

BOARD OF REGENTS
BRIEFING PAPER

1. Agenda Item Title: UNLV Department of Police Services External Review

Meeting Date: June 5-6, 2014

2. BACKGROUND & POLICY CONTEXT OF ISSUE:

NSHE Board of Regents policy (Title 4, Chapter 1, Section 12.14) requires that, at least every five years, NSHE police departments shall undergo an external evaluation to assure effective and appropriate operations.

3. SPECIFIC ACTIONS BEING RECOMMENDED OR REQUESTED:

No action is requested. This is an information item.

4. IMPETUS (WHY NOW?):

The last review was conducted November 5-7, 2007 and presented to the Cultural Diversity and Security Committee on December 4, 2008. In compliance with Board policy the current review was conducted September 23-26, 2012. The report was completed in April 2013. It is now time to present this report to the Board.

5. BULLET POINTS TO SUPPORT REQUEST/RECOMMENDATION:

This report is to comply with Board Policy Title 4, Chapter 1, Section 12.14.

6. POTENTIAL ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE REQUEST/RECOMMENDATION:

None

7. ALTERNATIVE(S) TO WHAT IS BEING REQUESTED/RECOMMENDED:

Non-compliance with Board policy

8. COMPLIANCE WITH BOARD POLICY:

- Consistent With Current Board Policy: Title # 4 Chapter # 1 Section #12 (14)
- Amends Current Board Policy: Title # _____ Chapter # _____ Section # _____
- Amends Current Procedures & Guidelines Manual: Chapter # _____ Section # _____
- Other: _____
- Fiscal Impact: Yes _____ No _____
Explain: _____



MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Juanita Fain
FROM: Chief José A. Elique
DATE: May 6th, 2014
RE: External Management Review Report (Update to department responses): University of Nevada, Las Vegas Department of Police Services

Attached please find the UNLV Department of Police Services' updated responses to the NSHE mandated 5-year external management assessment report from April 2013.

1.) Review current budget making process to take into account annual overtime costs.

Response: Under current budget making processes the UNLV Department of Police Services is unable to correct this problem for itself. The State of Nevada does not recognize overtime or holiday pay. Therefore, Police Services does not have a holiday and overtime budget. No provisions exist to establish a means by which to pay officers who work shifts outside normal business hours (including holidays). This creates an annual funding shortfall that the department must correct through the use of monies found in its other departmental budgets. This shortfall adjustment is done through an annual review made during the budget preparation cycle.

2.) Undertake a comprehensive review of staffing and consider alternative models based on a cost benefit analysis.

Response: The staffing levels have been extensively reviewed, taking into account various shift tours. We have instituted a combination of various work shifts to achieve the most optimal and productive patrol coverage. Police officers work overlapping tours from 7:00 a.m. – 7:00 p.m., 7:00 p.m. – 7:00 a.m., 8:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m., and 6:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m. This type of deployment allows for maximum coverage during peak hours and also permits the officers to engage in community relations programs that enable Police Services to better interact with students, faculty, staff, and visitors. It should also be noted that all sworn UNLV

University Police
4505 Maryland Parkway • Box 452007 • Las Vegas, Nevada 89154-2007
(702) 895-3668



police officers (including detectives, sergeants, lieutenants, the assistant chief, and the chief) work the majority of their shifts in uniform. This assures the highest visibility of uniformed officers on campus.

3.) Continue workplace diversity efforts.

Response: These efforts are a priority of our department and will be continued. Since the initial authoring of this report back in April 2014, UNLV Police Services has hired 8 new full time employees (5 police officers and 3 civilian administrative staff). 75% of these new hires (6 of 8) representing a minority and/or female gender background. 60% of the new police officers (3 of 5) represent a minority background. The department is currently looking to hire an additional 3 police officers and 1 administrative staffer, and we are committed to continuing our development of a diverse workplace with these new hires as well.

4.) Consider designation of full time emergency manager under UNLV Police Services.

Response: The department recently worked in cooperation with UNLV's Thomas & Mack Center staff to create a new special events lieutenant to address emergency preparedness concerns at Thomas & Mack Arena, Sam Boyd Stadium, and Cox Pavilion events. While this position does not address the full scope of UNLV's emergency planning needs it is a move in the right direction. An emergency preparedness planning position for the rest of the university's operations will be established when funding becomes available.

5.) Work the community policing philosophy into Department mission statement, policies and procedures, performance evaluations, and hiring and promotional practices, training and other systems and activities that define organizational culture and activities.

Response: The department administration has reviewed all of these areas and concludes that the community policing philosophy is fully integrated into all policies, procedures and activities.

6.) Ensure that most, if not all, line officers and police supervisory staff understand the COP concept. This is essential as COP will not work without good support (from top and from campus administrators) and a solid team effort.



Response: Expanding on our existing training efforts in this area is underway. The department has already doubled the number of Rebel Roundtables and Girls on Guard community outreach events it conducts on an annual basis. New officers have been brought into both the Public Information Officer (PIO) and K-9 Units. These officers are routinely utilized for community outreach programs. Finally, new officers have been introduced to our new student and staff orientations to expand our officers' contact with the public.

7.) Review all community policing programs in terms of their objectives, need, and participation.

Response: This process is ongoing.

8.) Centralize all CCTV efforts under DPS.

Response: We are working with the General Counsel's Office to develop new university policies to address this issue. We have submitted a comprehensive draft policy to the University Policy Committee for consideration and passage regarding the matter.

9.) Review and take administrative action on identified issues related to morale.

