"The true site of learning is not the college classroom but in the spatial and social borders enforced by campus police. Cops on Campus tracks the evolution of these forces from their founding to the present. As this book powerfully argues, the fight to transform higher education will redefine the meaning of security far beyond the campus gates."

CHRISTINA HEATHERTON
coeditor of Policing the Planet: Why the Policing Crisis Led to Black Lives Matter

"A critical, multidisciplinary analysis of university police. University students, employees, and neighbors should read this book to learn why campus police have become so common and why they continue to meet resistance."

STUART SCHRADER
author of Badges without Borders: How Global Counterinsurgency Transformed American Policing

Over the last five years, headlines have thrust campus police departments from relative obscurity into the national spotlight. Campus constituents have called for campus police, as a tangible manifestation of the War on Crime within the sphere of higher education, to be disarmed, defunded, and abolished. Using a multidisciplinary approach that draws from the fields of history, American studies, ethnic studies, criminology, higher education, and sociology, Cops on Campus provides critical perspectives on the organization and social consequences of campus policing. Chapters uncover details of the structure and culture of university police—some of the best-funded and largest private police forces in the nation—and examine the institution in relation to racialized and gendered violence, racial profiling, and the surveillance of marginalized communities on and off campus. The volume also features interviews with students, staff, and faculty activists to showcase efforts to redefine and reimagine campus safety and explore alternatives for the future.

YALILE SURIEL is assistant professor of history at the University of Minnesota. GRACE WATKINS is a law student at Yale University. JUDE PAUL MATIAS DIZON is assistant professor of higher education leadership at California State University, Stanislaus. JOHN J. SLOAN III is professor emeritus at the University of Alabama at Birmingham.

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON PRESS
Seattle uwapress.uw.edu
COPS ON CAMPUS
ABOLITION: EMANCIPATION FROM THE CARCERAL

Michael Roy Hames-García
and Micol Seigel

Series Editors
Edited by Yalile Suriel, Grace Watkins, Jude Paul Matias Dizon, and John J. Sloan III

COPS ON CAMPUS

RETHINKING SAFETY AND CONFRONTING POLICE VIOLENCE

University of Washington Press  Seattle
CONTENTS

Acknowledgments / vii
Introduction / A Fresh Perspective on Campus Policing in America / Yalile Suriel, Grace Watkins, Jude Paul Matias Dizon, John J. Sloan III / ix

PART I Critical Perspectives on the Organization, Culture, and Tactics of Campus Police

1 The End of In Loco Parentis and Institutionalization of Campus Policing / John J. Sloan III / 3

2 A Critical Legal Analysis of Campus Police Authority / Vanessa Miller / 17

3 “Just Protecting the University Property” / Campus Policing as Extraterritorial Expansion / Davarian L. Baldwin / 33

4 Pushing Back on Campus Police Unions / Histories and Strategies / Lucien Baskin, Erica R. Meiners, and Grace Watkins / 41

PART II Challenging the Narrative of Campus Policing

5 Locking the Gates / Yale University and the Police Power in the Postindustrial City, 1959–1976 / Jacob Anbinder / 57

6 Anti–Sexual Assault Activism and the Legitimacy of Campus Police in Philadelphia / Matt Johnson / 77

7 The War on Drugs Meets Campus Police / Yalile Suriel / 95
PART III Current Issues in Campus Policing

9 “You’re Not Even in the United States. You’re in Georgia Tech” / Campus Police, Urban Governance, and the Creation of the Client-Student / Stephen Averill Sherman / 127

10 Uncovering the Racial Power of Campus Police / Jude Paul Matias Dizon / 144

11 Campus Police and Racialized Barriers to Reporting Sexual Assault for Black Women / Kamaria B. Porter / 160

12 Ed Tech Is Surveillance Tech / Pedagogies of Surveillance in Physical and Digital Campuses / Vineeta Singh / 178

PART IV Transforming Campus Safety

13 Campus Policing and the Experiences of Formerly Incarcerated Students / An Interview with Ryan Flaco Rising / 195

14 How Student Activists Are Working to Defund, Disarm, and Abolish the Campus Police / An Interview with Jael Kerandi / 203

15 Rethinking the Archives on Campus Policing / An Interview with Kacie Lucchini Butcher / 209

16 An Interview with Cops Off Campus Research Collective / Eli Meyerhoff, Nick Mitchell, Brendan Hornbostel, and Zach Schwartz-Weinstein / 223

