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**PURPOSE OF UNIT REVIEW**
The primary purpose of the review is to confirm that the CSU Stanislaus Public Safety/University Police Department supports the Mission and Strategic Plan of the University. The secondary purpose is to evaluate and assess the Public Safety/University Police Department functions and resources.

**UNIVERSITY MISSION STATEMENT**
“The faculty, staff, administrators, and students of California State University, Stanislaus are committed to creating a learning environment which encourages all members of the campus community to expand their intellectual, creative and social horizons. We challenge on another to realize our potential, to appreciate and contribute to the enrichment of our diverse community, and to develop a passion for lifelong learning. To facilitate this mission, we promote academic excellence in the teaching and scholarly activities of our faculty, encourage personalized student learning, foster interactions and partnerships with surrounding communities, and provide opportunities for the intellectual, cultural, and artistic enrichment of the region.”

**UNIVERSITY STRATEGIC PLAN**
“This Strategic Plan, *Framing the Future*, capitalizes on the development over the past decade of the University Mission and the Vision and Values statement, documents created through extensive intramural collaboration. This Strategic Plan frames our future in three key initiatives:

- Create a world-class center for intellectual and academic pursuits
- Develop a University known for student access and academic achievement
- Build with the region

The Plan states that the University will provide the necessary infrastructure – informational, technological, human, and material – to support the Mission. The Public Safety/University Police department is an integral part of that infrastructure.
MISSION
To improve the quality of life at CSU Stanislaus by promoting safety, accountability, tolerance, and compassion.

VISION
To be an integral partner in the academic, personal, and professional success of our campus community members.
PUBLIC SAFETY FUNCTIONS

The department of Public Safety is divided into five functional areas: Police Services, Environmental Health, Safety & Emergency Management, Community & Parking Services, Communications & Records, and Parking Management Bureau.

POLICE SERVICES
The University Police Department (UPD) has primary law enforcement jurisdiction on the grounds of California State University, Stanislaus with authority extended to anywhere within the state. This authority is consistent with the California Penal Code Section 830.2 and the California Education Code Section 89560. The UPD is responsible for the 24-hour protection of the entire campus community.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH, SAFETY & EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT
EHS/EM has responsibility for campus environmental protection, employee accident prevention and investigation, safety training, emergency preparedness, Clery Act requirements, ergonomic evaluation, risk management, victim assistance, defensive driving, workplace violence, first aid, CPR, AED, and a number of related services for the campus community. EHS/EM ensures compliance with OSHA, Cal/OSHA, the State and Federal codes and regulations for general industry safety standards. Executive Order 921 addresses the Emergency Management requirements.
COMMUNITY & PARKING SERVICES
Public Safety is responsible for administration and maintenance of the campus parking program consistent with the California Education and Vehicle Codes as well as Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations. Community Service Officers assist motorists with all traffic and parking regulations.

COMMUNICATIONS & RECORDS
Public Safety is designated as a 9-1-1 emergency answering point for the university community. Dispatchers monitor alarms, Blue Light emergency phones, elevator phones, and all incoming 9-1-1 calls. The Communications Center dispatches university police officers and other emergency services for the university. All reported incidents and crimes are recorded at Public Safety and forwarded as required. All information, records, and communications must be maintained in accordance with legal and procedural standards.

PARKING MANAGEMENT BUREAU
PMB is a self-support operation under the purview of Public Safety. It provides essential parking related services (e.g., parking citation processing, revenue collection, and disbursement as well as adjudication and technical support including enforcement and processing of fines) to CSU Stanislaus and other California public higher education campuses. California’s Community Colleges and Universities are responsible for the administration of their individual parking programs and many find it advantageous to contract with PMB for these services. PMB also provides direct support for Public Safety health and safety services, partnerships with student organizations and programs, student scholarships, workshops and conferences.
PUBLIC SAFETY
PERSONNEL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Total # of sworn personnel</th>
<th>Total population by headcount F/S/S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Bay</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel Islands</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stanislaus</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,200</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population served</th>
<th>Stanislaus - Officers at 1.2 per 1,000</th>
<th>Western Region - Officers at 1.7 per 1,000</th>
<th>Counties - Officers at 2.6 per 1,000</th>
<th>Cities &lt;10,000 - Officers at 3.3 per 1,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>11(current staffing)</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POLICE SERVICES

11 – Personnel

5 – Officers
2 – Corporals
2 – Sergeants
1 – Lieutenant
1 – Chief

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH, SAFETY & EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

2 – Personnel

1 – Assistant Director
1 – Health and Safety Specialist

COMMUNITY & PARKING SERVICES

3 – Personnel

1 – Supervisor
2 – Community Service Officers

COMMUNICATIONS & RECORDS

5 – Personnel

1 – Supervisor
4 – Dispatchers

PARKING MANAGEMENT BUREAU

2 – Personnel

1 – Administrative Coordinator
1 – Technology Coordinator (Half-time position)
ASSESSMENT PROCESS
AND ACTIVITIES

Assessment of effectiveness involves both self-study and obtaining responses from others to determine “how we are doing”. The Public Safety/University Police Department personnel take very seriously their charge of providing a safe and secure environment for University students, faculty, and staff. Their self study includes periodic evaluation of department resources (personnel and equipment), internal meetings by function groups, regular department senior management meetings, and participation in the Business and Finance Division Balanced Scorecard. Outside reviews include surveys, compliance audits, and studies by a team of specialists.

SELF STUDY

EVALUATION & RESOURCES
Benchmark information from other CSU campuses and outside agencies allows for periodic evaluation of departmental resources. (See comparison table on page 4.)

INTERNAL MEETINGS

WEEKLY MEETINGS
- Managers meet with support staff supervisors and leads once a week
- Department Managers meet as a group twice a week
- Managers meet with Police Supervisors once a week

The purpose for the weekly meetings is to maintain open and clear communications within the Public Safety department. The discussions include both operational issues and strategic planning. There is continual self-study by the participants in these discussions to determine if situations were handled correctly, if the best service was provided, and how service can be improved.

ANNUAL MEETINGS

In August of each year all managers meet with personnel over a five-day period for academic/fiscal year planning. Sessions are organized as follows:
- Supervisors and Leads
- Police
- Community and Parking Services
- Environmental Health, Safety & Emergency Management
- Front Office/Communications Center

In January of each fiscal year all managers meet with personnel over a five day period for mid-year assessment, organized in the same sessions outlined above.

These annual planning and assessment sessions allow the department personnel to participate in development of department goals and objectives and the department budget. The annual plan then becomes a part of the Business and Finance division strategic plan and budget.

BALANCED SCORECARD

The Business and Finance division, which includes Public Safety, began the process of developing a Balanced Scorecard as its assessment tool in FY 2001-02. The Balanced Scorecard, introduced by Drs. Robert Kaplan and David Norton, has served as the foundation for the Performance Management systems found in many Fortune 1000 companies and government organizations. The division Vice President believed strongly that a division-wide Balanced Scorecard would provide the assessment information needed to verify the division’s support of and contribution to the University’s mission and strategic plan.

A Balanced Scorecard is a Performance Management system that can be used to align vision and mission with customer requirements and day-to-day work,

manage and evaluate business strategy, monitor operation efficiency improvements, build organization capacity, and communicate progress to all employees. The real value of a scorecard system comes from the continuous self-inquiry and in-depth analysis that is at the heart of all successful strategic planning and Performance Management systems. Doing the right things and doing things right is a balancing act. The Balanced Scorecard is a framework (Exhibit A) that helps achieve the required balance between strategy and operations.  

The senior management team for all the departments within Business and Finance (Facilities Services, Financial Services, Human Resources, and Public Safety) worked together to establish the division’s mission (who we are and what we do) and the division’s vision (what we want to be in 3 to 5 years.  

MISSION

- The Business and Finance team partners to effectively manage campus human, physical, and financial resources to support a learning-center environment.

VISION

- By 2005 the campus will recognize Business & Finance’s value to the success of the University.