Response: As of the writing of this memo, no morale issues are apparent among department staff. UNLVDPS administrators have made themselves more accessible to first-line supervisors and rank and file officers, and police administration has provided opportunities for staff to bring forth any concerns they may have.

10.) Update campus manual of rules, issue to all officers, and begin using the document for department review and training operations.

Response: An updated Operations Guide has been promulgated and disseminated to all members of the department.

11.) Continue interagency training and sharing of criminal information with Metro PD.

Response: We concur and have been doing this for years. The UNLV Department of Police Services is involved in the following groups and interagency trainings:



- Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department's (LVMPD) active shooter training
- Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department's K-9 Unit training
- Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department special events coordination and training
- Henderson Police Department's mutual aid and assistance
- Standing member serving on the committee of Clark County Emergency Management
- Standing member serving on the Las Vegas Fusion Center (intelligence sharing)
- Standing members serving on the FBI's Joint Terrorism Task Force (JTTF)
- Standing member serving on the FBI's College and University Liaison program

12.) Begin planning for accreditation.

Response: An administrative Sergeant has been tasked with managing the accreditation process. Due to the fact that the participating accrediting body recently suspended its program, Police Services has had to rethink its strategy in this process. Efforts are now underway to conduct this accreditation through a different accrediting body.

**EXTERNAL REVIEW OF
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, LAS VEGAS
DEPARTMENT OF POLICE SERVICES**

**John Carpenter
Oliver Clark
Bruce McBride**

April 2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction	1
II.	Methodology	2
III.	General Observations	3
IV.	Discussion of Findings	4
	Staffing	4
	Retention	5
	Auxiliary Services	5
	Demographics	6
	Deployment of Tasers	6
	Training	6
	Community Policing	7
	Surveillance Camera System	8
	Special Events and Mandatory Overtime	9
	Emergency Management	9
	Emergency Notification System	10
	Police Facility	10
	Morale	11
	Law Enforcement Partnerships	12
	Accreditation	13
V.	Summary of Recommendations	14
VI.	References	15
VII.	Appendices:	16
	Job Description	16
	Accreditation by IACLEA	20

**EXTERNAL REVIEW OF
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, LAS VEGAS
DEPARTMENT OF POLICE SERVICES**

I. INTRODUCTION

This assessment of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas Department of Police Services (UNLV DPS) was conducted by John Carpenter, former chief of police for the San Diego State Police Department; Oliver J. Clark, retired executive director of public safety, and chief of the University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana Police Department; and Bruce McBride, Professor of Criminal Justice, Utica College, and recently appointed Commissioner for Police, the State University of New York. The review was completed under the request of Chief Jose Elique, Director of the University Of Nevada Las Vegas Department Of Police Services and Dr. Juanita Fain, Vice President of Student Affairs.

This is the third of a series of external reviews led by Mr. Carpenter, who headed teams for 2002 and 2007. Dr. McBride participated in the 2007 review. As in previous years, annual department reports were reviewed beforehand and followed by an on-campus visit, which took place from September 23 to 26, 2012.

The previous report addressed a number of areas that will be updated. Areas that are indicated by an asterisk are additional items. They are as follows:

1. Staffing and Retention
2. Diversity and Recruitment Efforts
3. Deployment of Tasers
4. Training
5. Community Policing
6. Surveillance Camera Expansion
7. Special Events and Mandatory Overtime
8. Emergency Management
9. Need for an Emergency Notification System
10. Police Facility

11. Department Morale
12. Accreditation*
13. Relationships with Area Law Enforcement Agencies*

II. METHODOLOGY

The request for an assessment of department operations was made to Mr. Carpenter from Chief Elique in spring 2012. Following a series of discussions and schedule changes, the dates for the campus visit were established. The site visit to Las Vegas began September 23 with a briefing on department operations by Chief Elique. For the next two days interviews were held with various sectors of the campus community from the following areas:

President Smatresk and Cabinet

Administrative Officers, Facilities and Maintenance

Administrative Officer, Risk Management

Administrative Officer, Diversity

Administrative Officer, Human Resources

Administrative Staff, Thomas & Mack Center

Editor, Rebel Yell

President, Graduate Study Body

Staff, Residential Life

Staff, Campus Conduct Code Enforcement

Vice President for Student Affairs and Council

Group interviews were held with all sections of the department including administration, auxiliary services, communications, patrol, investigations, and supervision. A series of interviews were held with the Chief of Police and his command staff. Additionally, a phone interview was conducted with the Sheriff of Clark County to review interdepartmental relations with the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department. On September 25, an exit interview was held with Chief Elique and Deputy Chief Seda. Requests for further information were made on various operational matters following the visit and updates were presented on several issues.

This report is prepared under the direction of John Carpenter with concurrences by Chief Clark and Commissioner McBride. The observations and recommendations contained here are for the benefit of the University of Nevada Las Vegas for review and improvement of police operations and services.

III. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

Much has changed since our 2007 report on the department. The current national economic recession, which began in 2008, continues to have a profound impact on the Nevada and Las Vegas economy. As discussed by *Las Vegas Sun* columnist Patrick Cooligan (2012), "The Las Vegas economy remains a basket case, with an unemployment rate of 12 percent, plus clogged bankruptcy courts and a ravaged real estate market" (p.1).

For the past several years, reductions of state aid have impacted the University, which in turn, resulted in employee layoffs, furloughs, and salary reductions. The campus was able to prevent employee layoffs for the police department, although two positions were lost due to retirements. Against this background in 2012, we found that the university community remains positive and supportive for management and staff efforts in providing quality police services. It is clear that the department remains an intricate part of the University community and continues to build positive working partnerships with community stakeholders.