17 “A Moment of Profound Counterinsurgency” / A Reflection on Faculty Abolitionist Praxis with Dylan Rodriguez / 236

Afterword / Yalile Suriel, Grace Watkins, Jude Paul Matias Dizon, and John J. Sloan III / 245

List of Contributors / 251

Index / 259
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The coeditors sincerely thank all of the contributors to this volume, whose chapters expanded and reshaped our understanding of this burgeoning and critical field. We also thank the student, staff, and faculty activists who, while tirelessly working on issues of campus policing across the country, nonetheless took time to share their insights with us in the interviews found in part 4 of the book. We are immensely grateful to each of them! Yalile, Grace, and Jude Paul thank John Sloan for his guidance and mentorship. It is an honor to work with and learn from a scholar whose work laid the very foundations for the study of campus policing as it now exists. We greatly appreciate his generosity and willingness to help usher in a new generation of scholarship. Finally, we thank Andrew Berzanski (our former editor) and Michael Baccam (our current editor) and the staff at the University of Washington Press for their support throughout the process of producing this volume.

Yalile thanks her parents and her mentors from several walks of life for their continued support.

Grace thanks her parents and her friends James and Foo for their love and encouragement.

Jude Paul thanks his family—mom, Justin, Monique, Arieus, and Miles—and partner, Kristine, for their unwavering support. He is eternally grateful to the student leaders at the University of Maryland, College Park, for their activism and courage in the face of police violence. This book is for you!

John thanks Grace, Jude, and Yalile for agreeing to work with him on this project and tolerating his “old school” foibles; his life partner Tavis for supporting another book project; his faithful companion Savannah—un chien merveilleux—and Professor Max Bromley for the many hours spent discussing the campus police and the humanity he brought to campus policing practice. This one’s for Dad . . .
Lastly, we thank you, the reader, for picking up this volume. Whether you are
a student, a researcher, a faculty or staff member, or unaffiliated with a university,
we hope you find it useful for better understanding the complexities of higher
education and its impact on the world around us.
INTRODUCTION

A Fresh Perspective on Campus Policing in America

YALILE SURIEL, GRACE WATKINS,
JUDE PAUL MATIAS DIZON, AND JOHN J. SLOAN III

For years the police departments that are nearly ubiquitous on university and college campuses attracted little scholarly or public attention due to their reputation as “rent-a-cop” operations. However, the last five years witnessed an explosion of interest in these departments and officers. Headline after headline has thrust campus police departments from relative obscurity into the national spotlight and raised questions about their powers and impact:¹

- In 2017, a nonbinary student named Scout Schultz was shot and killed by Georgia Tech police while experiencing a mental health crisis.² In the past decade, multiple other students have been injured or killed by campus police while experiencing severe mental distress.
- In 2018, brothers Thomas Kanewakeron Gray and Lloyd Skanahwati Gray, members of the Mohawk nation, were pulled from a campus tour by University of Colorado police officers for “looking like they didn’t belong.”³ Just a few days later, a Black student named Lolade Siyonbola was questioned by Yale police for sleeping in a common room for graduate students.⁴ These incidents prompted others across the nation to recount, on social media and to reporters, their experiences with racial profiling by campus police officers.
- In 2019, a Yale University police officer and a local city police officer opened fire into a car containing a Black couple named Stephanie Washington and Paul Witherspoon, resulting in serious injuries to Washington.⁵ The incident drew parallels to past instances where campus police
killed Black people on and off campus, such as the 2015 murder of Sam Dubose by a University of Cincinnati officer during a traffic stop. The shooting also raised questions about the frequent and often dangerous collaborations between campus and municipal police.

- In 2020, it was discovered that campus police at the University of California, Santa Cruz, used military-grade technology to surveil a graduate student strike, which raised concerns about the technology available to campus police and their connections to the US Department of Defense and federal intelligence agencies.

In the aftermath of George Floyd’s 2020 murder by City of Minneapolis police officer Derek Chauvin, increased attention on police violence turned into a national movement. Black, Indigenous, Latinx, Asian American, and other students of color brought the demands of Black Lives Matter and the summer of 2020 uprisings against police violence to the setting they knew best: colleges and universities. As a result, a new generation of undergraduate student activists—along with their supporters—called for their institutions to disarm, defund, or abolish campus police departments. In their demands, students cited evidence of the abusive practices of campus police, such as pervasive racial profiling, targeted surveillance of LGBTQ people, and the routine dismissal of women’s reports of sexual violence, with some victims even experiencing sexual harassment from campus officers themselves.

