsin-Stout

The Student of Concern team at the University of Wisconsin-Stout is very similar to the intervention teams at the University of Wisconsin-River Falls and the University of South Carolina. UW-Stout's Student of Concern assessment team began in 2000, but it was formalized following the Virginia Tech shootings in 2007 (UWSPD, 2010). The SOC team is comprised of the UW-Stout's Chief of Police, the Dean of Students, and the directors of the University's counseling center and residential life departments. The SOC operates under a mission that is focused on promoting a healthy and safe learning environment at the University through assessing and providing early intervention for students who display certain at-risk behaviors (UW-Stout, n.d.). The same behaviors assessed by UW-River Fall's and USC's BITs are also the behaviors assessed by UW-Stout's SOC team. These behaviors can also include inexplicable changes in emotion, unusually poor dress or hygiene patterns, and a loss of contact with reality (UW-Stout, n.d.). The SOC is informed of at-risk students through their contacts with the University Police Department and the Counseling Center, as well as referrals from concerned

members of the campus community. The SOC meet monthly to track remain updated on the students currently being assessed by the team (UWSPD, 2010).

IV. Recommendations for Effective Collaborations

The use of interdepartmental relationships in the areas of residential life, counseling centers, as well as an involvement from academic faculty and staff are instrumental in protecting the health and safety of the campus community. These relationships also benefit the departments involved by providing opportunities to learn about the other departments and develop successful relationships with the other departments. Therefore, it is recommended that campuses attempt to develop interdepartmental relationships similar to campus community liaisons, residence hall liaisons, and intervention teams.

These three collaborations have individual unique qualities. Even though one specific relationship may involve departments that the other collaborations do not involve, each relationship still serves to educate and protect the campus community. This goal is essential when campus administrators are attempting to minimize the effects of student alcohol abuse, sexual assaults, and student mental issues.

A. Community Liaisons

The role of a community liaison officer on a campus can involve a relationship among many campus departments. For example, the Harvard Police Department's liaison officer interacts with many University groups ranging from residence hall groups to multicultural

groups. Therefore, the use of these liaison officers can strengthen the department's relationships with many campus departments.

Unlike residence hall liaisons and even intervention teams, the effectiveness of community liaison officers can be quickly noticed. In 2005, the Georgia Tech Police Department reported at 30% decrease in crime from 2004 (Hagearty, 2005). The department's chief contributed this drop to the efforts of the department's community liaison officer, which strengthened the lines of communication between the department and the University community (Hagearty, 2005). According to Hagearty (2005), the use of the community liaison helped establish the use of community-oriented policing, which, in turn, led to the development of relationships with various student groups around campus. The trust developed through these relationships lead students to report more suspicious activities.

B. Residence Hall Liaisons

The use of residence hall liaisons helps strengthen the relationships between the campus police and residential life departments. Through the use of the liaison, an ongoing open line of communication exists between the two departments. The use of the liaison also helps the campus police department understand the types of communities that are developed within the residence halls.

Residence hall liaisons are also beneficial toward the students living in the halls. The use of the liaisons allows campus police officers to develop and improve relationships with the students. As a result of these relationships, the students feel confident and comfortable enough to call the campus police when there is a problem (UW System, 2004).

The ResCop program at Tufts University and the Hall Liaison program at UC-Irvine provide sufficient examples of these types of liaison programs can be effective. Even though the programs are limited to residence halls, they are still considered far-reaching programs. In fact, according to census data from 2000 (the most recent data available), there are approximately 2.1 million college students who live on-campus (U.S. Census Bureau, 2003). Therefore, such collaborations that actively educate students in safety and crime prevention and build relationships with those residents should not only be considered far-reaching, but highly successful.

C. Intervention Teams (BIT and SOC)

Collegiate threat assessment teams, such as BITs and SOC teams, are also built upon interdepartmental relationships and are beneficial to the campus community. These teams operate using the College and University Behavioral Intervention Team (CUBIT) model adapted from the National Behavioral Intervention Team Association (NaBITA) (Sokolow & Hughes, 2007). According to Sokolow and Hughes (2007), some elements of the CUBIT model include: a formalized protocol of intervention techniques and strategies, a campus-wide reporting culture that is aided by available data collection software and intervention tools, and the integration of both campus and community resources.

