March 31, 2000

Robert L. Ackerman  
Vice President for Student Services  
University of Nevada, Las Vegas  
4505 Maryland Parkway  
Box 452019  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89154-2019

Dear Vice President Ackerman,

It is a pleasure to present this management report on the University of Nevada, Las Vegas Department of Public Safety. The report provides an assessment of the department’s organizational, management, and operational status, strengths and weaknesses of the department, status of internal and external relations, and adequacy of staffing, equipment, and resources.

This report has been prepared in accordance with our earlier agreement as outlined in my letter of December 16, 1999. I conducted a pre-assessment site visit on January 26-28, 1999. The Management Assessment Team conducted their formal assessment over a three day period, March 1-3, 2000. The findings and recommendations are specifically derived from the observations and conclusions of the Management Assessment Team and are tailored to address the concerns that precipitated the request for a management audit.

The Team and I wish to acknowledge the cooperation and support provided by yourself, your office, members of the Department of Public Safety, and numerous individuals throughout the campus. We could not have satisfied the requirements of your charge without their assistance. In fact, we found everyone we met to be very helpful and interested in the process.

On behalf of Mr. Robert T. Robinson and Mr. John Carpenter, my associates on the Management Assessment Team, I extend our appreciation for the truly hospitable treatment we received from everyone at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

Sincerely,

Frank J. Pizzulo

Cc. Robert T. Robinson  
John Carpenter
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I. INTRODUCTION AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This general survey of the management/organizational structure of The University of Nevada, Las Vegas Department of Public Safety was conducted upon the request of Robert L. Ackerman, Vice President for Student Services. The review was conducted over the period of March 1-3, 2000. The Management Assessment Team consisted of:

Frank J. Pizzulo  
Senior Associate Vice President  
Student Life and Administrative Services  
Drexel University

Robert T. Robinson  
Assistant Vice President  
Public Safety  
Syracuse University

John J Carpenter  
Director of Public Safety  
San Diego State University

The charge from the Vice President Ackerman was to review all aspects of the Department of Public Safety to include an assessment of its organizational, management, and operational status; strengths and weaknesses of the department; status of internal and external relations; as well as its adequacy of staffing, equipment and resources. In addition, the Team was asked to specifically review the following:

- Police-Community Relations
- Campus Police relationships with external agencies
- The morale of officers within the Campus Police Department

In addition to the above special areas of concern, the Review Team focused on the following topic areas:

- Policing The University: Police/Community Relations
- The Status and Authority of The University Police
- Staffing, Organization and Direction of Personnel
- Performance Evaluations
- Goals and Objectives
- Policies and Procedures
- Complaint Processing and Internal Discipline
- Recruitment and Selection
- Training
- Budgeting
- Records System
- Property and Evidence
- Equipment
- Communication and Dispatching
- Relations With Other Agencies
- Residence Halls Security
- Space and Facilities
- Compliance With Crime Awareness and Campus Security Act of 1990
- Events Planning
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The most critical finding, and the one which merits immediate attention, is the rift that currently exists between the department and the community. There are a significant number of officers who do not understand the nature of their employment relationship to the university and their duty to the university community. This misunderstanding derives from their status as state classified employees.

After reviewing Nevada Revised Statutes, the Delegation Agreement Between Nevada Department of Personnel and University of Nevada System, Business Center South, it was clear to the Team that the State of Nevada Department of Personnel has delegated “appointing authority” to UNLV through a formal agreement. The officers are hired (appointed), evaluated, disciplined, rewarded, and terminated by the University. As classified state employees of the University and Community College System of Nevada (UCCSN) and UNLV, their compensation, and terms and conditions of employment are governed by Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) and Nevada Administrative Code (NAC.) Thus, the officers have the full protection of state classified employees but are clearly accountable to UNLV. The University, UCCSN, and State Department of Personnel work together to administer the NRS, NAC, University, and departmental policies and procedures.

The officers are accountable to their immediate supervisors and UNLV administration as evidenced by the University’s organizational chart and reporting structures. Some officers have the mistaken notion that they are not accountable to the University and/or the campus community. This has led them to become arrogant with no affinity to the campus, no commitment to the community, and a belief there is no one to whom they are accountable.

The formal job description for University Police Officer clearly emphasizes their responsibilities as “University” police officers with specific knowledge, sensitivity, and accountability to University supervisors in their chain of command. Therefore, the Team finds no justification for this mistaken belief.

The morale within the department is poor and continues to suffer from the lack of effective leadership, internal dissension, and continuing controversies that question the competencies and qualifications the officers. The observations and recommendations that follow serve to provide a wider discussion of these issues.

It is clear at this point that the University is taking positive steps to address this problem. In order to be successful, they must do a more effective job of supervising, directing, managing, coaching, mentoring, and disciplining the officers. Most importantly, they must clearly articulate the relationship between the classified employees, the State Department of Personnel, and the University.

Recommendations:

1. The first priority for the University should be to open the lines of communication with the officers and provide annual training and education on these matters.
2. Make sure all officers receive copies of the appropriate NRS, NAC, “Prohibitions and Penalties, A Guide for Classified Staff, University & Community College System of Nevada,” University policies and procedures and UNLV/DPS policies and procedures which govern their conduct and establish standards to which they will be accountable.
II. METHODOLOGY

The following methods and techniques were used in gathering and evaluating information relevant to the University of Nevada, Las Vegas Department of Public Safety:

- Written policies, procedures, budgets and other documents and pertinent information were gathered during on-site visit.

- A three-day on-site visit was used to tour the campus proper and conduct interviews. Interviews and meetings were conducted with more than forty members of the community and the department.

- Follow-up telephone conversations and e-mails were utilized to gather additional information and resolve unanswered questions.

- The Team was provided with copies of articles written in the Las Vegas Sun, Review-Journal, Nevada Appeal, Henderson Home News and Rebel Yell newspapers that were critical of the enforcement policies of the University Administration and its Police Department.

Some of the findings and recommendations will involve investment of resources. Other recommendations involve changing procedures and practices. All of the recommendations are aimed at making the UNLV Department of Public Safety a state-of-the-art and respected campus law enforcement agency.
III. AGENCY DESCRIPTION

The University of Nevada, Las Vegas is a large public university providing graduate and undergraduate education to a population of approximately 21,300 students. They employ 1,218 faculty and staff. The university provides eight (8) on-campus residence halls. There are eighteen (18) fraternities and six (6) sororities located off campus, of which three fraternities and three sororities are traditionally African-American Greek organizations.