There are issues that need to be addressed. In our past report, emergency management was identified as an important issue, especially after events at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and other campuses in the past several years. While the Department, working in concert with other campus stakeholders, has a plan to respond to most emergencies, we are still not completely confident that the campus has a coordinated response plan. This issue will be addressed in our discussion on emergency management.

At this time there is a critical need to maintain and update equipment, particularly in communications and informational technology. While minimum annual training has been accomplished, outside training options should be expanded. Additionally, there are signs that the working relationships among patrol, supervisory, and administrative staff need to be reviewed and strengthened.

At this present time, the department operates on an annual budget of just over \$5.3 million. As with other police agencies, approximately 94 percent of expenditures are directed towards personnel salaries and fringe benefits. The rest of funding is directed toward equipment, training, and operating expenses such as uniforms and fuel. One of the major budgetary areas is police overtime, which has remained constant at approximately \$400 thousand. Funding for overtime is not a separate fiscal item and costs are taken directly from department personnel operating expenses. Thus, there is a need for the university to review its budgetary process with state of Nevada guidelines

to fund overtime as a specific expenditure and not from general personnel expenses. If this cannot be accomplished, then overtime may have to be done on an income fund reimbursement or paid back basis per event.

IV. DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

1. STAFFING

The Department is organized according to three main areas: patrol and investigations, communications and dispatch, and administration. The authorized sworn law enforcement staff is 36 members which includes administrators, detectives, and supervisors. This is augmented by reserve personnel and some student escort people. Non-sworn staff includes dispatchers, and technical and support personnel. The total staff of sworn and un-sworn members of the Department is 51 full and 20 part-time.

Staffing for patrol shifts remains an issue. At this time, the department assigns its patrol force on a 12-hour schedule from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. and then from 7:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. Personnel must be assigned to the main campus and two off-campus locations. As in the 2007 visit, we heard from officers and supervisors that there were not enough patrol personnel to meet the various task demands including the high number of details brought on by activities at the Thomas & Mack Center. On a typical day during the academic semester, there is one supervisor and two officers on the campus. At other times, there may be only one officer and one supervisor. During our campus interviews, concerns were expressed by some stakeholders of the lack of police visibility during the academic semester. The Department notes that visibility remains a challenge based on campus size and indoor and outdoor directed patrol assignments.

In 2007, the review team conducted a staffing analysis based on a formula developed by the International Association of Chiefs of Police. Using calls for service as the unit of analysis, the formula called for the need of an additional six officers for a total of 30 patrol officers. At this time there are only 21. The department is forced to use overtime and non-patrol personnel to staff regular operations, special assignments such as the horse and K-9 patrol, and the rising number of special events.

The need for overtime is reflected in actual costs. As indicated earlier, overtime for regular shifts and special events amounted to approximately over \$400,000 for each budget year since 2006. For 2011, the overtime budget is approximately \$388,000. At present there are two vacancies. The review team was advised that these vacancies will be filled this year. Based on the economic realities facing the University, the department will have to suffice with the current patrol staff.

Against this background, we recommend that the for the Department to review deployment and cost benefit analysis related to the current 12 hour shift program in comparison to alternative arrangements such as 10 or 8 hour shifts scenarios. . There

will have to be a candid assessment of continuing or discontinuing certain special patrol assignments discussed above.

Retention

Retention of personnel was an issue identified in our last report. Retention here is defined as keeping police and civilian employees in the organization for a reasonable amount of time. In our previous report, we characterized the Department as having "negative retention" based on the number of personnel who left the agency for other employment opportunities based on benefit and retirement packages offered by police departments in the Las Vegas area.

Because of current economic conditions, there have not been many officers changing to other neighboring departments for better pay and benefits. In fact, the Department may be able to attract fully trained officers for the current vacancies. Nevertheless, there remains need for the University to review police officer salaries and benefits in comparison to nearby agencies. If and when the economy improves, we expect to see a sudden increase in police recruitment based on regular turnover caused by job changes and retirements.

Auxiliary services

The focus of our attention for this review was communications. The Police Communications and Dispatch unit consists of eight personnel supervised by a communications director. There are normally two dispatchers on duty during a shift.

The communications section of the UNLV DPS provides telephone and wireless communications to field personnel based on information received from citizens and other police units. They are also responsible for retrieving police information (receiving and disseminating warnings and alerts, wanted persons, motor vehicle information, and so forth) and scanning area police communications networks for area police traffic that might be of interest to the campus. They are also charged with monitoring fire alarm and CCTV units in the dispatch center. The center is located on 4505 South Maryland Parkway and is separate from the main police station 1325 East Harmon Avenue.

A major change for this unit will be the cessation of dispatching services for the College of Southern Nevada Police Department (CSNPD), which has grown to over some 70,000 students over the past several years. This decision was based on a decision by CSNPD to combine their communications operations with the Clark County School District Police. In some respects, this move will result in stress reduction as UNLV communications personnel often times felt overwhelmed by the number of calls from CSNPD.

At this time, there is a morale issue between communicators and police officers in that the communicators feel that they are isolated from the general operations of the

department. While moving to the new facility on Harmon Avenue is an obvious solution, this is not an option at this time.

There is also a need for additional training for communicators. We will recommend that an in-service refresher course be developed to bring all personnel up to date with department response protocols. Included in this program should be a module which would provide an opportunity for staff and administrators to review major issues and future changes in the department.