The protocols and procedures of these risk assessment teams may vary between colleges and universities. However, their fundamental mission is to ensure the safety of the campus community. Eells and Rockland-Miller (2011) identify various procedures that intervention teams use to follow through on their mission. Some of these procedures include training and

educating the community on what to report, using mandatory psychological assessments, and invoking involuntary withdrawal policies if necessary. According to Eells and Rockland-Miller (2011), intention teams also focus on any risks from faculty and staff as well. Since these intervention teams recognize that their role is to address threats and provide support and resources for students, they maintain their responsibilities even when troubled students are not acting out.

The use of the community referral is especially important to intervention teams. Since the staffing of many invention teams is limited, the resources for those teams are limited as well. Many campus communities have potential at-risk students that are "under the radar" of the departments involved in the intervention teams. Sokolow and Lewis (2009) contend that there are currently three types of campus involvement toward its intervention team: the campus that underreports at-risk students, the campus that over-reports them, and the campus that has developed a balance between under-and over-reporting. According to the authors, it is important that the intervention team teach the campus community what behaviors to report and how to address those behaviors before the team has the opportunity to assess the student. Sokolow and Lewis (2009) also stress that it is important for the intervention team to investigate every report thoroughly, even if it may be outside the scope of the intervention team. Effective intervention teams, such as the teams within the University of Wisconsin system and at the University of South Carolina allow concerned community members refer students through the intervention teams' websites.

Despite their differences, community liaisons, resident housing liaisons, and intervention teams are effective forms of interdepartmental relationships. These relationships not only

improve the relationships with the departments involved, but they also build a relationship with the rest of the campus community. These relationships also address, educate, and respond to the three common issues of alcohol abuse, sexual assault, and mental health issues (including student suicide).

V. Summary and Conclusion

College students and administrators alike are plagued with various problems on a daily basis. For students, academic performances and the development of their social lives represent two major problems that they face. For administrators, lower enrollment rates or the lack of government funding represent the challenges that they face daily. However, there are three other issues that students and administrators alike must address: student alcohol abuse, sexual assaults, and mental illnesses and student suicides.

These three issues are so widespread across college and university campuses that they cannot be sufficiently addressed by one department. Available literature suggests that these three issues affect both students and administrators. These issues also affect a campus's police, residential life, and counseling departments. Therefore, the development successful collaborative relationships involving these three departments are a recommended first step to developing awareness for these three important issues.

Interdepartmental collaborations such as community liaisons, residence hall liaisons, and intervention teams are great tools for emphasizing safety and educating the campus community about the dangers of these three issues. The relationships built through the liaison programs can develop trust for the police department that can lead to students to feel more comfortable

communicating with the police. Collaborations like intervention teams have a focus on seeking out at-risk students and using campus and community resources to provide assistance for those students as well as make efforts to ensure the safety of the campus community.

Like other information concerning campus policing, information regarding the use of these collaborative relationships is sparse. Much more information is needed regarding the development, maintenance, and effectiveness of these interdepartmental collaborations on college and university campuses. Therefore, it is currently difficult to immediately judge any collaborative relationship as either "successful" or "unsuccessful." However, interdepartmental collaborations that maintain open communication and focus on the safety and security of the campus community have great potential to be successful in their endeavors.

VI. References

Armstrong, E., Hamilton L., & Sweeney, B. (2006). Sexual assault on campus: a multilevel, integrative approach to party rape. *Social Problems, 53*(4), 483-499. Retrieved November 19, 2010 from EBSCOhost database.

Boyd, B. (1966). An analysis of communication between departments-roadblocks and bypasses. *Journal of Business Administration, 3*(2), 27-35. Retrieved March 9, 2011 from EBSCOhost database.