Over two-thirds of universities and colleges in the United States enrolling 2,500 or more students have sworn and armed campus police departments with jurisdiction beyond school grounds. These departments’ organizational and jurisdictional characteristics mirror those of traditional law enforcement agencies: paramilitary-oriented bureaucracies featuring a rank structure, specialization, and multifunctionality. They recruit and hire new officers using tactics and processes similar to those used by state, county, and municipal police departments across the nation. Newly hired campus police officers then undergo basic training at more than 350 police academies across the county that also train new hires from state, county, and municipal police departments. At the academy, new campus officers receive an average of twenty weeks of training across multiple areas including firearms and nonlethal weapons (e.g., batons), defensive and arrest/control tactics, constitutional and criminal law, self-improvement (e.g., stress management) and operations (e.g., patrol procedures, emergency vehicle driving; report writing; interviewing and interrogation). Successful completion
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of basic training is followed by a variable period of field training (typically 90 to 120 days) supervised by a Field Training Officer (FTO) who evaluates the new officers’ performances. On successful completion of field training, the new officers begin their law enforcement and order maintenance duties as full-fledged campus police officers.

With the Cops Off Campus Movement as its backdrop, this volume examines the history, operations, and impact of the campus police and its role in the symbiotic relationship between higher education and the carceral state. The volume’s chapters span a range of fields (e.g., history, American studies, ethnic studies, criminology, higher education, and sociology), critical perspectives, and methodologies (e.g., case studies, surveys, archival research, ethnographies, and oral histories) to explore different facets of campus policing. Contributors possess a variety of backgrounds both within and outside the academy and use their different perspectives to excavate narratives about campus police abuses.

Collectively, the volume explores new directions in the burgeoning field of critical campus police studies, which challenges the hegemonic conception of colleges and universities as “safe havens” detached from “real-world” issues like racial profiling, illegal surveillance, and police violence. It also challenges the assumption that universities exist to “serve the public good.” The contemporary American university has been cast as a center for expanding access, especially following the years of the Student Protest Movement, which contributed to significant postsecondary educational attainment among Black, Latinx, and Asian American students. Yet, at the same time that universities moved away from being exclusive spaces for elites, higher education leaders and state lawmakers constructed a new kind of police that has caused significant harm to marginalized communities.

In this introduction, we first present a brief history of the evolution of campus policing in the United States. Next, we provide an overview of existing and emerging scholarship on campus police. We then conclude with a summary of the chapters that follow.

**THE HISTORY AND EVOLUTION OF CAMPUS POLICING**

The first known occurrence of armed, sworn police officers patrolling a college campus in the United States was in 1894, when Yale University hired two officers from the New Haven Police Department to create a “campus police department.”

*Introduction*
Over the next 130 years, campus security slowly became institutionalized in higher education, culminating with the presence of sworn, uniformed, and armed campus police officers or nonsworn security guards at nearly every American postsecondary institution in the United States. This evolution occurred throughout multiple eras, each influenced by factors both internal and external to postsecondary institutions that resulted in a particular “model” of campus security becoming preeminent.

**ERAS OF CAMPUS SECURITY IN AMERICAN POSTSECONDARY INSTITUTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Era</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Influence(s)</th>
<th>Key features of the era</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>17th–19th centuries</td>
<td>In loco parentis</td>
<td>Faculty and administrators responsible for physical plant maintenance and identifying rule-breakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watchman</td>
<td>late 19th–early 20th centuries</td>
<td>Rapidly expanding access to higher education via creation of public land grant colleges</td>
<td>Patrol and control access to campus; identify rule-breakers; raise alarms for fires or other threats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security guard</td>
<td>mid-20th century</td>
<td>Post–World War II GI Bill and continuing expansion of access to higher education</td>
<td>Traffic control and parking oversight; routine patrol of campus and access control to it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policing</td>
<td>late 20th century–present</td>
<td>End of in loco parentis; campus protests of 1960s; end of segregation and continuing expansion of access to higher education for members of previously excluded groups</td>
<td>Sworn, uniformed, armed; random, routine patrol; rapid response to calls for service; police academy trained; ongoing “professionalization”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in the table, the evolution of campus policing requires an understanding of how contextual influences helped shape campus police as they exist today. Spanning nearly three centuries of American history, the *in loco parentis* era in higher education saw no need for formalized campus security like what is seen at today’s colleges and universities. Largely due to the fact that postsecondary institutions were uncommon, relatively small—both in size and complexity of their physical plants—and had few enrollees, professors and institutional administrators tended to campus maintenance and “security” needs. When students were caught violating codes of conduct, they were summarily expelled. In cases of larger-scale disorders occurring on campus, local police were summoned to address the situation. When threats to the physical plant arose from fire or flood, institutions sought help from the surrounding community. Not until the latter part of the nineteenth century and the creation of land-grant colleges and universities in the United States did institutional security needs change enough to warrant formalizing security operations. It was then that colleges and universities began using watchmen and janitors to address campus security.

