Fall 2020

An Evaluation Of Georgia Southern University Public Safety Department's Community Policing Program: A Residence Hall Partnership Program

Charles P. Bowen

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/etd

Part of the Quantitative, Qualitative, Comparative, and Historical Methodologies Commons, and the Social Control, Law, Crime, and Deviance Commons

AN EVALUATION OF GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY PUBLIC

SAFETY DEPARTMENT'S COMMUNITY POLICING PROGRAM:

A RESIDENCE HALL PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM

by

CHARLES BOWEN

(Under the Direction of Chad Posick)

ABSTRACT

The Residence Hall Partnership Program (R.H.P.P.) is the first major department wide community policing effort by the Georgia Southern Police Department. This study is an evaluation of that program's first year of implementation. The evaluation process consists of a series of two mostly quantitative surveys of the residence hall students and officers of the Georgia Southern Police Department. The first survey was distributed at the beginning of the program during the fall 2019 semester, the follow-up survey at the end of the spring 2020 semester. The theories being examined are that community policing programs will improve student's perceptions of police, reduce student's fear of crime, improve officer's perceptions of students, and improve officer job satisfaction. The results were mixed concerning student's perceptions of police, and officer job satisfaction. There were positive results for this program improving officer perceptions of students and reducing student's fear of crime.

INDEX WORDS: Community policing, Officer job satisfaction, Fear of crime, Police legitimacy, Policing, Public safety, Quantitative, Qualitative.

AN EVALUATION OF GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY PUBLIC

SAFETY DEPARTMENT'S COMMUNITY POLICING PROGRAM:

RESIDENCE HALL PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM

by

CHARLES BOWEN

B.A., Georgia Southern University, 2009

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of Georgia Southern University in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

AN EVALUATION OF GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY PUBLIC

SAFETY DEPARTMENT'S COMMUNITY POLICING PROGRAM:

A RESIDENCE HALL PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM

by

CHARLES BOWEN

Major Professor: Chad Posick

Committee: Jonathan Grubb

Amanda Graham

Electronic Version Approved:

December 2020

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The completion of this degree and thesis project would not be possible without the assistance and support I've received from many other people. I'd like to first thank Georgia Southern for creating the Tuition Assistance Program (TAP). Without TAP, I would not have been able to afford to even start graduate school. I would also like to thank Chief Laura McCullough for her support and encouragement in my professional life. I have to give many thanks to Dr. A. Graham for her assistance in editing my thesis and providing guidance through this process. Lastly and most of all, I would like to thank my wife, Megan Bowen, for all of her love and assistance during the stressful times.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This study is an evaluation of the Residence Hall Partnership Program (RHPP) a new community policing program implemented by the Georgia Southern Police Department. This program is part of Georgia Southern University's efforts to become a more inclusive university. This push for more inclusivity has come after having multiple racially driven incidents that have occurred on Georgia Southern's campus, which were followed by community protests. During the summer of 2018, a white Georgia Southern student sent a text message to her future roommate who is black stating, "Her insta looks pretty normal not to ni**erish" (Baxley, 2018). The student later stated that she meant to send the message to a friend and meant to type "triggerish" instead of the offensive term. The text message was then shared on social media by the victim of this racial incident, which sparked protests on the Georgia Southern campus starting during the Fall 2018 semester (Baxley, 2018).

In response to this incident, Interim Georgia Southern President, Shelley Nickel, put forth an initiative to improve diversity and inclusion on campus (Enfinger, 2018). I attended some of the protests concerning this incident in 2018 it became clear that minority students did not feel safe on this campus or accepted as part of the University community. Another theme that was mentioned by the minority students during the protests was that they also did not feel safe when dealing with police. Because of this, there was concern within Georgia Southern's Police Department that the current tactics and programs were not reducing community fears or building community relationships and community confidence. After the completion of the 2018 school year, I proposed the RHPP in an attempt to address these issues and the Georgia Southern University Police Department decided to implement it.

Program Background

The prior community policing efforts implemented by the Georgia Southern police department included alternative patrol methods, crime prevention investigators, and Night Escort Safety Team (NEST) employee initiatives. Georgia Southern Police have a variety of patrol tactics that are geared towards encouraging officers to interact more with the public such as walking patrol, bicycle patrol, and patrol in an open-sided golf cart. These varying methods of patrolling allow officers to move around the campus in places that are primarily designed for foot traffic so that they can better interact with the community. However, most officer's rarely patrol by walking or golf carts, and there are only four officers assigned to bicycle patrol.

The Georgia Southern Police Department also employs two investigators (one for the Statesboro campus and the other for the Armstrong campus), whose job descriptions require being a crime prevention specialist in addition to investigating unsolved criminal incidents. The crime prevention specialist tasks include creating and presenting crime prevention classes to faculty, students, and staff, along with participating in various community-building events that are hosted on campus. These crime prevention investigators regularly interact with the student population at social functions in an attempt to increase awareness within the community about safety issues, but also to give the community positive non-law enforcement interactions with our officers. The Georgia Southern Police Department also employs up to four NEST employees. These are Georgia Southern students that work for the Public Safety Department and wear a uniform similar to an officer's uniform; however, they have no weapons or arrest powers. Their job is to conduct walking patrol or golf cart patrol on campus and assist the university community. The primary way that they assist students is by escorting those who do not feel safe walking alone.

The RHPP created a networking program between the Residence Life Department and Georgia Southern's Police Department. In order to provide the best possible service to the Georgia Southern residence hall community, the Georgia Southern Police Department has partnered with the Residence Life Department to educate and inform the residence life employees and community on the topics of personal and campus safety. The partnership will include periodic safety programming, spending extra time patrolling residence halls on foot, and making patrol officers more readily available to the residence life community members. Patrol officers will be responsible for working in close conjunction with Resident Directors (RDs) and Resident Advisors (RAs) by meeting with them regularly to discuss any concerns or trouble areas. Resident Directors are full-time Georgia Southern employees who hold a Master's degree and live in a resident hall. Resident Directors oversee their particular residence hall while also supervising RAs. Resident Advisors are full-time Georgia Southern students that live in the resident halls with the goal of assisting and educating the residence hall community.

One of the goals of this networking program is to give the members of the patrol division more opportunities to interact with the community. Another goal is to get the community to participate in policing efforts, which is essential for creating a community policing program (Brown, 1989). Residence Hall staff and residents will be encouraged to share and discuss community issues or concerns in policing efforts during meetings and events. For the officers in the program, the goal is to enhance the knowledge, skills, and abilities of the patrol division officers to interact with university residents and deal with community issues (Lurigio & Skogan, 1994). In turn, this should encourage officers to strive for professionalism, effectiveness, and efficiency, which could foster a positive image of the agency with the residence hall community creating a more positive work, learning, and living environment (Lurigio & Skogan, 1994).

The prior community policing efforts by Georgia Southern's Police Department were focused on only a few people conducting community policing efforts, while the majority of the department operated in the more traditional law enforcement model. In contrast, the RHPP will get every member of the patrol division (approximately 45 officers and supervisors) on the Georgia Southern Statesboro campus to actively participate in community policing. This program is an attempt to make community policing a priority for the entire patrol division at Georgia Southern's Police Department.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the effectiveness of the RHPP. This study will examine students' and officers' perspectives on the RHPP in order to improve the program. This program is also attempting to make students feel safer on campus, and improve their perceptions of the police department. According to Tom Tyler (2004), if citizens perceive their police department as being legitimate then they will be more cooperative in their police encounters. Understanding the perspectives of the community on local law enforcement can help explain how the community interacts with law enforcement (Steinmetz, & Gerber, 2014). Evaluating what law enforcement is doing is paramount to improving. The main goal of the research is to improve the work-life of the officers and the college-life of the students on this campus. This program will hopefully do both, while also documenting the benefits of community policing through research. However, if it is discovered during this research that the program does not meet those expectations, then this information will also be beneficial in revising the program and community policing efforts at Georgia Southern.

This research project aims to evaluate how well the RHPP has achieved its goals of 1) making residence hall students feel safer on campus, 2) improving students' perceptions of

police, 3) increasing officer job satisfaction, and 4) improving officers' perceptions of students (Lurigio & Skogan, 1994). The increased presence of socially interacting police officers will hopefully make the students feel safer (Skogan, 2009). The students will have more opportunities to socially interact with the officers and observe them doing activities other than making arrests or writing citations. These new observations and interactions will hopefully improve their perspectives of police (Lurigio & Skogan, 1994). Officers will have additional job duties due to this program; however, the social aspect of the program will encourage officers to spend more time socially interacting with faculty, staff, and students while at work, which could improve their job satisfaction.

Willard M. Oliver (1998) defines community policing as:

"A systematic approach to policing with the paradigm of instilling and fostering a sense of community, within a geographic neighborhood, to improve the quality of life. It achieves this through the decentralization of the police and the implementation of a synthesis of three key components: (1) … the redistribution of traditional police resources; (2) … the interaction of police and all community members to reduce crime and the fear of crime through indigenous proactive programs; and (3) … a concerted effort to tackle the causes of crime problems rather than to put Band-Aids on the symptoms." (p. 51)

The RHPP will attempt to address the three key components of Oliver's 1998 definition of community policing. First, there will be a change in how patrol officers check residence halls. Officers patrolling in the residence halls will now be required to do these checks on foot instead of driving by them in patrol vehicles. Second, the patrol officers will also be encouraged to interact and socialize more with community members by attending residence hall functions as participants. Before officers did not attend residence hall functions at all or if they did attend it

was only to provide security for the event and the officers rarely interacted or socialized with the students. The agency will also increase the amount of crime prevention classes and programs it offers to the students. Lastly, patrol officers will be meeting regularly with Resident Directors (RDs) to confer and share information in an attempt to find and address the causes of crime problems in the residence halls. A community policing program like this can be beneficial because it can be tailored to fit the unique demands of the community it is addressing and help law enforcement provide the best service possible (Brown, 1989).

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

History of Community Policing

The history of policing is generally broken down into three different eras; political, reform, and community problem-solving. The first era lasted until the early 1900s and was considered the political era because police agencies had very close relationships with politicians. The second era, from the 1920s to the 1970s, is referred to as the reform era, during which rules and regulations were put in place to try and remove political influence from police agencies. A side effect of this was that officers were not socializing as much with the communities that they were policing, and an us-versus-them mentality grew among police and the community (Kelling & Moore, 2019). At this time, police officers began to separate themselves from the communities they were supposed to be serving. There are many explanations for how this separation occurred. For example, in Philadelphia, they passed a law making it illegal for patrol officers to live in the communities that they patrolled (Kelling & Moore, 2019). Another reason for this separation was the abandonment of foot patrol which was viewed at the time as outdated and inefficient when compared to vehicle patrol. It was thought that by putting all police officers in patrol vehicles they would be able to respond faster to calls for service and they would also be able to catch more criminals (Kelling & Moore, 2019). However, this increased time in patrol vehicles limited the officers' ability to interact and communicate with the members of the community while they were on patrol. In the process of professionalizing and reforming policing, police became law enforcement officers and the personable approach to dealing with the public was replaced by the professional case approach (Kelling & Moore, 2019).

In the 1960s and 70s in the United States, there were large social movements, occurring that impacted policing such as the civil rights movement and anti-war movement. These social movements placed increased demands on police services. Crime rates began to rise, and police legitimacy was being questioned. Citizens protested police mistreatment but also not getting enough police services (Kelling & Moore, 2019). During this time period, researchers published many critiques about the professional police model, including its failure to address community concerns (Goldstein, 1987). Police agencies eventually started to realize that what they were doing needed to change and, in the 1970s, the nation saw the start of the third era, the community problem-solving era (Kelling & Moore, 2019).

This change, to be more community-oriented, began with departments bringing back foot patrol in certain areas of their jurisdiction. In Flint, Michigan the return of foot patrol for police agencies was so popular that the community voted twice to increase taxes to fund more foot patrol (Kelling & Moore, 2019). One reason foot patrol may have been so popular is that officers on foot patrol can socialize with the community easier which can build bonds between them. Community socializing is made more difficult if officers spend the majority of their work time in patrol vehicles. The second element of this era of policing is the problem-solving element. Departments with their training procedures and policies attempted to have officers handle every similar call for service in the same routine way without considering what may occur in the future if this incident was not fully resolved (Goldstein, 1979). The problem-solving method works off of the premise that much of police work is repeatedly dealing with the same people. So, instead of addressing each new incident as a stand-alone event, which could possibly lead to having to deal with those same people later in time, officers were encouraged to think outside-the-box in an attempt to solve personal and community issues in unique ways (Goldstein, 1979). By

attempting to get to the root of the issue going on, officers have a better chance of not having to return later to deal with similar incidents with the same people. By addressing the communities' issues the police agency should be viewed in a more positive light which can translate to improving the work environment for officers (Goldstein, 1979).

Community policing has become something that most law enforcement agencies across the United States implement in one form or another (Gordner, 2015). This method of policing became so popular that the 1994 Crime Bill passed by Congress included funding for 100,000 new community-oriented police officers throughout the United States (Gordner, 2015). With funding support, departments across the United States started or expanded their community policing efforts. The biggest problem with community policing programs is that it is difficult to quantify how many crimes were not committed because of community policing efforts. Also, each agency had its own way of implementing a community policing program and this led to a wide range of what was considered community policing without any sort of regulation (Palmiotto & Donahue, 1995).

With the rise of community policing, there was also a rise in studies concerning community policing, and not all of the studies were supportive of the new programs. Some researchers, such as Rosenbaum (1988), attacked the qualities of the studies and described many of them as having been poorly designed. Rosenbaum (1994) states, "Community policing will provide a panacea for not only crime, disorder, and racial tensions but many of the other problems that plague our urban areas" (p. viii). Rosenbaum's reasoning for this was that the term community policing was being used as a catch-all to get funding and its real meaning had been lost (Rosenbaum, 1994). Despite criticism, there was a decrease in overall crime rates throughout the United States in the mid-1990s which could be attributed to community policing (U.S.

Department of Justice, 2019). However, with crime rates dropping, funding for policing also dropped, and this reduced funding for community policing. So, during the 2000s, police began going back to the reform era tactics of mostly patrolling in vehicles and having less personable interactions with the communities they were serving.

When the makeup of the community changes, the traditions, and values of that community also change. Because of this it is important that officers come from the communities that they serve and that the racial demographics of a police department match its community. The United States has seen a shift since the 1990s to a population that is less white or of European descent (Trojanowicz, 1991). According to the 2010 census, the city of Statesboro breaks down demographically as approximately 50% white, 43% black, and 7% other races/ethnicities (U. S. Census Bureau, 2010). The racial breakdown of the student population at Georgia Southern, according to Georgia Southern's Fall 2018 fact sheet, is approximately 60% white, 25% black, and 15% other races/ethnicities (Georgia Southern, 2019). The demographics for sworn personnel at Georgia Southern University Police Department is approximately 78% white and 22% black. What this shows is that the makeup of the police department has not diversified as much, or as fast as the communities they serve.

Sir Robert Peel, one of the founding fathers of modern policing, stated that police should "maintain at all times a relationship with the public that gives reality to the historic tradition that the police are the public and that the public are the police" (Miller, 1994, p. 6). However, when police do not hold the same values as the community they serve, conflicts with them are more likely. In 2013, the majority of the community leaders in Baltimore that were surveyed stated that they thought the local police were not applying the law fairly and that they did not understand or identify with the community (Margulies, 2016). The officer-involved shooting in

2014 in Ferguson, Missouri started a renewed social movement where minority communities were expressing their anger and distrust of law enforcement (Wolfe & Nix, 2016). The argument is being made once again that officers have become disconnected from the communities that they serve. Communities want more transparency and accountability from police agencies. These are some of the same arguments made by the civil rights organizers of the 1960s before the first big community policing push. These conflicts, once recognized by the police agency, should be addressed and be the cause of change within the department to end or reduce this conflict (Stojkovic et al., 2012). This is one way in which better communication with the community can bring about positive change within the police agency. Some agencies have responded to these conflicts and criticisms by returning to community policing efforts in an attempt to win back community trust (Wolfe & Nix, 2016). Even though agencies are going back to implementing community policing programs, there is a need to conduct new research into the effectiveness of these community policing efforts. If the programs are ineffective due to agencies not fully understanding how to serve a more diverse community then they could just be wasting time and funding.

Effects of Community Policing

In addition to improving community perceptions, agencies that implemented community policing programs have found positive work-related effects for the officers that were part of the program (Wycoff & Skogan, 1993). Officers that were part of a Madison, Wisconsin community policing program showed more job satisfaction, stronger commitments to the agency, and were also more friendly or customer-oriented compared to the officers who were not assigned to the program (Wycoff & Skogan, 1993). The Madison agency also found that the officers in this program had fewer disciplinary actions taken against them compared to regular shift officers and

fewer work absences. Other studies have further found that officers involved in community policing programs were less frustrated at work and believed that the work they were doing was more rewarding, interesting, and important (Lurigio, & Skogan, 1994). Another interesting research finding was that officers involved in community policing programs showed a positive change in attitude towards community members (Lurigio, & Skogan, 1994). The change in attitudes in one study found that community policing programs were the cause for improving the relations between police and the community (McElroy, Cosgrove, & Sadd, 1990).

Another effect of community policing that this program is looking to recreate is that foot patrol has been able to reduce the fear of crime, even if it does not reduce the number of crimes being committed (Brown, 1989). Wesley G. Skogan (1994), when examining six community policing programs, found that all of them showed that the communities involved had a reduced fear of crime and a favorable impression of police services. Skogan (1994) states, "Where officers have developed sustained cooperation with community groups and fostered self-help, the public has witnessed declining levels of social disorder and physical decay" (p. 180). This illustrates the results that community policing programs are hoping to attain.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

On August 30, 2019 the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Georgia Southern approved the evaluation study into the RHPP. The RHPP was implemented in September of the Fall 2019 semester. To evaluate the program, a series of surveys were created to examine the perspectives of the officers involved in the program and the students who live in the residence halls. These surveys will attempt to evaluate the program's effectiveness. The pre-test surveys were taken by officers and students during the Fall 2019 semester as the RHPP was beginning, to get a baseline for their perspectives and opinions. In these pre-test surveys participants were asked to provide their Georgia Southern email address. The post-test surveys were then emailed to all pre-test participants at the end of the Spring 2020 semester, to see if participants' perspectives and opinions have changed during the academic year in which the RHPP was being conducted. Building a strong relationship with the residence hall community will require mutual trust and this program will attempt to establish that trust, so that the safety of the campus can be maintained (U.S. Dept. of Justice, 2016).

The RHPP was explained to the patrol division at shift briefings, at the beginning of September during the Fall 2019 semester. Officers were then asked during the briefing if they would like to participate in a study to evaluate the effectiveness of the program. Officers were advised that their identity would be protected if they participated and that participation in this study is voluntary. There was no gift card incentive offered to the officers for participation. Student participants in the study were recruited through a variety of methods. The student pre-test surveys were mostly advertised by the primary researcher at the University Housing sponsored safety event on September 20th, 2019. During this event, while not wearing anything

to identify the researcher as a member of the police department, the researcher solicited resident housing students in attendance to take part in a graduate student's study on community policing for a chance to win a $25 gift card. After the event emails were sent out by the University housing department only to students living in the residence halls and flyers were put up in the residence halls also advertising the survey and offering a chance to win a gift card. There were six student winners of the $25 gift cards were A. R., T. A., C. R., M. R., A. S., and T. E.. Winners were contacted by the Assistant Director of University Housing Casey Weaver by email. The program was concluded at the end of the Spring 2020 semester. As a member of the Georgia Southern Police Department, I will work with members of the patrol division during this time, however, I will not directly participate in the RHPP. All patrol officers will be required by the department to participate in the RHPP; however, only consenting officers will participate in the study by taking the surveys.