Bromley, M., & Reaves, B. (1998). Comparing campus and city police operational practices. *Journal of Security Administration, 21*(2), 41-54. Retrieved February 3, 2011 from ABI/INFORM Global Database.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2010). *Fact Sheets.* Retrieved February 7, 2011 from http://www.cdc.gov/alcohol/fact-sheets/underage-drinking.htm

Drum, D., Brownson, C., Denmark, A., & Smith, S. (2009). New data on the nature of suicidal crises in college students: shifting the paradigm. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 40*(3), 213-222. doi: 10.1037/a0014465

Eells, G., & Rockland-Miller, H. (2011). Assessing and responding to disturbed and disturbing students: understanding the role of administrative teams in institutions of higher education. *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy, 25*(1), 8-23. doi: 10.1080/87568225.2011.532470

Francis, P. (2003). Developing ethical institutional policies and procedures for working with suicidal students on a college campus. *Journal of College Counseling, 6,* 114-123. Retrieved January 25, 2011 from EBSCOhost database.

Hagearty, M. (2005, January 21). Police department reports sharp decrease in campus crime. *The Whistle*. Retrieved April 12, 2011 from www.whistle.gatech.edu

Harvard University Police Department (2010). *Diversity and community liaison.* Retrieved March 22, 2011 from www.hupd.harvard.edu

Harvard University Police Department (2010). *Pamphlet.* Retrieved March 22, 2011 from www.hupd.harvard.edu

Karjane, H., Fisher, B., & Cullen F. (2005). Sexual assault on campus: what colleges and universities are doing about it. Retrieved November 19, 2010 from www.ojp.usdoj.gov/nij

Meunier, L. & Wolf, C. (2006). Mental health issues on campus. *NYSBA Health Law Journal, 11*(2), 42-52.

National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. (2008). Special NASPA supplement 2008: in search of safer communities. Retrieved February 3, 2011 from www.naspa.org

National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. (2002). A call to action: changing the culture of drinking at U.S. colleges. Retrieved February 8, 2011 from http://www.collegedrinkingprevention.gov/media/TaskForceReport.pdf

National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. (2010). *A snapshot of annual high-risk college drinking consequences.* Retrieved February 7, 2011 from http://www.collegedrinkingprevention.gov/StatsSummaries/snapshot.aspx

Nicholson, M., Wang, M., Maney, D., Yaun, J., Mahoney, B., & Adame, D. (1998). Alcohol related violence and unwanted sexual activity on the college campus. *Faculty Publications and Presentations.* Paper 8. Retrieved October 21, 2010 from http://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/health_fac_pubs/8

North Carolina State University Police Department. (n.d.). *Crime prevention and community relations.* Retrieved April 10, 2011 from www. campuspolice.ehps.ncsu.edu

North Carolina State University Police Department. (n.d.). *Divisions and staff.* Retrieved April 10, 2011 from www. campuspolice.ehps.ncsu.edu

North Carolina State University Police Department. (n.d.). *Mission statement.* Retrieved April 10, 2011 from www. campuspolice.ehps.ncsu.edu

Owen, J., & Rodolfa, E. (2009). Prevention through connection: creating a campus climate of care. *Planning for Higher Education, 37*(2), 26-33. Retrieved February 9, 2011 from www.scup.org

Paoline, E., & Sloan, J. (2003). Variability in the organizational structure of contemporary campus law enforcement agencies: a national-level analysis. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management, 26*(4), 612-639. doi: 10.1108/13639510310503541

Pascarella, E., Goodman, K., Seifert, T., Tagliapietra-Nicoli, G., Park, S., & Whitt, E. (2007). College student binge drinking: a longitudinal replication and extension. *Journal of College Student Development, 48*(6), 715-727. doi: 10.1353/csd.2007.0060

Perkins, H. (2003). Surveying the damage: a review of research on consequences of alcohol misuse in college populations. Retrieved February 24, 2011 from www.collegedrinkingprevention.gov

Porter S., & Pryor, J. (2007). The effects of heavy episodic alcohol use on student engagement, academic performance, and time use. *Journal of College Student Development, 48*(4), 455-467. doi: 10.1353/csd.2007.0042

Potter, L., Silverman, M., Connorton, E., & Posner, M.(2004). Promoting mental health and preventing suicide in college and university settings. Newton, MA: Education Development Center, Inc.