Once the team was comfortable with the determined mission and vision, they went on to verbalize and clarify what objectives, or critical success factors, would chart the path to successful outcomes. “A well designed scorecard bridges the gap between strategies and day-to-day action by aligning performance measures with the organization’s critical perspectives.” The four perspectives (dashboard) that traditionally characterize the Kaplan and Norton Scorecard (Financial, Customer, Internal Process, and Learning and Growth) were revised by Business & Finance leadership to reflect their key strategic elements. The dashboard and critical success factors for the period of 2003 – 2006 were as follows:

CUSTOMER

- Enhance our customers’ lives by minimizing student, faculty, and staff time on administrative tasks, and,
- Facilitate an environment that allows the campus to excel

EMPLOYEE

- Impact the Business & Finance employees by providing an environment that allows us to excel

FINANCIAL

- Enhance learning by showing accountability and stewardship of University resources, and,
- Enhance learning by striving to acquire supplemental resources.

OPERATIONAL PROCESSES

- Develop model practices and demonstrate investment in technology and equipment that enhances the delivery of Business & Finance services to the University.

The next step in the development of the Business and Finance Balanced Scorecard was to identify performance measures to track both strategic and operational progress. Performance data for the following measures has been collected for three years (2003/04, 2004/05, and 2005/06). The Public Safety performance measures are shown in the table below.

---

## BUSINESS & FINANCE STRATEGIC GOALS

### Public Safety Performance Measures

#### CUSTOMER
Enhance our customers' lives by minimizing student, faculty, and staff time on administrative tasks, and facilitating an environment that allows the campus to excel.

**Measure A**
Minimize student, faculty, and staff time on administrative tasks.
- Total number of Business & Finance division forms/documents/publications published on the web.

**Measure B**
Facilitate an environment that allows the campus to excel
- Number of Part 1 crimes.
- Number of times SEMS training is given in the year.
- Number of evacuation drills in the year.
- Number of health & safety programs put on in the year.
- Total number of participants at health and safety events during the year.

#### EMPLOYEE
Provide ourselves and environment that allows us to excel.

**Measure**
Impact the Business & Finance employees by providing an environment that allows us to excel.
- Number of days employees in each department on sick leave.
- Number of meetings in each department (e.g., full staff, team leads, management).
- The number of dollars allocated per person in Business & Finance for personal training and professional development.
- Hours during year dedicated to personal training and professional development.
- Total number of department staff, permanent and temporary, in the department the first day of the fiscal year.
- Total number of department staff, permanent and temporary, that left university employment during the year.
- Total number of department staff, permanent and temporary, that were reassigned.
- Percentage of the department staff that left university employment or were reassigned during the year.

#### FINANCIAL
Enhance learning by showing accountability and stewardship of University resources and striving to acquire supplemental resources.

**Measure**
Accountability and stewardship
- Number of audit findings for all of Business and Finance during the year that remain un-cleared 6 months after the finding report.
- Number of grants applied for by Public Safety.
- Number of grants identified that could be available to Public Safety.
- Dollar amount awarded to Public Safety.

#### OPERATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS
The development of model practices and demonstration of investment in technology and equipment that enhances the delivery of Business & Finance services to the University.

**Measure**
Change business practices
- Total number of model practices implemented in Business & Finance (e.g., improve process, new use of technology)
- Dollars invested during the year in the Business & Finance department on new technology and equipment for efficiency.
Supporting the University Strategic Plan: Exhibit B is a flow chart showing how Public Safety Balanced Scorecard Strategic Goals and Performance Measures roll up in support of the University Strategic Plan.

CUSTOMER & INTERNAL EVALUATIONS
The Public Safety/University Police Department has adopted the concept of Community Oriented Policing. This approach to law enforcement encourages a partnership with the University community to identify community safety issues, determine resources needs, and apply innovative strategies designed to create a vital and healthy campus environment. The Department has conducted the surveys listed below over the last ten years for self-evaluation and self-assessment of existing department programs and procedures:

- 1995 Community Policing Survey
- 1996 Community Policing Housing Survey The Village
- 1999 Community Policing Survey
- 1999 California State University Student Needs and Priorities Survey (SNAPS)
- 2001 Customer Satisfaction Surveys for University Police and Parking Services
- 2004 California State University Police Customer Satisfaction Survey
- Fall 2004 Security & Safety Survey of the University Student Union
- 2005 California State University Employee Satisfaction Survey

COMPLIANCE REVIEWS & REPORTS
Because the Public Safety/University Police Department is a public agency it is subject to specific compliances inspections and audits on a regular basis.

2. The Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) annual compliance inspections
3. The Department of Justice performs annual audits of the CSU Stanislaus University Police Department to determine compliance with Criminal Justice Information Systems (CJIS) and FBI’s National Crime Information Center (NCIC).

REVIEW BY OUTSIDE ORGANIZATION
In November 2005 the CSU Stanislaus University Police Department contracted with the International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators (IACLEA) Loaned Executive Management Assistance Program (LEMAP) to perform an in-depth management and organizational review. IACLEA is the premier international association representing members of the campus law enforcement community. The charge to the LEMAP team was to review all aspects of the CSU Stanislaus University Police Department, including an assessment of its organizational management structure, and issue a report of findings and recommendations.
ASSESSMENT RESULTS

SELF STUDY RESULTS

EVALUATION OF RESOURCES

- Stanislaus ranks lowest in the California State University system for police staffing with eleven (11) positions based on campus and resident population. The average number of sworn officers at six other CSU campuses is 13.8. Five of the six comparison campuses have smaller populations.

- The U.S. Department of Justice annual publication, “Crime in the United States” lists law enforcement personnel rates by geographic region and division (city or county). Using data from the nations more than 14,000 state, city, university, county and other law enforcement agencies, the U.S. DOJ compiles staffing rates by region and division. These rates are listed as number of officers per 1,000 population. CSU Stanislaus is currently at a staffing rate of 1.2 officers per 1,000. The chart shows officer staffing using our current rate as well as staffing levels using the DOJ data for region and division. The populations served illustrate the current CSU Stanislaus level and two projected levels.

- Stanislaus is the only campus in the CSU system with a 9-1-1 Emergency Communications Center that does not operate 24/7. The California Department of General Services has notified the campus that we do not meet the requirement of 24/7 operation. Two additional dispatchers are needed to meet the necessary criteria and provide the university community with a full-time emergency communications center.

- The LEMAP team had specific findings regarding staffing (Report Exhibit C):

  “The CSU Stanislaus Police Department is providing a level of quality service to the community. However, to be able to provide an appropriate level of the unique law enforcement and security services required in an academic environment, staffing levels within the dispatch area and uniformed patrol operations need to be increased to a realistic level.”

  “The department’s sworn staff does not interact routinely with campus organizations or with other groups. Some of this inactivity can be attributed to a lack of patrol staff. In other instances, it would appear that department officials have not taken the initiative. With its eleven member sworn team, the department is often left with only one officer on duty.”

  “The police department operates a 24-hour police/security function with very limited staffing. This staffing issue impacts all aspects of department management and organization. There are only two sergeants assigned to the patrol division. Since the patrol division operates 24 hours a day, there is not sergeant on duty eight hours daily during the week and no sergeants on duty at all on the weekends. The two corporals in the division are used as police officers. The two sergeants are assigned separate duties, one as administrative sergeant and one as operations sergeant. However, both sergeants spend the majority of their time in the office rather than in

5 Ibid, page 37.
the field supervising their employees. As a result, there seems to be some confusion within the patrol division regarding supervisory chain of command. It is the consensus of the LEMAP Team that additional police personnel are needed to provide adequate patrol coverage. At least three additional positions are needed in the patrol division: one sergeant, one corporal, and one police officer.6

“One LEMAP team member identified the police department as a tightly stretched rubber band that is providing efficient and quality service to the community. On the surface, this organization is operating effectively, but it would be unable to allocate resources to address the kind of ‘unknowns’ or potential crises that are inherent in the police/security function.”7