2. Department Demographics: Diversity and Recruitment Efforts

The review team was asked to review the effectiveness and status of diversity within the department. The Department has made tremendous strides in recruiting and hiring one of the most diverse university police departments in the country. As noted in the most recent annual report, the percentage of racial minorities and women is 65 percent (33/51) of all personnel. For sworn members, the percentage is 60 percent (21/35). At this time there has not been a great deal of recruitment efforts based on budgetary issues and very low turnover. As positions open, the department should continue to maintain its proactive diversity initiatives.

3. Deployment of Tasers

"Taser" is the brand name of a conducted energy device (CED) that is classified as a non-lethal, self defense weapon that uses compressed nitrogen to shoot two tethered needle-like probes at an assailant in order to deliver an electric shock. Based on our recommendation in 2007, and in consultations with the campus community regarding the use of the device as less than lethal means for deadly physical force, the department has successfully deployed and trained its officers with Taser devices. During our visit, no concerns were expressed by University stakeholders on the deployment of Tasers.

4. Training

The training partnership developed with local law enforcement agencies continues. As noted in our last report, these training opportunities create opportunities to improve the operational relationship between the Las Vegas Metro Police Department and UNLV DPS. Recent activities include joint active shooter response training held in vacant resident halls during the summer and interagency radio communication exercises.

We note that training opportunities beyond mandatory state re-certification requirements have been virtually eliminated because of budget issues. When the economy improves, we anticipate that greater training opportunities will be available including those out-of-state.

5. Community Policing

The United States Department of Justice has defined community oriented policing (COP) as a philosophy that “focuses on crime and social disorder through the delivery of police services that includes aspects of traditional law enforcement, as well as prevention, problem-solving, community engagement, and partnerships” (Docobo, 2005). Effective partnerships with community, public and private-sector resources, applying problem-solving strategies or tactics, and transforming your police organization and culture should support this philosophical shift. In other words, As Docobo (2005) states “Community policing is not in itself a tactic, strategy or another program, but instead a philosophical approach to how policing is conducted. At its core, community-oriented policing is based on law enforcement and the community joining together to identify and address issues of crime and social disorder.”

We have personally observed that community policing helps to build trust between the community and law enforcement, and allows officers to develop personal knowledge of the students, staff, faculty, and visitors.

As stated by Docobo (2005), and the review team agrees, “In the community policing model, individual officers are given broader freedom to resolve concerns within their community. Individual officers are presumably the most familiar with their communities and are, therefore, in the best position to forge close ties with the community and create effective solutions.”

Review team findings

The review team had only two days on campus to collect information on various topics. At some future time, we would like to spend considerable time interviewing community members, and police personnel on all shifts; and conducting a review of documents relating to crime prevention, crime statistics, and so forth. Therefore, this reporting segment will be limited to what this review team could glean from people we were able to interview within our three-day visit.

From all appearances UNLV DPS does an adequate job in community policing efforts in working with the UNLV community. It provides crime prevention programs to the community, and has a student security patrol program that appears to be short staffed. The Department has several programs such as mounted patrol, bicycle patrol, the Rebel Connection and S.O.A.R., Rape Aggression Defense, Police Honor Guards, and so forth. In fact, the review team found that UNLV DPS may have too many programs that can be effectively handled by the number of staff they presently have. As for conducting a sound COP initiative on campus, staffing level and shifts structure may be a hindrance to being successful in forging partnerships.

At this time, some line officers understand the COP concept well and practice it when possible; however the review team believes some personnel do not fully understand this concept, and it is especially important for shift supervisors to understand and buy-in to COP. In addition, many campus administrators and community members lack this

understanding. For the most part, indications are that students feel safe on campus and it appears to this review team that crime on campus is low. Information gathered and reported to the review team provides evidence that the community and local law enforcement agencies have a positive feeling about UNLV DPS.

The review team suggests that the Department review its community policing philosophy and program efforts. This would include reviewing all outreach programs that have the potential of being successful.

It is important to note that this is a long term process that requires acceptance by a majority of the police department members. The philosophy should be included in the mission statement, policies and procedures, performance evaluations, training, and all related personnel practices.

Vision/mission statements and advisory group

As mentioned previously, all agencies require these tools to define their basic values: mission statement, policies and procedures, performance evaluations and hiring and promotional practices, training programs, and other systems and activities that define organizational culture and activities.

The Police Department has a mission statement; however, this statement needs to be redefined as it is outdated. The review team was advised that the present statement was developed without input from any members of the department. It appears that one person developed the vision statement and goals, which were then unilaterally approved by police administration. Developing the revised mission statement would be a great place to reinvent the community policing philosophy.

The Department previously had an advisory board that later disbanded once prior problems were addressed. The review team suggests that the University activate the advisory board as there are a number of immediate agenda items that need to be addressed. We have found that a good active advisory board is paramount to the success of any police agency.

6. Surveillance Camera System

The surveillance camera system continues to expand and campus policymakers have rightly decided that all camera operations should be centralized in Police Services. The department is using the Milestone and Sting security systems to merge the various types of analog and digital cameras into combined systems. At present there are some CCTV cameras that various departments have installed that are not monitored by the police services department. We were advised that one department even contracts with a local alarm company who would be notified of an activated alarm and they would contact UNLV police communications. This is clearly a poor method when an alarm is activated on campus. Specific issues that should continue to be addressed include:

- Monitoring of all CCTV cameras needs to be centralized through UNLV DPS.
- A campus policy needs to be developed on camera installation, monitoring, and their use for administrative and criminal investigative purposes.
- A schedule for inspection and maintenance needs to be created. We are fearful of the various liability and reputation issues that occur when cameras are not inspected and maintained and then a serious incident occurs.