Sampson, R.(2002). *Acquaintance rape of college students.* Retrieved October 23, 2010 from www.cops.usdoj.gov

Schulte, B., & Helderman, R. (2009, July 23). Va. Tech shooter's mental files show up. *The Washington Post.* Retrieved February 3, 2011 from http://www.washingtonpost.com

Seiler, J. (1963). Diagnosing interdepartmental conflict. *Harvard Business Review, 41*(5), 121-132. Retrieved November 26, 2010 from EBSCOhost database.

Sloan, J., Lanier, M., & Beer, L. (2000). Policing the contemporary university campus: challenging traditional organizational models. *Journal of Security Administration, 23*(1), 1-22. Retrieved October 5, 2010 from ABI/INFORM Global database.

Sokolow, B. & Hughes, S. (2007). Risk mitigation through the NCHERM Behavioral Intervention and Threat Assessment Model. Retrieved April 4, 2011 from www.nabita.org

Sokolow, B. & Lewis, W. (2009). 2nd Generation behavioral intervention best practices. Retrieved April 11, 2011 from www.nabita.org

Spitzberg, Jr. I., & Thorndike, V. (1992). *Creating community on college campuses.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Thompson, M., Sitterle, D., Clay, G., & Kingree, J. (2007). Reasons for not reporting victimizations to the police: do they vary for physical and sexual incidents? *Journal of American College Health, 55*(5), 277-282. Retrieved January 28, 2011 from EBSCOhost database.

Tufts University Police Department (2011). *About TUPD.* Retrieved March 22, 2011 from www.publicsafety.tufts.edu.

Tufts University Police Department (2011). *ResCop Program.* Retrieved March 22, 2011 from www.publicsafety.tufts.edu.

Underage Drinking Enforcement Training Center (n.d.). *Law Enforcement and Higher Education: Finding Common Ground To Address Underage Drinking On Campus.* Retrieved October 23, 2010 from http://www.udetc.org/Publications.htm

United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organizations (2002). The role of student affairs and services in higher education. Retrieved January 25, 2011 from www.unesco.org

United States Census Bureau. (2003). *Population in group quarters by type, sex and age, for the United States: 2000.* Retrieved April 11, 2011 from www.census.gov

United States Department of Justice. (n.d.). *Community Policing Defined.* Retrieved February 22, 2011 from www.cops.usdoj.gov

University of California-Irvine (2009). *About Us.* Retrieved March 23, 2011 from www.police.uci.edu

University of California-Irvine (2009). *Housing Liaison.* Retrieved November 26, 2010 from www.police.uci.edu

University of North Carolina-Charlotte. Campus Safety and Security Committee. (2008). Report to the Chancellor. Retrieved October 8, 2010 from www. publicrelations.uncc.edu

University of South Carolina Behavioral Intervention Team. (n.d.). *Home.* Retrieved April 10, 2011 from www.housing.sc.edu/bit

University of South Carolina Behavioral Intervention Team. (n.d.). *Members of the team.* Retrieved April 10, 2011 from www.housing.sc.edu/bit

University of South Carolina Behavioral Intervention Team. (n.d.). *Protocol.* Retrieved April 10, 2011 from www.housing.sc.edu/bit

University of Wisconsin-River Falls Division of Student Affairs (2010). *Behavior Intervention Team.* Retrieved March 28, 2011 from www.uwrf.edu.

University of Wisconsin-Stout. (n.d.) *Memorandum to UW-Stout faculty and staff when student behavior concerns you.* Retrieved March 28, 2011 from www.uwstout.edu

University of Wisconsin-Stout Police Department (2010). *Faculty and staff.* Retrieved March 25,2011 from www.uwstout.edu

University of Wisconsin System. (2004). *UW Residence Halls Programming, Occupancy Requirements, and Safety*. Retrieved March 30, 2011 from www.wisconsin.edu

Walton, R., Dutton, J., & Cafferty, T. (1969). Organizational context and interdepartmental conflict. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *14*(4), 522-543. Retrieved March 9, 2011 from EBSCOhost database.