The student body profile includes 53.8 female students; 6.3% African-American; 9.0% Asian; 7.4% Latino; 0.9% Native American; 4.6% International; and 6.9% Unknown. [Source: Selected Institutional Characteristics, Fall 1998, 20th Anniversary Edition, The Office of Institutional Analysis and Planning, University of Nevada, Las Vegas.]

The campus consists of 350 acres with approximately 72 buildings comprising 3,351,000 gross square feet. The UNLV Department of Public Safety is responsible for the protection of lives and property within the boundaries and jurisdiction of the university campus. University police officers are vested with full law enforcement powers and responsibilities within their jurisdiction. Their authority is derived from NRS 396.325 and related Nevada Revised Statutes.

The Department consists of one (1) director, six (6) sergeants, fifteen (15) officers, one (1) parking manager, seven (7) management assistants and parking enforcement officers (all in parking,) one (1) accountant technician, one (1) dispatch supervisor, six (6) dispatchers, and two (2) records personnel. The director reports to the Vice President for Student Services.

The police officers are deployed in ten hour/four day shifts that provide a 24-hour-a-day patrol protection to the campus, including parking lots and residence halls. The officers are uniformed in the standard police uniform and are armed with a .40 caliber handgun.
IV. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

The section deals with some of the Team’s general observations regarding the UNLV DPS and the overall law enforcement philosophy at the University.

The most obvious observation is the misunderstanding and mistrust that exists between the Department and the campus community. This problem is the underlying reason for inviting the Team to review the Department. Addressing and eliminating this problem represents a formidable challenge for all members of the UNLV community.

The Team did, however, find that most members of the Department are committed to delivering the highest quality police services to the university community. Member of the Department were open and forthright with Team members. Likewise, the students, faculty and staff want to retain the Department of Public Safety and work with them to integrate them into the campus community. They have a sincere appreciation for the role and responsibilities of the officers and are generally supportive of the department.

It was also obvious that several officers harbor attitudes that are not compatible with concept of community-oriented policing on a university campus. They do not identify with the community, they have no loyalty to the University, and they see themselves a separate and apart from the University. They have an “us versus them” mentality, expressed no interest in working with the University administration, students, or other members of the community-at-large and, in fact, are actively seeking to formally separate the department from the University. This is serious problem for the University and department because it reinforces the notion that the officers are not accountable to the University community. Furthermore, these officers are not above using intimidation to keep other members of the department “in line” with their thinking. In the opinion of team, this is the main reason for low morale within the department.

In the course of the interviews, members of the university community and the department provided information willingly and with welcome candor. The majority of persons interviewed welcomed the review and viewed it as an opportunity for the Department to formulate new goals and move forward in a more professional manner. Overall, the Team received excellent cooperation from the staff and members of the department.

A. Client Response

Client interviews included faculty, administrators, student leaders, staff and outside agency representatives. The information gained was especially helpful in obtaining a “consumer’s view” of the department and the services it provides. Input was mixed depending on the individual interaction with department personnel. Comments tended to focus on the relationship between the campus police and the community, the University’s lack of respect for its own Police Department and vice versa, and the lack of leadership within the UNLV Department of Public Safety. The following are some of the specific comments and impressions expressed by the client group.

- “The University wants us to be University employees when it suits them and state employees the rest of the time.”
- “The department needs to be under someone other than Ackerman (sic), someone impartial who doesn’t always side with the students and assume the officers are automatically guilty.”
- “The best thing that could happen to this department is to hire a female or African-American chief who is a strong leader.
- “The department operates with dilapidated equipment.”
- “There is no planning for crises.”
- “The university won’t let the offices do their job, won’t let them investigate internal problems.
- “The department lacks goals and objectives.
- “People want to see us when there is a problem. Otherwise, they don’t want us around.”
- “We (the DPS) don’t owe anything to UNLV. We’re here to enforce the laws.”
- “Most of us (the officers) are parents. We don’t mind taking care of the kids like our own.”
- “There is not enough security (visibility) at night.”
• “The culture here is to communicate through the press.”
• “The problems are institutional, not just with DPS.”
• “We need officers who are very well educated, able to work with all cultures, understand all cultures, etc.”
• “We need better lighting on campus.”
• “When we go into a residence hall, the RA’s better get out of the way. We will handle the problem the way we have to. Then we’ll let them know what we did.”

B. Goal of the Management Review Team

The goal of the Management Review Team in approaching this review is to help UNLV develop a state-of-the-art campus law enforcement agency. It is recognized that the achievement of this goal is not easy. It takes time and effort and support from all parts of the university community. Such a community wide effort is important to the overall safety of the campus as well as the self-respect of offices charged with the task of protecting members of the academic community.

The public safety challenges in today’s environment, as well as the civil liability risks attendant to those challenges require that public safety agencies be organized and operated in accordance with established and recognized professional standards. Failure to do so invites not only community dissatisfaction, but also the very real potential for civil liability in such areas as NEGLIGENT HIRING, FAILURE TO TRAIN, FAILURE TO DIRECT, NEGLIGENT ENTRUSTMENT, NEGLIGENT RETENTION, NEGLIGENT SUPERVISION and FAILURE TO PROTECT. Various Universities throughout the country have lost substantial sums of money based on any one of these issues, not to mention the unnecessary toll in the terms of human suffering, lost enrollment, and damage to the university’s standing in the community.

It was clear to the Team that UNLV recognizes the importance of public safety to the campus community. This is reflected by the decision made by Vice President Ackerman to have the UNLV Department of Public Safety reviewed by an outside team. Both the University administration and members of the department clearly recognize the need to build a strong agency that meets the highest professional standards and one capable of delivering quality service.

The findings and recommendations which follow are aimed at building and strengthening the police department, building greater community support, reducing liability risk, and enhancing the safety and security of the UNLV campus and community.
V. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following material covers the findings and recommendations of the Management Assessment Team. A total of 19 topic areas were addressed by the Team.