7. Special Events & Mandatory Overtime

During our 2007 visit, officers and supervisors complained of being required to work special events. This year we did not receive any complaints of forced overtime.

The department continues to staff special events through a voluntary scheduling system that includes regular and reserve UNLV police personnel. Once posts are scheduled, assistance is rendered by contracted Metro PD personnel. This arrangement seems to be working and deals with the issues of event coverage v. the limited number of available university officers.

8. Emergency Management

Once again, we reviewed the current status of emergency management activities at UNLV and suggested that it be created under an emergency management department with an emergency manager or director. A campus emergency manager provides campus leaders, faculty governance, student governance, campus law enforcement/security departments, campus health/medical and mental health services, campus public affairs, jurisdictional law enforcement and public safety agencies, and jurisdictional public information officers with an understanding and ability to navigate through the difficult aspects of dealing with campus emergencies such as man-made or natural events, including acts of violence.

Most institutions have experienced some form of critical incident—whether a natural disaster, financial crisis, criminal act, or man-made accidents—with consequences ranging from minor operational disruptions to the brink of permanent closure. Yet in recent years, heightened awareness has been leveraged toward improving campus capabilities for managing students and employees with serious emotional and psychological problems, responding to active-shooter scenarios, preventing cyber terrorism that compromises confidential records and sensitive research, and mitigating the risks of natural and man-made disasters such as floods, hurricanes, and chemical and biological incidents.

After a high-consequence event occurs, restoring normalcy is critical. This task should be undertaken with support for all concerned. In order for recovery efforts to succeed, campus communities must recognize that campus and community entities must work together when developing and updating Emergency Operations Plans (EOP). Having

an EOP will help designate the parties who are in charge and responsible for key decisions during the recovery process. Universities and colleges find that there is a significant advantage in having at least one person on campus with the title and expertise, along with an organizational structure, to direct the management of campus emergencies and who is responsible for planning for emergencies associated with a spontaneous event that requires the attention of campus officials, emergency responders, elected officials, and other community stakeholders. It is extremely important to have a clear understanding of who is responsible for managing these events.

The emergency manager is responsible for developing a strategy that tailors integrated solutions providing a comprehensive all-hazards training continuum focused to address the unique campus prevention, preparedness, response, and recovery elements. The strategy includes a continuum of awareness, operational and management level, supplemented as needed by technical assistance tailored for the entire campus community. The training continuum components are tailored to meet the differing challenges faced by the executive management team; including the Board of Regents, president, chancellor, provosts, and deans; the faculty and staff, the student body, and the emergency responders including campus and jurisdictional components.

Thus, we recommend that an emergency manager be appointed and that this position be part of UNLV Police Services. This would be a major step in addressing emergency situations on campus and develop further institutional expertise in this important function.

A comprehensive job description for a Director of Campus Emergency Management taken from the University of Illinois appears in Appendix A.

9. Emergency Notification System

An increase in weather-related disasters and continued tragic events such as the shooting rampage at Virginia Polytechnic Institute has resulted in the creation of mass-communication alerting systems. The UNLV Emergency Notification System was implemented in July 2008 and consists of an emergency text messaging program. Enrollment in the system is voluntary and faculty, staff, and students can opt not to participate in the program. This is an additional service to the campus emergency e-mail system.

10. Police Facility

Just after the 2007 review, the Department moved into a new police facility at 1325 Harmon Avenue. The facility, which consists of about 7,600 square feet, is spacious and functional for police activities and it includes parking for department and private vehicles. It must be noted that this is leased from a private individual and the lease has been renewed for a three-year period.

The review team asked about the status of the current facility and future prospects for a new station that would include space for the communications section. At this time, no new construction is being planned for the department in the upcoming fiscal year. However, the University is in the process of planning for an expansion of current facilities which would include the construction of a new police station under the "UNLV Now" project series.

Plans to reorganize the server room were not completed due to financial limitations. Environmental controls and expansion of the electrical panel are still required. Completing this project is important to protect the equipment and to also allow for securing the room itself. If the temperature can be controlled properly, the solid core door can be closed and access can be managed through the use of keys and Marlok cards. The security of the room is essential and now is mandated (PCI compliance) as part of a requirement to protect the information acquired by Parking Services associates during the transactions with their customers. An updated quote was obtained from Facilities in the spring of 2011 and the cost to provide the necessary environmental controls is approximately \$19,700.00.

As the present location is temporary, the review team was advised of two separate possibilities when it comes to a new police facility. The first is that the present owner of the property is considering relocating the police department and the second prospect is to include a new police station within the proposed stadium project on campus. In addition to the need for more space to accommodate police services, we believe it is essential that the police dispatch center be located within the police facility.

At this time, the front desk at the entrance to the facility is staffed with student assistants who are also charged with various administrative projects. There are times when no one is at the desk to accommodate students, faculty, staff or visitors who need to talk with someone within the Department. We believe it is important to have a front desk staffed at least during campus business hours. After hours the door is locked and there is a "bell" that customers push to sound within the Department so that someone responds. While we were advised that there is typically someone in the station after hours, it is possible that circumstances might require that staff member to be elsewhere in an emergency. This could be resolved once communications is located within the police facility.

11. Morale

As stated before in our first review, department members are well equipped and trained. There were no layoffs of department personnel when the 2008 recession started. However, during this visit, we heard a number of candid concerns expressed by some line personnel with regards to assignments, promotions, intra-departmental communication, and overall administrative decision making. We were told by some officers that the chief's open door policy is presently not working and there are allegations of retaliation if personnel complain.