During the Fall 2019 and Spring 2020 semesters, I collected data from Georgia Southern's police department's reporting system, the Automated Records Management System (ARMS). Whenever an officer is conducting any type of work-related task, they are supposed to supply that information to the police department's dispatchers via either their police radio or on a mobile terminal device. All patrol vehicles have mobile terminal devices installed in them which are laptop computers that can connect to the ARMS reporting system. A variety of statistics were tracked on ARMS such as residence hall checks, crime prevention hours, crime prevention programs, and criminal incidents reports. Tracking these statistics and comparing them to years prior should assist in determining if these community policing efforts are having an effect on reported crimes. It is also a way to track that the patrol officers are actually participating in the RHPP by conducting more frequent checks than the previous year.

The Residence Hall Partnership Program is attached in Appendix A.

Student survey is attached in Appendix B.

Student follow-up survey is attached in Appendix C.

Police survey is attached in Appendix D.

Police follow-up survey is attached in Appendix E.

Data Sample

The pre-test samples included 304 student surveys and 32 officer surveys. Upon examination of those surveys after the study was completed, it was revealed that there were 57 student surveys, and 3 officer surveys in which, after consenting to participate in the study, they did not answer any questions at all. Since those participants refused to give any opinions in the survey they were removed from the dataset. The last question in each survey asked them to enter in their Georgia Southern email address and after examining these responses it was discovered that there were three student pre-tests and 14 student post-tests that were duplicate surveys; surveys filled out by the same person multiple times. In all of these cases only the first survey was kept in the dataset and the later response from the same person was deleted amending the sample size of this study to 244 student pre-tests and 29 officer pre-tests. There were no duplicate officer surveys. Of the student responses, 79% (193 of 244) of those that answered the question about their age stated that they were either 18 or 19 years old. Since all freshmen have to live in the residence halls this high percentage of 18 and 19-year-old participants was expected. Georgia Southern University's student racial demographics breakdown as 60.4% White, 25.2% Black, 6.9% Hispanic, 2.8% Asian, 0.3% Native American, and 7.2% other (Georgia Southern University, 2019). This study's student racial demographics are 51.2% (125)

White, 34.4% (84) Black, 4.5% (11) Hispanic, 5.3% (13) Asian, 0.8% (2) Native American, and

3.7% (9) other. Georgia Southern also lists its student gender breakdown as 56.4% female, and

43.6% male, whereas the student respondents in this study are 61% (149) female, 37.7% (92)

male, and 1.2% (3) other (Georgia Southern University, 2019). The student survey respondents

being of similar racial and gender percentages to the actual full student makeup of the University

helps validate the survey population. Of the 244 students that completed the pre-test 40% (98)

completed the post-test.

Of the 53 sworn members of the Georgia Southern Police Department (which excludes

the primary investigator), 29 of them completed the survey. The range for years of experience for

the participating officers begins with less than a year and goes up to 24 years. This wide range of

years of experience and the officer sample size making up 55% of the department's officers

should give a broad view of how the department as a whole feels about the students and the

community policing program. Of the 29 officers that completed the pre-test 97% (28) completed

the post-test.

Research Questions

It is important for Georgia Southern's Police Department to know what students think

about the agency. How students feel about the agency will influence how students react to

officers of the agency if they have any interactions. If students perceive Georgia Southern Police

as being ineffective at dealing with crime, then they will also feel fearful of crime occurring to

them (Haberman et al., 2016). In a series of two student surveys, students will be asked a series

of questions using the five-point Likert agreement scale ranging from "strongly agree" to

"strongly disagree." These questions will attempt to gauge student's overall perceptions of police

services before arriving at Georgia Southern and after attending Georgia Southern for an

academic year. This series of satisfaction with police questions are some of the same questions used in Haberman's 2016 study for satisfaction with police in violent crime hot spots using community surveys. It will also address student fears. Through a scale of responses, current students will address what crimes they are fearful of occurring to them. This will assist the Police Department in being able to apply future crime prevention efforts towards the crimes that students fear the most. This will allow the agency to possibly expand future RHPPs to include other crime prevention efforts towards areas that students themselves have identified as being important to them. This line of questioning can also examine the linkage between people that are fearful of crime occurring to them and confidence in local police (Skogan, 2009). The survey will directly ask students their opinions about Georgia Southern Police and how they are perceived. In the post-test survey that will be distributed during the Spring 2020 semester, students will also have the opportunity to directly name Georgia Southern Officers they have interacted with, and describe any positive or negative interactions they have had with police during the academic year.

Part of the officer study will attempt to figure out if the officers are more satisfied with their job after taking part in community policing for an academic year. Studies have shown officers that are involved with community policing tactics generally have improved satisfaction with their agency (Greene, 1989). This question of job satisfaction is important because a study has shown that the more officers are satisfied with their job, then the better quality of police service they will provide the community (Goldstein, 1987). Officers will answer a series of questions about if they consider their work worthwhile and enjoyable, also if they consider working for Georgia Southern as being better than working for most other law enforcement agencies. It is vitally important for the agency to determine if officers are satisfied with their job

because it also directly relates to their intention to leave the agency (Frost, 2006). The questions used to gauge officer satisfaction were based on Frost's 2006 study on job satisfaction within police organizations. It is important to know if the RHPP is making the officers less satisfied with their job, because even if the program has positive effects on the community if the agency starts losing more officers because of it then it will have fewer resources to devote towards community programs. The second line of questioning for the officers concerns their perspectives of the community they serve, the Georgia Southern students. When officers view students as having high rates of criminality, then they are more likely to perceive ambiguous actions as being suspicious or threatening (Richardson, 2018). Officers will be asked whether they consider Georgia Southern students to be studious, partiers, supporters of law enforcement, haters of law enforcement, honest, immature, and if they are generally good people. Officers will also be asked to give their opinions on if Georgia Southern students smoke marijuana, drink underage, speed while driving, ignore traffic control devices, and steal. This should give a good insight into any biases officers have towards the Georgia Southern students. When officers only interact with students that they suspect of violating the law, it can create an image in the officer's mind that higher percentages of students are breaking the law than they actually are. The RHPP will encourage officers to have more interactions with students that are not suspected of doing anything illegal. This should lower in the officer's mind the percentage of students that are breaking the law. If officers think of students less as criminals, then they should talk to and treat them with more respect. Lastly, in the officer post-test survey, they will be asked about the effectiveness of the RHPP to determine officer buy-in to the program. It has been found that when officers feel like their job is meaningful and that they have input then they have higher levels of job satisfaction (Getahun et al., 2008). The overall goal of the RHPP in regard to the

officers is for the officers to have higher levels of job satisfaction, and think more positively

about the students.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Officer Pre-Test Results

The pre-test for officers was completed by 29 or 55% of Georgia Southern's Police Department's 53 sworn personnel excluding the primary researcher. These 29 officers demographically consisted of 62% (18) male, 38% (11) female, 83% (24) white, 14% (4) black, and 3% (1) other. When it comes to the political leaning of the officers, it is not surprising that they trend more conservative than liberal; 14% (4) very conservative, 43% (12) somewhat conservative, 32% (9) in the middle, 7% (2) somewhat liberal, and 4% (1) very liberal. Officers were also asked about their years of experience in law enforcement overall as well as years of experience with Georgia Southern's department. In regard to overall experience, 38% (11) of the officers had 2 or less years of experience, 24% (7) had between 5-8 years of experience, 24% (7) had between 12-19 years, and 14% (4) had over 20 years. Compare that with the years the officers had worked for Georgia Southern police, there were 55% (16) officers with 2 or fewer years, 21% (6) had between 2-5 years, 14% (4) had between 5-8 years, and 10% (3) had over 12 years. This demonstrates that many of the officers working for Georgia Southern first worked somewhere else and over half of them have less than two years with Georgia Southern's department. The last demographic question looked at the officer's age; 28% (8) were between 20-24 years old, 17% (5) were between 25-29 years old, 20% (6) were between 30-34 years old, 7% (2) were between 35-39 years old, 14% (4) were between 40-44 years old, and 14% (4) were over 45. For full results, see Table 1 on the next page.

Officer Demographics

Gender	Female 38% (11)	Male 62% (18)				
Race	White 83% (24)	Black or African American 14% (4)	Other 3% (1)			
Political Leaning	Very Conservative 14% (4)	Somewhat Conservative 43% (12)	In the Middle 32% (9)	Somewhat Liberal 7% (2)	Very Liberal 4% (1)	
Overall years of experience	2 or less 38% (11)	between 2-5 0% (0)	between 5-8 24% (7)	between 12-19 14% (7)	over 20 14% (4)	
Years of experience at GS	2 or less 55% (16)	between 2-5 21% (6)	between 5-8 14% (4)	between 12-19 10% (3)	over 20 0% (0)	
Age	20-24 28% (8)	25-29 17% (5)	30-34 20% (6)	35-39 14% (4)	40-44 14% (4)	46 and over 14% (4)

Table 1, Officer pre-test, results for demographic questions. Percentages were rounded, actual count in parentheses.

The first section of questions that were asked to officers during the pre-test concerned their perspectives towards students other than criminal intent. These questions attempt to gauge whether officers believe students are good people or not good people by asking them a series of questions about student's personal qualities and having them respond on a five-point Likert

agreement scale of "strongly agree," "somewhat agree," "neither agree or disagree," "somewhat disagree," and "strongly disagree." There were seven questions about students that were positive such as, are they; studious, honest, good people, concerned about getting a job after college, respectful towards law enforcement, support law enforcement, and want to help law enforcement solve problems. The officers responded that they somewhat or strongly agree with those positive statements 62% (127) of the time. The rest of the responses were as follows; 27% (54) neither agree nor disagree, 9% (19) somewhat disagree, and 2% (3) strongly disagree. It is very interesting that the only question that didn't get any disagree options selected in this section was the question "are students good people." The results for "are students good people" were 79% (23) somewhat agree, 14% (4) neither agree nor disagree, and 7% (2) strongly agree. Overwhelmingly officers agreed that students had positive personality traits and are good people.

There were also five questions about students that were negative such as, are they; here to party, immature, elitist and overly concerned with status, hate law enforcement, and bend easily to peer pressure. The total responses to these negative questions were; 13% (19) strongly agree, 49% (71) somewhat agree, 26% (38) neither agree nor disagree, 10% (14) somewhat disagree, and 2% (3) strongly disagree. There was one question that didn't receive any disagree responses: if students are elitist or overly concerned with their status. The responses for that question were 10% (3) strongly agree, 48% (14) somewhat agree, and 42% (12) neither agree nor disagree. Overall officers agreed more with the ideas that students also had negative personality traits. These two groupings of questions together somewhat cancel each other out, the officers overwhelmingly agree that the students are good people, while also mostly agreeing that they simultaneously have negative traits. This demonstrates that the officer's perspectives of the students are not cut and dry. See Table 2 on the next page for full results to Question one.

Question 1: Thinking about the average Georgia Southern University student, do you think they...

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
are immature?	0% (0)	10% (3)	17.5% (5)	55% (16)	17.5% (5)
are here to party?	0% (0)	7% (2)	14% (4)	69% (20)	10% (3)
bend easily to peer pressure?	0% (0)	3% (1)	10% (3)	59% (17)	28% (8)
hate law enforcement	10% (3)	28% (8)	48% (14)	14% (4)	0% (0)
are elitist or are overly concerned with their status?	0% (0)	0% (0)	42% (12)	48% (14)	10% (3)
Negative Totals	2% (3)	10% (14)	26% (38)	49% (71)	13% (19)
are honest?	3% (1)	18% (5)	38% (11)	41% (12)	0% (0)
are studious?	0% (0)	10% (3)	14% (4)	69% (20)	7% (2)
support law enforcement?	0% (0)	18% (5)	41% (12)	41% (12)	0% (0)
are concerned about getting a job after college?	3% (1)	3% (1)	11% (3)	62% (18)	21% (6)
want to help officers solve problems?	4% (1)	10% (3)	41% (12)	41% (12)	4% (1)
are respectful towards officers?	0% (0)	7% (2)	28% (8)	65% (19)	0% (0)
are "good" people?	0% (0)	0% (0)	14% (4)	79% (23)	7% (2)
Positive Totals	1% (3)	9% (19)	27% (54)	57% (116)	5% (11)

Table 2, Officer pre-test results concerning officer perceptions of students. Percentages were rounded, actual count in parentheses.

The next set of questions set to evaluate officers' satisfaction with working for the Georgia Southern University police department. These questions included if they thought their job was; worthwhile, enjoyable, better than most in law enforcement, a good job to have, an excellent job, a job at which they were content, and a job that satisfied them. Officers responded to these questions using a seven-point Likert satisfaction scale of answers that range from "like a great deal" to "dislike a great deal." Understanding officer job satisfaction is important in keeping turnover low and providing the best service to the community. The pre-test indicates that the officers in the study overwhelmingly like working for Georgia Southern's police department.

The overall combined totals for the officer job satisfaction questions resulted in 43% (86) of the officer responses were for "like a great deal," 25% (51) for "like a moderate amount," 17% (35) for "like a little," 9% (19) for "neither like nor dislike," and only 6% (11) responded "dislike a little." There were no responses for "dislike a moderate amount," or "dislike a great deal." The responses when sorted by years of experience and political leaning, did not show any trend towards one of those dependent variables affecting officer job satisfaction. This information is good news for the department because it shows that a majority of the officers participating in the survey are satisfied with their job. See Table 3 on the next page for full results to question two.

Question 2: To what extent do you feel like your job is...

	Dislike a great deal	Dislike a moderate amount	Dislike a little	Neither like nor dislike	Like a little	Like a moderate amount	Like a great deal
Worthwhile?	0% (0)	0% (0)	3.5% (1)	3.5% (1)	14% (4)	24% (7)	55% (16)
Enjoyable?	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	10% (3)	17% (5)	38% (11)	35% (10)
Better than most in law enforcement ?	0% (0)	0% (0)	10% (3)	14% (4)	20.5% (6)	20.5% (6)	35% (10)
A good job to have?	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (3)	11% (3)	21% (6)	57% (16)
An excellent job?	0% (0)	0% (0)	7% (2)	7% (2)	24% (7)	28% (8)	34% (10)
A job at which you are content?	0% (0)	0% (0)	7% (2)	10% (3)	17% (5)	28% (8)	38% (11)
A job with which you are satisfied?	0% (0)	0% (0)	10.5% (3)	10.5% (3)	17% (5)	17% (5)	45% (13)
Totals	0% (0)	0% (0)	6% (11)	9% (19)	17% (35)	25% (51)	43% (86)

Table 3, Officer pre-test results concerning officer job satisfaction. Percentages were rounded, actual count in parentheses.

The third question attempted to gauge the officers' perspectives on student criminality,

which is one of the major focuses of this study. The officers were asked to rate how likely the

average Georgia Southern student is to commit various crimes. The crimes asked about were

smoking marijuana, drinking underage, speeding, disregarding traffic control devices, using a

cellphone while driving, stealing a bicycle, stealing unattended items, intentionally starting a fire

to damaging something, getting into a physical altercation with someone, committing entering auto, and sexually assaulting someone. Overall 26% (83) of the responses were for "very likely," 31% (99) were for "somewhat likely," 1% (2) was for "don't know," 28% (88) were for "somewhat unlikely" and 14% (46) were for "very unlikely." The responses for the "very unlikely" mostly came from the more serious crimes, and property crimes; intentionally setting fire to something 35% (16), committing entering auto 22% (10), stealing a bicycle 13% (6), sexually assaulting someone 11% (5), stealing unattended items 9% (4), getting into a physical altercation with someone 7% (3), marijuana 1.5% (1), and disobeying a traffic control device 1.5% (1). I found it interesting that officers felt that students were less likely to steal a bicycle than they were to commit sexual assault. The percentages for the crimes that officers believed the students were very likely to commit broke down by crime as; drinking underage 23% (19), using a cellphone while driving 23% (19), speeding 19% (16), disobeying a traffic control device 16% (13), marijuana 10% (8), stealing unattended items at 6% (5), steal a bicycle 2% (2), and commit sexual assault 1% (1). The crimes officers feel students are most likely to commit largely deal with alcohol, drugs, and driving infractions. See Table 4 on the next page for full results to question three.

Question 3: Thinking of the average Georgia Southern University student, how likely would one be to…

	Very unlikely	Unlikely	Don't know	Likely	Very likely
Smoke marijuana?	3% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	69% (20)	28% (8)
Drink underage?	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	34% (10)	66% (19)
Speed while driving?	0% (0)	0% (0)	4% (1)	39% (11)	57% (16)
Disregard or ignore a traffic control device?	3% (1)	14% (4)	0% (0)	38% (11)	45% (13)
Use a cell phone (not hands-free) while driving?	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	34% (10)	66% (19)
Steal a bicycle?	21% (6)	55% (16)	0% (0)	17% (5)	7% (2)
Steal an unattended item?	14% (4)	38% (11)	0% (0)	31% (9)	17% (5)
Intentionally start a fire with the purpose of damaging something?	55% (16)	41% (12)	4% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Get into a physical altercation with someone?	10% (3)	45% (13)	0% (0)	45% (13)	0% (0)
Commit entering-auto?	34% (10)	59% (17)	0% (0)	7% (2)	0% (0)
Sexually assault someone?	17% (5)	52% (15)	0% (0)	28% (8)	3% (1)
Totals	14% (46)	28% (88)	1% (2)	31% (99)	26% (83)

Table 4, Officer pre-test results concerning perspectives on students. Percentages were rounded, actual count in parentheses.

The last series of questions asked in the officer pre-test examines if officers are buying into the program's effectiveness before the program has started. The questions to evaluate this

feeling were if they thought the RHPP would improve student-officer relations, student's

perspective of officers, officer perspectives of students, and the safety in residence halls. Forty-

one percent (47) of the responses were that they "strongly agreed" this program would improve

relations and safety, 42% (48) stated that they "somewhat agreed," 14% (16) stated that they

"neither agree nor disagree," and only 3% (4) stated that they "somewhat disagreed" that the

program would be effective. With 83% (95) of the overall responses being for "somewhat agree"

or "strongly agree" this demonstrates that from the beginning of the program the officers

participants overwhelmingly thought that the RHPP was going to improve officer-student

relations while also making the Residence Hall safer. For a community policing program to truly

be effective officers are going to have to put forth an effort to build familiarity, respect, and

support from the public (Gordner, 1996). The likelihood of officers putting forth effort is not

going to be high unless the officers buy into the program, which they seem to have done here.

See Table 5 on the next page for full results to question four.

Question 4: How strongly do you agree or disagree that the Residence Hall Partnership Program will be effective at improving...

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
Student-officer relations?	0% (0)	3% (1)	10% (3)	42% (12)	45% (13)
Student's perspectives of officers?	0% (0)	3% (1)	14% (4)	52% (15)	31% (9)
Officer's perspectives of students?	0% (0)	7% (2)	17% (5)	42% (12)	34% (10)
The safety in Residence Halls?	0% (0)	0% (0)	14% (4)	32% (9)	54% (15)
Totals	0% (0)	3% (4)	14% (16)	42% (48)	41% (47)

Table 5, Officer pre-test results concerning perspectives on the RHPP. Percentages were rounded, actual count in parentheses.