1.0 Policing The University: Police/Community Relations

The community, as noted in the interviews conducted by the Team, wishes to make itself less vulnerable to crime while integrating their Department of Public Safety into the campus culture. The community seems to be very open to crime prevention efforts and community policing efforts. There also seems to be an expectation that the University Police Department will work pro-actively and in close cooperation with the campus. Many in the campus community have high expectations for the performance and professionalism on the part of officers. There is anticipation by all that the reduction of crime can be achieved and tensions between the police and community alleviated when the police and community work cooperatively. It was brought to the Team’s attention that the borders of the campus are particularly vulnerable to gang-related activity. There is a perception among some officers that this activity will infiltrate the campus if the patrol focus is shifted from the borders of campus to the central grounds.

It is encouraging that the community would have high expectations of the department. By stepping forward to meet these expectations, the department could do itself and the community some real good. The development of a comprehensive Police Role, Mission, and Vision Plan, with input from the community, will be beneficial in establishing the department’s focus and developing performance measures by which to determine the accomplishment of the state role, mission, and vision.

The University of Nevada, Las Vegas Department of Public Safety has not proven itself to the university community as effective in developing positive police/community relations. While there have been some instances when the police department has provided input and services, that activity has not been consistent. In addition, there is a strong desire among campus constituencies to work collaboratively in developing and recommending police policies. The formation of the Public Safety Advisory Board is one step that will improve police-community relations. In the course of the Management Assessment Team review, the campus seemed to be united in its desire to support and promote a high quality police department. A major concern heard from many sources was a desire for continuous contact and consistent services. There was also a clear message that officers must be sensitive to the needs of the campus community and accountable for their actions.

The Team also learned that there is a concern in the community that officers are not particularly visible on campus. There was a clear indication that greater visibility is preferred. The community seems to have definite preferences as to the manner in which it should be policed. There seems to be a consensus that police need to be more involved with the campus community, more visible and have high performance standards. The majority of officers in the UNLV DPS appear very willing to find ways to meet these preferences.

During the review process it became apparent that many of the police officers have difficulty identifying with the campus. The Team attributes this to poor intra-university communication and interaction and a general failure of leadership at the department and administrative levels. In addition, there seems to be a great deal of confusion among classified staff as to whom they report to. Many of the police officers felt they did not need to meet and/or cooperate with campus members because they receive their authority from and work for the State and not the University.
**Recommendations**

1.1 Make regular on-campus community contacts part of the performance expectations for each officer.

1.2 Develop a Role, Vision, and Mission Plan in consultation with University administration for a more community-oriented and student-centered approach to policing. Likewise, the University administration should develop a plan to promote the University’s mission and vision among its staff.

1.3 Use crime prevention activities and education as the entry to the new approach.

1.4 Work with the Director of Residence Life and the Dean of Students to establish greater police presence in the residence halls, student union, etc. Work with administrators, faculty and students to establish proper expectations for police presence and activities.

1.5 Work in partnership with Student Life Administrators in planning and communicating expectations for organized events.

1.6 Work collaboratively with Metro police in patrolling the boundaries of campus. Develop a strategic plan to implement effective patrols, both on and off campus. University administration should play an integral role in this planning.

1.7 Establish a goal of developing a community-oriented philosophy that recognizes the unique nature of the campus culture and the need for the University police officers to be part of the campus community.

1.8 Place more emphasis on foot and bicycle patrols and spend less time in cars patrolling the campus perimeter. The Team recognizes the officers need to respond rapidly to an emergency, thereby necessitating close proximity to a patrol car. We would therefore suggest that the patrol car be parked near a given section of campus while the officer walks that area. The car can then be moved to another section and the officer again perform a foot patrol once again.

1.9 The position of the director is currently vacant. The University is strongly encouraged to use this opportunity to recruit an individual who has a proven record of strong leadership in this field. The process must be an open process with community involvement at every step of the way. Modern assessment techniques should be utilized to glean the best candidate(s) from the field of applicants. If necessary, the University should identify and recruit qualified applicants. The Team is ready to assist the University in this regard.

1.10 The new director will need a firm commitment from the University is s/he is to succeed. Part of the commitment should be the recruitment and hiring of a mid-level manager (captain or assistant director). One individual will not be able to cope with all of the challenges and effect a cultural shift in the department unless s/he has capable assistance within the department as well as the unwavering support of the president and executive team, Human Resources Department, State Personnel Office, and legal counsel.

1.11 Utilize the newly created Public Safety Advisory Board to assist the director and vice president in all phases of implementing the recommendations of this report. The Public Safety Advisory Board can be a tremendous asset if there is broad campus representation on the Board and their role and responsibilities are clearly defined.
2.0 The Status and Authority of the University Police

The University of Nevada, Las Vegas Police Department is granted authority through NRS 396.325 (Creation; inter local agreement with other law enforcement agencies.)

1. Police officers of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, are appointed with specific authority under NRS 289.350. A person employed and compensated as a member of the police department of the University and Community College System of Nevada may exercise his/her power only:
   (a) Upon the campuses of the University and Community College System of Nevada, including that area to the center line of public streets adjacent to campus;
   (b) When in hot pursuit of a violator leaving such a campus or area;
   (c) In or about other grounds or properties of the University and Community College System of Nevada; or
   (d) Except as limited by subsection 2, in accordance with inter local agreements entered into with other law enforcement agencies.

Many of the officers believe they are subservient to the State and not the University. The University Administration needs to recognize the causal factors for the perception and implement solutions.

Currently, there is a strong movement to consolidate police resources in the State of Nevada. Although consolidation may be cost-effective, there is evidence across the country that it may not be effective in providing quality service on college campuses.

Recommendations

2.1 The Team encourages the University to clarify the Classified Personnel reporting structure.

2.2 The University should research the positives and negatives of separating the Department of Public Safety from the University and consolidating it under a statewide Department of Public Safety. The University should then proceed to support and defend their position across all levels.

2.3 The Team encourages the University President to publicly state her support and confidence in the Department of Public Safety. While some changes may be necessary in order to justify such support, it nevertheless is critical to the effective functioning of the department.

2.4 The Team encourages a clear and delineated command structure. To effect this, officers should report to supervisors, supervisors should report to command staff, command staff should report the director, and the director should report to the vice president.