“Currently, the dispatch staff consists of four full-time dispatchers. The police department dispatch service is operational from 7:30 a.m. to 11: p.m. Monday through Thursday and 7:30 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Friday. All other times, the dispatch service is provided by the city of Turlock Police Department. Although this shared dispatch service seems to be somewhat effective, the LEMAP team believes that it would be best for the university to have a 24-hour dispatch operation because the city police department dispatch is usually much busier and thus less likely to view non-emergency calls from the university community as important. Further, the university does not have any managerial or supervisory control over city employees and is not authorized to hold them accountable or to a standard that is appropriate to the university. To staff a 24-hour, 365-day operation with one dispatcher on duty at all times will require adding two more full-time dispatcher positions.”8

“The LEMAP team interviewed members of the community and observed officers during their hours of duty. The university police department does a very good job of providing service to the community and keeping the university a safe and secure environment. The department provides many services even though understaffed and does it so well that the personnel shortage is not readily apparent. However, should a major incident occur at the wrong time or multiple incidents occur that need attention at the same time, the resources and ability of the police department to respond satisfactorily could be overextended. LEMAP team recommendations:

- Add another sergeant position and make each sergeant responsible for a shift and for the personnel on that shift.
- Add two police officers to bring minimum patrol staffing levels to two peace officers at all times.
- Increase the number of community service officers by one so there is adequate staff to perform all assigned tasks effectively.”9

The LEMAP team had specific findings regarding equipment (Report Exhibit C): “Upon initial inspection, it is evident that the CSU Stanislaus Police Department’s staff appreciates and is accountable for its equipment and resources. This inspection included a review of patrol cars and other vehicles, department equipment, uniforms, and the storage and upkeep.

Over the last few years the department has gradually replaced patrol vehicles and has acquired specialty vehicles for emergency preparedness and supervisory staff. Additionally, the department operates a night escort service with the use of carts. All of the equipment appeared well-maintained and in good working order. Personal equipment assigned to the patrol staff did not appear worn or outdated.

There appears to be much satisfaction that the staff possesses ample equipment and resources to effectively carry out its duties and the department mission, including technological resources.”10

---

6 Ibid, page 12.
7 Ibid, page 12.
8 Ibid, page 17.
INTERNAL MEETINGS

WEEKLY MEETINGS
The weekly meetings are focused on day-to-day operational issues. Depending upon the issues being addressed and the staffing currently available situational resolutions and self-study may lead to change. However, as indicated in the LEMAP review, current staffing levels have caused some command issues and policy/procedure issues that impact the ability to do more than just meet immediate needs:

“The department is meeting the basic requirements of the institution. However, internally, there is some confusion about chain of command and decision-making authority.”11

“Although the patrol division is accomplishing its basic mission, there is a great deal of confusion regarding the duties and functions of the patrol division sergeants. Both individuals seem to spend more time on administrative duties than actually supervising and guiding the patrol officers.”12

“There also seems to be a perception that information is not adequately disseminated from the command staff to the operational staff. More supervision visibility as well as some direct contact with the chief of police would more than likely address this issue.”13

“The police department has a policy manual in place and a copy is provided to each employee. However, it is very difficult to use. Since the purpose of the document is to help employees make decision and perform their duties, it should be as user-friendly as possible. The majority of the existing [police department] policies have been in existence since 1995 without any updating. The only policies that have been updated are the use of force policy and the taser policy. A major program should be initiated to update the entire manual and train all employees in it use. The LEMAP team agrees that developing a new updated policy manual is a key priority for the department.”14

ANNUAL MEETINGS
The purpose for the annual meetings is strategic (goals and objectives) and budget planning. According to the LEMAP team: “For a university police department to perform its function adequately it must be able to define and understand its proper objectives, translate these objectives into precise policies and operational procedures, and employ qualified professionals to carry out these objectives. The department must establish goals to ensure its mission is being met actively and the services provided are necessary, adequate, and of a level and quality to meet the university’s expectations. A long-range or strategic plan should be written to outline the direction the university desires the police department to go, and priorities should be set.

The LEMAP team requested police department goals and objectives for the current year [2005] but was informed that they had not been completed. Detailed and organized notes from an annual department retreat conducted in August 2005 were presented with the explanation that they would be used to prepare the annual strategic report, but there had not been time to do so. The last available annual strategic report was several years old.”15

“During the on-site review, LEMAP team members found no indication that the department’s progress toward attaining goals and objectives received any formal periodic review, although some goals and objectives identified in the annual retreat notes had already been achieved and others were in the process of being addressed.”16

The university police chief agrees with the LEMAP team recommendations listed below and will attempt to implement them as staffing levels allow:

- Delegate responsibility for completion of annual strategic report to a department

---

16 Ibid, page 19.
manager with time to devote to its completion.

- Update department goals and objectives annually.
- Review progress toward achieving department goals and objectives regularly to determine if adjustments are necessary to attain the goals and objectives.
- Share the department’s goals and objectives with the university administration and the department leadership team so that everyone understands what the department is working to achieve.
- Develop a long-range (three- to five-year) plan and update it annually.
- Prepare and distribute an annual strategic report that includes the department’s long-range plan, the annual goals and objectives, and describes the activities the department performs to achieve the goals and objectives established to meet the department’s mission.

BALANCED SCORECARD
The benefits of developing the Balanced Scorecard as an assessment tool have been two-fold:

- The journey from the beginning point of developing a Balanced Scorecard for the Business and Finance Division, and Public Safety as a department within Business and Finance, produced results separate from the actual Scorecard development. Determining what would be the strategic goals and measures within the four business perspectives (Customer, Employee, Financial, and Operational Effectiveness) required self-study and introspection. Policies, processes, and procedures were examined and evaluated. Many improvements occurred and internal communications were improved as a result.

- Statistical performance measures provide an indication of how well Public Safety is meeting the performance measure goal, or target. Performance measurement data and targets are entered into PbViews software (licensed through the CSU Office of the Chancellor QI department). Exhibit D is a three-page Performance Matrix Report showing the measurement data for 2003-04, 2004-05, and 2005-06. The color code is as follows:
  - Green – attained or surpassed target
  - Yellow – below target but within a close range
  - Red – not achieving target by a greater range
  - Gray – no data entered

The PbViews software also establishes a Balanced Scorecard Briefing Book. The Business and Finance Division book and the Public Safety book can be viewed via the internet by accessing www.calstate.edu/QI/Stanislaus.

CUSTOMER & INTERNAL EVALUATIONS
Summaries of the survey methodology and results are presented below. Full copies of each survey can viewed upon request.

1995 COMMUNITY POLICING SURVEY
A total of 1,386 questionnaires were distributed to students, faculty, and staff representing 20% of the faculty, 20% of the staff, and 20% of the students. 411 questionnaires were returned; 30% of the target group. The questions were structured to allow the respondents the opportunity to prioritize services and to rate the department as compared to other law enforcement agencies. Overall, the respondents felt that the department was providing a service equal to or better than other police departments the respondents knew about: 30.9% rated services “better than”; 50.6% rated services “same as”; and, 3.9% rated services “worse than”.

1996 COMMUNITY POLICING HOUSING SURVEY THE VILLAGE
A total of 256 questionnaires were distributed to on-campus housing residents. 100 questionnaires were returned; 39% of the target group.

The 1995 Community Policing Survey and the 1996 Community Policing Housing Survey (both based on the 1988 study by the School of Criminal Justice
and the Department of Public Safety at Michigan State University) allowed for a comparison of twelve general questions asked on both surveys. The separate survey for housing resident included an additional five questions not on the general survey. The results of the survey were used by the Public Safety department to evaluate and assess the existing Public Safety programs and procedures against the Community Policing concept.

The results of the general survey and housing survey were very similar. Crimes against the person were clearly rated as the number one concern. Specific crimes identified were sexual assault, robbery, burglary, auto theft and destruction of property.

Programs resulting from these survey results included concentrating on expanding public awareness and crime prevention program, addressing such issues as date rape, harassment, and how to reduce the risk of becoming a crime victim.