Student Pre-Test Results

The pre-test for students had 244 responses, or 6%, of the 4,090 students living in the Statesboro residence halls during the 2019-2020 academic year. The first question asked of these students attempted to determine how satisfied students were with law enforcement based on their experiences with their hometown law enforcement agency before coming to Georgia Southern. To determine this satisfaction level students were asked a series of questions about their hometown agency and asked to answer on a five-point Likert agreement scale ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." The responses for "somewhat agree" or "strongly agree" that they were satisfied by their hometown police agency totaled 73% (1,068). When looking at

the strongly disagree responses 21 of the 32, or 65% came from students that identified as non-white. Also, 47% (15) of the strongly disagree responses came from students that identified as being in the bottom two household yearly income brackets (between $25,000-$80,000, less than $25,000).

There were only 98 student post-tests completed. When the 146 student pre-tests that do not have a post-test to pair with are removed from the dataset that group is referred to as the "paired student pre-tests." See Table 6 on the next page for full student pre-test results to question one. See Table 7 on the following page for the paired student pre-test results for question one.

Question 1: How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements about satisfaction with police services where you lived before coming to Georgia Southern University?

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
The police are dealing with the problems that really concern people.	30% (74)	46% (111)	15% (36)	7% (18)	2% (5)
Police are keeping order.	36% (88)	48% (118)	9% (22)	6% (14)	1% (2)
The job police are doing is reducing violent crime.	35% (86)	37% (91)	16% (39)	8% (19)	4% (9)
The job police are doing is reducing non-violent crime.	27% (65)	41% (100)	25% (60)	6% (15)	1% (4)
Police are solving the crimes that occur.	29% (71)	39% (95)	24% (59)	6% (14)	2% (4)
The job police are doing is preventing crime.	29% (71)	41% (98)	20% (48)	7% (17)	3% (8)
Totals	31% (455)	42% (613)	18% (264)	7% (97)	2% (32)

Table 6, Student pre-test results concerning perspectives on hometown law enforcement satisfaction. Percentages were rounded, actual count in parentheses.

Question 1: How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements about satisfaction with police services where you lived before coming to Georgia Southern University?

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
The police are dealing with the problems that really concern people.	28% (27)	53% (52)	11% (11)	6% (6)	2% (5)
Police are keeping order.	42% (41)	47% (46)	6% (6)	5% (5)	0% (0)
The job police are doing is reducing violent crime.	35% (34)	42% (41)	15% (15)	5% (5)	3% (3)
The job police are doing is reducing non-violent crime.	23% (23)	46% (45)	27% (26)	3% (3)	1% (1)
Police are solving the crimes that occur.	33% (32)	38% (37)	24% (23)	4% (4)	1% (1)
The job police are doing is preventing crime.	24% (23)	49% (47)	19% (18)	5% (5)	3% (3)
Totals	31% (180)	45% (268)	17% (99)	5% (28)	2% (13)

Table 7, Paired Student pre-test results concerning perspectives on hometown law enforcement satisfaction. Percentages were rounded, actual count in parentheses.

The next question on the student pre-test attempted to identify what crimes students were most afraid of occurring to them. This sort of insight is important for law enforcement to understand so that they can better address the fears of the community they serve. An interesting, however somewhat predictable finding was that of the 78 respondents stated that they were not

fearful at all of being sexually assaulted on campus 76% (59) of those were male-identifying students. Similarly, of the 38 respondents that stated they feared being sexually assaulted on campus all the time 74% (28) of them were female. Also interesting was that, of the three respondents, that identified as other when asked about their sex, two of those respondents also responded that they were fearful "all the time" about being sexually assaulted on campus. The other questions were fairly similar in breakdowns between genders; however, females did give slightly more fearful responses compared to the males. See Table 8 on the next page for full results of question 2. See Table 9 on the following page for the paired student pre-test results for question two.

Question 2: How fearful are you of this crime occurring to you?

	Not at all	Hardly ever	Some of the time	All of the time	Don't know
Resident Hall (home) break in/ burglary	27% (66)	38% (93)	28% (69)	5% (12)	2% (4)
car crime (damage, or broken into)	29% (70)	27% (65)	32% (79)	10% (24)	2% (6)
Being physically assaulted on campus	25% (61)	31% (76)	31% (74)	12% (28)	1% (3)
Theft of your property on campus	17% (42)	34% (82)	36% (89)	12% (30)	1% (1)
Cybercrime (stolen identity, scam, stolen credit card info)	24% (59)	36% (87)	27% (66)	12% (29)	1% (3)
Being sexually assaulted on campus	32% (78)	23% (57)	26% (64)	16% (38)	3% (7)
Totals	26% (376)	31% (460)	30% (441)	11% (161)	2% (24)

Table 8, Student pre-test results concerning perspectives on fearfulness of crime. Percentages were rounded, actual count in parentheses.

Question 2: How fearful are you of this crime occurring to you?

	Not at all	Hardly ever	Some of the time	All of the time	Don't know
Resident Hall (home) break in/ burglary	25% (25)	39% (38)	31% (30)	4% (4)	1% (1)
car crime (damage, or broken into)	27% (26)	22% (22)	40% (39)	11% (11)	0% (0)
Being physically assaulted on campus	22% (22)	29% (28)	37% (36)	11% (11)	1% (1)
Theft of your property on campus	17% (17)	34% (33)	37% (36)	12% (12)	0% (0)
Cybercrime (stolen identity, scam, stolen credit card info)	22% (22)	34% (33)	32% (31)	10% (10)	2% (2)
Being sexually assaulted on campus	30% (29)	21% (21)	29% (28)	17% (17)	3% (3)
Totals	24% (141)	30% (175)	34% (200)	11% (65)	1% (7)

Table 9, Paired Student pre-test results concerning perspectives on fearfulness of crime. Percentages were rounded, actual count in parentheses.

The next two questions in the student pre-test survey attempt to gauge how incoming students perceive Georgia Southern police and other local agencies in the area. Students were asked to gauge on a matrix if they think these agencies harass students, are courteous to students,

and are professional. These results show that, overall, the students have a good perception of Georgia Southern police. Most 63% (154) strongly disagree that GS police harass students. Also, most of the students believe that Georgia Southern police are courteous 82% (198) and professional 89% (215). When compared to the same questions about other local agencies significantly fewer students agreed that the other agencies were courteous 63% (153) and professional 71% (172). However, instead of selecting a disagreeing option, they instead mostly choose the option of "neither agree nor disagree." We see a similar result in the opposite direction for the question of if local police harass students. Fewer students strongly disagreed that local agencies harass students 38% (92) compared to Georgia Southern police 63% (154), however, most of the different choices went to "neither agree nor disagree" instead of one of the agree options. See Table 10 on the next page for the full results of question 3, and Table 11 for the paired student pre-test results to question three. See Table 12 on the following page for full results to question four, and Table 13 for the paired student pre-test results.

Question 3: How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your attitudes towards Georgia Southern (GS) police?

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
GS police harass students	1% (3)	5% (12)	15% (36)	16% (39)	63% (154)
GS police are courteous to students	47% (114)	35% (84)	15% (37)	1% (3)	2% (5)
GS police are professional	55% (133)	34% (82)	8% (19)	2% (4)	1% (3)

Table 10, Student pre-test results concerning their perceptions on Georgia Southern police. Percentages were rounded, actual count in parentheses.

Question 3: How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your attitudes towards Georgia Southern (GS) police?

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
GS police harass students	1% (1)	3% (3)	11% (11)	17% (17)	68% (66)
GS police are courteous to students	53% (51)	34% (33)	11% (11)	2% (2)	0% (0)
GS police are professional	55% (53)	35% (34)	5% (5)	3% (3)	2% (2)

Table 11, Paired Student pre-test results concerning their perceptions on Georgia Southern police. Percentages were rounded, actual count in parentheses.

Question 4: How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your attitudes towards other local area police and law enforcement (excluding Georgia Southern Police) in the area of Georgia Southern University?

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
Local police harass students	4% (9)	10% (26)	30% (74)	18% (43)	38% (92)
Local police are courteous to students	31% (75)	32% (78)	31% (75)	4% (10)	2% (6)
Local police are professional	39% (95)	32% (77)	23% (56)	4% (9)	2% (5)

Table 12, Student pre-test results concerning their perceptions on local area police. Percentages were rounded, actual count in parentheses.

Question 4: How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your attitudes towards other local area police and law enforcement (excluding Georgia Southern Police) in the area of Georgia Southern University?

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
Local police harass students	3% (3)	7% (7)	28% (27)	18% (18)	44% (43)
Local police are courteous to students	33% (32)	33% (32)	30% (30)	2% (2)	2% (2)
Local police are professional	41% (40)	31% (30)	23% (23)	4% (4)	1% (1)

Table 13, Paired Student pre-test results concerning their perceptions on local area police. Percentages were rounded, actual count in parentheses.

The next question asked to students was if they felt police interacted professionally, courteously, and appropriately when dealing with different groups of citizens. The groups that were included for the question were Hispanics, African Americans, members of the LGBTQIA+ community, women, victims of sexual assault, and white men. Overall, 57% (821) of the students strongly or somewhat agreed that police are professional, courteous, and appropriate when dealing with all the communities. The African American community got the most responses for somewhat and strongly disagree 26% (64), which reinforces the theory that the community does not believe police treat African American's fairly. Of the "somewhat disagree" responses from the African American prompt 49% (20) were from students that identified as being part of that community, the percentages were similar for "strongly disagreeing" 52% (12). Interestingly, no members of the Hispanic community responded with the option "strongly disagree;" 71% (5) of those responses came from the African American students. Similarly, the responses for "somewhat disagree" for the Hispanic community 42% (10) came from African American students while only 8% (2) came from Hispanic students. White men received the most responses for somewhat and strongly agreed out of all the groups, with 76% (183). Women received the second lowest amounts of responses for "somewhat disagree" and "strongly disagree" compared to the other groups 9% (27), white men being the lowest 4% (9). However, 87% (13) of the total responses for women "somewhat disagree" were from students that identified as female. Similarly, 75% (6) of the total responses for women "strongly disagree" were from students that identified as female. The same trend was visible when it came to victims of sexual assault. Most of the responses for "somewhat disagree" 75% (18), and 83% (10) of the "strongly disagree" were from female students. See Table 14 on the next page for full results of

question five. See Table 15 on the following page for the paired student pre-test results to

question five.

Question 5: Do you feel that police interact professionally, courteously, and appropriately when dealing with...

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
Hispanic community	25% (61)	26% (63)	36% (88)	10% (24)	3% (7)
African American community	22% (53)	23% (55)	29% (71)	17% (41)	9% (23)
LGBTQIA+ community	25% (61)	25% (62)	38% (91)	9% (21)	3% (6)
Women	34% (82)	30% (73)	27% (64)	6% (15)	3% (8)
Victims of sexual assaults	33% (79)	20% (49)	32% (77)	10% (24)	5% (12)
White men	53% (128)	23% (55)	20% (49)	3% (7)	1% (2)
Totals	32% (464)	25% (357)	30% (440)	9% (132)	4% (58)

Table 14, Student pre-test results concerning their perceptions on police when dealing with different communities or groups of people. Percentages were rounded, actual count in parentheses.

Question 5: Do you feel that police interact professionally, courteously, and appropriately when dealing with...

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
Hispanic community	26% (25)	24% (23)	41% (40)	5% (5)	4% (4)
African American community	22% (21)	22% (21)	34% (33)	11% (11)	11% (11)
LGBTQIA+ community	27% (26)	25% (25)	38% (37)	6% (6)	4% (4)
Women	33% (32)	33% (32)	25% (25)	3% (3)	6% (6)
Victims of sexual assaults	36% (35)	15% (15)	38% (37)	7% (7)	4% (4)
White men	51% (50)	19% (19)	26% (25)	3% (3)	1% (1)
Totals	32% (189)	23% (135)	34% (197)	6% (35)	5% (30)

Table 15, Paired Student pre-test results concerning their perceptions on police when dealing with different communities or groups of people. Percentages were rounded, actual count in parentheses.

The following question looked into the student's prior experiences with law enforcement, asking them if they have had any interactions with police before coming to Georgia Southern. Of the responses 34% (107) reported not having any interactions with police before coming to Georgia Southern. Then, of the yes responses, 22% (71) had social interactions, 14% (44) had been during a traffic stop, 12% (37) have police family members or friends, 9% (28) had been a witness to an incident, 7% (24) had been a victim of a crime, and 2% (6) had been a suspect in a

crime. See Table 16 for the full results to questions six. See Table 17 for the paired student pre-test results to question six.

Question 6: Have you had any interactions with police before coming to GS?

No	Yes: family members or friends	Yes: social interactions	Yes: victim of a crime	Yes: witness	Yes: suspect	Yes: traffic stop
34% (107)	12% (37)	22% (71)	7% (24)	9% (28)	2% (6)	14% (44)

Table 16, Student pre-test results concerning prior police interactions. Percentages were rounded, actual count in parentheses.

Question 6: Have you had any interactions with police before coming to GS?

No	Yes: family members or friends	Yes: social interactions	Yes: victim of a crime	Yes: witness	Yes: suspect	Yes: traffic stop
30% (37)	15% (19)	26% (33)	6% (8)	12% (15)	2% (2)	9% (11)

Table 17, Paired Student pre-test results concerning prior police interactions. Percentages were rounded, actual count in parentheses.

When asked about if they had the Livesafe app downloaded on their phone, the students were split 49% (118) had not, while 51% (125) had. Georgia Southern's police department has been urging students to download the app as an easier way to contact the police department, report crime anonymously, and receive crime alerts. Georgia Southern has been a client of Livesafe since 2018. Livesafe allows users to connect quickly to the public safety department, while also allowing the public safety department to push out warnings or public alerts to every registered Georgia Southern user, among other features (Livesafe, 2018). See Table 18 one the next page for the full results, including the paired results.

Question 7: Do you have the Livesafe app on your phone?

Full Pre-Test Results	No	Yes
	49% (118)	51% (125)
Paired Pre-Test Results	No	Yes
	39% (38)	61% (60)

Table 18, Student pre-test and paired student pre-test results concerning Livesafe downloads. Percentages were rounded, actual count in parentheses.

The remainder of the questions dealt with demographic information. The first demographic that was obtained was the approximate population of the student's hometown. The population of the hometowns for the students in the study were 17% (41) less than 10,000, 35% (86) between 10,000-50,000, 22% (53) between 50,001-100,000, 13% (32) between 100,001-300,000, and 13% (31) over 300,001. This shows a nice spread across the various populations. The next demographic question concerned the approximate household yearly income of the students. The yearly household income of the students in the study were 14% (35) less than $25,000, 41% (99) between $25,001-$80,000, 38% (92) between $80,001-200,000, 5% (11) between $200,001-$300,000, and 2% (6) over $300,001. This shows that the majority of Georgia Southern students come from lower to upper-middle-class families. As it pertains to how the students identify their sex 61% (149) identify as female, 38% (92) identify as male, and 1% (3) identified as other. The race of the students in the study are 51% (125) white, 34% (84) black or African American, 5% (13) Asian or Pacific Islander, 5% (11) Hispanic or Latino, 4% (9) other, and 1% (2) Native American or American Indian. The ages of the students in the study are 63%

(154) eighteen, 16% (39) nineteen, 13% (31) twenty, 5% (12) twenty-one, 1.5% (4) twenty-two, 1.5% (4) twenty-three and up. The last of the demographic questions asked the students what they were majoring in; 12% (30) majored in a degree from Parker college of business, 24% (59) majored in a degree from Allen E. Paulson College of engineering and computing, 17% (42) majored in a degree from Waters College of health professionals, 9% (21) majored in a degree from the College of arts and humanities, 21% (50) majored in a degree from the College of behavior and social sciences, 11% (28) majored in a degree from the College of science and mathematics, 5% (11) majored in a degree from the College of education, and 1% (1) majored in a degree from Jiann-Ping Hsu College of public health.

For the full results of student pre-test demographics see Table 19 on the next page. See Table 20 on the following page for the paired student pre-test demographics.

Student Demographics

Gender	Female 61% (149)	Male 38% (92)	Other 1% (3)			
Race of study participants	White 51% (125)	Hispanic or Latino 5% (11)	Black or African American 34% (84)	Native American or American Indian 1% (2)	Asian or Pacific Islander 5% (13)	Other 4% (9)
Race of Georgia Southern student population	White 60.4%	Hispanic or Latino 6.9%	Black or African American 25.2%	Native American 0.3%	Asian 2.8%	Other 7.2%
Population of city before coming to GS	< 10,000 17% (41)	10,000-50,000 35% (86)	50,001-100,000 22% (53)	100,001-300,000 13% (32)	>300,001 13% (31)	
Approximate Household yearly income	<$25,000 14% (35)	$25,000-$80,000 41% (99)	$80,001-$200,000 38% (92)	$200,001-$300,000 5% (11)	>$300,000 2% (6)	
Age	18 63% (154)	19 16% (39)	20 13% (31)	21 5% (12)	22 1.5% (4)	23+ 1.5% (4)
Majors sorted by College	Business 12% (30)	Engineering and computing 24% (59)	Health professionals 17% (42)	Arts and humanities 9% (21)	Behavior and social science 21% (50)	Science and mathematics 11% (28)
Majors sorted by College continued	Education 5% (11)	Public Health 1% (2)				

Table 19, Student pre-test, results of student demographic information. Percentages were rounded, actual count in parentheses.

Paired Student Demographics

Gender	Female 62% (61)	Male 37% (36)	Other 1% (1)			
Race of study participants	White 55% (54)	Hispanic or Latino 5% (5)	Black or African American 32% (31)	Native American or American Indian 1% (1)	Asian or Pacific Islander 6% (6)	Other 1% (1)
Race of Georgia Southern student population	White 60.4%	Hispanic or Latino 6.9%	Black or African American 25.2%	Native American 0.3%	Asian 2.8%	Other 7.2%
Population of city before coming to GS	< 10,000 13% (13)	10,000- 50,000 37% (36)	50,001- 100,000 24% (23)	100,001- 300,000 18% (18)	>300,001 8% (8)	
Approximate Household yearly income	<$25,000 12% (11)	$25,000- $80,000 43% (42)	$80,001- $200,000 37% (36)	$200,001- $300,000 5% (5)	>$300,000 3% (3)	
Age	18 62% (61)	19 20% (19)	20 13% (13)	21 3% (3)	22 1% (1)	23+ 1% (1)

Table 20, Paired Student pre-test, results of student demographic information. Percentages were rounded, actual count in parentheses.