2.5 For critical issues, the University should continue to delegate a professional public spokesperson for the University. For issues that the public spokesperson may delegate, the director, in collaboration with the vice president, should be the primary spokespeople for the department. It is important to deal with all issues in a straight forward, open manner. When mistakes are made the University and DPS must be willing to admit it and correct it. When the DPS acts properly, the University must support them without apologies. It is obvious that the role of the department is critical to the safety and security of the campus. What may not be so obvious is the role campus safety and security plays in the recruitment, enrollment, and retention of students and faculty. Recent surveys of parents of incoming students nationally indicate that safety and security is one of their most important concerns. In this particular area, image and perception are larger than reality.

2.6 The Team encourages interaction with all university constituencies to develop respectful working relationships.

2.7 The Team also recommends the University actively participate in developing a dynamic public relations plan for the department. Carefully constructed statements, well planned literature, and programs
explaining the role and authority the police have on campus, as well as their accountability, will help ease the tensions that currently exist.

3.0 **Staffing, Organization and Direction of Personnel**

The UNLV Police Department has twenty-one (21) sworn police officers, seven (7) communications personnel, two support personnel in records, and one budget and payroll administrator. The department is clearly understaffed at the supervisory and administrative support levels. In particular, the absence of a hierarchical command structure leaves a void in supervision of the department. The first priority should be to establish such a structure and institute a procedural policy for having adequate supervision on each shift. The roles of the members of the department have not been adequately defined and therefore they have no basis for direction. Without the direction and supervision of a dynamic and challenging leader, the officers will continue to “police and supervise” themselves. The lack of supervision and leadership has clearly become detrimental to community relations. (Refer to “General Observations” and “Policing the Community: Police/Community Relations.”)

Based on a 1990 national survey by *USA Today* of every four-year college in the nation with at least 3,000 students, the national ratio of police officers to students is approximately one (1) officer per 700 students. This translates to approximately thirty officers for the UNLV DPS. This should be a planning goal for the University. Growth and structure in the Department have not kept pace with campus growth. There is sufficient campus population and activity to justify additional positions for campus patrol, administrative support, and criminal investigations.

At present, officers work a 4/10 scheduling plan and are allowed to “bid” on the shift they prefer. This method of shift assignment reduces the level of management prerogatives necessary to run the department. It also fosters “clicks” and alienation from the greater campus community. This method of scheduling i.e. bidding for shifts generally is a result of police departments with strong police unions. It is not something that should be given up lightly.

**Recommendations**

3.1 The Team recommends establishing a goal of increasing DPS staffing to meet the national average. Staffing in the patrol division should be sufficient to insure adequate coverage and supervision on all shifts, seven days per week.

3.2 Clearly define the expectations, authority, accountability, and roles of police officers and supervisors.

3.3 Create communication opportunities across all levels in the police department. Organize staff meetings, continue to publish the DPS Weekly newsletter, and establish formal roll calls at the DPS facility.

3.4 Consider shift rotation as a positive operational move. The shift assignments of offices should be on a “rotation” bases which requires all officers to work on all shifts quarterly, or as a maximum, yearly. Offices need to know how the community operates both day and night.

3.5 Consider remedial supervisor training for those who are suitable for the campus environment.

3.6 The position of director is currently vacant. The University is strongly encouraged to use this opportunity to recruit an individual who has a proven record of strong leadership in this field. The process must be an open process with community involvement at every step of the way. Modern assessment techniques should be utilized to glean the best candidate(s) from the field of applicants. If necessary, The University should identify and recruit qualified applicants. The Team is ready to assist the University in this regard. (Note: This recommendation has been repeated from Section 1.0 because it is so important.)
3.7 The new director will need a firm commitment from the University if s/he is to succeed. Part of the commitment should be the recruitment and hiring of a mid level manager (captain or assistant director). One individual will not be able to cope with all of the challenges and effect a cultural shift in the department unless s/he has capable assistance within the department as well as the unwavering support of the president and executive team, Human Resources Department, State Personnel Office, and legal counsel (Note: This recommendation has been repeated from Section 1.0 because it is so important.)

4.0 Goals and Objectives

The ability of a police agency to perform its functions adequately is based upon its ability to define and understand its proper objectives, to translate these objectives in precise policies and operational procedures, and to employ qualified professionals to carry out these objectives. It is also a necessity that the department defines and understands its role within the college community. There is a basic societal expectation that the police should make citizens feel secure in their community. Whether or not the police agency is fulfilling this responsibility to the community, the public needs to know what its police administration has defined as their objectives and goals. Annual reports summarizing the department’s activities, crime statistics and operational expenditures provide the indices by which to measure these achievements.

Without clearly written and defined goals, administrators would find difficulty in developing programs and effectively managing the department’s role, mission, and vision.

The University of Nevada, Las Vegas DPS does not currently have written goals and objectives. Although there are specific plans for the future, there is not a general written plan that provides direction to the Department for a systematic approach to anticipating future demands and challenges.

Recommendations

4.1 The university administration, DPS, and community, through the auspices of the Police Advisory Board, should develop a Role, Mission, and Vision plan that contributes to the overall University’s vision and mission.

4.2 Develop a three-to-five year strategic plan incorporating future demand levels for service and projecting what the agency needs to do to address the issues in this management review and generally develop a state-of-the-art campus law enforcement agency.

4.3 Keep University administrators and the Police Advisory Board informed of the progress of developing this material and seek their input as well as other key campus departments on pertinent issues.

4.4 Review and update the department’s goals and plans annually. Evaluate progress as to the Plan’s goals twice a year with the evaluation available to all personnel.

4.5 Once the Role, Mission, and Vision plan are adopted, training must be provided for all Officers on an annual and continuing basis. The philosophy espoused in the Role, Mission, and Vision plan must permeate the department’s operating policies and procedures. Each officer must be held to the standards established therein. Those who cannot or will not commit to the Role, Mission, and Vision plan should be encouraged to find employment elsewhere.
5.0 Policies and Procedures

Written policies and procedures are an integral part of any campus law enforcement agency. These policies not only serve to define the role of the agency, but also provide operating guidelines for department personnel. It is important that these guidelines be periodically reviewed, not only by the head of the law enforcement agency, but also by legal counsel and the vice president.

The increasing complexity of providing a reasonably safe campus, both at the managerial and operational level, is one of the most important reasons for having a complete up-to-date manual. Carefully drafted written directives are the backbone of a top quality policy and procedures manual. Written directives and internal department discipline are essential to one another. They not only serve to inform department personnel of what is expected of them, but they also provide a basis for establishing a disciplinary process with the department. When issuing the manual, it should be made clear to all personnel the violations of policies, procedures or regulations will be considered as a basis for disciplinary action.