As reviewed by David Cruickshank in a recent article that appeared in the September 2012 issue of *Police Chief*, poor morale can be tied to a number of factors such as turnover, critical incidents, and, in this case organizational stress. Organizational stress, he writes, is linked to poor communication, inconsistent discipline, and favoritism. Thus, there appears to be a need for UNLV PD administrative staff to become more accessible, attentive, and visible for line personnel, and to seriously review these concerns with their officers and supervisory staff. Since our visit we are pleased to report that steps have been taken to increase accessibility to police managers.

One area that needs to be immediately addressed is some degree of consistency in decision and policy making. We get the sense that most operational decisions are based on the individualistic leadership styles of supervisors. A review of the manual of rules shows that this document is in the process of being updated but it has not been issued to all line and supervisory staff. The manual of rules, or standard operating procedures, serves as the guideline for department operations and training, and ultimately decisions made by department personnel. It is imperative that this be finalized and distributed to all members, and used on a daily operational basis. This task will also be critical in our discussion on future accreditation.

12. Law enforcement partnerships between UNLV Police Services and local agencies

The review team was asked to evaluate the relationship/partnership between the UNLV Police Department and local law enforcement. While we did not have the opportunity to discuss that specifically with members of the Metro PD, we did discuss such relationships with members of the UNLV Police Department and the Sheriff of Clark County (Douglas Gillespie). It was clear that Sheriff Gillespie has a great professional relationship with Chief Elique and believes that his deputies work well with UNLV officers on a routine basis. The Sheriff stated that he would have no concerns with having his deputies work closely with UNLV officers in handling community disasters or criminal situations.

There is a long-standing agreement between UNLV Police Services and Las Vegas Metro Police whereby the department is contacted when a UNLV student, staff or faculty member is arrested. These notifications occur even for crimes that occur outside of UNLV Police jurisdiction, and when incidents are significant enough the Sheriff or Las Vegas Metro would call Chief Elique directly to inform him of the issue.

While the relationship between police officials of all local law enforcement agencies is very good, the review team found several UNLV officers who expressed frustration with some Metro PD officers relative to their interaction on patrol and during special events on campus. We recognize such frustrations, but we also understand this is an issue many law enforcement agencies express about other officers in adjoining jurisdictions across the country. The review team believes that with continued interagency joint training this relationship could improve.

Chief Elique and his staff meet routinely with Metro PD staff in comparable positions. This helps to maintain a relationship that allows for an exchange of issues that can resolve problems before they can get out of hand. We were informed that department supervisors periodically join in Roll Call briefings with Metro PD. This is an excellent way to help develop a positive relationship between departments. We were also advised that UNLV detectives meet with their counterparts at Metro PD on a monthly basis. We would recommend that such interactions be continued and expanded where appropriate.

UNLV Police Officers are involved in Active Shooter and First Responder training with Metro PD Officers. We believe that this joint training is helpful to both agencies, because they would often be required to conduct such actions together when necessary. It is also another example of building positive working relationships between agencies.

Another example of inter-agency training occurred on April 13th, 2011, when a combined regional radio communication inter-operability exercise at the Las Vegas Speedway was held in which UNLV Police Services was a participant. This multi-agency exercise tested the interoperable communications capabilities and plans for nearly a dozen local, state and federal agencies identified as first-responders throughout Clark County.

13. Accreditation

The review team was asked to determine the desirability and potentiality of UNLV Police Services to become an International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators (IACLEA) accredited department and to explain the initial and on-going costs in money and staffing to achieve this goal.

Accreditation by IACLEA constitutes recognition that the department conforms to the highest professional standards for campus law enforcement and protective services. IACLEA accreditation provides a professional benchmark with which to measure a campus public safety department's policies and practices. It requires that procedures are documented and that personnel are given clear guidance. It enhances the recruitment and retention of qualified personnel and ensures that staff is trained and functions according to established policies and procedures. Accreditation assures the university administration, the community served, local law enforcement, and institutional peers of the quality of services provided by a campus law enforcement department. The review team believes this is an extremely worthwhile goal and one that UNLV Police Services is positioned to achieve with nominal extra effort. There are some important considerations that the department should review before initiating the accreditation process.

According to department management, the Department Policies and Procedures Manual is about 80% complete and they are using the nationally recognized program called "Lexipole" to formalize the new manual. Once this manual is complete the department will be well on its way in preparation for accreditation. There are many

additional steps that will have to be completed, but this will be a major step toward achieving accreditation.

All department staff must be familiar with the contents of this manual and those affected by its contents must be trained in those areas that affect their duties and responsibilities and be prepared to answer specific questions from the accreditation review team during their site visit. While having an updated and comprehensive policy manual is important, it is more important that every member of the department understand what is in the manual and how their specific duties may be impacted.

Another important step is to appoint an Accreditation Manager to take responsibility for preparing for accreditation and all aspects of compliance and department training required. IACLEA has an accreditation management training program that outlines the critical steps to achieving accreditation. This workshop will identify and explain the principal duties of an Accreditation Manager, including preparing a self-assessment plan, writing effective directives, organizing accreditation files, and preparing for an on-site assessment.

We have included some examples of standards, application process, costs, training and management of accreditation process, preparation and supervision of compliance. Information for accreditation appears in Appendix B which contains information from the IACLEA Accreditation Standards Manual and suggestions by IACLEA staff associated with the accreditation program

V. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Review current budget making process to take into account annual overtime costs.
2. Undertake a comprehensive review of staffing and consider alternative models based on a cost benefit analysis.
3. Continue workplace diversity efforts.
4. Consider designation of a full time emergency manager under UNLV Police Services
5. Work the community policing philosophy into Department mission statement, policies and procedures, performance evaluations, and hiring and promotional practices, training and other systems and activities that define organizational culture and activities.
6. Ensure that most, if not all, line officers and police supervisory staff understand the COP concept. This is essential as COP will not work without good support (from the top and from campus administrators) and a solid team effort.