Officer Post-Test Results

After the Spring 2020 semester was transitioned to online-only classes due to the coronavirus pandemic, most of the residents living in the Resident Halls were moved out. The moving out of these students officially ended the RHPP. The 29 officers that participated in the pre-test were then all emailed and asked to participate in the post-test. Of the 29 officers that completed the pre-test survey, 28 of them completed the post-test survey, which gives the study an almost exact examination of the same officers for the pre and post-tests. The officers responded that they somewhat or strongly agree with those positive statements 70% (137) of the time. The rest of the responses were as follows; 23% (45) neither agree nor disagree, 6% (12) somewhat disagree, and 1% (2) strongly disagree. In the post-test there were two positive questions that officers didn't select any disagree options. Those two questions were for the statements "are good people" and "are concerned about getting a job after college." The total responses to these negative questions were; 6% (9) strongly agree, 50% (69) somewhat agree, 31% (43) neither agree nor disagree, 12% (16) somewhat disagree, and 1% (2) strongly disagree. There was one question that did not receive any disagree responses: if students bend easily to peer pressure. The responses for that question were 18% (5) strongly agree, 64% (18) somewhat agree, and 18% (5) neither agree nor disagree. For the full results of officer post-test question one see Table 21 on the next page.

Question 1: Thinking about the average Georgia Southern University student, do you think they…

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
are immature?	0% (0)	7% (2)	39% (11)	50% (14)	4% (1)
are here to party?	0% (0)	4% (1)	32% (9)	60% (17)	4% (1)
bend easily to peer pressure?	0% (0)	0% (0)	18% (5)	64% (18)	18% (5)
hate law enforcement.	7% (2)	33% (9)	45% (12)	15% (4)	0% (0)
are elitist or are overly concerned with their status?	0% (0)	14% (4)	22% (6)	57% (16)	7% (2)
Negative Totals	1% (2)	12% (16)	31% (43)	50% (69)	6% (9)
are honest?	0% (0)	10% (3)	36% (10)	54% (15)	0% (0)
are studious?	4% (1)	4% (1)	17% (5)	68% (19)	7% (2)
support law enforcement	0% (0)	11% (3)	29% (8)	60% (17)	0% (0)
are concerned about getting a job after college?	0% (0)	0% (0)	4% (1)	57% (16)	39% (11)
want to help officers solve problems?	4% (1)	10% (3)	36% (10)	46% (13)	4% (1)
are respectful towards officers?	0% (0)	7% (2)	21% (6)	68% (19)	4% (1)
are "good" people?	0% (0)	0% (0)	18% (5)	68% (19)	14% (4)
Positive Totals	1% (2)	6% (12)	23% (45)	60% (118)	10% (19)

Table 21, Officer post-test results concerning officer perceptions of students. Percentages were rounded, actual count in parentheses.

The next question dealt with officer job satisfaction. Overall, the job satisfaction for the

officers at the department is similar, with a slight trend towards a few officers being less

satisfied. There was a decrease of 5% (13) in the total responses for "like a great deal" which is the best response option. Followed by an increase of 10% (16) in the total responses for "like a moderate amount" the second-best option. There was also an increase of 3% (6) in the total responses to "dislike a moderate amount," whereas in the pre-test no officers selected that option at all. There are outside factors that could have played into officer's being less satisfied with their job when the post-test was issued. The post-test was given during the COVID-19 pandemic in which officers were still expected to come into work and deal with the public, while most of the community was working from home and sheltering in place. The department was also slow to provide personal protective equipment for officers. There was also the issue that officers were not given any extra pay, or hazard pay for their continued work efforts during the pandemic, which many in the patrol department were vocally upset about. For the full results of officer post-test question two see Table 22 on the next page.

Question 2: To what extent do you feel like your job is...

	Dislike a great deal	Dislike a moderate amount	Dislike a little	Neither like nor dislike	Like a little	Like a moderate amount	Like a great deal
Worthwhile?	0% (0)	0% (0)	4% (1)	7% (2)	11% (3)	21% (6)	57% (16)
Enjoyable?	0% (0)	4% (1)	4% (1)	7% (2)	7% (2)	46% (13)	32% (9)
Better than most in law enforcement ?	0% (0)	4% (1)	4% (1)	11% (3)	7% (2)	41% (11)	33% (9)
A good job to have?	0% (0)	4% (1)	0% (0)	4% (1)	11% (3)	33% (9)	48% (13)
An excellent job?	0% (0)	3% (1)	0% (0)	11% (3)	18% (5)	43% (12)	25% (7)
A job at which you are content?	0% (0)	3% (1)	3% (1)	11% (3)	18% (5)	29% (8)	36% (10)
A job with which you are satisfied?	0% (0)	3.5% (1)	3.5% (1)	11% (3)	21% (6)	29% (8)	32% (9)
Totals	0% (0)	3% (6)	2% (5)	9% (17)	13% (26)	35% (67)	38% (73)

Table 22, Officer post-test results concerning officer job satisfaction. Percentages were rounded, actual count in parentheses.

The next question examined the officer's perspective of student criminality. There was an overall slight shift towards officers thinking of students less as criminals. The "very likely" response received 4% (14) fewer total selections in the post-test, "likely" received 1% (7) fewer selections, while the "unlikely" response received 5% (10) more selections. For the full results of officer post-test question three see Table 23 on the next page.

Question 3: Thinking of the average Georgia Southern University student, how likely would one be to…

	Very unlikely	Unlikely	Don't know	Likely	Very likely
Smoke marijuana?	0% (0)	7% (2)	0% (0)	57% (16)	36% (10)
Drink underage?	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	39% (11)	61% (17)
Speed while driving?	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	54% (15)	46% (13)
Disregard or ignore a traffic control device?	0% (0)	11% (3)	0% (0)	46% (13)	43% (12)
Use a cell phone (not handsfree) while driving?	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	43% (12)	57% (16)
Steal a bicycle?	21% (6)	68% (19)	4% (1)	7% (2)	0% (0)
Steal an unattended item?	7% (2)	64% (18)	7% (2)	22% (6)	0% (0)
Intentionally start a fire with the purpose of damaging something?	54% (15)	43% (12)	0% (0)	3% (1)	0% (0)
Get into a physical altercation with someone?	14% (4)	50% (14)	0% (0)	32% (9)	4% (1)
Commit entering-auto?	50% (14)	50% (14)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Sexually assault someone?	18% (5)	54% (15)	3% (1)	25% (7)	0% (0)
Totals	15% (46)	32% (97)	1% (4)	30% (92)	22% (69)

Table 23, Officer Post-Test results concerning perspectives on students. Percentages were rounded, actual count in parentheses.

With the next questions, officers were asked their opinion on how effective they believed

the RHPP would be. Overall, there was a shift of 15% (18) fewer selections for "strongly agree"

and 19% (20) more selections of "somewhat agree," showing a decrease in officer belief in the

program by the end of the Spring 2020 semester. For the full results of officer post-test question,

four see Table 24.

Question 4: How strongly do you agree or disagree that the Residence Hall Partnership Program will be effective at improving...

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
Student-officer relations?	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (3)	68% (19)	21% (6)
Student's perspectives of officers?	0% (0)	0% (0)	14% (4)	61% (17)	25% (7)
Officer's perspectives of students?	0% (0)	4% (1)	14% (4)	61% (17)	21% (6)
The safety in Residence Halls?	0% (0)	0% (0)	10% (3)	54% (15)	36% (10)
Totals	0% (0)	1% (1)	12% (14)	61% (68)	26% (29)

Table 24, Officer post-test results concerning perspectives on the RHPP. Percentages were rounded, actual count in parentheses.

There were some new questions on the post-test specific to the RHPP such as asking the

officers how many student events at residence halls they attended. The responses were 5 (18%)

did not attend any events, 13 (46%) attended between 1-3 events, 7 (25%) attended between 4-6

events, 2 (7%) attended between 7-9 events, and 1(4%) attended over 10 events. Officers were

also asked if there were any problems they became aware of because of their meetings with the

residence hall staff. The responses were campus lighting issues, fecal matter in the laundry room,

officer response time to calls for service, officers not seeming friendly, and general security

issues. Officers were also asked if they could name any Resident Director or Resident Advisor. In total 33 names were mentioned which belonged to 15 different Resident Directors and Resident Advisors. The officers were also asked in which residence halls they attended student events. The results for the Statesboro campus were Centennial Place 11, Eagle Village 9, Freedom's Landing 6, Kennedy Hall 0 (Kennedy was closed for remodeling and repairs), Southern Courtyard 3, Southern Pines 8, University Villas 5, Watson Hall 5, and did not attend any 5. The results for the Savannah campus were Windward Commons 4, Compass Point 5, University Crossings 1, and University Terrace 1.

<div align="center">Student Post-Test Results</div>

Of the 244 students that completed the pre-test, there were 98 (40%) students that completed the post-test. The first question in the student post-test attempted to gauge the student's satisfaction with police during their year at Georgia Southern. To determine this satisfaction level students were asked a series of questions about police and asked to answer on a five-point Likert agreement scale ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." The statements were: the police are dealing with the problems that really concern people, police are keeping order, the job police are doing is reducing violent crime, the job police are doing is reducing non-violent crime, police are solving the crimes that occur, and the job police are doing is preventing crime. The totals for all those questions showed that 30% (176) strongly agreed, 40% (237) somewhat agreed, 20% (119) neither agree and disagree, 7% (39) somewhat disagree, and 2% (17) strongly disagree. The statement that received the most responses of strongly agree and somewhat agree was "police are keeping order" with 80% (78). The statement that received the least responses of strongly agree and somewhat agree was "police are solving the crimes that occur" with 63% (62). These satisfaction responses towards police services appear fairly similar

to the pre-test with a slight slant towards less satisfaction. For the full results of student post-test

question one, see Table 25.

Question 1: How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements about satisfaction with police services since coming to Georgia Southern University?

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
The police are dealing with the problems that really concern people.	32% (31)	42% (41)	20% (20)	4% (4)	2% (2)
Police are keeping order.	34% (33)	46% (45)	11% (11)	7% (7)	2% (2)
The job police are doing is reducing violent crime.	32% (31)	38% (37)	20% (20)	7% (7)	3% (3)
The job police are doing is reducing non-violent crime.	27% (26)	39% (38)	22% (22)	7% (7)	5% (5)
Police are solving the crimes that occur.	24% (24)	39% (38)	29% (28)	5% (5)	3% (3)
The job police are doing is preventing crime.	32% (31)	39% (38)	18% (18)	9% (9)	2% (2)
Totals	30% (176)	40% (237)	20% (119)	7% (39)	3% (17)

Table 25, Student post-test results concerning perspectives on law enforcement satisfaction. Percentages were rounded, actual count in parentheses.

The next question on the student post-test attempted to identify what crimes students were most afraid of occurring to them now that they have lived on campus for a year. This insight can assist law enforcement in future programs because it gives a better understanding of the fears of the community that have now lived for one academic year on Georgia Southern's campus. Students were asked to rate their fear of various crimes occurring to them. The crimes questioned were break-in or burglary, car damage or car broken into, being physically assaulted on campus, theft of property on campus, cybercrimes such as identity theft, scams, and stolen credit card information, and being sexually assaulted on campus. The overall results of these questions were that 29% (168) are not at all fearful, 31% (181) are hardly ever fearful, 30% (177) are fearful some of the time, 8% (48) are fearful all of the time, and 2% (12) did not know if they were fearful. When compared to the pre-test there has been a shift towards less fearful of crime. With each question except for "being physically assaulted on campus" showing an increase in response percentage for "not at all" fearful. Even though "being physically assaulted on campus" did not show an increase in percentage of responses for "not at all" it did show an increase for "hardly ever" and a decrease in "all of the time." For the full results of student post-test question two, see Table 26 on the next page.

Question 2: How fearful are you of this crime occurring to you?

	Not at all	Hardly ever	Some of the time	All of the time	Don't know
Resident Hall (home) break in/ burglary	31% (30)	37% (36)	28% (28)	2% (2)	2% (2)
car crime (damage, or broken into)	34% (33)	29% (28)	28% (27)	7% (7)	2% (2)
Being physically assaulted on campus	22% (22)	37% (36)	30% (29)	9% (9)	2% (2)
Theft of your property on campus	22% (21)	30% (29)	40% (39)	7% (7)	1% (1)
Cybercrime (stolen identity, scam, stolen credit card info)	29% (28)	31% (30)	26% (26)	12% (12)	2% (2)
Being sexually assaulted on campus	35% (34)	22% (22)	29% (28)	11% (11)	3% (3)
Totals	29% (168)	31% (181)	30% (177)	8% (48)	2% (12)

Table 26, Student post-test results concerning perspectives on the fearfulness of crime.
Percentages were rounded, actual count in parentheses.

The next two questions in the student post-test survey attempt to gauge how the students

now perceive Georgia Southern police and other local agencies in the area, after spending an

academic year in Statesboro. Students were asked to gauge on a five-point Likert agreement

scale if they think these agencies harass, are courteous, and are professional towards students. In comparison it appears to demonstrate that students prefer Georgia Southern's police department to the other local agencies. The question concerning if police are courteous, 80% (78) of the responses were either strongly agree or somewhat agree for Georgia Southern, compared to 65% (63) for other local police. When asked about police professionalism, 85% (83) of the responses were either strongly agree or somewhat agree for Georgia Southern, compared to 69% (67) for other local police. When asked if police harass students, 10% (10) of the responses were either strongly agree or somewhat agree for Georgia Southern, compared to 15% (15) for other local police. For the full results of student post-test question three, see Table 27, for the full results of student post-test question four, see Table 28 on the next page.

Question 3: How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your attitudes towards Georgia Southern (GS) police?

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
GS police harass students	5% (5)	5% (5)	16% (16)	23% (22)	51% (50)
GS police are courteous to students	51% (50)	29% (28)	13% (13)	5% (5)	2% (2)
GS police are professional	59% (58)	26% (25)	11% (11)	3% (3)	1% (1)

Table 27, Student post-test results concerning their perceptions of Georgia Southern police. Percentages were rounded, actual count in parentheses.

Question 4: How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your attitudes towards other local area police and law enforcement (excluding Georgia Southern Police) in the area of Georgia Southern University?

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
Local police harass students	4% (4)	11% (11)	33% (32)	19% (19)	33% (32)
Local police are courteous to students	34% (33)	31% (30)	28% (28)	6% (6)	1% (1)
Local police are professional	39% (38)	30% (29)	24% (24)	4% (4)	3% (3)

Table 28, Student post-test results concerning their perceptions of local area police. Percentages were rounded, actual count in parentheses.

The next question posed to students attempted to figure out if student's felt police interacted professionally, courteously, and appropriately when dealing with different groups of citizens. The groups that were included for the question were Hispanics, African Americans, members of the LGBTQIA+ community, women, victims of sexual assault, and white men. The students overwhelmingly believe that police interact professionally courteously and appropriately when dealing with white men, responding with 52% (51) in the category of strongly agree, the next highest result total for strongly agreed was for women with 37% (36). The category that received the lowest percentage of strongly agree responses was African Americans with 27% (26). The African American group also received the most responses for strongly disagreed with 10% (10), the next closest group was Hispanic with 5% (5). When comparing the pre-test to the post-test it does appear that there was a small shift towards students more strongly agreeing that police interact professionally with the strongly agree percentage

going up 3 percentage points. The strongly agree percentages went up in the post-test for the group options of Hispanics, African Americans, LGBTQIA+, and women. For the full results of student post-test question five, see Table 29.

Question 5: Do you feel that police interact professionally, courteously, and appropriately when dealing with...

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
Hispanic community	30% (29)	21% (21)	36% (35)	8% (8)	5% (5)
African American community	27% (26)	21% (20)	31% (30)	11% (11)	10% (10)
LGBTQIA+ community	30% (29)	22% (22)	36% (35)	10% (10)	2% (2)
Women	37% (36)	30% (29)	23% (22)	8% (8)	2% (2)
Victims of sexual assaults	33% (32)	22% (21)	31% (30)	11% (10)	3% (3)
White men	52% (51)	20% (20)	23% (22)	4% (4)	1% (1)
Totals	35% (203)	23% (133)	30% (174)	8% (51)	4% (23)

Table 29, Student post-test results concerning their perceptions of police when dealing with different communities or groups of people. Percentages were rounded, actual count in parentheses.

The next question asks if the students have had any interactions with police since coming to Georgia Southern. This question helps to assess if the student's in the study have formed their opinions on police from first hand contact, or secondhand contact. It can also be a telling indicator for if the RHPP was effective at increasing police citizen encounters. Compared to the

pre-test there was a drop of 10% in responses of "no" meaning that the students have not had any interactions with police during their time at Georgia Southern. There was also an increase of 19% from the pre-test to the post-test in responses to the question of having "a social interaction" with police. For the full results of student post-test question six, see Table 30.

Question 6: Have you had any interactions with police since coming to GS?

No	Yes: family members or friends	Yes: social interactions	Yes: victim of a crime	Yes: witness	Yes: suspect	Yes: traffic stop
24% (29)	6% (7)	41% (48)	5% (6)	13% (15)	1% (1)	10% (12)

Table 30, Student post-test results concerning police interactions while at Georgia Southern. Percentages were rounded, actual count in parentheses.

The next two questions deal with the Livesafe app the Georgia Southern police department has encouraged students to download and use the app. The Livesafe app is a way to directly contact the Georgia Southern police department with one button access, it also allows users to report crimes or incidents to the police department anonymously. Users can request walking escorts from the app, if they do not feel safe walking someplace on campus alone, and if given permission from the user, Georgia Southern dispatchers can even track the users location while they walk to make sure they make it to their destination safely. The public safety department can also push out information and warnings to the users if there is a dangerous situation on campus that needs to be shared with the public (Livesafe, 2018). The first question about Livesafe asked students if they have downloaded the app, the second question asked them about if they have used the app during this academic year. For the full results of student post-test questions seven and eight see, Table 31 on the next page.

Questions 7 and 8: Livesafe questions

Do you have the Livesafe app downloaded on your phone?	No 44% (43)	Yes 56% (55)		
How often have you used the Livesafe app during Fall 19 - Spring 20	I haven't used it 71% (68)	Once 16% (15)	Between 2-5 times 12% (12)	More than 5 times 1% (1)

Table 31, Student post-test results concerning Livesafe. Percentages were rounded, actual count in parentheses.

The next four questions in the survey were not part of the pre-test and were added to give more detailed information about how these students interacted with law enforcement. The first of these questions asked the students if they could name any Georgia Southern officers. The students were given a text block to write in the name(s) of any officer they knew. Of the 98 post-tests only eight responses to this question 8% (8) could name any officers. Of those there were 11 Georgia Southern officers named, and one NEST officer (student employee that works Georgia Southern police). Next, students were asked if they attended any event this year in the Residence Hall where Georgia Southern police were also in attendance. Of the 98 responses, 82% (80) stated that they had not attended any RH event where GS officers were participating. There were four events that received multiple mentions, a DUI education event received six mentions, a ping pong event received three mentions, donuts with a cop received two mentions, and waffle Wednesday event received two mentions. The other events that were mentioned once were a haunted house, pizza gathering, Eagle Village kickback, a late-night breakfast event, and an event about intervening in social situations. Students were also asked what Residence Hall(s)

they lived in this past year. Only 8% (9) stated that they did not live in a Residence Hall, 29%

(32) lived in Centennial Place, 19% (21) Southern Pines, 17% (18) Freedom's Landing, 13%

(14) Eagle Village, 6% (7) Southern Courtyard, 5% (5) Watson Hall, and 3% (3) University

Villas. This question shows that there were student participants in every Residence Hall on the

Statesboro campus, except Kennedy Hall, which did not have any students living in it this

academic year due to refurbishment. For the full results of student post-test question nine, see

Table 32.