The Team suggests that in order for the manual to be a true department manual, a process should be established whereby a joint line and supervisory staff committee review each policy and procedure for applicability to current operations. Each member of the department should receive a copy of the manual and provide written acknowledgment that they received and understand the contents of the manual. Some members of the police department stated that they have not seen the new policy manual.

Recommendations

5.1 Establish a process to involve all members of the department in the development of policies and procedures. The Human Resources Department and office of the University legal counsel should be partners in this effort. There are resources available through professional organizations (IACP and IACLEA) to assist in this endeavor.

5.2 Merge University policy and procedures into the content of the manual. Include communications and administration policies and procedures.

5.3 Policies and procedures should be periodically reviewed by the officers and so noted for file. This can be done in formal training sessions, roll call training, or one-on-one training.

6.0 Complaint Processing and Internal Discipline

The department established a Citizen Complaint form in 1996. The procedure for complaints is outlined in section 8.02.00 of the department’s policy manual. Although the form can certainly facilitate the complaint process, careful attention to how the complaint is resolved needs to be considered. The Team interviewed many students and staff who were not aware of the complaint proves. In addition, those who did file a complaint did not receive confirmation that the complaint was handled. An oversight agency, such as Human Resources, should be involved in the process. In addition, there is a legislative mandate to record and report all complaints of officer misconduct.

The elements of a formal citizen complaint process include the following:

- Publishing a form and procedure for citizens
- Outlining the department’s policy and procedure for all members, according to existing Nevada state law and personnel policies, Human resources policies and Police Association guidelines.
- Documenting informal complaints involving no signed statement. In such cases, the chief may create a log to record the complaints. Then based on the amount and quality of information available, investigate and resolve the complaint to the best extent possible.
- Creating a process to deal with formal complaints (signed statement), to include: investigation, review, follow-up and possible initiation of disciplinary procedures. Discipline may include counseling, oral or written warnings, suspension without pay, arrest, and/or termination.
Recommendations

6.1 Document all formal and informal complaints, using the process noted above.

6.2 Establish an oversight agency to ensure the integrity of the complaint process and compliance with Nevada state law and personnel policies.

7.0 Performance Evaluations

Evaluating employee job performance is an important element for supervision. Employee evaluation should be viewed as one of the many methods for the organization to give feedback and guidance on employee performance and to identify individual goals as well as strengths and weaknesses. Additionally, it is one of the ways in which the department can judge its overall performance in terms of strengths and shortcomings in such areas as training, communication, relationships with the campus community, and policies and procedures.

At this time, the department does not have a formal employee evaluation program for veteran officers. Some members stated that they had never received a performance appraisal. At a minimum, each employee should be evaluated annually; however, the department should not solely rely on the individual employee’s evaluations to evaluate performance. Indicators that can also be used include customer/community surveys, the department awards program, focus groups with constituents, number and type of complaints, and assessments conducted by the department.

Some considerations the department should make when evaluating employees might be:

- Defining the organization’s expectations for employee performance as described in the department’s role, mission and vision statement and policy manual.
- Creating a rating instrument that captures the main job tasks performed by the employee.
- Defining the time period for evaluation.
- Creating consensus between the employee and the supervisor on those tasks or performance goals or areas in need of improvement.
- Preparing a formal evaluation by the supervisor or the employee after a formal meeting.
- Timely method of appeal for the employee to address issues, disputed ratings and allegations of personal bias.
- Conducting training on the evaluation program.

Recommendations

7.1 Initiate a performance evaluation program for all employees. This should be preceded by a formal job task analysis to identify the factors that are germane to the position.

7.2 Create customer surveys and an awards program to reward employees for heroism, professionalism and other good work.

8.0 Recruitment and Selection

For a police department, human resources management accounts for the vast majority of expenses and administrative attention. A crucial factor in the delivery of services and the creation of police/community partnerships involves the selection and retention of qualified personnel who can work in a campus environment.

At the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, the recruitment and selection of officers follows the typical pattern for state agencies across the nation. The University does have some control over the selection process and should be monitored by the office of Human Resources. A trained background investigator is critical to the quality of candidates the University selects. The Management Assessment Team recommends that all new hires undergo psychological and drug testing. In addition, the University may consider an assessment center format whereby candidates are required to prepare written materials and participate in role-playing scenarios.
Based on college philosophy and operating needs, there is a need to attract traditionally underrepresented groups (i.e. African-Americans, Latinos, Asians and female applicants.) This may be accomplished by more intensive recruiting efforts in area media and at colleges. Two important factors for improving recruiting efforts are to improve the image of the department and provide wages that are competitive with area law enforcement agencies.

**Recommendations**

8.1 Create a work group with the Human Resources Office to develop new methods of recruitment to increase the traditionally underrepresented composition of the department.

8.2 Review the hiring process and introduce assessment center techniques for officer selection. Expand the selection committee to include members of the community

9.0 **Training**

The purpose of training is to provide department members with the necessary information and skills for performing police and community-oriented tasks. At the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, training consists of basic recruitment and in-service training. The Team was advised that the basic training for campus officers throughout the state is conducted off-site at a state academy. The Team clearly recognized that, although the training provides critical policing skills, it does not provide the skills and socialization techniques necessary for police officers in campus environments.

A collaborative in-service and field training program between University departments and the police department needs to be developed. It was brought to our attention that in the past, members of the department were invited to participate in various staff development programs. However, members of the University stated they observed some officers behaving indifferently to the training. The unresponsiveness of the officers could be due to lack of a clearly defined role at the University. The Management Assessment Team observed that many officers do not behave as though they are part of the campus community.

**Recommendations**

9.1 Augment in-services and field training opportunities with other campus groups. Invite Professional instructors from within and without the University who bring new perspectives in areas such as cultural diversity, customer service, inter-personal skills and supervisory development.

9.2 Clearly define the officer’s role at the University and the expectations of meeting the needs of the University community.

9.3 Do not rely strictly on off-site, police-oriented training. The officers must be socialized into the campus environment.
10.0 **Budgeting**

The source of funds for the DPS is primarily derived from the state appropriation/subsidy received by the University. This comes in the form of a biennial appropriation directly from the state legislature. Furthermore, the appropriation is received not as a lump sum, but as a line item appropriation by the department. This method of funding severely limits the ability of the University to manage its own affairs.