1999 COMMUNITY POLICING SURVEY
This survey was also modeled after the Michigan State University School of Criminal Justice. As in the 1995 survey, respondents were asked to prioritize services and to rate the department as compared to other law enforcement agencies. A total of 1,350 questionnaires were distributed to students, faculty and staff, chosen by random sample; 20% of each constituent group. 335 surveys were returned representing 24.8% of the target group. The survey report contains a comparison of the 1999 responses to the 1995 survey responses. Overall, the respondents felt that the department was providing a service equal to or better than other police departments the respondents knew about: 22.7% (30.9% in 1995) rated services “better than”; 59.1% (50.6% in 1995) rated services “same as”; and, 4.8% (3.9% in 1995) rated services “worse than”.

1999 CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY STUDENT NEEDS & PRIORITIES SURVEY (SNAPS)
The purpose of this survey was to assess students’ attitudes toward CSU Stanislaus such as: if the student would choose this university again; if they felt the university was equally supportive of all racial/ ethnic groups and women and men; and if the student felt safe on campus. The rating codes were Neutral (3), Agree (4), and Strongly Agree (5). The survey result for the Public Safety department was a score of 3.97 for “I feel safe on my campus”. The survey results also rated the safety factors as important in the student’s decision to attend CSU Stanislaus at 3.55. Reasons given by African-American students who enroll at CSU Stanislaus was 86% the fact that they were admitted followed by perceived safety of the campus at 85%.

2001 CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEYS FOR UNIVERSITY POLICE & PARKING SERVICES
CSU Stanislaus Public Safety Department participated in two of the CSU system customer surveys: Parking and Police. In each of these the rate codes were Neutral (3), Agree (4), and Strongly Agree (5).

In the 2001 Parking Survey students rated “personal safety in and around parking facilities at 3.7. The three items that they felt should be given highest priority for improvement were:
- Motorist assistance services
- Availability of escort service to vehicles
- Directional signs

The department identified these improvements for consideration when staffing and budget levels could be increased. The survey confirmed that the Public Safety mission of providing a safe and secure environment was being met.

In the 2001 Police Survey students rated the importance of University Police services at 4.3 and rated satisfaction of “overall University Police services” at 3.7. Specific questions (with student ratings) that confirm that the Public Safety department supports the University’s mission are the following:
- Contribute to the University’s mission of teaching and learning (3.5)
- Provide adequate communication to the campus community (3.7)
- Serve an essential role on my campus (4.2)
- Concerned with helping you resolve your problem (3.9)
- Make you feel safe on campus: during the day (3.8) and during the night (3.9)
- The conduct of employees is professional (3.9)
- Employees are sensitive to the cultural diversity of this campus (3.4)

2004 CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY POLICE CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY

The 2004 Police Survey questions were basically the same as the 2001 survey with some minor variations. Students rate satisfaction with “overall University Police services” at 4.04. Customer satisfaction increased since the 2001 survey on the specific questions (with student ratings) listed below:

- Contribute to the University’s mission of teaching and learning (4.14)
- Provide adequate communication to the campus community (4.15)
- Serve an essential role on my campus (3.95)
- Concerned with helping you resolve your problem (4.95)
- The conduct of employees is professional (4.53)
- Employees are sensitive to the cultural diversity of this campus (4.89)

FALL 2004 SECURITY & SAFETY SURVEY OF THE UNIVERSITY STUDENT UNION

During October and November 2004 a security and safety survey of the University Student Union Building was conducted by Public Safety and a report was prepared. The purpose was to provide useful recommendations to identified problems:

- Police presence and incidents
- Building use and access
- Key accountability
- Emergency preparedness
- Lighting survey

2005 CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION SURVEY

This survey was web-based and went to all employees in the Business and Finance division. The employees were asked to rate their direct supervisor using the scale of strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). The questions were developed to assess the employees since of satisfaction with their duties and with how their supervisor worked with them in job assignments and professional development. In the four function areas in Public Safety the ratings were all satisfactory or above with the exception of the 2-member Emergency Health and Safety Office. The supervisor of that function area retired shortly after the survey was completed.

COMPLIANCE REVIEWS & REPORTS

ANNUAL CRIME STATISTICS REPORTS TO THE CSU OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR

Each of the CSU campuses submits an annual report to the Chancellor’s Office following Uniform Crime Report (UCR) publishing guidelines used by the FBI for governmental jurisdictions all over the country. UCR uses a specific method of counting crimes, wherein, only the “highest” crime is counted when numerous crimes are reported on the same police report. Each month, law enforcement agencies report the number of known index crimes in their jurisdiction to the FBI. This mainly includes crimes reported to the police by the general public, but may also include crimes that police officers discover through other sources. For reporting purposes (including CSU reporting), criminal offenses are divided into two groups: Part I offenses and Part II offenses.

In Part I, the UCR indexes reported incidents in two categories: violent and property crimes. The violent crimes include robbery, aggravated assault, rape, and murder. The property crimes include motor vehicle theft, larceny, burglary, and arson.

Part II crimes are everything other than Part I, which include other assault (not aggravated assault or sexual assault), forgery and counterfeiting, fraud, embezzlement, stolen property, criminal damage, weapons, commercialized sex, sex offenses, narcotic drug laws, gambling, offenses against the
family, driving under the influence, liquor laws, intoxication, disorderly conduct, vagrancy, other offenses, juvenile violations, and runaway juvenile.

The Chancellor’s Office compiles a four-year consolidated report for all 23 campuses. The most recent report, 2002 through 2005, is attached as Exhibit E.

ANNUAL COMPLIANCE INSPECTIONS
Annual compliance inspections conducted by the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST). The most recent inspection of the CSU Stanislaus Public Safety department occurred November 23, 2005. The purpose is to determine Public Safety’s adherence to POST standards for the selection and training of peace officers and/or dispatchers. The POST listing of agency personnel was reviewed and found to be in alignment with the current agency staff list. All officers, reserves, and dispatchers were in compliance on training standards. The files on two recent hires (one officer and one dispatcher) did not contain all of the required documents to comply with selection standards. The identified deficiencies were to be corrected and submitted to POST.

ANNUAL AUDITS BY THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
Annual audits by State Department of Justice of the records that are maintained in the Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS) and the data bases managed by the FBI’s National Crime Information Center (NCIC): The goal of the CJIS/NCIC audit is to improve the quality of entries into the automated files. This is accomplished by verifying, in accordance with the NCIC Users Agreement, the accuracy, validity and completeness of a random sample of entries into each of the CJIS/NCIC system used by Public Safety. Total records selected in the most recent audit, December 2, 2005, were 36. The audit found Public Safety in compliance with all CJIS/NCIC requirements.

ANNUAL CAMPUS SECURITY REPORTS
Annual Campus Security Reports (Federal Safety Compliance) 2001 – 2006 are on the web. Public Safety prepares this report to comply with the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Crime Statistics Act. The report is prepared in cooperation with the following: police agencies surrounding our campus; Housing and Residential Services; Judicial Affairs Officer; and, the Division of Student Affairs. By October 1st of each year, a postcard is mailed to all enrolled students, faculty, and staff announcing availability of the CSU Stanislaus Campus Security Report on the campus web site and at specified locations on campus. The Campus Security Report not only provides crime statistics, but also is an education tool and resource guide for understanding various crimes and how and where to report them. It also addresses health and safety policies.

REVIEW BY OUTSIDE ORGANIZATION
A full copy (49 pages) of the Review of Selected Management and Organization Structures of the California State University at Stanislaus Police Department is attached as Exhibit C. The comprehensive assessment was performed by a team from the International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators (IACLEA) Loaned Executive Management Assistance Program (LEMAP). The LEMAP review team members were: Ron Seacrist, Chief of Police, Texas Tech University System; Bill Taylor, Chief of Police Rice University; and Nate Johnson, Chief of Police, California State University at Sonoma.

IACLEA standards are based upon the Commission of Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA) standards. The CSU Stanislaus Public Safety/University Police department is a member of IACLEA. Other campuses that have undertaken a LEMAP review include San Luis Obispo, Hayward, San Marcos, and Fresno.