Question 9: What Residence Hall(s) did you live in this year. Check all that apply

I didn't live in a RH	Centennial Place	Eagle Village	Southern Pines	Watson Hall	Freedom's Landing	Southern Courtyard	University Villas
8% (9)	29% (32)	13% (14)	19% (21)	5% (5)	17% (18)	6% (7)	3% (3)

Table 32, Student post-test results concerning which Residence Hall the student's lived in.
Percentages were rounded, actual count in parentheses.

The last question asked the students was if they have had any positive or negative

interactions with Georgia Southern police that they wanted to share. Of the 98 responses to this

question 74% (73) responded with no, N/A, nope, or they just left the question blank. Of the 25

other responses about officers 76% (19) were positive, 12% (3) were negative, 8% (2) were

neither positive nor negative, and 4% (1) was both positive and negative. The two responses that

were neither positive nor negative one only stated "yes" and the other stated "UPB" which could

be a misspelling of the acronym UPD (University Police Department). The lone statement that

was negative and positive stated "Negative, but had a positive outcome. Would love to provide a

new guideline for the university police that actually makes people feel safe at the school! The police are doing a fine job but they could always do better!"

In one of the three negative responses, a student recounted an incident with Georgia Southern police in which they along with another student were taking pictures around the outside of Watson Hall at around 9pm. The student stated that officers stopped and interrogated them about their activities and refused to understand that they were not doing anything illegal. The student stated that the entire interaction lasted approximately 46 minutes. The second negative response a student stated that they were a witness to a situation and didn't like the way that they were treated by the officer, stating that the officer was rude and unprofessional towards them as well as their boyfriend. The third and last negative response only stated "negative" with no further explanation.

For the 19 positive responses I broke them down into three groups; six were general statements, six were from specific social interactions, and seven were from specific interactions due to calls for service. In the general statements group, two general statements were "very positive environment" and "very positive environment." The other four generalized encounters were "friendly greetings," "every officer that I have interacted with has been professional and friendly," "I wave to them and they are generally nice to me," "the officers are nice with me, respectful and courteous all the time. I feel safe with campus police," "yes, positive interactions on campus near Dining Commons, the RAC, and walking places," and "positive whenever I see them patrolling parking lots and campus." There is a range of stories that were shared that were classified as specific social interactions. The six specific social interactions were; saying their dog was cute, being "very nice" while helping pump up the student's bicycle tire, socializing in a community room of a Residence Hall also checking up on the student which "made me feel

safe," giving them a ride to their Residence Hall because they were walking back and it started raining "it was a very kind act that he certainly didn't have to do for me," talking to the student about policing because they are a criminal justice major making them "feel more confident about going into the field of policing," and being a Resident Advisor and interacting regularly with one of the departments officers who they also observed interacting "very openly and positively with other students."

There were seven other positive responses that referenced specific calls for service. Half of those responses referenced Georgia Southern officers that assisted students either with jump starting a vehicle or unlocking a vehicle. One student referenced Georgia Southern's help with jumpstarting their vehicle once, while another student stated they have had "very positive" interactions and that Georgia Southern police have jump-started their vehicle 6 times this past academic year and were "very polite and helpful." Another student that was locked out of their vehicle stated that Georgia Southern police were "quick and courteous" with helping to get them back in their vehicle. One student that had their vehicle vandalized stated that they had a positive interaction with Georgia Southern police that helped them calling them "very helpful." Another student stated that Georgia Southern police "helped with noise disturbance." In another positive response from a call of service, the student stated they had "become very worried about one of my roommates and the Georgia Southern police were very kind and helpful." The last response was from a Resident Advisor in Eagle Village that stated that they had called Georgia Southern police to turn over a found wallet and that the officer went above and beyond just taking the property and attempting to find the owner. The RA stated that this officer "took time out of his night to talk and get to know us," and then later stated that the officer "continued to check in with me and would stop by any program I had to say hello and interact with the students there."

This RA wanted to "thank him for making me and other students at Georgia Southern feel welcomed," further stating that "It is experiences like these that make me feel proud to be a member of Georgia Southern."

Paired Results

The pre and post tests were paired together using the responses to the question asking participants to provide their email address. After being paired all the responses were formatted from the verbal scales to numeric values, which required some reserve scoring. All calculations were completed using SPSS conducting a paired t-test analysis.

In the first officer question the participants were asked their perspectives towards students other than criminal intent. All of the means averaged higher in the post-test except for "are studious" which didn't change at all. The only statistically significant increase ($p < .05$) was on the question for "are concerned about getting a job after college." Even though only one question was statistically significant, this shows that officers on average did perceive the students in a more positive manner at the end of the year compared to the beginning. For full results, see Table 33 on the next page.

Officer Question 1 paired T-test results.

Thinking of the average GS student, do you think they...	Pre-Test Mean	Post-Test Mean	Mean	T-Statistic	P-Value
are studious?	3.7143	3.7143	0	0	1
are here to party?	2.1786	2.3571	-0.17857	-1.223	2.32
support law enforcement?	3.2143	3.5	-0.28571	-1.549	0.166
hate law enforcement?	3.2593	3.3333	-1.17407	-0.319	0.752
want to help officers solve problems?	3.3214	3.3571	-0.03571	-0.254	0.802
are respectful towards officers?	3.5714	3.6786	-0.10714	-0.721	0.477
are honest?	3.2143	3.4286	-0.21429	-1.14	0.264
are immature?	2.1786	2.5	-0.32143	-1.56	0.13
are concerned about getting a job after college?	3.8929	4.3571	-0.46429	-2.458	0.021
bend easily to peer pressure?	1.8929	2	-0.10714	-0.827	0.415
are elitist or are overly concerned with their status?	2.2857	2.4286	-0.14286	-0.779	0.443
are "good" people?	3.8929	3.9643	-0.07143	-0.812	0.424

Table 33 paired T-test results for question one in the officer's surveys.

The second officer question attempted to gauge their job satisfaction. There were no responses that had any statistically significant changes for this question. Four of the seven responses actually averaged lower means in the post-test results. Two responses did not have any change at all, and the question "better than most in law enforcement" was the only response that received an increase in its mean change. The post-tests were given during the middle of the

COVID-19 pandemic in which law enforcement were still required to work while most everyone else was able to work from home. For the full results, see table 34.

Officer question 2 paired T-test results

To what extent do you feel like your job is...	Pre-Test Mean	Post-Test Mean	Mean	T-Statistic	P-Value
worthwhile?	6.2143	6.2143	0	0	1
enjoyable?	5.9286	5.8571	0.07143	0.386	0.702
better than most in law enforcement?	5.4815	5.7778	-0.2963	-1.189	0.245
a good job to have?	6.1923	6.1154	0.07692	0.44	0.664
an excellent job?	5.7143	5.7143	0	0	1
a job at which you are content?	5.7857	5.7143	0.07143	0.278	0.783
a job with which you are satisfied?	5.7143	5.6429	0.07143	0.273	0.787

Table 34 paired T-test results for question two in the officer's surveys.

The third officer question dealt with their perspectives of the criminality of students. All of the means increased except for two "disregard or ignore a traffic control device" and "intentionally start a fire with the purpose of damaging something." The intentionally starting a fire having a lower mean makes sense in this study since during the course of this academic year there were six cases of arson committed by one student, in an attempt to get out of going to a class they did not like. Two questions show statistically significant changes which were "steal a bicycle" ($p < .05$) and "steal an unattended item" ($p < .01$). Commit entering-auto which is also a theft-based crime almost was statistically significant with a p-value of 0.059. For the full results, see Table 35 on the next page.

Officer question 3 paired T-Test results.

Thinking of the average GS student, how likely would one be to...	Pre-Test Mean	Post-Test Mean	Mean	T-Statistic	P-Value
smoke marijuana?	1.7143	1.7857	-0.07143	-0.465	0.646
drink underage?	1.3214	1.3929	-0.07143	-0.57	0.573
speed while driving?	1.4074	1.5185	-0.11111	-1	0.327
disregard or ignore a traffic control device?	1.8214	1.7857	0.03571	0.214	0.832
use a cell phone (not handsfree) while driving?	1.3214	1.4286	-0.10714	-1	0.326
steal a bicycle?	3.6071	4.0357	-0.42857	-2.364	0.026
steal an unattended item?	2.9286	3.5714	-0.64286	-2.851	0.008
intentionally start a fire with the purpose of damaging something?	4.5	4.4643	0.03571	0.238	0.813
get into a physical altercation with someone?	3.1429	3.3929	-0.25	-1.158	0.257
commit entering-auto?	4.1786	4.5	-0.32143	-1.971	0.059
sexually assault someone?	3.4643	3.6429	-0.17857	-0.723	0.476

Table 35 paired T-test results for question three in the officer's surveys.

The last officer question in the paired T-Tests concerned their perspectives on if they thought the RHPP was going to be effective at achieving its theoretical goals. None of the results were statistically significant ($p < .05$) and most officer's perspectives went down in the post-test except for the question about "student's perspectives of officers" which didn't change at all. See Table 36 for the full results on the next page.

Officer question 4 paired T-Test results.

How strongly do you agree or disagree that the RHPP will be effective at improving...	Pre-Test Mean	Post-Test Mean	Mean	T-Statistic	P-Value
student-officer relations?	4.2857	4.1071	0.17857	1.154	0.259
student's perspectives of officers?	4.1071	4.1071	0	0	1
officer's perspectives of students?	4.0357	4	0.03571	0.225	0.823
the safety in Residence Halls?	4.4074	4.2593	0.14815	1.162	0.256

Table 36 paired T-test results for question four in the officer's surveys.

The first question compared in the student survey deals with their perspectives and satisfaction with police. Overall, every portion of this question showed that students were less satisfied with police at the end of the academic year. The only part that showed an improvement of student satisfaction with police was in the section concerning "the job police are doing is preventing crime." The only question that showed a statistically significant change was "police are solving the crimes that occur" ($p < .05$). Unfortunately though, the statistical change was that the students were less satisfied with the job police were doing. For full results, see Table 37 on the next page.

Student question 1 paired T-Test results.

How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements about satisfaction with police services?	Pre-Test Mean	Post-Test Mean	Mean	T-Statistic	P-Value
The police are dealing with the problems that really concern people.	3.9796	3.9694	0.0102	0.093	0.926
Police are keeping order.	4.2551	4.0204	0.23469	2.147	0.294
The job police are doing is reducing violent crime.	4.	3.8776	0.12245	1.061	0.291
The job police are doing is reducing non-violent crime.	3.8776	3.7449	0.13265	1.081	0.283
Police are solving the crimes that occur.	3.9794	3.7526	0.2268	2.2	0.03
The job police are doing is preventing crime.	3.8542	3.8646	-0.01042	-0.09	0.928

Table 37 paired T-Test results for question one in the student survey.

Question two of the student survey deals with fear of crime. Even though only one section in this line of questioning showed statistical significance "car crime (damaged or broken into)" ($p < .01$) all areas of this section showed improved scores in the post-test. For full results, see Table 38 on the next page.

Student question 2 paired T-Test

How fearful are you of this crime occurring to you?	Pre-Test Mean	Post-Test Mean	Mean	T-Statistic	P-Value
Resident Hall (home) break in/burglary	3.5102	3.6531	-0.14286	-1.027	0.307
Car crime (damaged, or broken into)	3.1134	3.5464	-0.43299	-3.099	0.003
Being physically assaulted on campus	3.1429	3.3367	-0.19388	-1.374	0.173
Theft of your property on campus	3.0619	3.1856	-0.12371	-0.78	0.438
Cybercrime (stolen identity, scam, stolen credit card info)	3.2653	3.3673	-0.10204	-0.698	0.487
Being sexually assaulted on campus	3.1735	3.4082	-0.23469	-1.448	0.151

Table 38 paired T-Test results for question two in the student survey.

The next question in the student survey deals specifically with the student's perspectives on Georgia Southern Police. In all three portions of this question the student responses were worse during the post-test. The section asking participants if "GS police harass GS students" was statistically significant ($p<01$). For full results, see Table 39 on the next page.

Student question 3 paired T-Test.

How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements about attitudes towards Georgia Southern police?	Pre-Test Mean	Post-Test Mean	Mean	T-Statistic	P-Value
GS police harass GS students	4.4694	4.0918	0.37755	3.558	0.001
GS police are courteous to GS students	4.3711	4.2062	0.16495	1.787	0.077
GS police are professional	4.4063	4.375	0.03125	0.37	0.712

Table 39 paired T-Test results for question three in the student survey.

Question four of the student surveys is the same as question three however instead of asking student's perspectives on Georgia Southern police, it asks about other local agencies. All of these results also had lower means in the post-tests. The question of harassing GS students was also statistically significant ($p<.05$). This shows that whatever changed the student's perceptions of law enforcement was not necessarily agency specific. See Table 40 for full results.

Student question 4 paired T-Test.

How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements about attitudes towards other local area police and law enforcement (excluding GS police).	Pre-Test Mean	Post-Test Mean	Mean	T-Statistic	P-Value
Local agencies harass GS students	3.9286	3.6531	0.27551	2.075	0.041
Local agencies are courteous to GS students	3.9184	3.898	0.02041	0.245	0.807
Local agencies are professional	4.0612	3.9694	0.09184	1	0.32

Table 40 paired T-Test results for question four in the student survey.

The final student question that was examined with a paired T-Test concerned student perspectives on how well police deal with different communities. None of the sections in this question showed statistically significant change. It is interesting that the student responses showed that they believe all the agencies in this area harass the students; however, they also think that police are doing better when dealing with different communities. This shows how complex the perspectives of law enforcement can be. For the full results, see Table 41.

Student question 5 paired T-Test.

Do you feel that police interact professionally, courteously, and appropriately when dealing with...	Pre-Test Mean	Post-Test Mean	Mean	T-Statistic	P-Value
Hispanic community	3.6186	3.6392	-0.02062	-0.182	0.856
African American community	3.3229	3.4271	-0.10417	-0.912	0.364
Members of the LGBTQIA+ community	3.6429	3.6735	-0.03061	-0.276	0.783
Women	3.8144	3.9175	-0.10309	-0.89	0.376
Victims of sexual assault	3.7083	3.7188	-0.01042	-0.087	0.931
White men	4.1633	4.1837	-0.02041	-0.172	0.864

Table 41 paired T-Test results for question five in the student survey.

Crime Statistics

First, looking at the calls for service, a call for service is defined by the agency as any work-related activity performed by an employee. This includes location checks (buildings, parking lots, residence halls), assisting members of the community (unlocking vehicles, unlocking offices, jump-starting vehicles, escorts), taking a report of a crime, conducting a traffic

accident report, traffic stops, responding to a call for the need of an officer even if no crime has been committed. Statistically, the calls for service that Georgia Southern Police responded to during the time of the study remained somewhat stable, averaging 1,150 calls per month. There are two dips in the calls for service which went below 1,000 for the month and that was in December and March. The average number of calls for service, excluding the anomalies of December and March, is 1,243 a month, in which case only September and January were below average. December is a month that doesn't normally follow the statistical trends mainly because for the majority of that month the students are away from campus on winter break (December 13-January 9). During the winter break, most Residence Halls close, and students that live in them have to leave and stay somewhere else. Resident Halls University Villas, Freedom's Landing, and Centennial Place will allow students to stay for all or some of the winter break if they make special arrangements by signing up with Residence Life (University Housing, 2019). The decrease in March for calls of service, is also due to students being away from campus this time though because of the coronavirus. Students largely left campus for their spring break during the week of March 16th-20th. However, during spring break coronavirus started spreading more in the United States so the students were advised to not return to campus if they did not have to, and the majority of all students living in the residence halls were eventually moved out during the week of March 23th-27th. Georgia Southern then transitioned to offering fully online teaching for the rest of the Spring 2020 semester so that students do not have a reason to be on campus any longer, which led to a drop in calls for service. Comparing these calls for service numbers to last year during the same time period, this year was higher by a total of 26 calls. There were only two months in which this year's calls for service numbers were lower than the previous year, which were September (-167) and March (-250). If the COVID-19

impacted March is removed from the comparison, then during this academic year there were 276 more calls for service during the same time period.

The trend observed with calls for service is seen again with incidents reported. Incident reports are official reports made by Georgia Southern Officers for violations of the law (criminal, and traffic) or suspicious incidents that are not crimes however were documented by officers for future reference. There were an average of 229 incidents reported each month during the study. The two months in which there were less than 200 incidents reported that month were December and March. The average number of incidents, without those anomaly months, was 255, in which November, January, and February were all below average. When looking at the incidents reported, excluding the anomaly months, after October, each month decreased in incidents. When comparing this year's incident reports to last year during the same time period last year there were 78 less incident reports this year. If the anomaly month of COVID-19 March is removed then compared to the same time period last year, this academic year had 10 more incidents reported.

A closer examination of all the incidents reported was conducted and from that, the number of crimes reported in residence halls was calculated. The overall average for every month of the study was 27 crimes per month in a residence hall. Again, the months of December and March were clear anomalies with both months only having 16 crimes reported. January was also below the overall average with 26 crimes; however, since the beginning portion of that month students were still on winter break it makes sense for it to be lower. Compared to last year there were 34 less crimes in Residence Halls reported during the same time frame. Excluding March then that number does down to 14 less crimes in Residence Halls reported during the same time frame when compared to the last year.

Since the start of the RHPP in September, the officers of Georgia Southern University have conducted more Residence Hall checks every month than they did the previous year. During the first month of the program officers only conducted 19 more checks than the previous year. However, after that initial slow start, the residence hall checks jumped in October through December compared to the previous year. Between October and December officers averaged 642 residence hall checks a month, which was an average increase from the previous year of 146 checks a month. In January, the Chief of Police advised the patrol department that they needed to increase their productivity to include building checks, Residence Hall checks, parking lot checks, and traffic stops. This directive coming from the Chief is likely why we see such a sharp increase for Residence Hall checks in January through March. The January through March residence hall checks averaged 1,591 a month, which is an average increase of 884 a month compared to last year.

The officers averaged 15 arrests per month, during the time of the study. October, December and March were below average months for arrests. This 15 arrest average is down compared to the 18 arrests average per month for the same months the previous year. The coronavirus did not have a strong statistical effect on March's arrest statistics, which were only three less than the previous year. Removing March from the examination, this academic year's total arrests were 15 lower than last year. Of those arrests there was an average of five arrests a month in the residence halls, which is also down from the eight arrests per month average of the previous year. This year's March statistics were three arrests lower compared to last year. Removing March from the examination and comparing it to last year's total arrests in the residence halls ended up still being 16 arrests lower than the previous year.