**THE WATCHMAN/JANITOR ERA**

Seymour Gelber posits campus watchmen as being the direct lineal predecessor of the contemporary campus police or security officer. Gelber also suggests the likely origins of the watchman system in US higher education was with the bedels at the University of Oxford during the fifteenth century. As described by Gelber, bedels were “servants appointed to execute the orders of the university Chancellor and the proctors” and performed such functions as collecting fines, escorting people to prison, and administering punishment to offending students. In the United States, college or university watchmen carried out tasks such as responding to burglaries and fires. They also worked to prevent incursions onto campus by livestock, stoked stoves during winter, and tended the campus gate(s).

Along with watchmen, also important to the evolving system of campus security were janitors (now known as custodians). At Colby College, for example, janitors served as unofficial policemen and advisors to students and faculty alike, while at Lehigh University janitors were considered “officers of the university” and placed in charge of buildings and grounds. They were also
empowered to direct student-involved disorders to cease and were responsible for reporting damages and breaches of order to the university president.\textsuperscript{26}

\textbf{THE SECURITY GUARD ERA}

With the arrival of the twentieth century came further changes to campus security as the number of postsecondary institutions in the United States grew and many of the original land-grant colleges became full-fledged universities featuring increasingly large physical plants and enrollments. Gelber points to the invention of the mass-produced automobile and its arrival on college and university campuses as marking the emergence of what most experts would consider “modern” campus security operations.\textsuperscript{27} As more cars appeared on campus, university administrators increasingly needed a way to control traffic, address parking issues, and ensure that “students act[ed] within proper moral constraints,” particularly women riding around campus (and beyond) in cars.

These changes led to the creation of security personnel who were equipped to patrol the campus and its immediate environs, as well as address growing traffic problems, including issues surrounding parking on campus. The years following the end of World War II “saw a divestment of the watchman-janitor image and the formation of a formal organizational police structure in the form of campus security departments.”\textsuperscript{28} For example, the 1950s witnessed the creation of a national-level professional association to represent campus security interests and professionalize their work.\textsuperscript{29} In November 1958, eight campus security officers representing colleges and universities from a geographic cross-section of the country met in Tempe, Arizona, to create the International Association of College and University Security Directors (\textit{iacusd}), which is now known as the International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators (\textit{iaclea}).\textsuperscript{30} The first formal meeting of the organization occurred just over a year later in Houston, Texas, with representatives from twenty-eight colleges and universities attending. Prior to the creation of \textit{iacusd}, campus security personnel associated themselves with several other national groups including the Association of Physical Plant Directors, the Higher Education Section of the Campus Safety Association, and the Association of College Business Officers. Regional campus security groups were also organized such as the Northeast College and University Security Association, which included the Ivy League institutions. In multiple states, campus security officials also gathered informally to share ideas and identify emerging security issues on campus.\textsuperscript{31}
Until the 1960s and 1970s, the legal authority of campus security officials to stop, question, detain, or arrest was uncertain. Almost no state legislation had been passed specifically addressing campus security officers, their duties, and their legal authority. Most officers functioned under derivative authority through deputization by the local sheriff or municipal chief of police. Some departments relied upon state statutes that appeared to provide the color of legal authority to them but had not been formally tested in court.32

**THE CAMPUS POLICE ERA**

The Student Protest and Black Campus Movements sparked mass demonstrations over civil rights, the Vietnam War, and free speech. University administrators often responded by calling state and municipal police to campus to quell the unrest. The result was a series of near-fatal and fatal encounters between students and police that swept the nation. For example, in 1967 officers from the City of Houston Police Department fired thousands of rounds of ammunition at Black protestors at Texas Southern University.33 In 1970, members of the Ohio National Guard opened fire on protesters gathered at Kent State University, killing four students and injuring nine others.34 Just two weeks later, state and municipal police fired on a women’s dormitory at the historically Black institution Jackson State College in Jackson, Mississippi, killing two students and injuring twelve others.35