A LEMAP review prepares a roadmap to improve departmental operations and services that will create a foundation for future efforts toward accreditation of the department. One of the long-term goals for the CSU Stanislaus Public Safety/University Police department is to achieve accreditation. Two CSU police departments (Fullerton and L.A.) recently received CALEA accreditation and two others
(Northridge and San Francisco) have begun the process.

The LEMAP report presents findings and recommendations on 21 core areas (listed below) within the department that contribute to its effectiveness in supporting and serving the University. For example, the core area of Police/Community Interactions includes the perceptions of students and the campus community toward the department and of the department toward the campus community. The 21 core areas reviewed are:

- Status and Authority of the Police Department
- Staffing, organization and management of Personnel
- Policies and Procedures
- Space and Facilities
- Budget Process and Allocation
- Communications and Dispatch
- Resident Hall Security
- Goals and Objectives
- Relations with Other Criminal Justice Agencies
- Patrol Operations and Enforcement
- Records Systems
- Property and Evidence
- Parking Operations
- Compliance with the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act
- Policing the University: Police/Community Interaction
- Equipment
- Performance Evaluation Process
- Compliant Processing and Internal Discipline
- Training
- Crime Prevention
- Investigations

Various sections of the LEMAP findings and recommendations have been sited earlier in this Unit Review report to present assessment results (beginning in Section III). The following citations from the report provide an overview.

“The LEMAP Team’s unanimous opinion is that the California State University (CSU), Stanislaus Police Department is exceptionally well versed in the unique services needed in an academic environment. The department is meeting the basic requirement of the institution. However, internally, there is some confusion about chain of command and decision-making authority. These issues can be easily addressed by internal policy development. One of the biggest concerns noted by the LEMAP Team is the limited staffing within the patrol operation, and the liberal off-campus patrol philosophy. The department has an extremely close working relationship with the Turlock Police Department, which is very commendable. However, this relationship could, at some point, compromise the unique police/security services required on a university campus. To better serve the campus community, this philosophy needs to be addressed.

The consistent opinion of the entire campus community is that the department provides an exceptional level of service. This opinion seems to be a direct result of the ability of the chief and command staff to prioritize responses to community concerns.

The crime prevention efforts of the department are very visible in the community. However, this recognition seems to be the result of one individual officer’s efforts within the residence hall areas. The patrol officers assigned to the patrol division do not seem to be a part of the effort. Some additional training of these officers in conjunction with specific policy development is needed.

The CSU Stanislaus Police Department is providing a level of quality service to the community. However, to be able to provide an appropriate level of the unique law enforcement and security services required in an academic environment, staffing levels within the dispatch area and uniformed patrol operations need to be increased to a realistic level.”17

PUBLIC SAFETY
DIRECTOR’S CONCLUSION

Assessment, evaluation, and planning for improvements and changes have always been an integral part of the CSU Stanislaus Public Safety/University Police department philosophy and activities. As the Chief I am very proud of our standing within the campus community and of our fulfillment of our mission, “to improve the quality of life at CSU Stanislaus.” I am confident that through the various assessment tools we have established that the department supports and advances the mission and strategic goals of the University. The LEMAP review provides specific recommendations for our department that will be addressed in our future planning.
Exhibit A
Business and Finance Division

Performance Measurement Framework

Strategy is the approach used to accomplish the mission and implement an organization’s vision. Balance is the integrated relationship among the key parts of a scorecard. Measures are a means to an end, not the end themselves. Our goal is to identify the critical business drivers, measure them, and use the information to improve decision-making. A Balanced Scorecard system provides a basis for executing good strategy well and managing change successfully.

- What the organization is.
- The future goal(s) of the organization.
- What the organization stands for.

- What the organization needs to focus on to be best practice and achieve its vision.
- Perspectives of Customer Employee Excellence, and Operational Excellence

- Keeping Score - Measures Past-Present-Future

- The desired annual and long-term levels for each measurement

Activities to achieve the goals.
Exhibit B

CSU Stanislaus Public Safety Strategic (A Business & Finance Department) Planning Map

CSU Stanislaus University Goals & Priorities
Identification of the University goals that Business & Finance impacts

Business & Finance Critical Success Factors and relationship to University goals

Actions required to achieve or to progress toward achieving the goal that involve Public Safety

Public Safety department performance measures (Balanced Scorecard)
Exhibit B

CSU Stanislaus Public Safety Strategic (A Business & Finance Department) Planning Map

CSU Stanislaus University Goals & Priorities
Identification of the University goals that Business & Finance impacts

CSU Stanislaus Strategic Goal and Priority
(1) Establish, enhance, and support a culture of continuous academic excellence in a learning-centered university through
   c. Hiring and retaining high quality, diverse faculty and staff by supporting dedicated recruitment efforts, fostering professional development, offering competitive salaries, and assuring that workloads are appropriate.

Business & Finance Critical Success Factors and relationship to University goals

Customer: Facilitate an environment that allows the campus to excel.

Employee: Impact the Business & Finance employees by providing an environment that allows us to excel.

Actions required to achieve or to progress toward achieving the goal that involve Public Safety

PUBLIC SAFETY MEASURES
- Number of days employees in each department on sick leave.
- Number of meetings in the department (e.g., full staff, team leads, management).
- Number of dollars allocated per person for personal training and professional development.
- Number of hours dedicated to personal training and professional development.
- Number of department staff, permanent and temporary, that left university employment during the year.
- Percentage of the department staff that left university employment or were reassigned during the year.

PUBLIC SAFETY MEASURES (Balanced Scorecard)
- Number of campus wide training events per year.
- Number of hours allocated per person for personal training and professional development.
- Number of quarterly meetings for all campus management personnel.

Public Safety department performance measures (Balanced Scorecard)
EXHIBIT C

A Review of

Selected Management and Organization Structures

of the

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AT STANISLAUS
POLICE DEPARTMENT
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I. Introduction

This management and organizational review of the California State University at Stanislaus Police Department was conducted at the request of Steven P. Jaureguy, Chief of Police and Director of Public Safety. Under the auspices of the International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators Loaned Executive Management Assistance Program (LEMAP), this review was conducted November 7-9, 2005. The LEMAP Team was led by Ron Seacrist, Chief of Police, Texas Tech University System; Bill Taylor, Chief of Police, Rice University; and Nate Johnson, Chief of Police, California State University at Sonoma.

The charge to the LEMAP Team was to review all aspects of the university police department, to include an assessment of its organizational management structure. To accomplish this, the following areas were reviewed:

- Status and Authority of the Police Department
- Staffing, Organization and Management of Personnel
- Policies and Procedures
- Space and Facilities
- Budget Process and Allocation
- Communications and Dispatch
- Residence Hall Security
- Goals and Objectives
- Relations with Other Criminal Justice Agencies
- Patrol Operations and Enforcement
- Records Systems
- Property and Evidence
- Parking Operations
- Compliance with the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act
- Policing the University: Police/Community Interaction
- Equipment
- Performance Evaluation Process
- Complaint Processing and Internal Discipline
- Training
- Crime Prevention
- Investigations
II. Summary of Recommendations

1.0 Status and Authority of the Police Department

1.1 Given the limited patrol staffing in the department, consider reducing the number of officers assigned to the system-wide Emergency Response Team to one officer.

1.2 Develop a detailed operating procedure that outlines the actual use and limitation of the mutual aid agreement with the city police department.

1.3 Consider restricting officers to perimeter patrols on streets contiguous to the campus.

1.4 Consider restricting officers to off-campus calls for which the city police department requests their assistance.

2.0 Staffing, Organization and Management of Personnel

2.1 Consider having the sergeants spend more time working in the field rather than in the office.

2.2 Evaluate the feasibility of increasing the patrol staff by adding one additional sergeant, corporal and police officer.

2.3 With the additional staffing, require that at least one supervisor and one police officer are on duty at all times.

2.4 Restrict patrol division patrol areas to the campus property and those streets contiguous to the campus.

2.5 Restrict patrol officers from going off campus and responding to city police calls unless they are specifically requested by the city.