A crime prevention program to be counted in this study as defined by Georgia Southern's police department is any program that has a crime prevention element in it that is presented for residence hall students in which Georgia Southern officers participate in the program or teach the program. Some of the programs that were offered during this time were Rape Aggression Defense (R.A.D.) classes, alcohol awareness and DUI education, active shooter training, the amnesty program, sexual assault education, lime scooter safety course, and general campus safety classes. The RAD class is a women's self-defense class taught by officers to educate women on how to defend themselves (R.A.D. systems, 2020). The alcohol awareness and DUI education classes usually have two elements: the education element, and a fun activity such as trying to play the video game Mario Kart while wearing drunk goggles (goggles which impair your vision to simulate alcohol impairments). Active shooter training can be just educational based or include walk-through simulations with students to prepare them for that situation. The classes about the amnesty program inform students that if they are with someone that overdoses on alcohol or drugs, they can notify the police department and will not be charged with any possession crimes because they are attempting to save someone else's life. The classes on sexual assault are two-part, first to educate students on what sexual assault is, and then provide them with where they can get assistance if they have been sexually assaulted such as the Teal House. The Teal House is a regional sexual assault and child advocacy center that conducts free sexual assault examinations and counseling to survivors of sexual violence. The agency also offers classes on relevant campus safety topics such as lime scooter safety and bicycle safety, in an attempt to reduce accidents involving those transportation devices. Lastly, officers participated in general crime prevention talks such as coffee with a cop, ping pong with a cop, and pool with a cop in which officers would engage with the students and answer any law enforcement questions

they had. The agency averaged five crime prevention programs a month, with December and March being the only months below five, each with just one program that month. The previous year the agency averaged six programs a month. So, even with the RHPP which prioritized conducting these programs, there was a decrease compared to the previous year. The programs were very similar in numbers compared to the previous year except for October and March. It is not clear why October's numbers this academic year were so off the average, however, March had low numbers due to many classes being canceled because of the coronavirus. When you look at the average number of hours per month spent presenting crime prevention programs the average was 14.8 hours a month, compared to 14.7 hours per month the previous year. So, even though there were an average of one less crime prevention class per month this academic year compared to the previous year the total number of hours spent giving instruction did increase, even with the very low March month this year. When March is removed from the examination there were only two less crime prevention classes this academic year compared to last year, along with 11 more hours of crime prevention classes compared to last year. The classes may have decreased slightly in number; however the police department has made the classes they are currently offering longer.

A new entry was added to the ARMS computer system in October of 2019 listed as Community Oriented Policing (COP). Since this is a new entry option, there are not any statistics for this prior to October of 2019. Whenever an officer attended a Residence Hall event as a participant, so that they could socialize with the students they were supposed to log with dispatch that they were doing a COP event. Starting in October and excluding December because of the winter break and March in which the semester was cut short, officers averaged 13.75 events a month. This shows that officers were participating in Resident Hall events on a regular basis.

Officers participated in a total of 61 Community Policing Events in the Residence Halls during which the halls only hosted 71 events. Officers attended 86% of all of the Residence Halls events further demonstrating their participation in the RHPP.

Statistically calls for service and incident reports were both higher this year than last, however reported crimes in the residence halls and arrests in the residence halls were down. The biggest change in the residence halls from last year was the addition of the RHPP and officers conducting a higher number of residence hall checks this year compared to last. See Table 42 for the full results of the crime statistics on the next page.

Georgia Southern Crime statistics during the RHPP.

	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Totals (excluding March)
Calls for service	1123 (-167)	1235 (+57)	1285 (+121)	935 (+67)	1180 (+48)	1392 (+150)	906 (-250)	7,150 (+276)
Incidents reported	265 (-26)	297 (-6)	249 (-1)	167 (-14)	248 (+31)	219 (+26)	160 (-88)	1,445 (+10)
Reported crimes in R.H.s	40 (-10)	33 (-3)	30 (+4)	16 (+1)	26 (+1)	31 (-7)	16 (-20)	176 (-14)
R.H. checks	480 (+19)	625 (+145)	652 (+184)	651 (+110)	1536 (+715)	1693 (+968)	1546 (+971)	5,637 (2,141)
Arrests made	17 (-17)	13 (-20)	15 (+8)	8 (+3)	22 (+7)	20 (+4)	12 (-3)	95 (-15)
Arrests in R.H.s	5 (-6)	7 (-10)	2 (-1)	2 (+2)	8 (+2)	9 (-3)	4 (-3)	33 (-16)
Crime Prevention Programs	12 (+2)	5 (-6)	5 (+2)	1 (0)	7 (+2)	8 (-2)	1 (-5)	38 (-2)
Crime Prevention hours	36 (+16)	16 (-18)	18 (+15)	1 (0)	16 (+11)	15 (-13)	2 (-10)	102 (11)
Community Policing event	0	12	10	5	23	10	1	60

Table 42, Monthly statistics with change from previous year in parentheses.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Research Implications

Police officers need to be engaging with the community they serve on a regular basis to improve relations between the two and to fight against the "us-versus-them" mentality. Georgia Southern's police department has taken the initiative to partner with Residence Life to create a program that will hopefully facilitate increased positive student-officer interactions. The officers focused on socializing with the residence life community, which could humanize both sides to each other and assist in breaking down preconceived ideas about the other. With both citizens and officers understanding each other better, this should lead to less miscommunication between the two and more willingness to cooperate.

Officers also engaged in multiple crime prevention activities. These programs are the agency's attempt to be responsive to community concerns, which is a key function of community policing (Moore, 1992). These programs have until recently been mostly conducted by the two crime prevention investigators, however, now the entire patrol division was encouraged to also participate in them. Students should feel safe while on campus, and their ability to feel safe could have drastic effects on their lives. This program attempts to make students feel safer while on campus by educating them through crime prevention classes on how to better protect themselves, along with making officers more visible to the students. This study examined the student's fears so that the police department can better address them with new future programming. The RHPP did increase officer's presence in the residence halls, which hopefully made the students feel safer in their new home away from their parents.

What needs further exploration is how college student's fear of crime changes on its own during the course of their college career. Are students more fearful of crime when they first start their college career because they are fearful of the unknown? Do most college students become less fearful of crime occurring to them through the course of their college career because they become more familiar with the college environment? These are questions that should be addressed in future studies that look into fear of crime among college students.

This study examined students' and officers' perspectives on the RHPP in an attempt to make the program better or eliminate it if it is not beneficial. The Georgia Southern police department wants its officers to be satisfied with their job and if this program is not improving job satisfaction then it needs to be changed. Evaluating what we are doing is paramount to improving. The main goal of the research was to improve the work-life of the Georgia Southern officers and the college-life of the Georgia Southern students. However, through the responses it is evident that the students have different perspectives of Georgia Southern police compared to other local law enforcement agencies. Future research should examine what if any community policing efforts those other local agencies are doing which could help explain the difference in student perspectives. Another agency comparison that should be examined are the numbers of citations and arrests of students made by all the local agencies to see if these numbers are similar across all agencies.

Limitations of this Study

Community Policing programs are wide-ranging in styles and execution. Community policing programs are sometimes as simple as adding more officers on foot patrol. However, community policing programs can get more complex by getting the community actually involved not only in the program but also include them in the decision making for what the program is

going to be (Cardarelli et al. 1998). The RHPP has had citizen input in the creation of the program. Researcher Bowen met with the Assistant Director of Residence Life and it was determined jointly what the requirements for the officers and residence hall staff would be. The Assistant Director of Residence Life was also in charge of determining the number of meetings officers would have with RDs. This civilian input from the Assistant Director of Residence Life is not a member of the residence hall community. However, it was an attempt to make sure that the program has the support of those that are running the Residence Life Department which oversees RDs and RAs which are part of the community.

There are validity concerns with this study due to the researcher's position as a member of the administration of the police agency conducting the program. Because of the researcher's position, integrity questions could be posed due to the agency's desire for positive results from the research. The researcher's goal is to have created an effective program, not to get all positive responses from officers and students. If the program is not effective that information is just as important because then the researcher can adjust or remove the program completely as a department requirement. To protect the validity of the study, researcher Bowen did not access the pre-test surveys until Dr. Posick, the thesis supervisor, removed all of the identifiable information from them. In this way, researcher Bowen did not know what students or officers were participating in the study. Most police agencies do not partner with researchers to study any aspect of their job performance (Rojek et al., 2012). In a recent study, it was shown that only about one-third of police agencies that were asked stated that they have participated in research within the past five years (Rojek et al., 2012). If there is no research being conducted about the effectiveness of an agencies' programs, then there is little chance of them proving their effectiveness or improving the programs. The concerns of validity can also be countered by the

public's desire to have a more transparent police force, which studies have shown should encourage better community-police collaborations (Glaser et al., 2010).

Furthermore, the RHPP was supposed to have ended at the end of April. However, due to the outbreak of the coronavirus, the program was ended during the middle of March. On March 16th, Governor of Georgia Brian Kemp issued executive order 03.16.20.01, which closed all public elementary, secondary, and post-secondary schools in the State of Georgia in an attempt to stop the spread of COVID-19 (Executive order No. 03.16.20.01, 2020). The program was forced to end early because most of the residents of the residence halls were forced to permanently move out during the week of March 23rd through the 27th. Georgia Southern issued a directive on March 16th, closing all Resident Halls and advising students that they were not allowed to return to campus until further advised (Georgia Southern University March 16th directive, 2020). Then on March 20th, Georgia Southern issued a new directive that advised students in the Resident Halls how and when they could move out (Georgia Southern University March 20th, directive, 2020). Also, during this time all functions or events that would have more than ten people in attendance were canceled. Georgia Southern police continued to patrol; however, their patrol functions were modified. Officers were encouraged to be less proactive with citizen contacts and interactions. To reduce face to face contact with the public for the first time ever Georgia Southern police allowed supervisors to use their discretion for deciding if some calls for service could be handled completely over the phone. Until this outbreak officers were not allowed to take reports by phone and had to always meet face to face with anyone wanting to report a crime.

Additionally, the student and officer post-test surveys were originally intended to be collected throughout the entire summer 2020 semester via emails provided during the pre-test.

However, on May 25th, George Floyd was killed by Minneapolis Police Officers and a phone recorded video of the incident was made public. The video went viral sparking protests in Minneapolis against police excessive force (Deliso, 2020). Protestors first gathered in Minneapolis on May 26th, which resulted in officers eventually using force and chemical munitions against protestors (Rodgers & Kosier, 2020). After that protests against police excessive force sprung up in other cities starting on May 27th. On May 31st Georgia Southern students organized their first protest inspired by George Floyd, against police excessive force on Georgia Southern's campus (Cole, 2020). Since officer and student post-test survey collection started at the beginning of April, due to the coronavirus, these current protests had the potential to affect students' opinions of law enforcement overall. Because of this the post-test survey was officially closed on June 2nd, after consulting with Dr. Posick. By closing the post-test collection period early, it will allow the researchers to view results that are about law enforcement encounters and experiences at Georgia Southern and not about the national law enforcement movement. Only 40% (98 of 244) of the students participating in the study completed the post-test survey. There were two student post-test surveys completed on May 26th, and one on May 27th; therefore, it is unlikely that there was an influence from these current police use of force events on the study results. However, it does create the unfortunate problem of having less than half of the student participants from the pre-test participating in the post-test. The collection period for the post-test was originally supposed to end on July 31st, which means that the collection period was shortened by two months because of the national attention to police excessive force incidents.

There were 149 student pre-tests that didn't have a post-test for comparison. Comparison T-tests were conducted on the unpaired pre-tests comparing them to the paired pre-tests. When

comparing the unpaired pre-tests to the paired pre-tests their means are very similar overall.

There were very only two responses that shows statistical significance between the two groups of

student pre-tests. The questions that did show statistical significance (<0.05) were; "Police are

keeping order," and "GS police are courteous to GS students." All of the other questions didn't

deviate enough from the other group to be significant.

    This evaluation does not take into account maturation or any other outside factors

affecting student and officer perceptions. Future evaluations should create a control group to rule

out other nuisance variables that could have influence the results.

Conclusions

Statistically we know that the officers were participating in the RHPP, because they

logged increased foot patrol checks on the Residence Halls compared to the prior year, and they

logged attending 61 Residence Hall events as participants. Looking at the crime statistics there

are increased calls for service this year and more incidents reported than the prior year. However,

there was a lower number of crimes reported in the Residence Halls and lower arrests of students

from Residence Halls. Both of these trends going against the overall trends of the University

could be attributed to the increased officer presence during foot patrol and the officers attending

Residence Hall events which are both key parts of the RHPP.

Officer's showed marked increases in their perspectives towards the students. This could

be the result of increased social interaction with the students while on foot patrol or attending

Residence Hall events. The non-criminal aspects about students indicated increased perceptions

of the students in every aspect mentioned, except for "are studious" which did not change at all.

The category of "are concerned about getting a job after college" showed statistically significant

increases. This is possibly due to questions about majors and what job they want after college are common talking starting points. In the criminal aspects about students, all but two perceptions of the students showed improvement. The two categories that did not improve were "disregard or ignoring a traffic control device" and "intentionally start a fire with the purpose of damaging something." There were six arson incidents this year by one student, in the prior year there were not any arson incidents. There were two categories that were statistically significant "steal a bicycle" and "steal an unattended item," and one category that came very close to being statistically significant "commit entering auto." All of the largest changes in perspectives about criminality concern theft crimes, which is an unforeseen trend in the officer changes in perspective.

Unfortunately, this evaluation does not indicate that officers improved their job satisfaction level. Job satisfaction is a difficult variable to quantify. The one variable in the job satisfaction question that showed improvement was in the section "better than most in law enforcement." An increase in this variable with no other increase in the other job satisfaction variables could indicate that officers are just less satisfied with the profession overall instead of being less satisfied with this agency as a result of having to participate in the RHPP.

This evaluation indicates that the student's perspectives on police are complex. Students showed positive changes across the board when considering how police deal with different community groups. However, they also indicated statistically significant negative changes when considering how police harass Georgia Southern students and how well police are solving the crimes that occur. Even though most of the mean changes became worse when looking at student perspectives of police, the questions that had the highest satisfaction levels were those concerning how Georgia Southern police interact with students. This could indicate that even

though student satisfaction in police overall did not improve due to this program, maybe this program did assist in keeping students more satisfied with the Georgia Southern police. Another positive indicator that this program has influenced students to like police more, is the results from the qualitative question in the post-test where students were given an opportunity to share any positive or negative interaction they have had with Georgia Southern police over the past academic year. Of the 25 total responses to this question 76% (19) of those were positive. This shows that this program has created opportunities that resulted in positive officer-student interactions.

A definite positive outcome of this evaluation is that during the academic year students overall indicated a reduction in their fear of crime while on campus. Every possible crime proposed to the students in this survey showed a reduction in fear over the course of the academic year. There was only one section that showed a statistically significant reduction which was concerning car crime either being broken into or damaged. This across the board reduction in fear of crime, even though it was mostly not statistically significant, is a great indication that this program succeeded in achieving its goal of reducing students' fear.

The RHPP evaluation does indicate that it improved the officer's perspectives of students and reduced the student's fear of crime. The RHPP does not indicate that it improved officer job satisfaction and student perspectives of officers. However, the results in these two sections were not completely negative, and because of the mixed results more study into these elements is recommended. After examining the crime statistics, the RHPP does appear to have helped in reducing the amount of crimes and arrests in Residence Halls. This evaluation year was fraught with complications due to the COVID-19 pandemic; however, looking at the results of this program evaluation, the RHPP was a success and is worth continuing.

REFERENCES

Baxley, M. (2018). Breaking Down the First Home Swim Meet and Everything Surrounding it. *The George-Anne.* http://www.thegeorgeanne.com/sports/article_4a409870-d7a5-11e8-b095-178d83d75763.html

Brown, L. P. (1989). *Community Policing: A Practical Guide for Police Officials.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice. https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/118001.pdf

Cole, A. (2020). Hundreds of protestors gathered on-campus for the "Justice for Us" march. *The George-Anne.* http://www.thegeorgeanne.com/news/article_41e8656c-a37e-11ea-a22f-f38816fda281.html

Deliso, Meredith (2020). Timeline: The impact of George Floyd's death in Minneapolis and beyond. ABC news. https://abcnews.go.com/US/timeline-impact-george-floyds-death-minneapolis/story?id=70999322.

Enfinger, M. (2018). Georgia Southern President Announces Plans to Improve Diversity and Inclusion on Campus. *The George-Anne.* http://www.thegeorgeanne.com/news/article_6a66a1ae-3da1-56f9-883f-bd4b7e92c5af.html

Executive Order No. 03.16.20.01. (2020). School Closures to Stop Spread of COVID-19. https://gov.georgia.gov/executive-action/executive-orders/2020-executive-orders

Frost, J. A. (2007). Predictors of job satisfaction and turnover intention of police organizations: A procedural approach. In *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences.*

Georgia Southern University (2019). Student Enrollment Data. https://em.georgiasouthern.edu/ir/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/GS_Fall2018FastFacts.pdf

Georgia Southern University March 16th directive (2020). Suspension of instruction for two weeks. https://www.georgiasouthern.edu/covid-19-information/

Georgia Southern University March 20th directive (2020). New operational status. https://www.georgiasouthern.edu/covid-19-information/

Getahun, S., Sims, B., & Hummer, D. (2008). *Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment Among Probation and Parole Officers: A Case Study.* Purdue University.

Glaser, M. A., & Denhardt, J. (2010). Community policing and community building: A case study of officer perceptions. *American Review of Public Administration*. https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074009340050

Goldstein, H. (1979). Improving Policing: A Problem-Oriented Approach. Crime & Delinquency. https://doi.org/10.1177/001112877902500207

Goldstein, H. (1987). Toward Community-Oriented Policing: Potential, Basic Requirements, and Threshold Questions. Crime & Delinquency. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128787033001002

Gordner, G. (2015). Community Policing Elements and Effects. *Critical Issues in Policing: Contemporary Readings.* (pp. 481-498). Waveland, Press, Inc.

Greene, J. R. (1989). Police officer job satisfaction and community perceptions: Implications for community-oriented policing. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022427889026002004

Haberman, C. P., Groff, E. R., Ratcliffe, J. H., & Sorg, E. T. (2016). Satisfaction With Police in Violent Crime Hot Spots: Using Community Surveys as a Guide for Selecting Hot Spots Policing Tactics. Crime and Delinquency. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128713516840

Kelling, G. L., & Moore, M. H. (2019). The Evolving Strategy of Policing. *The Policing & Society: Touchstone Readings* (4th ed., pp. 2-26). Long Grove, IL: Waveland.

Livesafe. (2018). Livesafe. https://finops.georgiasouthern.edu/publicsafety/contact-us/livesafe/#:~:text=LiveSafe,Southern%20students%2C%20faculty%20and%20staff

Lurigio, A. J., & Skogan, W. G. (1994). Winning the Hearts and Minds of Police Officers: An Assessment of Staff Perceptions of Community Policing in Chicago. Crime & Delinquency. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128794040003002

Margulies, J. (2016). Clear Thinking About the Ferguson Effect. https://verdict.justia.com/2016/10/31/clear-thinking-ferguson-effect

McElroy, J., Cosgrove, C., & Sadd, S. (1990). *CPOP: The Research: An Evaluative Study of the New York City Community Patrol Officer Program.* New York, NY: Vera Institute of Justice.

Miller, D. (1994). *Community Oriented Policing,* Law Enforcement Management Institute, McAllen, TX.

Moore, M. H. (1992). Problem-Solving and Community Policing. Crime and Justice. https://doi.org/10.1086/449194

Oliver, W. M. (1998). *Community-Oriented Policing: A Systemic Approach to Policing.* 51. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall. Inc.