In the aftermath of these violent and deadly encounters, higher education officials faced mounting pressure from state governors and other officials to crack down on the increasing number of student-led protests.36 College and university administrators—with assistance from state legislatures and attorneys general—then took the steps necessary to create their own campus police forces. States passed enabling legislation (or attorneys general issued formal opinions) that officially authorized colleges and universities to create their own campus police departments whose personnel would include sworn officers, which addressed the previous uncertainty surrounding the legal authority of these departments. This step would not only have serious consequences for the future of policing of race, gender, and sexuality within university spaces but would also change town-gown relations as campus police increasingly focused their attention on keeping out members of the larger community in the name of “campus security.”

Over the following decades, as more campus police departments were created, colleges and universities chose two different paths for campus security operations. One path, taken mostly by smaller private postsecondary institutions, resulted
in the continued use of nonsworn security guards (either hired directly or contracted through third-party vendors) to patrol campus and provide other security services. The other path, chosen mainly by larger public institutions of higher learning, involved creating campus police departments staffed by sworn officers.37

Colleges and universities choosing the campus police path first hired senior-level officers away from municipal and state law enforcement agencies to establish state-sanctioned campus police departments. This fact helps explain why campus police departments possess many of the same organizational and tactical characteristics of municipal police departments including a rank structure, task specialization, top-down communication, use of routine patrol and rapid response to calls for service, and sanctioned use of both lethal and nonlethal weapons.38 Like their municipal counterparts, sworn campus police officers now complete basic training at police academies and a period of on-the-job field training. They also have to complete some number of hours of department-established annual in-service training.

In summary, modern campus police—replete with all of the regalia commonly associated with municipal police such as uniforms with insignia, sidearms, batons, handcuffs, and communication devices—were the end result of an evolutionary process that began with professors, administrators, and janitors handling “campus security” and ended with academy-trained, sworn, “professional” law enforcement personnel within agencies whose organizational and tactical features resemble modern municipal police. With this brief review of the origins and evolution of the campus police in mind, attention now turns to an overview of what scholars have written about campus policing.


Diane Bordner and David Petersen commented in 1983 that “much of the existing literature on campus police may be generally characterized as highly descriptive and particularistic, concerned with specific issues and statements of opinion, and lacking in substantive research evidence.”39 Although important scholarly contributions have since been made, Bordner and Petersen’s point that campus police departments remain an understudied topic is still valid, especially in light of their significant impact not only in shaping university life for students, faculty, and staff but also in gentrifying surrounding neighborhoods.

The lack of scholarship on campus policing partly stems from the popular
misconception of campus police as not “real” police, resulting from their association with security guards and night watchmen.40 Campus police also do not neatly fit within existing areas of study because of their unusual hybrid status and powers. For example, they have largely been excluded from histories of American municipal police and private police forces in the United States, both of which have received significant attention in recent years.41

Further hindering campus policing scholarship is the ability of many departments, especially those at private universities, to avoid public access to their records.42 Only campus police at public universities are subject to Freedom of Information Act requests.43 There is also evidence of campus forces regularly destroying their records.44 Additional hindrances arise when university archives are able to deaccess or otherwise restrict access to materials that do exist. Finally, comprehensive aggregate data on the budgets, powers, and size of campus police departments across the United States is limited to occasional surveys conducted by the US Department of Justice’s Bureau of Justice Statistics.45 As a result of these obstacles, the majority of scholarship on campus police departments has tended to focus on one or a few institutions at a time and is generally restricted to departments or institutions willing to release relevant records.