It appears that a base budget was established some years ago. To over simplify the process, there are several ways to increase the budget. At the system level, the University prepares a list of budget “enhancements” or increases following state guidelines and presents them to the legislative budget committee, as do all other state supported or state funded agencies and institutions. The budget committee may vote to approve or deny each request. The state legislature may also award an across the board increase.

At the institutional level, the University may allocate uncommitted funds to a specific department either as continuing (base) budget or one-time funds. The department may also help to support itself by generating revenue, i.e. self-supporting budget areas. DPS has utilized revenue from the Thomas and Mack special events account, meters and fines, and other self-supporting budgets to improve their funding, especially with equipment purchases. It has also been necessary to hold two positions open and unfilled in order to have a budget for overtime.

The Team found the current budget to be insufficient to adequately support the needs of the department. Only recently has there been an increase in the operating budget to its present level, yet it remains inadequate. It will be necessary to conduct an in-depth analysis of the department’s needs in order to develop an accurate funding request. Some examples to be considered are: overtime wages, supplies expense, communications expense, books and subscriptions, dues and memberships, printing and duplication expense, postage expense, travel expense to include training, professional services, equipment service contracts, maintenance expense, minor equipment and major equipment.

The department should not have to depend on special event and/or parking revenue in order to provide basic services. This may not be a consistent or dependable source of funds. Moreover, when the department is forced to become “entrepreneurial,” this may raise the suspicions of their customers as to their motives for charging back for services.

The Team found no specific reason as to why this situation has developed except the overall rapid growth of the University which has apparently outpaced the growth of funding and governance infrastructure at the state and institutional levels. The Team did not find a specific bias against DPS.

**Recommendations**

10.1 The University should conduct a “zero-based” analysis of the true budgetary needs of the department and make an institutional effort to improve funding in order to allow the department to succeed.

11.0 **Records System**

Efficient recording and flow of paperwork are essential to the successful operation of any police agency. The records function is important in retrieving and utilizing information about accidents, crimes, events, investigations and services rendered. It is a critical management tool for allocating and documenting departmental resources and filing state and national reports. The chief task of the records unit includes filing and indexing police paperwork by various classification systems so that this information is accessible for future use.

The police department currently uses a professional software package used by many police departments across the country, Automated Records Management System (ARMS). The software is instrumental in generating statistics and is a vehicle for providing facts to the campus community. The software is a relational database and can be used as an administrative tool to generate reports. While on-site, the Team observed the use of Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD), a module of ARMS. During an hour of observation, the CAD system was
used to document vehicle stops. The dispatcher did not receive or document any other activities (for example property checks, community contacts, and status checks). In addition, the dispatcher did not give arrival and clear times to the officers. From our observations, there was no indication that the officers generate a written daily activity log, or note the arrival and clear times of their activities.

**Recommendations**

11.1 Develop and implement written procedures. Document and monitor types of activity the officers are expected to perform. The officers should be involved in more activities other than vehicle stops. Subsequently, the dispatcher needs clear instructions for documentation. As an indicator of consistent documentation, the Radio Log generated from CAD should match the police officers written activity log.

11.2 The Management Assessment Team recommends requiring officers to make at least two community contacts during their tour of duty and documenting such activity on their activity logs and with the dispatch.

**Property and Evidence**

Property and evidence is an important function managed by police departments. It is critical to maintain proper chain of custody on all evidence and property items. The Management Assessment Team observed that the property and evidence room was very organized. The Team was told that there were two property custodians who had sole access to the property and evidence room. In addition, officers are able to secure property items in the room through a drop box.

**Recommendations**

12.1 Currently the property and evidence room is overcrowded. In the future, any space allocated for property should be larger to facilitate the volume.

12.2 Property custodians should continually evaluate and audit records for property in the room that may be destroyed or purged.

12.3 Assign an independent auditor from the police department, who routinely verifies chain of custody reports for both property and evidence.

**Equipment**

The effectiveness of every law enforcement agency is impacted positively or negatively by the adequacy of the equipment provided. Quality, delivery of service, employee morale and community confidence are all affected by the appearance and condition of the equipment.

Equipment is currently scattered throughout the department, making the space cramped and inefficient. Vehicles and maintenance records are in poor condition. Members of the community had several concerns about the M-16’s in the patrol cars and did not feel the weapons were appropriate for the type of work they perceive the officers to be doing. Community members also stated that some of the uniforms officers wear to special events appear to be riot gear. They find the gear threatening and not oriented towards a campus community environment.

**Recommendations**

13.1 The police department and University administration should discuss the appropriateness, deployment and sensitivity of the equipment utilized. In addition, attempts should be made to ameliorate the perceptions of members of the community regarding any necessary equipment. It should be noted that the deployment of M16’s in the passenger compartment of the patrol vehicle is highly unusual.

13.2 The communications center will be receiving a new NCIC 2000 console. The Team agrees that this equipment is necessary and an invaluable resource in the day-to-day operations.
13.3 The Team recommends careful analysis and use of the proposed vehicle acquisition under the Nevada Highway Patrol. Normally, vehicle purchases and replacement should be budgeted. The used vehicles should be a supplemental, not primary source of vehicle acquisition.

13.4 The Department, with the assistance of the purchasing department, should conduct a thorough analysis of all its equipment, purchasing requirements, maintenance needs, and replacement schedules and incorporate the results into a multi-year budget request.

14.0 Communications And Dispatching

The police communications unit is the center of communications and reporting for the department and for the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. The members of this unit answer telephone inquiries from students, employees, and the public, and relay police related requests for services to mobile patrol nits via radio. In addition, the communications unit is responsible for handling walk-in customer complaints. The dispatchers also monitor alarms, various police frequencies and request data from the Criminal Justice Information System/National Crime Information Center (CJIS/NCIC). They also utilize a county wide criminal records terminal. Radio reception for the campus and patrol zones was found to be adequate.

The volume of work was moderate and at times steady. The dispatchers enter calls for service and patrol activity in CAD. The team did not observe the dispatcher performing status checks of the patrol units. The dispatch did not give arrival or clear times to the officers for any activity.

The work area is located near the front lobby of the facility. The door leading into the facility is not secured or monitored by a camera during non-University business hours. Space in the room is cramped. The supervisor of the unit does not have a private office to perform performance appraisals or conduct discipline.