7. Review all community policing programs in terms of their objectives, need, and participation.
8. Centralize all CCTV efforts under DPS.
9. Review and take administrative action on identified issues related to morale.
10. Update campus manual of rules, issue to all officers, and begin using the document for department review and training operations.
11. Continue interagency training and sharing of criminal information with Metro PD.
12. Begin planning for accreditation.

VI. REFERENCES

Coolgan, J.P. (July 2012). The hangover: How Las Vegas explains the past and future of the economy. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved from <http://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2012/07/the-hangover-ho...>

Cruickshank, D. (September 2012). Recognizing the true cost of low morale. *The Police Chief*. Retrieved at <http://www.policechiefmagazine.org>.

Docobo, J. (June 2005). Community policing as the primary prevention strategy for Homeland Security at the local enforcement level. *Homeland Security*. Retrieved at <http://www.hsaj.org/?article=1.1.4>.

APPENDIX A: JOB DESCRIPTION FOR EMERGENCY MANAGER

Function – The Director of Emergency Planning is responsible for coordinating the emergency planning and crisis response initiatives and activities for the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign Campus. The purpose is to assure that during an emergency or crisis, campus plans are coordinated for the purpose of business continuity as well as protecting and minimizing the danger/risk to University personnel and property resources including intellectual property (i.e. research).

Organizational Relationship – Reports to the Executive Director of Public Safety, who in turn reports to the Chancellor.

Duties and Responsibilities –

1. Work with the various campus colleges and departments to establish unit crisis response plans.
2. Coordinate the college and department crisis response plans with the Campus Emergency Operations Committee plan of operation.
3. Work with the campus colleges, departments and local inter-agency representatives (police, fire, public health, ESDA, etc.) to plan emergency response activities and coordinate routine testing of emergency operations plans;
4. Coordinate the development of campus operational plans in conjunction with Homeland Security objectives and National Incident Management System (NIMS);
5. Provide ongoing review of existing crisis response plans for necessary modifications as state and federal guidelines are amended;
6. Work with various standing campus research and safety committees with respect to facilities and security related issues.
7. Oversee the approval process for the distribution of campus building documents and related drawings;
8. Recommend improvements to the existing campus infrastructure or policy processes to more effectively streamline the campus emergency response doctrines;
9. Conduct special projects as required to further enhance the safety and security of campus buildings;
10. Represent the campus on interagency Boards and Committees as directed by the Executive Director of Public Safety;

11. Assist in the coordination of campus emergency planning with local utilities;
12. Other duties as assigned.

Campus / Community Responsibilities

1. Represent the UIUC on the MetCAD Board of Directors
2. Represent the UIUC on the ETSB Board of Directors
3. Represent the UIUC on the Region VI Bioterrorism Committee
4. Member of the UIUC Radiation Safety Committee
5. Member of the UIUC Institutional Biosafety Committee
6. Member of the Champaign County Terrorism Task Force
7. Member of the F&S Fire Services Planning Team
8. Chair the Facilities & Services Safety Committee
9. Serve as an Ad Hoc member of the Public Safety Advisory Committee
10. Chair the Committee to establish an activation plan for the campus Surge Facility
11. Chair the Committee to establish an activation plan for the PULL facility.
12. Serve on Celebratory Violence Committee
13. Serve on the Campus Emergency Operations Committee (CEOC)

Evaluation Factors

1. Knowledge required for the position

- a) Thorough understanding of the principles and practices surrounding emergency planning and NIMS;
- b) Working knowledge of UIUC business management principles;
- c) Understanding of UIUC campus policies and procedures;
- d) Thorough knowledge of the campus buildings and their location coupled with a working knowledge of the UIUC organizational structure and administration;
- e) Excellent interpersonal skills coupled with management and leadership skills to effectively organize and manage committee assignments;
- f) Ability to work with individuals of diverse cultural backgrounds;
- g) Excellent verbal and written communication skills;
- h) Working knowledge and above average computer skills utilizing programs such as Excel, Word and Powerpoint.

2. Responsibility

- a) Supervisory Controls – Ability to work independently within the guidelines provided by the Executive Director of Public Safety. Coordinate and work with other members of the Public Safety staff, campus personnel, interagency representatives, and provide regular as well as informal progress reports to the Executive Director.
- b) Guidelines – Operates within established campus guidelines using considerable professional freedom to perform all duties and functions of this position. The incumbent is provided broad general guidelines as delivered by

the Executive Director and is evaluated on the degree of success with respect to meeting the duties and responsibilities of the position.

2. Difficulty

- a) Complexity – This position requires continuous interaction with a diverse group of officials, campus faculty, staff, students, as well as interagency representatives. The incumbent should demonstrate professional competency and a general understanding of the operating interests of the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign campus. The incumbent should demonstrate excellent initiative and judgment with respect to meeting the various challenges/expectations of the position and representing the professional staff of the Division of Public Safety.
- b) Scope and Effect – This position is designed to fulfill the obligations of the University to prepare an integrated plan for campus emergency response to either natural disasters or acts of domestic violence. The purpose is to protect campus human resources, physical assets and intellectual resources to minimize losses in these areas by having an integrated response plan. Interagency coordination is essential and the activities of this position affect the entire Urbana campus as well as interagency interests.