Palmiotto, M. J., & Donahue, M. E. (1995). Evaluating community policing: problems and prospects. Police Studies: Intnl Review of Police Development. https://doi.org/10.1108/13639519510368460

R.A.D. systems (2020). Rape Aggression Defense Systems. http://www.rad-systems.com/rad_package.html

Richardson, L. S. (2018). Implicit Racial Bias and Racial Anxiety: Implications for Stops and Frisks. *Ohio State Journal of Criminal Law.* http://escholarship.org/uc/item/5dm8r131

Rodgers, J., & Kosier, A. (2020). The last days of May: A visual timeline of the George Floyd Protests. *Minnesota Daily,* 06-08-2020. https://www.mndaily.com/article/2020/06/pf-the-george-floyd-protests-a-visual-timeline

Rojek, J., Smith, H. P., & Alpert, G. P. (2012). The Prevalence and Characteristics of Police Practitioner-Researcher Partnerships. Police Quarterly. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098611112440698

Rosenbaum, D. P. (1988). Community crime prevention: A review and synthesis of the literature. Justice Quarterly. https://doi.org/10.1080/07418828800089781

Rosenbaum, D. (1994). *The Challenge of Community Policing, Testing the Promises.* viii. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Skogan, W. G. (1994). The Impact of Neighborhood Policing on Neighborhood Residents: A Cross-Site Analysis. *The Challenge of Community Policing: Testing the Promises,* 180. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Skogan, W. G. (2009). Concern about crime and confidence in the police: Reassurance or accountability? Police Quarterly. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098611109339893

Steinmetz, K. F., & Gerber, J. (2014). "The Greatest Crime Syndicate since the Gambinos": A Hacker Critique of Government, Law, and Law Enforcement. Deviant Behavior. https://doi.org/10.1080/01639625.2013.823344

Stojkovic, S., Kalinich, D. B., & Klofas, J. (2012). *Criminal Justice Organizations: Administration and Management.* (5th ed.). Stamford, CT: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.

Trojanowicz, R., & Bucqueroux, B. (1991). *Community Policing and the challenge of diversity*. National Institute of Justice. Michigan State University. http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/Photocopy/134975NCJRS.pdf

Tyler, T. R. (2004). Enhancing Police Legitimacy. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,* 593, 84-99. https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/4127668.pdf

University Housing (2019). Break Closing & Housing. https://auxiliary.georgiasouthern.edu/housing/current-students/break-closings-housing/

U. S. Census Bureau (2010). Retrieved December 11, 2019, from https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/statesborocitygeorgia,US/POP010210

U. S. Department of Justice. (2016). Importance of Police-Community Relationships and Resources for Further Reading. *Community Relations Services Toolkit for Policing,* Retrieved from https://www.justice.gov/crs/file/836486/download

U. S. Department of Justice. (2019). Uniform Crime Reporting Statistics. Retrieved December 12, 2019, from https://www.ucrdatatool.gov/Search/Crime/State/RunCrimeStatebyState.cfm

Wolfe, S. E., & Nix, J. (2016). The alleged "ferguson effect" and police willingness to engage in community partnership. Law and Human Behavior. https://doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000164

Wycoff, M. A., & Skogan, W. (1993). *Community Policing in Madison: Quality From the Inside Out: An Evaluation of its Implementation and Impact.* (Final Technical Report). Washington, D.C.: The Police Foundation.

APPENDIX A

Residence Hall Partnership Program outline

PURPOSE AND SCOPE

Georgia Southern University Public Safety shall provide for the establishment of a Residence

Hall Partnership Program to ensure that sworn members of the department have an opportunity

to reach out to the university community. The emphasis of the program shall be to enhance the

knowledge, skills, and abilities of the sworn member as it relates to university resident and

community issues. In turn, this should influence the professionalism, effectiveness, and

efficiency of the sworn member, thereby fostering a positive image of the agency and creating a

more positive working, learning, and living environment.

POLICY

Georgia Southern University Public Safety shall utilize the Residence Hall Partnership Program

for the development of sworn members and members of the university community as a means to

enhance knowledge, skills, and abilities; foster a sense of professionalism and cooperation, as

well as improve the effectiveness of the agency in accomplishing goals and objectives. The

Crime Prevention Coordinator shall coordinate the implementation of the program in

consultation with the Director and Assistant Director for Public Safety. It shall be the duty and

responsibility of supervisors of Georgia Southern University Public Safety to evaluate and

counsel assigned members and employees regarding participation in the Residence Hall

Partnership Program.

INFORMATION

In order to provide the best quality of service to the Georgia Southern University community, the

Department of Public Safety has partnered with the university community to educate and inform university community members on the topics of campus and personal safety. Georgia Southern University Police Officers take part in the Residence Hall Partnership Program and conduct periodic safety programming, spend extra time patrolling their assigned areas, and are readily available to speak with community members on safety related questions or concerns. Officers work closely with the Residence Hall Directors, Community Leaders, and Housing Staff of each residential area on campus to maintain resident safety.

CRIME PREVENTION COORDINATOR RESPONSIBILITIES

The Crime Prevention Coordinator, in consultation with the Director and Assistant Director for Public Safety, will assign sworn members of the Georgia Southern University Public Safety Department to participate in the Residence Hall Partnership Program prior to shift rotation.

OFFICER RESPONSIBILITIES

All sworn members are required to participate when assigned and will be held accountable for their participation in the program on their yearly employment evaluation reviews.

Procedures

Upon assignment to a residence facility the sworn members are required to do the following:

Day Shift Rotations

1. Conduct at least one (1) inspection (walk-through of common areas) of the residence facility per **SHIFT**.

2. Conduct at least one (1) **Monthly** meeting (30 Minutes) with the Resident Director to discuss any concerns and conduct a walkthrough of the common area identifying any trouble area or areas of concern.

    a. This meeting and this walkthrough can be completed at the same time

     b. This meeting should be scheduled with the RD

     c. If both parties agree a meeting is not needed they can communicate with each other and skip that meeting. This must be agreed upon by both parties and should only happen once a month.

3. Monitor crime reports that originate or affect the residence facility.

4. Conduct at least one (2) door check (minimum of 10 doors) for Smarties and Dum Dums per month (results must be logged and turned into Crime Prevention Coordinator).

Night Shift Rotations

1. Conduct at least one (1) inspection (walk-through of common areas) with the on-duty Community Leader or Resident Director per **SHIFT**.

2. Night Shift rotation officers must attend the building weekly staff meeting every **month**. These meetings vary in times but will be the same time each week.

     a. During this meeting CL, RD and UPD officers should see if there are any areas of concern that need to be addressed

     b. Share any problems the CL or RD are seeing in the building and would like to address

     c. Update UPD about any upcoming programs for the hall

     d. They should also get to know one another

3. Monitor crime reports that originate or affect the residence facility.

4. Attend two (2) Residence Hall programs originating in the Residence facility per semester.

UPD Investigator

1. Attend the weekly Residence Education Staff meeting to do a check in with the staff

   about this program and any area of concern across the campus.

APPENDIX B

Student Survey

Welcome to the research study!

We are interested in understanding Community Policing. You will be presented with information relevant to Policing and asked to answer some questions about it. Please be assured that your responses will be kept completely confidential.

The study should take you around 15 minutes to complete. Your participation in this research is voluntary. You have the right to withdraw at any point during the study, for any reason, and without any prejudice. If you would like to contact the Principal Investigator in the study to discuss this research, please email cbowen@georgiasouthern.edu

By clicking the button below, you acknowledge that your participation in the study is voluntary, you are 18 years of age, and that you are aware that you may choose to terminate your participation in the study at any time and for any reason.

Please note that this survey will be best displayed on a laptop or desktop computer. Some features may be less compatible for use on a mobile device. There will be a follow-up survey sent to your Georgia Southern email address in the Spring semester.
    1.   Principal Investigator: Charles Bowen, Graduate student of the Criminal Justice and Criminology Department; Master's Thesis research project. Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this research is to evaluate the effectiveness of Georgia Southern University Police Department's community policing program (aka. Residence Hall partnership program) from the students and officers' perspectives. Procedures to be followed: Participation in this research will include taking an initial survey during the beginning of the Fall 2019 semester. Then in April of the Spring 2020 semester all student and officer participants of the first surveys will be contacted via email to take the follow-up surveys. Discomforts and Risks: Some questions might increase a participant's emotional state. While each question is important for the research, and thus included in the survey, all questions are voluntary. Contact information for the counseling center and to the University Police Department will be provided in case follow-up is necessary. Benefits: The benefits to participants include students that attend the Sept. 20th safety event and complete this survey will be entered into a raffle to win a $25. gift card for the University Store for the completion of the first survey. Officers won't have any benefits for completing either survey. There won't be any benefit offered for the students to complete the second survey. The benefits to society include evaluating and better understanding a community partnership program that will impact Georgia Southern students and officers. This will benefit future community policing efforts at Georgia Southern University and possibly other locations.   Duration/Time required from the participant: Is the time it takes to fill out two surveys. The first survey will be given at the beginning of the Fall 2019 semester and the second survey is at the end of the Spring 2020 semester. Statement of Confidentiality: Doctor Chad Posick will have access to all the information. Charles Bowen will only have access to the data once personal identifiers have been removed. It will be maintained at Georgia Southern

University's Police Department on an encrypted and secure server. All data will be saved for a minimum of three years. Future use of data: Identifiable information will be removed during the analysis stage of this study. De-identified or coded data from this study may be placed in a publicly available repository for study validation and further research. You will not be identified by name in the data set or any reports using information obtained from this study, and your confidentiality as a participant in this study will remain secure. Subsequent uses of records and data will be subject to standard data use policies which protect the anonymity of individuals and institutions. Right to Ask Questions: You have the right to ask questions and have those questions answered. If you have questions about this study, please contact the researcher named above or the researcher's faculty adviser, whose contact information is located at the end of the informed consent. For questions concerning your rights as a research participant, contact Georgia Southern University Institutional Review Board at 912-478-5465. Compensation: Students that attend the Sept. 20th public safety event and complete the survey there will have the incentive of being entered into a raffle for a $25. gift card at the University Store for participating in the first survey. There will be 3 of these $25. gift cards being raffled off in total during the Safety event on September 20th 2019. All gift cards will be purchased using student fees from the Residential Housings budget. There is no incentive for officers to participate, there is also no incentive for the students to complete the follow-up survey during the Spring semester of 2020. Voluntary Participation: You are not required to participate in this study. You may terminate your participation at any time by telling the PI. You do not have to answer questions you do not wish you answer. Any findings that may reveal themselves during the course of the research and may impact your disposition to participate in the study will be provided to you. Penalty: There are no penalties for not participating in this study. You must be 18 years of age or older to consent to participate in this research study. If a participant consents to participate in the study then indicated that they are under 18 in the age question of the survey they will be removed from the study. You will be given a copy of this consent form to keep for your records. This project has been reviewed and approved by the GSU Institutional Review Board under tracking number H_20023_____. Title of Project: Community Policing at Georgia Southern University   Principal Investigator: Charles Bowen,   1220 Forest Drive   Statesboro, Ga 30460   912-478-3026   cbowen@georgiasouthern.edu   Research Advisor: Dr. Chad PosickP.O. BOX 8105Statesboro, Ga 30460912-478-7098cposick@georgiasouthern.edu   You will be given a copy of this consent form to keep for your records. This project has been reviewed and approved by the GSU Institutional Review Board under tracking number H_20023_____.   Title of Project: Community Policing at Georgia Southern University   Principal Investigator: Charles Bowen,   1220 Forest Drive   Statesboro, Ga 30460   912-478-3026   cbowen@georgiasouthern.edu   Research Advisor: Dr. Chad Posick P.O. BOX 8105 Statesboro, Ga 30460 912-478-7098 cposick@georgiasouthern.edu

○ I consent, begin the study

○ I do not consent, I do not wish to participate, or I'm under the age of 18

How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements about satisfaction with police services where you lived before coming to Georgia Southern University?

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
The police are dealing with the problems that really concern people.	○	○	○	○	○
Police are keeping order.	○	○	○	○	○
The job police are doing is reducing violent crime.	○	○	○	○	○
The job police are doing is reducing non-violent crime.	○	○	○	○	○
Police are solving the crimes that occur.	○	○	○	○	○
The job police are doing is preventing crime.	○	○	○	○	○

How fearful are you of this crime occurring to you?

	Not at all	Hardly ever	Some of the time	All of the time	Don't know
Resident Hall (home) break in/ burglary	○	○	○	○	○
Car crime (damaged, or broken into)	○	○	○	○	○
Being physically assaulted on campus	○	○	○	○	○
Theft of your property on campus	○	○	○	○	○
Cybercrime (stolen identity, scam, stolen credit card info)	○	○	○	○	○
Being sexually assaulted on campus	○	○	○	○	○

How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your attitudes towards Georgia Southern (GS) police?

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
GS Police harass GS students	○	○	○	○	○
GS Police are courteous to GS students	○	○	○	○	○
GS Police are professional	○	○	○	○	○

How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your attitudes towards other local area police and law enforcement (excluding Georgia Southern Police) in the area of Georgia Southern University?

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
Local agencies harass GS students	○	○	○	○	○
Local agencies are courteous to GS students	○	○	○	○	○
Local agencies are professional	○	○	○	○	○

Do you feel that police interact professionally, courteously, and appropriately when dealing with...

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
Hispanic community	○	○	○	○	○
African American community	○	○	○	○	○
Members of the LGBTQIA+ (Lesbian, Gay, Bi-sexual, Transgender, Queer, Intersex, Asexual) community	○	○	○	○	○
Women	○	○	○	○	○
Victims of sexual assault	○	○	○	○	○
White men	○	○	○	○	○

Have you had any interactions with Police before coming to Georgia Southern? Check all that apply.

☐ No

☐ Yes as a victim of a crime

☐ Yes as a witness

☐ Yes as an suspect

☐ Yes during a traffic stop

☐ Yes as a social interaction

☐ Yes I have Police family members or friends

Do you have the Livesafe app on your phone?

○ Yes

○ No

What is the approximate population of the place you lived before coming to Georgia Southern?

○ Less than 10,000

○ Between 10,000-50,000

○ Between 50,001-100,000

○ Between 100,001-300,000

○ Over 300,001

What is your families approximate household yearly income?

○ Less than $25,000

○ Between $25,000-$80,000

○ Between $80,001-$200,000

○ Between $200,001-$300,000

○ Over $300,001

What is your major?

_____

What is your Sex?

◯ Male

◯ Female

◯ Other

What is your Race?

◯ White

◯ Hispanic or Latino

◯ Black or African American

◯ Native American or American Indian

◯ Asian / Pacific Islander

◯ Other

How old are you?

_____

My GS email address is _____@georgiasouthern.edu

_____

APPENDIX C

Student Follow-Up Survey

Welcome to the research study!

We are interested in understanding Community Policing. You will be presented with information relevant to Policing and asked to answer some questions about it. Please be assured that your responses will be kept completely confidential.

 The study should take you around 15 minutes to complete. Your participation in this research is voluntary. You have the right to withdraw at any point during the study, for any reason, and without any prejudice. If you would like to contact the Principal Investigator in the study to discuss this research, please email cbowen@georgiasouthern.edu

 By clicking the button below, you acknowledge that your participation in the study is voluntary, you are 18 years of age, and that you are aware that you may choose to terminate your participation in the study at any time and for any reason.

 Please note that this survey will be best displayed on a laptop or desktop computer. Some features may be less compatible for use on a mobile device. There will be a follow-up survey sent to your Georgia Southern email address in the Spring semester.

1.   Principal Investigator: Charles Bowen, Graduate student of the Criminal Justice and Criminology Department; Master's Thesis research project. Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this research is to evaluate the effectiveness of Georgia Southern University Police Department's community policing program (aka. Residence Hall partnership program) from the students and officers' perspectives. Procedures to be followed: Participation in this research will include taking an initial survey during the beginning of the Fall 2019 semester. Then in April of the Spring 2020 semester all student and officer participants of the first surveys will be contacted via email to take the follow-up surveys. Discomforts and Risks: Some questions might increase a participant's emotional state. While each question is important for the research, and thus included in the survey, all questions are voluntary. Contact information for the counseling center and to the University Police Department will be provided in case follow-up is necessary. Benefits: The benefits to participants include students that attend the Sept. 20th safety event and complete this survey will be entered into a raffle to win a $25. gift card for the University Store for the completion of the first survey. Officers won't have any benefits for completing either survey. There won't be any benefit offered for the students to complete the second survey. The benefits to society include evaluating and better understanding a community partnership program that will impact Georgia Southern students and officers. This will benefit future community policing efforts at Georgia Southern University and possibly other locations.   Duration/Time required from the participant: Is the time it takes to fill out two surveys. The first survey will be given at the beginning of the Fall 2019 semester and the second survey is at the end of the Spring 2020 semester. Statement of Confidentiality: Doctor Chad

Posick will have access to all the information. Charles Bowen will only have access to the data once personal identifiers have been removed. It will be maintained at Georgia Southern University's Police Department on an encrypted and secure server. All data will be saved for a minimum of three years. Future use of data: Identifiable information will be removed during the analysis stage of this study. De-identified or coded data from this study may be placed in a publicly available repository for study validation and further research. You will not be identified by name in the data set or any reports using information obtained from this study, and your confidentiality as a participant in this study will remain secure. Subsequent uses of records and data will be subject to standard data use policies which protect the anonymity of individuals and institutions. Right to Ask Questions: You have the right to ask questions and have those questions answered. If you have questions about this study, please contact the researcher named above or the researcher's faculty adviser, whose contact information is located at the end of the informed consent. For questions concerning your rights as a research participant, contact Georgia Southern University Institutional Review Board at 912-478-5465. Compensation: Students that attend the Sept. 20th public safety event and complete the survey there will have the incentive of being entered into a raffle for a $25. gift card at the University Store for participating in the first survey. There will be 3 of these $25. gift cards being raffled off in total during the Safety event on September 20th 2019. All gift cards will be purchased using student fees from the Residential Housings budget. There is no incentive for officers to participate, there is also no incentive for the students to complete the follow-up survey during the Spring semester of 2020. Voluntary Participation: You are not required to participate in this study. You may terminate your participation at any time by telling the PI. You do not have to answer questions you do not wish you answer. Any findings that may reveal themselves during the course of the research and may impact your disposition to participate in the study will be provided to you. Penalty: There are no penalties for not participating in this study. You must be 18 years of age or older to consent to participate in this research study. If a participant consents to participate in the study then indicated that they are under 18 in the age question of the survey they will be removed from the study. You will be given a copy of this consent form to keep for your records. This project has been reviewed and approved by the GSU Institutional Review Board under tracking number H_20023_____. Title of Project: Community Policing at Georgia Southern University   Principal Investigator: Charles Bowen,   1220 Forest Drive   Statesboro, Ga 30460   912-478-3026   cbowen@georgiasouthern.edu   Research Advisor: Dr. Chad PosickP.O. BOX 8105Statesboro, Ga 30460912-478-7098cposick@georgiasouthern.edu
You will be given a copy of this consent form to keep for your records. This project has been reviewed and approved by the GSU Institutional Review Board under tracking number H_20023_____. Title of Project: Community Policing at Georgia Southern University   Principal Investigator: Charles Bowen,   1220 Forest Drive   Statesboro, Ga 30460   912-478-3026   cbowen@georgiasouthern.edu   Research Advisor: Dr. Chad PosickP.O. BOX 8105Statesboro, Ga 30460912-478-7098cposick@georgiasouthern.edu

○ I consent, begin the study

○ I do not consent, I do not wish to participate, or I'm under the age of 18

How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements about satisfaction with police services since coming to Georgia Southern?

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
The police are dealing with the problems that really concern people.	○	○	○	○	○
Police are keeping order.	○	○	○	○	○
The job police are doing is reducing violent crime.	○	○	○	○	○
The job police are doing is reducing non-violent crime.	○	○	○	○	○
Police are solving the crimes that occur.	○	○	○	○	○
The job police are doing is preventing crime.	○	○	○	○	○

How fearful are you of this crime occurring to you?