2.6 Update the current policy manual to better reflect the services provided.

2.7 Train the community to use the appropriate process to request police services.

2.8 Consider developing a process to ensure the quality of information flow.

2.9 Consider establishing an investigator position to enhance follow-up investigations.

3.0 Policies and Procedures

3.1 Initiate a process to develop a new policy manual that is specific to the needs of the department and university.

3.2 Develop a specific policy that addresses the distribution of information within the department.

3.3 Develop a policy that assigns responsibility for updating and developing new policies.

3.4 Consider establishing a process by which all employees can review a proposed policy before it is published.

3.5 Consider using IACLEA and CALEA standards to identify necessary policies to be developed.

3.6 Provide specific training for all employees regarding each new policy before it is published.
3.7 Establish an arrest policy that specifically outlines protocols that comply with state law and internal university notification needs.

3.8 Eliminate all generic policies that do not address specific internal department needs and organizational structure.

4.0 **Space and Facilities**

None.

5.0 **Budget Process and Allocation**

5.1 Consider developing an internal procedure in which all department members are given the opportunity to recommend budget items to be included in the annual budget request.

5.2 When the budget has been allocated to the police department, consider having a department-wide meeting to discuss and explain the budget to all department members.

6.0 **Communications and Dispatch**

6.1 Make every effort to provide 24-hour, 365-day dispatch service to the community.

6.2 To staff this 24-hour, 365-day operation with one dispatcher on duty at all times will require adding two more full-time dispatcher positions (5.8 employees are required to staff one position 24-hours, 365-days).

6.3 Consider using only the ARMS records system rather than having two records systems.

6.4 If the decision is made to provide 24-hour, 365-day dispatch services, upgrade the current 911 equipment to receive cellular calls. Seek possible funding for this upgrade from the local 911 district.

7.0 **Residence Hall Security**

7.1 Consider developing a written policy that specifically outlines patrol officers’ responsibilities in the residence halls.

7.2 Develop a training program for officers that emphasizes their part in residence hall security.

7.3 Consider requiring officers to provide structured patrol frequency in the halls.

7.4 Consider limiting officers’ primary jurisdiction to the main campus.

7.5 Consider assigning all officers to periodic crime prevention programming duties in the residence halls.

7.6 Address the lack of access city police officers experience in the residence halls during an emergency.

8.0 **Goals and Objectives**

8.1 Delegate responsibility for completion of annual strategic report to a department manager with time to devote to its completion.
8.2 Update department goals and objectives annually.

8.3 Continue to involve department members in developing department goals and objectives.

8.4 Review progress toward achieving department goals and objectives regularly to determine if adjustments are necessary to attain the goals and objectives.

8.5 Share the department’s goals and objectives with the university administration and the department leadership team so that everyone understands what the department is working to achieve.

8.6 Conduct periodic reviews to measure how well employees are meeting the department goals and objectives in support of the department mission statement.

8.7 Evaluate the progress toward achieving department goals and objectives monthly and continue to include the final annual evaluation in the annual strategic report.

8.8 Develop a long-range (three- to five-year) plan that addresses facility, equipment and manpower needs and changes in the department mission based on institutional growth and development.

8.9 Evaluate and update the long-range plan annually.

8.10 Prepare and distribute an annual strategic report that includes the department’s long-range plan, the annual goals and objectives, and describes the activities the department performs to achieve the goals and objectives established to meet the department’s mission.

9.0 Relations with Other Criminal Justice Agencies

9.1 Develop a department policy that clearly defines the service area the university police department is to cover.

10.0 Patrol Operations and Enforcement

10.1 Pay peace officers for overtime worked in the pay period they work overtime to eliminate build-up of compensatory time that must be taken off or paid at a later date.

10.2 Add another sergeant position and make each sergeant responsible for a shift and for the personnel on that shift.

10.3 Reapportion administrative responsibilities among the sergeants to allow them time to supervise personnel in the field.

10.4 Add two police officers to bring minimum patrol staffing levels to two peace officers at all times.

10.5 Increase the number of community service officers by one so there is adequate staff to perform all assigned tasks effectively.

10.6 Clarify the role of corporal.

10.7 Enhance police officer involvement in the department’s crime prevention function.

10.8 Require inventory control to conduct a more thorough search for missing equipment before requesting an investigation by the police department.
10.9 Realign the shift schedule to optimize the police presence at the most needed times and the visibility of sworn police personnel on campus.
10.10 Increase the use of the police patrol bicycles on campus.
10.11 Train supervisors in effective communication techniques.
10.12 Institute a clear written policy regarding the responsibility for investigations.

11.0 Records Systems
11.1 Place juvenile records in a separate secure location with limited authorized access.
11.2 Implement a single computer aided dispatch/records management system that provides the necessary data collection and retention needed by the university police department.

12.0 Property and Evidence
12.1 Locate a new secure storage area for the department firearms equipment and supplies and remove these items from the evidence room.
12.2 Re-key the evidence room and issue the only key to the community services supervisor; conduct an inspection of evidence at the time the evidence room is resecured.
12.3 Establish a procedure for the police lieutenant to conduct quarterly inspections of the evidence room and property storage area.
12.4 Initiate unannounced regular inspections of the evidence room directed by the chief of police.
12.5 Clearly label the two found property lockers and conduct training for the police officers regarding their location and purpose.

13.0 Parking Operations
13.1 Develop a written policy that governs the department’s parking operation activities.
13.2 Increase the number of community service officers by one to provide consistent parking enforcement and supervision of student workers.
13.3 Employ a full-time staff person to assist with the citation appeals process, which generates revenue for the police department.

14.0 Compliance with the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act
14.1 Add information to the Annual Campus Security Report so that the document meets the Clery Act requirements for the Stockton satellite campus.
14.2 Ensure that entries and updates to the public access daily crime log are made within two business days.
14.3 Prepare a written directive that specifies that information may be withheld from the daily crime log in accordance with California law and include this in the Annual Campus Security Report.
14.4 Prepare a written directive that sets out the police department’s role in submitting the university’s Annual Campus Crime Report statistics to the Secretary of Education.

15.0 Policing the University: Police/Community Interaction

15.1 Develop a proactive posture regarding police/community relations to create the impression across the campus community that the department provides one-stop shopping for all public safety-related issues.

15.2 Initiate activities to develop working relationships with various departments, groups, and administrative personnel on campus through scheduled meetings and more frequent training sessions.

15.3 Provide pamphlets and/or flyers that cover a variety of safety and security topics and encourage the publication of safety tips and other crime prevention information in the student newspaper.

15.4 Allocate additional funding to increase staffing to allow for a minimum of two officers on duty.

15.5 Encourage department staff to participate in campus committees, i.e., student activities, women’s awareness month programs, residential housing training sessions, etc.

15.6 Increase community relations efforts by providing information to faculty and administrators on campus through increased crime prevention presentations during department meetings.

15.7 Work with the office of the vice president for administration to develop goals and strategies for performing campus-wide surveys of the police department.

15.8 Engage in police/community relations activities and community-oriented policing concepts where possible.

15.9 Revise shift schedules to allocate more patrol time for on-campus activities.

16.0 Equipment

16.1 Revise the annual equipment inventory program to include a net asset list that compares previous year’s inventory with the current year report.

16.2 Limit access to the police equipment by separating inventory from evidence and control access to storage units.

16.3 If twenty-four hour dispatching is implemented, upgrade dispatch equipment to meet current ergonomic standards and operational needs.

16.4 Revise department equipment use policy that clarifies intended equipment uses.

17.0 Performance Evaluation Process

17.1 Establish clear reporting lines with supervisors to ensure accountability and a consistent performance review process.

17.2 Establish a written policy that outlines performance review procedures, and expectations and that references established policies and relevant university guidelines.
17.3 Ensure that all employees involved in the process receive training in performance evaluations for reviewers to gain a deeper understanding of the review process, which might help in organizing records and linking expected outcomes to the department’s mission.

18.0 Complaint Processing and Internal Discipline
18.1 Establish a written policy for reviewing and processing complaints received about non-sworn employees, including potential discipline, to whom complaint will be directed, and who will serve as lead and back-up investigator.
18.2 Establish a formal rewards and recognition program to provide a continued process and opportunities for recognizing stellar employees on a more consistent basis.
18.3 Advise employees annually of the complaint policy and appeal process, and provide copies of the policies to all employees.