3. Personal Relationships

- a) Personal contacts – The incumbent is in daily contact with administrators, faculty, staff, and students that represent a diverse campus population. Routine contact is also made with representatives from various emergency planning organizations within the community and other interagency staff with whom contact is necessary in order to achieve the objectives of this position. Occasional contact is made with vendors, visitors, media personnel, and others.
- b) Purpose of contacts – the purpose of these contacts is to fulfill the goals and objectives of the position.

4. Environmental Demands

- a) Physical Requirements – The incumbent must be able to travel within the campus environment, meet with contact people, observe operations when appropriate and modify work hours to meet the needs of the University. This includes emergency response to campus to assist in emergency operations management whenever they might arise.
- b) Work Environment – Work is largely performed in an office environment whether in the Public Safety office or campus departmental offices. Meetings will routinely be scheduled at various campus meeting sites to include seminar and conference rooms as well as “off campus” interagency sites. Site studies and reviews and emergency response activities may include work

in areas with rapidly changing environments related to temperature, noise, odors, etc.

APPENDIX B: ACCREDITATION BY IACLEA

The annual fee for IACLEA accreditation is based on the institution's full time equivalent (FTE) student enrollment. For schools with an enrollment of fewer than 10,000 students the fee \$3,000 for the first year and \$2,500 per year thereafter. Institutions whose enrollment is 10,000 or greater pay an annual fee of \$3,000. Non-members will be assessed an additional \$1,500. The annual fee includes access to all required forms and materials, as well as the on-site evaluation by a team of assessors. An application fee of \$150 initiates the accreditation process and provides the agency with the *IACLEA Accreditation Process Manual*. The fee is non-refundable, unless a department or agency is ineligible to participate in the accreditation program. The application fee will be applied to the accreditation fee if the contract is signed within six (6) months of the application's submission.

Accreditation Standards Compliance training:

Training is an essential component to a successful accreditation effort. In order to achieve accreditation in an efficient and timely manner, department personnel require a thorough understanding of its concepts and procedures. Agency administrators should be familiar with the requirements of the program to allocate sufficient resources, delegate essential tasks, and implement required strategies. Similarly, staff members who coordinate the accreditation project, particularly the Accreditation Manager, need to understand the specific steps necessary to comply with standards, document their compliance, and prepare for the agency's review by assessors.

While procedural manuals will direct program implementation and provide useful guidance, participation in training sessions can accelerate and expand the understanding of concepts and procedures. The accreditation instructor will clarify, illuminate and spark enthusiasm during the training process. Training paves the way for a fuller and more comprehensive understanding of the principals contained in procedural guidebooks.

IACLEA will present Accreditation workshops during its Annual Conferences. If you expect to participate in the accreditation program, this is an excellent opportunity to learn about the process and to network with others who are involved. You may also get a head start by bringing any staff members who will be involved in implementing your program. Training sessions at the IACLEA Annual Conference will include a CEO Panel on Accreditation which consists of:

A panel of chief executive officers from accredited campus public safety departments will discuss their accreditation process experiences. They will answer frequently asked questions and address areas of concern for CEOs considering accreditation. Topics of discussion are likely to include the benefits of accreditation, how to manage the accreditation process, and how to avoid common problems or pitfalls.

Agencies interested in accreditation are encouraged to review the *IACLEA Accreditation Standards Manual*, available on the website. A familiarity with the scope and complexity of the standards will enable the agency to make an informed and reasoned decision about beginning the accreditation process. If accreditation seems attainable under these standards, the department can submit an application. Upon receipt of the application, IACLEA will send the department an Accreditation Agreement, an invoice, the Department Profile Questionnaire, and a copy of the *IACLEA Accreditation Process Manual*. IACLEA recommends that the department appoint a full-time Accreditation Manager to be assigned to coordinate the department's efforts.

Once the agency signs the contract, it has 36 months to complete the self-assessment process. This includes a comprehensive review of its policies and procedures, the development of written directives, and the implementation of systems to comply with applicable standards. Departments must prepare and maintain files containing documentation of its compliance with standards. Once the department is satisfied that it has met the standards' requirements, it notifies IACLEA to schedule an onsite assessment.

IACLEA appoints a two-member assessment team to visit the campus and review the department's compliance with all applicable standards and to observe its operations. Members of the assessment team are experienced campus law enforcement professionals or trained and certified assessors from related fields. IACLEA carefully screens potential evaluators with input from the candidate department to assure the assessor has no real or apparent conflict-of-interest. The assessor's relationship with the candidate department is non-adversarial. The assessment generally consists of a tour of facilities, interviews with agency personnel and members of the campus community served, a compliance review of applicable standards, and receipt of public comment. The assessor will review all standards and verify applicable standards as well as standards not applicable to the department. Assessors will provide feedback to the department during the review. The assessors will prepare a written report and submit it to IACLEA. IACLEA staff reviews the assessors' final report and sends a copy to the department. Following a favorable report, staff will present the final report to the Compliance Review Plan of the IACLEA Accreditation Commission. If the Compliance Review Panel is satisfied that the department has met all compliance criteria, the Compliance Review panel will conduct a vote to recommend the agency to the full Commission for a final vote. The Commission reviews the Compliance Review Panel's recommendation and conduct a vote to award Accreditation. IACLEA Accreditation is awarded for a four-year period and is awarded upon the Commission's action. Formal recognition of all agencies accredited or reaccredited during the year occurs at the IACLEA Annual Conference. The department is required to submit annual reports attesting to its continuing compliance with standards.