The majority of what might be considered “traditional” scholarship on campus police originated in the fields of criminology and criminal justice.46 These scholars have examined such topics as campus police departmental organizational structures and tactical practices;47 campus police officer discretion;48 and campus crime reduction effectiveness.49

Members of campus police leadership have also published on this topic through trade publications such as *Campus Law Enforcement Quarterly*, *Police Chief Magazine*, and the *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin*. The majority of this scholarship is descriptive and highlights issues and innovations in the field. Much of this scholarship assumes the necessity of campus policing in design and tactics.50 Such assumptions thus shape the focus and intent of the research, often geared toward formulating research- or evidence-based improvements. For example, research on legitimacy issues in campus policing have mostly focused on how to improve relations between campus police officers and students.51

Turning from practitioner-oriented scholarship, John Sloan has been a central figure in efforts to bring scholarly attention to the topic of campus policing.52 Beginning with his comprehensive account of the origins and growth of campus police forces nationally, to charting the political and cultural histories of campus securitization efforts, his scholarship has promoted the study of campus police
as its own distinct field, rooted in discussions of evolving perceptions of and responses to “campus crime.” Sloan’s analyses demonstrate how campus policing has traditionally been framed as both a legitimate and primary solution to lawbreaking, violence, and disorder at colleges and universities. Accordingly, his work also shows how campus police promoted themselves as a “safeguard” against all manner of “threats” to institutions of higher education.

In recent years, a range of scholars outside of criminology and the social sciences have built on Sloan’s work to make important contributions to the study of campus police as well. These scholars have brought new methodologies, archival sources, and a critical framework that questions the necessity and legitimacy of campus policing. Their scholarship presents campus policing as a multifaceted story with many actors and turning points involving higher education, the US Congress, state-level political actors, and municipal law enforcement agencies—all of which continue to seek more effective and efficient ways to surveil and control university space.

Following the infamous “pepper-spray incident” at the University of California, Davis, in 2011—during which a campus police officer pepper-sprayed student protesters sitting on the ground during an Occupy demonstration—several important publications laid much of the groundwork for a critical reinterpretation of campus police duties. Principally, essays by Dylan Rodríguez, Sunaina Maira, and Julie Sze in a 2012 issue of *American Quarterly*, as well as the 2013 anthology *Policing the Campus: Academic Repression, Surveillance, and the Occupy Movement*, connected campus policing to global struggles against police violence and the suppression of activist movements.

The growing field of carceral studies has also produced new ways of conceptualizing and analyzing the impact of campus police and their participation in the US government’s War on Crime initiative. In 2017, Roderick Ferguson published *We Demand: The University and Student Protests*, which demonstrates how “police violence, administrative violence, and ideological violence have come together in an institution that is at once a bureaucracy, a school, and a police station.” Davarian L. Baldwin’s book *In the Shadow of the Ivory Tower: How Universities Are Plundering Our Cities* extended this analysis to demonstrate the impact campus police have on communities surrounding colleges and universities. Teona Williams’s recent article “For ‘Peace, Quiet, and Respect’: Race, Policing, and Land Grabbing on Chicago’s South Side” uses literature on environmental justice to demonstrate how “green initiatives shape the intersections of gentrification and racial profiling” through campus police.
critical university studies and abolitionist university studies—especially the works of S. A. Smythe, Nick Mitchell, Abigail Boggs, Eli Meyerhoff, and Andy Hines—center abolitionist thought and connect the growth of campus police departments to broader ongoing campaigns of austerity and militarization in higher education. In a similar vein, David Allen’s recent analysis of how public, postsecondary institutions engage in self-protection via the use of campus police suggest there is much to be uncovered from closer analysis of available campus police budgetary information.

In the field of higher education research, attention to campus police is growing as a factor shaping the experiences of students of color. William Smith and colleagues identified a consistent pattern of Black undergraduate men being targeted by campus police for “fitting the description” of suspects. Campus police officers are frequent contributors to the racially hostile interactions Black undergraduates encounter at historically white institutions, reinforcing marginalization and exclusion. Amalia Dache-Gerbino and Julie White’s research demonstrates that geographic location and racial composition of different colleges and universities inform the different styles and tactics of policing that campus departments deploy. For example, their observational study of a suburban community college and its urban branch campus suggested that the latter campus functioned to criminalize the majority student of color population by maintaining a much more visible police force. These emerging contributions from higher education scholars demonstrate the range of adverse impacts that campus police have on student life, thus troubling the assumption that police promote a safe learning environment.

In summary, the scholarship of campus policing that began as a trickle in the 1990s has increased as previously ignored and marginalized perspectives come to the fore. Slowly, campus policing scholarship—originating in criminal justice and criminology—is now being expanded to include many other disciplines. These works go beyond discussions of how campus police might be reformed to question their very existence and examine their impact on marginalized people. It is in this emerging critical line of inquiry that this volume is situated.