19.0 Training
19.1 Develop and formalize progressive staff training for department members and include timelines for priority courses. Some training topics to be considered are verbal judo, report writing, crime scene detainment and investigation, active shooter, defensive driving, emergency management, physical fitness and wellness, campus peace officer, advanced dispatcher, hazardous materials, advanced sexual assault investigations, legal updates for peace officers, and powers of arrest for community service officers.
19.2 Encourage the patrol staff to adopt the principles of community-oriented policing, which requires that officers be trained in community policing methodologies and concepts. Consider sending officers to non-POST funded training.
19.3 Ensure that other department specialists are certified in their area of expertise, particularly in the areas of crime prevention, emergency management, investigations, and records management.
19.4 Follow-up with POST to ensure that the field training manual for new employees meets state guidelines and is approved by POST prior to training new personnel.

20.0 Crime Prevention
20.1 Establish a policy to balance patrol time to include on-campus foot and vehicle patrols.
20.2 Train all officers in basic campus crime prevention to gain better understanding of concept to gain buy-in, and so they are able to provide good advice when a residence needs security upgrading, and to provide crime prevention seminars periodically to residents and at employee staff meetings.
20.3 Consider holding group or individual programming on crime prevention addressing the following areas: rape and sexual assault awareness; new faculty/staff/student orientations; safety for commuter, residential or international students; alcohol and drug abuse prevention; personal, travel, and vehicle safety; property identification, and theft prevention.
20.4 Establish a program for weekly surveys and inspections of lighting, door hardware, emergency telephones, access systems and door alarms for deficiencies. Log these and report them to the physical plant department. Maintain a follow-up procedure.

20.5 Create a community policing and outreach program for employees, residents and commuter students that includes marketing of department services.

21.0 Investigations

21.1 Establish a written policy that outlines who is in charge of investigations and responsibilities of investigators.

21.2 Establish a written policy on who is responsible for reviewing reports and the expected timelines for completion.

21.3 Establish procedures for follow-up on criminal investigations.
III. Methodology

The following methods and techniques were used to gather and evaluate information relevant to the California State University at Stanislaus Police Department:

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

2. A three-day on-site visit to the California State University at Stanislaus was used to tour the campus property and conduct interviews and meetings with 35 members of the campus community and the city of Turlock, California.

3. Follow-up telephone conversations were used to gather additional information and clarify issues.
IV. Agency Description

California State University at Stanislaus is a public university in a suburban setting that provides both undergraduate and graduate education to 8,137 students. The university has residence halls that provide housing for approximately 650 students. There are 500 staff and management employees, 309 full-time professors and 245 part-time professors.

The university is composed of one main campus (approximately 255 acres) and one satellite campus approximately 30 miles north of the main campus. The university police department is responsible for all law enforcement, security, emergency management and parking services on the main campus. Police services for the satellite campus are provided by the local municipal law enforcement agency. University police officers are vested by state statute with full law enforcement authority on all property owned or leased by the university and all property within a one mile radius of this property. All police department employees are represented by unions and work under specific union contracts.

The police department consists of a total of 30 full-time, part-time and student employees:

- 1 Chief of Police/Director of Public Safety
- 1 Police Lieutenant
- 2 Police Sergeants
- 2 Police Corporals
- 5 Police Officers
- 1 Assistant Director of Health Safety and Emergency Management
- 1 Health and Safety Specialist
- 1 Parking Services Coordinator
- 1 Support Services Supervisor
- 4 Dispatchers
- 1 Community Service Supervisor
- 2 Community Service Officers

Student Employees:
- 2 Evening Shift Shuttle Drivers
- 1 Front Office Clerical Assistant
- 3 Parking Enforcement/Building Lockup Staff

The Chief of Police/Director of Public Safety reports directly to the Vice President of Business and Finance.

Nine police officer and supervisory positions are deployed on 24-hour shift coverage. Police officers work four ten-hour shifts and sergeants work five eight-hour shifts.

Officers wear standard police uniforms and are armed with semi-automatic handguns and tasers.
V. General Observations

The LEMAP Team’s unanimous opinion is that the California State University at Stanislaus Police Department is exceptionally well versed in the unique services needed in an academic environment. The command staff, which includes the chief, assistant director and lieutenant, are considered outstanding by the campus community. Much of this opinion is a result of the limited staffing within the department. This lack of adequate staffing results in the individual members of the command staff being the main contact point for many members of the community. Many of the day-to-day issues they each manage should be referred to line members of the department.

The department is meeting the basic requirements of the institution. However, internally, there is some confusion about chain of command and decision-making authority. These issues can be easily addressed by internal policy development. One of the biggest concerns noted by the LEMAP Team is the limited staffing within the patrol operation, and the liberal off-campus patrol philosophy. To better serve the campus community, this philosophy needs to be addressed.

The consistent opinion of the entire campus community is that the department provides an exceptional level of service. This opinion seems to be a direct result of the ability of the chief and command staff to prioritize responses to community concerns.

The department has an extremely close working relationship with the Turlock Police Department, which is very commendable. However, this relationship could, at some point, compromise the unique police/security services required on a university campus. This report will recommend several approaches to this issue.

The crime prevention efforts of the department are very visible in the community. However, this recognition seems to be the result of one individual officer’s efforts within the residence hall areas. The patrol officers assigned to the patrol division do not seem to be a part of the effort. Some additional training of these officers in conjunction with specific policy development would go a long way in developing the department’s crime prevention efforts.

Although the patrol division is accomplishing its basic mission, there is a great deal of confusion regarding the duties and functions of the patrol division sergeants. Both individuals seem to spend more time on administrative duties than actually supervising and guiding the patrol officers.

The LEMAP Team agrees that the use of the city police department to dispatch police calls after hours seems to be working. However, this practice could result in conflict. Since the university has no supervisory or managerial authority over employees of the city, it is not in a position to control and guide responses by city dispatchers and city police officers who respond to the campus when a university police officer is not available. The university should continue developing resources that will allow the department to provide 24-hour dispatch services and provide adequate police staffing so the city police department has to respond to the campus as primary law enforcement service providers.
The California State University at Stanislaus Police Department is providing a level of quality service to the community. However, to be able to provide an appropriate level of the unique law enforcement and security services required in an academic environment, staffing levels within the dispatch area and uniformed patrol operations need to be increased to a realistic level.
VI. Findings and Recommendations

The following material covers the findings and recommendations of the IACLEA Loaned Executive Management Assistance Program. The LEMAP Team addressed a total of twenty-one topic areas.

1. Status and Authority of the Police Department

Findings and Comments:

The California State University at Stanislaus Police Department is a full-service police department. Its police authority is derived from California State Statute, which grants full police authority on property owned or leased by the university and all property within a one-mile radius of the campus. The primary responsibility of the department is to protect campus citizens and all property owned or operated by the university. Currently officers are allowed to leave the campus to patrol in the one-mile radius at their discretion and respond to city police calls within that one-mile radius. At times, this results in the campus being unprotected.

The department does have a mutual aid agreement with the city of Turlock Police Department for the sharing of services as needed. However, there is no written department procedure to explain the implementation and use of the agreement.

Currently two members of the university police department serve on the system-wide Emergency Response Team. This commitment may adversely affect its ability to provide adequate service to the community given its limited staffing.

Recommendations:

1.1 Given the limited patrol staffing in the department, consider reducing the number of officers assigned to the system-wide Emergency Response Team to one officer.

1.2 Develop a detailed operating procedure that outlines the actual use and limitation of the mutual aid agreement with the city police department.