Recommendations

14.1 For the safety and security of the members of the police department, the Management Assessment Team recommends a camera, monitor, and electronic door switch be installed at the entranceway of the facility.

14.2 The communications unit should conduct at least one police officer status check per hour. The check should be documented in CAD and include each officer’s status, location and time of the check.

15.0 Relations With Other Agencies

The Las Vegas Metro Police Department is the primary assisting agency to the campus police department. Law enforcement officers were interviewed during the visit and reported that they have a fine working relationship with the campus police department. There is a mutual agreement that permits the officers to patrol the outlying streets that surround the campus.

The Team was also made aware that without adequate supervision, the patrol span tends to broaden to other areas of the community. Discussions should commence between the departments toward creating a memorandum of understanding to identify the department’s respective duties and responsibilities for mutual assistance.

The Team was also made aware that the department is working closely with Metro to capture data to comply with the Crime Awareness and Campus Security Act of 1990.

Recommendations

15.1 Begin discussions for a formal memorandum of understanding between the University of Nevada, Las Vegas police and the Las Vegas Metro police to outline general responsibilities for mutual assistance.
15.2 Continue to monitor and participate in discussions regarding the Crime Awareness and Campus security Act of 1990.

16.0 Residence Halls Security

Crime prevention activities on campus and in residence halls are central to a safe campus. Colleges and universities, however, have characteristics that provide unique challenges to crime prevention efforts. Foremost among these is the fact that a college community is a community of young adults whose population changes dramatically each year. In addition, the population typically is not especially concerned with safety until something happens. Crime prevention, in concert with police community relationships and problem solving, must be viewed as an ongoing and integral part of any viable safety program.

The Team did not see a significant investment or planning of proactive crime prevention programs. Members of the police department and campus community expressed interest in community policing concepts and crime prevention programs, but have limited interactions. Some students relayed that they felt comfortable calling the police department for service or advice only when specific officers are on duty. Currently, residence hall staff does not view some campus officers as “supporting” their roles, but rather as openly hostile towards them.

The University of Nevada Las Vegas provides a safety escort shuttle. Students feel the service is important, but are unclear about what the schedule and pick-up points are. They expressed concern that the “student shuttle system” was not effective in picking up and dropping off students in a timely and convenient manner. Most campuses across the country have specifically designated student escort programs that provide escorts across campus when called. It would be helpful if the Public Safety Advisory Committee reviewed the effectiveness of the shuttle system in relationship to an escort program.

Because of the serious lack of respect and interaction between campus police officers and residence life staff, the review team strongly recommends that frequent and productive meetings be held. As long as offices feel that the resident students and staff are against them and resident students and staff hesitate to call the police when appropriate, mistrust and miscommunication will endure. Such meetings should allow for an open exchange of views and conclude with recommendations to improve their working relationships.

Recommendations

16.1 Assign one position to coordinate community crime prevention during hours conducive to campus activity. Delegate some crime prevention functions to patrol divisions such as lighting surveys, emergency phone checks, surveys, etc so that the offices are actively engaged in frequent and regular crime prevention activities.

16.2 The crime prevention officer should frequently confer with patrol operations to focus efforts. Surveys of citizen’s attitudes and opinions should be studied to help develop programs for the community.

16.3 Evaluate past and current crime prevention programs. Invite the current Public Safety Advisory Board to assist in planning crime prevention programs.

16.4 Provide security surveys, including information such as exterior lighting, landscaping, and plant growth, exterior entrances, parking areas, trash container areas, vending machine areas, interior lighting, and door locking mechanisms.

16.5 Assure that emergency telephones or call boxes function as intended. These phones should be inspected periodically, and someone needs to ensure that repairs are done promptly. The practice of collaborating with student groups to conduct lighting surveys at least once a year should be continued. Inspect access control systems and door alarms on a regular basis. Affix current emergency telephone stickers to every phone on campus. Add emergency phone
locations to campus map.

16.6 Strive to develop outreach contacts with students, faculty and staff. Maintain regular contact with formal and informal groups. Strive to establish and strengthen relationships with residence hall staff.

16.7 Offer groups or individuals a specific contact person as a link to the department.

16.8 Identify opportunities to collaborate with student groups and academic classes on projects of mutual interest.

16.9 Convene a small group to discuss the current escort program. Promote and publish information about the program.

### 17.0 Space and Facilities

The department is located in a separate facility that is located on the border of the campus. Space is allocated for visitor parking, reception, chief’s office, room for officers to write reports, and locker rooms for men and women.

The area is well lit at night and maintenance is above average. The locker rooms are cramped in that there are no storage areas for equipment. Currently, two officers share one locker that would ordinarily be viewed as inadequate for one officer.

The space assigned to the police department is located in the front-left of the building. Parking Services is to the right. We were advised that plans are underway to relocate the parking services department. This will give the department opportunity to expand.

### Recommendations

17.1 Develop an action plan to secure the front door leading to the facility. The night dispatcher is very vulnerable to an angry or deranged person coming to the police station. The dispatcher should control access to the building after hours.

17.2 For long-term planning, consider moving the police department to an area or building that is closer to the center of campus and has adequate space.

### 18.0 Compliance With The Crime Awareness and Campus Security Act of 1990

The Crime Awareness and Campus Security Act of 1990 requires all colleges and universities to report campus safety policies and certain Part I Uniform Crime Report incidents to current students and staff members and, upon request, to prospective students and employees. Additionally the report must outline procedures for reporting crimes and sexual assaults.

This law was amended in October 1998 and renamed the Jeanne Cleary Act in memory of a student who was murdered in her college residence hall room. Amendments to the Cleary act require the following:

1. public inspection of campus police logs;
2. reporting incidents where students have been referred to campus judicial proceedings for alcohol and other drugs and weapons violations (the former statute only required arrests to be reported);
3. reporting incidents of manslaughter;
4. reporting offenses for off-campus properties and streets adjacent to campus properties owned or maintained by the institution.
These revisions of the Cleary Act also revise certain sections of the Family Rights and Privacy Act and Drug-Free Workplace Act. The revisions allow campuses to: (1) withhold aid for drug convictions; (2) inform parents on student alcohol and other drug offenses; (3) publish the names of students disciplined for violent crimes in campus judicial hearings. Institutions may also be fined for knowingly violating the provisions of this act. The procedures for implementation of the act continue to undergo negotiated rulemaking processes under the auspices of the Department of Education. The University will have to monitor this and prepare a compliance plan among the various offices responsible for reporting and collecting information, such as, campus and metro police, student affairs, and residential life. As this is a University wide compliance effort, we recommend that the office of student affairs coordinate this task.