	Not at all	Hardly ever	Some of the time	All of the time	Don't know
Resident Hall (home) break in/ burglary	○	○	○	○	○
Car crime (damaged, or broken into)	○	○	○	○	○
Being physically assaulted on campus	○	○	○	○	○
Theft of your property on campus	○	○	○	○	○
Cybercrime (stolen identity, scam, stolen credit card info)	○	○	○	○	○
Being sexually assaulted on campus	○	○	○	○	○

How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements about attitudes towards Georgia Southern (GS) police?

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
GS Police harass GS students	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
GS Police are courteous to GS students	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
GS Police are professional	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements about attitudes towards other local area police and law enforcement (excluding Georgia Southern Police) in the area of Georgia Southern University?

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
Local agencies harass GS students	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Local agencies are courteous to GS students	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Local agencies are professional	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

Do you feel that police interact professionally, courteously, and appropriately when dealing with...

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
Hispanic community	○	○	○	○	○
African American community	○	○	○	○	○
Members of the LGBTQIA+ (Lesbian, Gay, Bi-sexual, Transgender, Queer, Intersex, Asexual) community	○	○	○	○	○
Women	○	○	○	○	○
Victims of sexual assault	○	○	○	○	○
White men	○	○	○	○	○

Have you had any interactions with Police since coming to Georgia Southern? Check all that apply.

☐ No

☐ Yes as a victim of a crime

☐ Yes as a witness

☐ Yes as an suspect

☐ Yes during a traffic stop

☐ Yes as a social interaction

☐ Yes I have Police family members or friends

Do you have the Livesafe app on your phone?

○ Yes

○ No

If you have the Livesafe app on your phone, how often have you used it during Fall 2019 and Spring 2020?

○ I haven't used it

○ Once

○ Between 2-5 times

○ More than 5 times

Can you name any Georgia Southern Police officers? If yes, provide as many of their names as possible.

_____

Did you attend any events this year in your Residence Hall where GS police were in attendance? If yes list the events.

_____

Have you had any positive or negative interaction with any GS Police officers that you want to share with us?

_____

What Residence Hall(s) did you live in this year. Check all that apply

☐ Centennial Place

☐ Eagle Village

☐ Southern Pines

☐ Kennedy Hall

☐ Watson Hall

☐ Freedoms Landing

☐ Southern Courtyard

☐ University Villas

☐ Windward Commons

☐ Compass Point

☐ University Crossings

☐ University Terrace

☐ I didn't live in a Residence Hall

My GS email address is _____@georgiasouthern.edu

_____

APPENDIX D

Officer Survey

We are interested in understanding Community Policing. You will be presented with information relevant to Policing and asked to answer some questions about it. Please be assured that your responses will be kept completely confidential.

The study should take you around 15 minutes to complete. Your participation in this research is voluntary. You have the right to withdraw at any point during the study, for any reason, and without any prejudice. If you would like to contact the Principal Investigator in the study to discuss this research, please email cbowen@georgiasouthern.edu

By clicking the button below, you acknowledge that your participation in the study is voluntary, you are 18 years of age, and that you are aware that you may choose to terminate your participation in the study at any time and for any reason.

Please note that this survey will be best displayed on a laptop or desktop computer. Some features may be less compatible for use on a mobile device. There will be a follow-up survey sent to your Georgia Southern email address in the Spring semester.
 1.   Principal Investigator: Charles Bowen, Graduate student of the Criminal Justice and Criminology Department; Master's Thesis research project.   Purpose   of the Study: The purpose of   this research is to evaluate the effectiveness of Georgia Southern   University Police Department's community policing program (aka. Residence   Hall partnership program) from the students and officers' perspectives.   Procedures   to be followed: Participation in this research will include taking an initial survey during the beginning   of the Fall 2019 semester. Then in April of the Spring 2020 semester all   student and officer participants of the first surveys will be contacted   via email to take the follow-up surveys.   Discomforts   and Risks: Some questions might   increase a participant's emotional state. While each question is important   for the research, and thus included in the survey, all questions are   voluntary. Contact information for the counseling center and to the   University Police Department will be provided in case follow-up is   necessary.   Benefits: The benefits to participants include students that attend the Sept. 20th safety event and complete this survey will be entered into a raffle to win a $25. gift card for the University   Store for the completion of the first survey. Officers won't have any   benefits for completing either survey. There won't be any benefit offered   for the students to complete the second survey. The benefits to society include evaluating and better understanding a community partnership program that   will impact Georgia Southern students and officers. This will benefit   future community policing efforts at Georgia Southern University and   possibly other locations.   Duration/Time   required from the participant: Is   the time it takes to fill out two surveys. The first survey will be given   at the beginning of the Fall 2019 semester and the second survey is at the   end of the Spring 2020 semester.   Statement   of Confidentiality: Doctor Chad   Posick will have access to all the information. Charles Bowen will only   have access to the data once personal identifiers have been removed. It   will be maintained at Georgia Southern University's Police Department on an encrypted and secure server. All data will be saved for a minimum of   three years.   Future

use of data: Identifiable information will be   removed during the analysis stage of this study. De-identified or coded   data from this study may be placed in a publicly available repository for study validation and further research. You will not be   identified by name in the data set or any reports using information   obtained from this study, and your confidentiality as a participant in   this study will remain secure. Subsequent uses of records and data will be subject to standard data use policies which protect the anonymity of   individuals and institutions.   Right   to Ask Questions: You have the   right to ask questions and have those questions answered. If you have questions about this study,   please contact the researcher named above or the researcher's faculty   adviser, whose contact information is located at the end of the informed   consent. For questions concerning   your rights as a research participant, contact Georgia Southern University   Institutional Review Board at 912-478-5465.   Compensation: Students that attend the Sept. 20th public safety event and complete the survey there will have the incentive of being   entered into a raffle for a $25. gift card at the University Store for   participating in the first survey. There will be 3 of these $25. gift cards being raffled off in total during the Safety event on September 20th   2019. All gift cards will be purchased using student fees from the Residential   Housings budget. There is no incentive for officers to participate, there   is also no incentive for the students to complete the follow-up survey   during the Spring semester of 2020.   Voluntary   Participation: You are not   required to participate in this study. You may terminate your   participation at any time by telling the PI. You do not have to answer   questions you do not wish you answer. Any findings that may reveal   themselves during the course of the research and may impact your disposition to participate in the study will be provided to you.   Penalty: There are no penalties for not participating in   this study.   You   must be 18 years of age or older to consent to participate in this   research study. If a participant   consents to participate in the study then indicated that they are under 18   in the age question of the survey they will be removed from the study. You will be given a copy of this consent form to keep for your records. This project has been reviewed and approved by the GSU Institutional Review Board under tracking number H_20023_____. Title of Project: Community Policing at Georgia Southern University   Principal Investigator: Charles Bowen,   1220 Forest Drive   Statesboro, Ga 30460   912-478-3026   cbowen@georgiasouthern.edu   Research Advisor: Dr. Chad PosickP.O. BOX 8105Statesboro, Ga 30460912-478-7098cposick@georgiasouthern.edu

◯ I consent, begin the study

◯ I do not consent, I do not wish to participate, or I'm under the age of 18

Thinking about the average Georgia Southern University student, do you think they...

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
Are studious?	○	○	○	○	○
Are here to party?	○	○	○	○	○
Support law enforcement?	○	○	○	○	○
Hate law enforcement?	○	○	○	○	○
Want to help officers solve problems?	○	○	○	○	○
Are respectful towards officers?	○	○	○	○	○
Are honest?	○	○	○	○	○
Are immature?	○	○	○	○	○
Are concerned about getting a job after college?	○	○	○	○	○
Bend easily to peer pressure?	○	○	○	○	○
Are elitist or are overly concerned with their status?	○	○	○	○	○
are "good" people?	○	○	○	○	○

To what extent do you feel like your job is...

	Like a great deal	Like a moderate amount	Like a little	Neither like nor dislike	Dislike a little	Dislike a moderate amount	Dislike a great deal
Worthwhile?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Enjoyable?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Better than most in Law Enforcement?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
A good job to have?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
An excellent job?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
A job at which you are content?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
A job with which you are satisfied?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Thinking of the average Georgia Southern University student, how likely would one be to...

	Very likely	Likely	Unlikely	Very unlikely	Don't know
Smoke marijuana?	○	○	○	○	○
Drink underage?	○	○	○	○	○
Speed while driving?	○	○	○	○	○
Disregard or ignore a traffic control device?	○	○	○	○	○
Use a cell phone (not handsfree) while driving?	○	○	○	○	○
Steal a bicycle?	○	○	○	○	○
Steal an unattended item?	○	○	○	○	○
Intentionally start a fire with the purpose of damaging something?	○	○	○	○	○
Get into a physical altercation with someone?	○	○	○	○	○
Commit entering-auto?	○	○	○	○	○
Sexually assault someone?	○	○	○	○	○

How strongly do you agree or disagree that the Residence hall partnership program will be effective at improving...

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
Student-officer relations?	○	○	○	○	○
Student's perspectives of officers?	○	○	○	○	○
Officer's perspectives of students?	○	○	○	○	○
the safety in Residence halls?	○	○	○	○	○

When it comes to politics I lean...

○ Very conservative

○ Somewhat conservative

○ In the middle

○ Somewhat liberal

○ Very liberal

How many years have you worked in Law Enforcement?

_____

How long have you been working for Georgia Southern's Police department?

_____

What is your Sex ?

○ Male

○ Female

○ Other

What is your race?

○ White

○ Hispanic or Latino

○ Black or African American

○ Native American or American Indian

○ Asian / Pacific islander

○ Other

How old are you?

_____

- -

What is your GS email address _____@georgiasouthern.edu

APPENDIX E

Officer Follow-Up Survey

Welcome to the research study!

We are interested in understanding Community Policing. You will be presented with information relevant to Policing and asked to answer some questions about it. Please be assured that your responses will be kept completely confidential.

 The study should take you around 15 minutes to complete. Your participation in this research is voluntary. You have the right to withdraw at any point during the study, for any reason, and without any prejudice. If you would like to contact the Principal Investigator in the study to discuss this research, please email cbowen@georgiasouthern.edu

 By clicking the button below, you acknowledge that your participation in the study is voluntary, you are 18 years of age, and that you are aware that you may choose to terminate your participation in the study at any time and for any reason.

 Please note that this survey will be best displayed on a laptop or desktop computer. Some features may be less compatible for use on a mobile device. There will be a follow-up survey sent to your Georgia Southern email address in the Spring semester.

1.   1.   Principal Investigator: Charles Bowen, Graduate student of the Criminal Justice and Criminology Department; Master's Thesis research project. Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this research is to evaluate the effectiveness of Georgia Southern University Police Department's community policing program (aka. Residence Hall partnership program) from the students and officers' perspectives. Procedures to be followed: Participation in this research will include taking an initial survey during the beginning of the Fall 2019 semester. Then in April of the Spring 2020 semester all student and officer participants of the first surveys will be contacted via email to take the follow-up surveys. Discomforts and Risks: Some questions might increase a participant's emotional state. While each question is important for the research, and thus included in the survey, all questions are voluntary. Contact information for the counseling center and to the University Police Department will be provided in case follow-up is necessary. Benefits: The benefits to participants include students that attend the Sept. 20th safety event and complete this survey will be entered into a raffle to win a $25. gift card for the University Store for the completion of the first survey. Officers won't have any benefits for completing either survey. There won't be any benefit offered for the students to complete the second survey. The benefits to society include evaluating and better understanding a community partnership program that will impact Georgia Southern students and officers. This will benefit future community policing efforts at Georgia Southern University and possibly other locations.   Duration/Time required from the participant: Is the time it takes to fill out two surveys. The first survey will be given at the beginning of the Fall 2019 semester and the second survey is at the end of the Spring 2020 semester. Statement of Confidentiality: Doctor Chad Posick will have access to all the information. Charles Bowen will only have access to the data

once personal identifiers have been removed. It will be maintained at Georgia Southern University's Police Department on an encrypted and secure server. All data will be saved for a minimum of three years. Future use of data: Identifiable information will be removed during the analysis stage of this study. De-identified or coded data from this study may be placed in a publicly available repository for study validation and further research. You will not be identified by name in the data set or any reports using information obtained from this study, and your confidentiality as a participant in this study will remain secure. Subsequent uses of records and data will be subject to standard data use policies which protect the anonymity of individuals and institutions. Right to Ask Questions: You have the right to ask questions and have those questions answered. If you have questions about this study, please contact the researcher named above or the researcher's faculty adviser, whose contact information is located at the end of the informed consent. For questions concerning your rights as a research participant, contact Georgia Southern University Institutional Review Board at 912-478-5465. Compensation: Students that attend the Sept. 20th public safety event and complete the survey there will have the incentive of being entered into a raffle for a $25. gift card at the University Store for participating in the first survey. There will be 3 of these $25. gift cards being raffled off in total during the Safety event on September 20th 2019. All gift cards will be purchased using student fees from the Residential Housings budget. There is no incentive for officers to participate, there is also no incentive for the students to complete the follow-up survey during the Spring semester of 2020. Voluntary Participation: You are not required to participate in this study. You may terminate your participation at any time by telling the PI. You do not have to answer questions you do not wish you answer. Any findings that may reveal themselves during the course of the research and may impact your disposition to participate in the study will be provided to you. Penalty: There are no penalties for not participating in this study. You must be 18 years of age or older to consent to participate in this research study. If a participant consents to participate in the study then indicated that they are under 18 in the age question of the survey they will be removed from the study. You will be given a copy of this consent form to keep for your records. This project has been reviewed and approved by the GSU Institutional Review Board under tracking number H_20023_____. Title of Project: Community Policing at Georgia Southern University   Principal Investigator: Charles Bowen,   1220 Forest Drive   Statesboro, Ga 30460   912-478-3026   cbowen@georgiasouthern.edu   Research Advisor: Dr. Chad PosickP.O. BOX 8105Statesboro, Ga 30460912-478-7098cposick@georgiasouthern.edu You will be given a copy of this consent form to keep for your records. This project has been reviewed and approved by the GSU Institutional Review Board under tracking number H_20023_____. Title of Project: Community Policing at Georgia Southern University   Principal Investigator: Charles Bowen,   1220 Forest Drive   Statesboro, Ga 30460   912-478-3026   cbowen@georgiasouthern.edu   Research Advisor: Dr. Chad Posick P.O. BOX 8105Statesboro, Ga 30460912-478-7098cposick@georgiasouthern.edu

○ I consent, begin the study

○ I do not consent, I do not wish to participate, or I'm under the age of 18

Thinking about the average Georgia Southern University student, do you think they...

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
Are studious?	○	○	○	○	○
Are here to party?	○	○	○	○	○
Support law enforcement?	○	○	○	○	○
Hate law enforcement?	○	○	○	○	○
Want to help officers solve problems?	○	○	○	○	○
Are respectful towards officers?	○	○	○	○	○
Are honest?	○	○	○	○	○
Are immature?	○	○	○	○	○
Are concerned about getting a job after college?	○	○	○	○	○
Bend easily to peer pressure?	○	○	○	○	○
Are elitist or are overly concerned with their status?	○	○	○	○	○
are "good" people?	○	○	○	○	○

To what extent do you feel like your job is...

	Like a great deal	Like a moderate amount	Like a little	Neither like nor dislike	Dislike a little	Dislike a moderate amount	Dislike a great deal
Worthwhile?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Enjoyable?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Better than most in Law Enforcement?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
A good job to have?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
An excellent job?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
A job at which you are content?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
A job with which you are satisfied?	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Thinking of the average Georgia Southern University student, how likely would one be to...

	Very likely	Likely	Unlikely	Very unlikely	Don't know
Smoke marijuana?	○	○	○	○	○
Drink underage?	○	○	○	○	○
Speed while driving?	○	○	○	○	○
Disregard or ignore a traffic control device?	○	○	○	○	○
Use a cell phone (not handsfree) while driving?	○	○	○	○	○
Steal a bicycle?	○	○	○	○	○
Steal an unattended item?	○	○	○	○	○
Intentionally start a fire with the purpose of damaging something?	○	○	○	○	○
Get into a physical altercation with someone?	○	○	○	○	○
Commit entering-auto?	○	○	○	○	○
Sexually assault someone?	○	○	○	○	○

Approximately how many student events at Residence halls did you participate in during Fall 2019 and Spring 2020 semesters?

○ 0

○ 1-3

○ 4-6

○ 7-9

○ 10+

How strongly do you agree or disagree that the Residence hall partnership program has been effective at improving...

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
Student-officer relations?	○	○	○	○	○
Student's perspectives of officers?	○	○	○	○	○
Officer's perspectives of students?	○	○	○	○	○
the safety in Residence halls?	○	○	○	○	○

In what residence halls did you attend student events at during the Fall 2019 Spring 2020 semesters?

☐ None

☐ Centennial Place

☐ Eagle Village

☐ Freedoms Landing

☐ Kennedy Hall

☐ Southern Courtyard

☐ Southern Pines

☐ University Villas

☐ Watson Hall

☐ Windward Commons

☐ Compass Point

☐ University Crossings

☐ University Terrace

☐ I didn't attend any residence hall events

What problems if any were brought up by Residence hall staff members that you had not been aware of until they mentioned it?

_____

Can you name any Resident Directors or Resident Advisers? If yes list them.

_____

What is your GS email address _____@georgiasouthern.edu

APPENDIX F

IRB Approval Letter

Georgia Southern University Office of Research Services &
Sponsored Programs

Institutional Review Board (IRB)

Phone: 912-478-5465 Veazey Hall 3000 PO Box 8005 Fax: 912-478-0719 IRB@GeorgiaSouthern.edu Statesboro, GA 30460

To: Bowen, Charles; Posick, Chad

From: Office of Research Services and Sponsored Programs

Initial Approval Date: 8/30/2019

Expiration Date: 7/31/2020

Subject: Status of Application for Approval to Utilize Human Subjects in Research —
Expedited Review

After a review of your proposed research project numbered H20023, and titled "Policing at Georgia Southern University," it appears that (1) the research subjects are at minimal risk, (2) appropriate safeguards are planned, and (3) the research activities involve only procedures which are allowable. You are authorized to enroll up to a maximum of **4,000** subjects.

There are human subjects incentives in this project in the amount of 3 $ **25 gift cards .** This project has been approved as **a named** data collection. If University or sponsored funds are used to pay incentives please refer to the Human Subjects Incentive Policy and Human Subjects Incentive Disbursement and Reconciliation Form.

Therefore, as authorized in the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects, I am pleased to notify you that the Institutional Review Board has approved your proposed research.

Description: The purpose of this study is to evaluate the effectiveness of Georgia Southern University's Police Department's community policing program, "Residence Hall Partnership Program."

If at the end of this approval period there have been no changes to the research protocol; you may request an extension of the approval period. In the interim, please provide the IRB with any information concerning any significant adverse event, **whether or not it is believed to be related to the study,** within five working days of the event. In addition, if a change or modification of the approved methodology becomes necessary, you must notify the IRB Coordinator **prior** to initiating any such changes or modifications. At that time, an amended application for IRB approval may be submitted. Upon completion of your data collection, you are required to complete a *Research Study Termination* form to notify the IRB Coordinator, so your file may be closed.

Sincerely,

Eleanor Haynes
Compliance Officer