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TITLE OF THE REVIEW

Policing Schools Strategies to Reduce Crime, Increase Perceptions of Safety, and Improve Learning Outcomes in Primary and Secondary Schools

BACKGROUND

School-based interventions by police departments have a long history (Shaw, 2004). In the United States, police presence on school grounds increased dramatically following several high-profile shootings (Brown, 2006). Increased police presence and intervention at schools has also been reported in the United Kingdom, Portugal, and other European nations (Smith, 2003). The recent massacre at the Sandy Hook Elementary School in December, 2012, has renewed calls for deploying armed police in schools, a proposal offered by both President Obama and the National Rifle Association.

Although schools remain safe places for students (relative to their time out of the school setting), a considerable amount of crime occurs in educational settings. The U.S. Departments of Education and Justice report that during the 2005-2006 school year, 86 percent of public schools reported that at least one violent crime, theft, or other crime occurred at their school (Dinkes, Kemp, & Baum, 2009). The problem of school violence, crime, and disorder is not just an American issue. Estimates from other countries of school-related crime are more difficult to obtain, but the European Observatory on School Violence has been collating data from nations such as the U.K., Germany, France, and Spain (Blaya, 2003). Early estimates from the Observatory’s work, for example, included nearly 6% of U.K. teachers claiming that they had been threatened or attacked at school, 20% of Spanish students self-reporting vandalism, 15-46% of German schools experiencing weapon carrying, and over 25% of French students being involved in a physical assault (Blaya, 2003).

Given the crime and disorder at schools in the U.S. and in other nations, it is not a surprise that police would devote resources toward partnering with educators to develop strategies to combat this issue. Shaw’s (2004) international review of police-school strategies categorized such strategies into three groups: (1) school-based police officer programs; (2) police as ‘teachers’ (curriculum approaches); and (3) comprehensive or broad-based liaison programs in which police and other social service agencies are involved with the schools. She reported that non-curricular policing programs have been implemented in a wide range of countries, including the U.S., U.K., Canada, Germany, Denmark, Australia, the Netherlands, Belgium, Estonia, Poland, and South Africa, at least through 2003.

In 2012, Petrosino, Guckenburg, and Fronius reported on a scoping study using systematic review techniques to assess the state of the evaluation evidence in this area. They located 11 quasi-experiments available that had a comparison group. Only one would have met the minimum evidentiary standards of the What Works Clearinghouse in education, and most of the studies would have been scored a “3” by the Maryland Scale of Scientific Methods—a
common approach to rating evaluations in justice. However, they did not attempt any meta-analysis, and their review covered the literature through 2009.

**OBJECTIVES**

The objectives of this review are to answer the following questions:

1. What are the effects of policing strategies in primary and secondary schools (K-12 in USA) on measures of crime and student misbehaviour in and around schools?

2. What are the effects of policing strategies in primary and secondary schools on measures of staff or student perceptions of safety?

3. What are the effects of policing strategies in primary and secondary schools on learning outcomes?

**EXISTING REVIEWS**

We have conducted the one scoping review in this area (Petrosino, Gucken burg, & Fronius, 2012). That review compared the quality of the evaluations we located through 2009 to established evidence-rating schemes in education and criminal justice. Shaw (2004) did report a comprehensive review of police-school practices around the world, as part of a larger effort on school safety. She did not conduct a systematic review of evidence from evaluations, but a comprehensive synthesis describing documented approaches used. She (2004, p. 26) concluded her synthesis with a future research agenda that includes a more comprehensive, comparative review of police-school interventions and the systematic collection and documentation of good practice models and tools. The currently proposed systematic review is designed to build upon the earlier Petrosino et al. (2012) scoping study and Shaw’s (2004) review to produce a Campbell Collaboration systematic review and incorporate meta-analytic techniques.

**INTERVENTION**

We will focus on non-curricular police strategies designed to prevent crime in or around schools (e.g., School Resource Officer programs). The programs can be police-led or be led by educational institutions with police involvement. The policing institutions can be external (e.g., an officer from a local municipal department is assigned to work site at the school) or internal (e.g., Texas has their own school district police).

**POPULATION**

The review focuses on policing schools strategies undertaken in primary and secondary schools (K-12 in USA) without restriction to nation or language, with students ranging from
approximately ages 5-18.

OUTCOMES

The outcomes for this review are:

- Crime or student misbehavior: police reports, calls for service, self-reported crime and delinquency, bullying or aggression measures, truancy, etc.

- Student or staff perceptions of safety or fear of crime or victimization.

- Learning outcomes: achievement, dropout, attendance, etc.

STUDY DESIGNS

The study must be an evaluation design. Randomized experiments, quasi-experiments with a comparison group, and single group time series are all eligible.
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ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

a) **Content:** Anthony Petrosino has over 25 years of experience in the justice field, and has spent the last 7 at WestEd, a pre-eminent education research and services non-profit firm. This has allowed him to join these perspectives to conduct research important to both disciplines. For example, he was Co-PI on a Department of Justice funded randomized experimental study of a school violence prevention program known as Tribes Learning Communities (Hanson, Izu, Petrosino, Delong-Cotty, & Zhang, 2011). He also led a systematic review of research on the effects of policing schools strategies (Petrosino et al., 2012) and led a research study for the Institute of Education Sciences on the reporting of bullying (Petrosino, Guckenburg, DeVoe, & Hanson, 2010).

b) **Systematic review methods:** Anthony Petrosino has been working on reviews and meta-analyses for the past 20 years, largely in the justice and education field. This project blends both of those experiences. Sarah Guckenburg has co-authored one Campbell review (on juvenile system processing; Petrosino, Turpin-Petrosino, & Guckenburg, 2010) and also collaborated on the policing schools review. Trevor Fronius co-authored one Campbell review (Petrosino, Morgan, Fronius, Tanner-Smith, & Boruch, 2012) and also co-authored the aforementioned policing schools report.

c) **Statistical analysis:** Anthony Petrosino has conducted several meta-analyses, including three prior C2 reviews. His latest review, on the effects of school enrollment programs in developing nations, coped with a broad range of experimental and quasi-experimental literature, most of it produced by economists. Again, Sarah Guckenburg and Trevor Fronius have each co-authored one quantitative review for C2.

d) **Information retrieval:** Anthony Petrosino has a significant amount of experience in searching for experimental studies, particularly in his work for the Campbell Collaboration (and its earliest development of C2-SPECTR). Sarah Guckenburg and Trevor Fronius have collaborated on one prior C2 review and a non-C2 synthesis of policing schools program evaluations.
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