Members of the campus community interested in this statute may find additional information at the IACLEA web site and a web site coordinated by the Campus Security Inc.

Recommendations

18.1 Closely monitor current rulemaking discussions for revisions to the Cleary Act. The Team understands that a sub-committee of the Public Safety Advisory Board is reviewing this matter.

18.2 Immediately prepare a compliance plan coordinated by a campus wide compliance committee, possibly the Public Safety Advisory Committee. It was brought to the Team’s attention that critical areas on campus are not aware of the law or reporting statistics to the police department. There is a severe penalty under Federal Law for violations of the act.

18.3 Make the report convenient and available for anyone who requests the data.

19.0 Event Planning

The input from events staff and the community in regards to special event security and policing echoed a familiar theme—their approach required trust and cooperation between the campus police and event staff. It seems that there are two main factors that give rise to this state of affairs. First, events take place in numerous venues on campus. They are scheduled and coordinated by various administrative or academic departments. In the past, these departments sometimes arranged for security without coordinating with the campus police and with little or no regard for the qualifications of the contract security guards, their training, or their supervision. Unfortunately, the actions of contract, uniformed security guards were mistakenly attributed to the campus police. Second, the campus police tend to be uncooperative, uncompromising, and insensitive to the needs of the organizers, events staff, student organizations, and performers. Finally, as stated previously under “Budgets,” the campus police department was forced to become entrepreneurial, i.e. raise money through special events charge backs, in order to sustain or supplement basic operational needs. This engendered mistrust on the part of the event organizers and sponsors and created a temptation for the campus police to over staff or inflate billing rates in order to generate revenue.

The Department of Public Safety can and should be the best resource available for providing assistance to the events staff and organizers when it comes to public safety and security concerns. In order for this occur, both sides must value each other’s role and operate from a position of mutual respect. Officers who cannot demonstrate these behaviors should not be assigned to special events. For example, the Team heard stories about officers intimidating ushers and other event staff in order to gain access to backstage areas, dressing rooms, and ultimately, the performers themselves, with no regard for privacy or rules pertaining to access. This kind of behavior is clearly not acceptable. Special events at UNLV, as at all other major universities, are very important to community life and the image of the University.
Recommendations

19.1 All events should be routed through DPS for assistance and advice with security planning.
19.2 No contract security agencies should be hired unless they are qualified and work under the direction of DPS.
19.3 All DPS officers must support the events staff, cooperate with designated officials and events supervisors, follow the rules established for the facility/event, and treat the public with respect.
19.4 The University should appoint an ad hoc committee to develop criteria for security staffing.
19.5 The billing rates for DPS officers should reflect all actual expenses plus an indirect or administrative overhead expense to compensate the department for use of their equipment, communications, planning assistance, and overall administrative oversight.
VII. Addendum 1- Persons Interviewed

Robert Ackerman, Vice President for Student Services
Brian Alvarez, Ethnic Student Council
Harold Archibald, Director of Facilities
Harriet Barlow, Director of Recruitment, Graduate College and Chair of the Director of Public Safety Search Committee
Rick Bennett, Director of Governmental Relations and Chair of Public Safety Advisory Board
Doris Berry DPS Budget and Payroll Administrator
Captain Bitsko, LVMPD
Aaron Clemens, Opinion Editor, Rebel Yell
Joey Cohn, Student ACLU
Steve Custer, COP Sergeant, SEA area Command, LVMPD
Semma Dayami, Senator, CSUN
Officer De Vilbiss, DPS Reserve Officer
Brian Diaz, DPS Sergeant
Don Drake, Interim Chief, DPS
Donna Edwards, DPS Dispatcher
Juanita Fain, Vice President for Administration
Paul Ferguson, Dean, Graduate College
Jeff Green, DPS Officer
Carol Harter, President UNLV
Esther Jones, Volunteer, Women’s Center
James Kettner, DPS Officer
Anne Kingsley, Director of Student Services, Budget and Administrative Support
Daren Libonati, Assistant Director, Thomas & Mack Center
Myron Martin, Director, Thomas & Mack Center
Velicia McMillan, Director, Multicultural Student Affairs
Rebecca Mills, Senior Advisor to the President
James Morrow, DPS Records Custodian
Lawrence Morsovillo, DPS Sergeant
Ann Mueller, Director, Office of Diversity Initiatives
John Mueller, Manager of State Personnel Services
Eric Nystrom, Director, CSUN Nevada Student Affairs Director
Preston Perrenot, DPS Officer
Joseph Santiago, Booking and Marketing Manager, Thomas & Mack Center
Rochelle Sax, DPS Sergeant
William Seifert, COP Officer, Patrol/SEAC, LVMPD
Kelly Stuehling, DPS Officer
Jennifer Peck, President, CSUN
Yvette Whipple, DPS Communications Supervisor

In addition, the Team met with the Public Safety Advisory Board, the Search Committee for the Director of Public Safety, and a large representative group of Student Life and Residential Living.
VII. Addendum 2- Documents Reviewed

1. Written Policies and Procedures of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas Department of Public Safety

2. Current budget documents for the UNLV DPS (2364, 3121, 3155, 3161, 3165, 3170, 3175, 3179, 3180, 3181.)

3. UNLV Police Advisory Board By-Laws

4. UNLV Organizational Chart

5. Director of Public Safety Search Committee Resume Screening Form


7. November 11, 1999 memo from Rebecca Mills, senior advisor to the president, to Carole Harter, president. Subject: Planning Discussion with Public Safety


9. February 19, 2000 letter from Ron Cuzze, president of State Peace Officers Council, to Chief Don Drake, UCCSN (sic) Police Department

10. March 1, 2000 Memorandum from Ron Cuzze, president of State Peace Officers Council, to Chief Don Drake, UCCSN (sic) Police Department.


13. State of Nevada-Department of Personnel Class Specifications for University Police Sergeant and University Police Officer I and II.


15. Sample evaluation forms for classified staff (NPD-15, Rev. 11/92).