**BOOK OVERVIEW**

The contributors of this volume critically analyze campus police in the context of the institutional arrangements that justify state-sanctioned violence, increased surveillance, racial injustice, economic inequality, nativism, and gender-based
oppression. The book is divided into four parts. In part 1, researchers uncover the structure, organization, and culture of campus policing. In chapter 1, John J. Sloan III discusses the implications of the end of *in loco parentis* and the subsequent institutionalization of campus policing. Chapter 2, by Vanessa Miller, establishes the legal history around campus police authority. Chapter 3, by Davarian L. Baldwin, explores how urban colleges and universities deploy the blunt force of campus police as an act of “extraterritorial expansion.” In chapter 4, Lucien Baskin, Erica R. Meiners, and Grace Watkins examine the role of police unions in organizing campus police and helping to shield violent officers from disciplinary sanctions.

Part 2 excavates histories of campus police at a wide array of higher education institutions and challenges previously held narratives of the trajectory of these forces. In chapter 5, Jacob Anbinder examines the development of the Yale University Police Department—a national leader in campus law enforcement—as an important case study of the interactions between school integration, coeducation, and shifts in municipal politics during the years of the Student Protest Movement and its aftermath. In chapter 6, Matt Johnson examines the relationship between campus activism against sexual assault activism at the University of Pennsylvania in the 1970s and 1980s and the parallel expansion of the Penn police, which has since become one of the largest private police forces in the world. In chapter 7, Yalile Suriel explores how the US government’s War on Drugs initiative shaped the development of campus policing. In chapter 8, Andrew Pedro Guerrero chronicles how the UCLA Police Department’s (UCLA PD) efforts to guard campus property grew into extensive undercover sting operations that criminalized not only UCLA affiliates but also thousands of Los Angeles residents. Together, this section brings to light the long-overlooked histories that shaped the evolution of American campus policing and frames the use of campus police as a means for postsecondary administrators to better maintain control of students, especially students of color, in the unique campus context.

The chapters in part 3 address current issues in campus policing such as racial profiling and the surveillance of marginalized communities on and off campus. In chapter 9, Stephen Averill Sherman uses fieldwork conducted at the Georgia Institute of Technology and Georgia State University to illustrate that campus police are important agents of urban governance, thereby complicating scholarly understandings of urban citizenship. In chapter 10, Jude Paul Matias Dizon examines the power of campus police to shape racial dynamics within a university community. Chapter 11, by Kamaria B. Porter, focuses on the specific
experiences of Black women and nonbinary sexual assault survivors in reporting sexual violence to campus police. In chapter 12, Vineeta Singh argues that education technology (ed tech) has become a legal battleground not just for college students’ privacy rights but also for conversations about campus policing. Together, this section challenges our understanding of “safety” and the bounds of campus policing.

Part 4 consists of interviews with students, staff, and faculty who are working to transform campus safety and “disrupt what must be dismantled or transformed to reduce harm and build supportive, sustainable communities, and to join in making connections between struggles across various thresholds.” There has been a tidal wave of organizing within the national Cops Off Campus Movement since 2020, and it is essential that these efforts be recorded. Therefore, part 4 is intended to preserve the reflections and observations of activists for the future. The interviewees each work in a variety of positions within and outside of the university to document campus police abuses, interrogate existing structures within higher education, and explore new ways of providing safety and support services. Chapter 13 is an interview with Jael Karedini, the former president of the University of Minnesota’s Student Government, who led a successful campaign for UMN to sever ties with the City of Minneapolis Police Department (MPD) during the 2020 uprising. In chapter 14, Ryan Flaco Rising—a member of the Underground Scholars Initiative, which helps formerly incarcerated students navigate the University of California system—discusses the unique challenges related to campus policing faced by system-impaired and formerly incarcerated students. Chapter 15 features an interview with the University of Wisconsin–Madison Public History Project director Kacie Lucchini Butcher on the challenges of researching the history of campus police, as well as her efforts to make archival discoveries accessible to the public. In chapter 16, members of the Cops Off Campus Research Collective discuss their efforts to work with students across the country to gather quantitative data on campus police departments and their ongoing educational projects related to campus policing. Part 4 concludes with chapter 17, which features an interview with Professor Dylan Rodriguez at the University of California, Riverside, on the Cops Off Campus Movement, its intersections with other radical and abolitionist organizing, and the specific role that faculty activists can play within these efforts. Together, these interviews showcase the vast array of efforts to redefine and reimagine campus safety by challenging the legitimacy of campus police and exploring alternatives for the future.
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