1.3 Consider restricting officers to perimeter patrols on streets contiguous to the campus.

1.4 Consider restricting officers to off-campus calls for which the city police department requests their assistance.
2. Staffing, Organization and Management of Personnel

Findings and Comments:

The police department operates a 24-hour police/security function with very limited staffing. This staffing issue impacts all aspects of department management and organization. There are only two sergeants assigned to the patrol division. Since the patrol division operates 24 hours a day, there is no sergeant on duty eight hours daily during the week and no sergeants on duty at all on the weekends. The two corporals in the division are used as police officers. The two sergeants are assigned separate duties, one as administrative sergeant and one as operations sergeant. However, both sergeants spend the majority of their time in the office rather than in the field supervising their employees. As a result, there seems to be some confusion within the patrol division regarding supervisory chain of command.

It is the consensus of the LEMAP Team that additional police personnel are needed to provide adequate patrol coverage. At least three additional positions are needed in the patrol division: one sergeant, one corporal and one police officer. The LEMAP Team also agrees that patrol officers should be restricted from patrolling beyond the streets contiguous to the campus. This would increase the on campus visibility of police.

The LEMAP Team was most impressed with the department command staff. The chief, assistant director and lieutenant are highly respected both inside the department and throughout the entire university community. Each demonstrates the skill and understanding necessary to adequately manage the police/security function. There is a concern that individuals in the community tend to contact a member of the command staff directly rather than go through appropriate department channels to request service. This adversely affects the command staff’s ability to concentrate on department-wide managerial issues. An effort should be made to educate the community regarding this issue.

The LEMAP Team also recommends that the current department policy/procedure manual be updated to reflect the actual functions and services the department provides. All staff should be trained on each new policy/procedure as it is published. There also seems to be a perception that information is not adequately disseminated from the command staff to the operational staff. More supervision visibility as well as some direct contact with the chief of police would more than likely address this issue.

Currently, follow-up investigations are completed by the officer who conducts the initial investigation. Further, no one is actually assigned to oversee the investigations function or the administrative aspects of that function. As a result, there is great inconsistency in finalizing and filing cases with the district attorney’s office. A full-time investigator position should be considered.

One LEMAP Team member identified the police department as a tightly stretched rubber band that is providing efficient and quality service to the community. On the surface, this organization is operating effectively, but it would be unable to allocate resources to address the kind of “unknowns” or potential crises that are inherent in the police/security function.
Recommendations:

2.1 Consider having the sergeants spend more time working in the field rather than in the office.

2.2 Evaluate the feasibility of increasing the patrol staff by adding one additional sergeant, corporal and police officer.

2.3 With the additional staffing, require that at least one supervisor and one police officer are on duty at all times.

2.4 Restrict patrol division patrol areas to the campus property and those streets contiguous to the campus.

2.5 Restrict patrol officers from going off campus and responding to city police calls unless they are specifically requested by the city.

2.6 Update the current policy manual to better reflect the services provided.

2.7 Train the community to use the appropriate process to request police services.

2.8 Consider developing a process to ensure the quality of information flow.

2.9 Consider establishing an investigator position to enhance follow-up investigations.
3. Policies and Procedures

Findings and Comments:
The police department has a policy manual in place and a copy is provided to each employee. The document is organized numerically and by subject title. However, it is very difficult to use. There is an alphabetical table of contents, but it is very redundant and confusing. Since the purpose of the document is to help employees make decisions and perform their duties, it should be as user-friendly as possible.

The majority of existing policies have been in existence since 1995 without any updating. The only policies that have been updated are the use of force policy and the taser policy. A major program should be initiated to update the entire manual and train all employees in its use.

Many current policies are generic and do not address specific issues a university police department would expect to confront. As an example, there is no policy regarding emergency notification for student-related situations that may occur on the campus. Some of the policies even assign specific duties to positions that do not exist in the department. There is no specific policy regarding follow-up investigations, or that outlines individual responsibilities for campus-wide emergency management situations. There should also be a specific policy addressing the department’s traffic enforcement philosophy as well as available alternatives to arrest.

To ensure buy-in by department employees, management should consider allowing all employees the opportunity to develop draft policies that will be considered for inclusion in the new manual.

The LEMAP Team agrees that developing a new updated policy manual is a key priority for the department.

Recommendations:

3.1 Initiate a process to develop a new policy manual that is specific to the needs of the department and university.

3.2 Develop a specific policy that addresses the distribution of information within the department.

3.3 Develop a policy that assigns responsibility for updating and developing new policies.

3.4 Consider establishing a process by which all employees can review a proposed policy before it is published.

3.5 Consider using IACLEA and CALEA standards to identify necessary policies to be developed.

3.6 Provide specific training for all employees regarding each new policy before it is published.

3.7 Establish an arrest policy that specifically outlines protocols that comply with state law and internal university notification needs.

3.8 Eliminate all generic policies that do not address specific internal department needs and organizational structure.
4. Space and Facilities

*Findings and Comments:*

The police department has an outstanding police facility. The building is appropriately located on campus and is easily available to the public. The facility provides adequate storage and operational space for each division and is aesthetically pleasing.

*Recommendation:*

None
5. Budget Process and Allocation

Findings and Comments:
The department budget is managed by the support services supervisor who reports directly to the chief of police. This individual prepares the annual budget request and submits it to the chief of police for review and approval before it is submitted to the university administration. There does not appear to be any process in place to obtain input from other members of the department in determining department budget needs. However, the chief of police does review the budget proposal with members of the command staff.

There is a detailed system in place for appropriate charge-backs to auxiliary functions for police services. These reimbursements seem to be in line with the services provided.

Recommendations:

5.1 Consider developing an internal procedure in which all department members are given the opportunity to recommend budget items to be included in the annual budget request.

5.2 When the budget has been allocated to the police department, consider having a department-wide meeting to discuss and explain the budget to all department members.
6. Communications and Dispatch

Findings and Comments:

Currently, the dispatch staff consists of four full-time dispatchers. These employees report directly to the support services supervisor. The police department dispatch service is operational from 7:30 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. Monday through Thursday and 7:30 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Friday. This service is available for 911 calls and non-emergency calls. All other times, the dispatch service is provided by the city of Turlock Police Department. There is a desire on the part of the university to have the police dispatch operate 24-hours a day, 365-days a year. However, there is inadequate staffing to provide this full service.

Although this shared dispatch service seems to be somewhat effective, the LEMAP Team believes that it would be best for the university to have a 24-hour dispatch operation because the city police department dispatch is usually much busier and thus less likely to view non-emergency calls from the university community as important. Further, the university does not have any managerial or supervisory control over city employees and is not authorized to hold them accountable or to a standard that is appropriate to the university.

Recommendations:

6.1 Make every effort to provide 24-hour, 365-day dispatch service to the community.

6.2 To staff this 24-hour, 365-day operation with one dispatcher on duty at all times will require adding two more full-time dispatcher positions (5.8 employees are required to staff one position 24-hours, 365-days).

6.3 Consider using only the ARMS records system rather than having two records systems.

6.4 If the decision is made to provide 24-hour, 365-day dispatch services, upgrade the current 911 equipment to receive cellular calls. Seek possible funding for this upgrade from the local 911 district.
7. Residence Hall Security

Findings and Comments:
The police department recently developed a residence hall liaison program designating one police officer as the contact point for all residence hall security and crime prevention issues. This has improved the working relationship between residence life and the police department. The LEMAP Team was extremely impressed with the officer designated to this position. He is very aware of the special issues that exist regarding residence hall security.

However, other patrol officers within the department seem to assume that all residence hall issues are now the responsibility of the liaison officer. They have not accepted their role in residence hall security. This is greatly limiting the department’s ability to expand any crime prevention efforts in this area.

Currently, university officers have keys to gain access to the residence hall gates when they respond to calls. When city police officers respond to a call at the residence halls, they do not have access to the gates unless a university officer is present. With the current staffing levels in the patrol division, and the liberal patrol policy that allows university officers to patrol within one mile of the campus, there is a significant possibility that emergency access to the residence halls cannot be made by responding officers. This issue should be addressed as soon as possible.

Recommendations:
7.1 Consider developing a written policy that specifically outlines patrol officers’ responsibilities in the residence halls.
7.2 Develop a training program for officers that emphasizes their part in residence hall security.
7.3 Consider requiring officers to provide structured patrol frequency in the halls.
7.4 Consider limiting officers’ primary jurisdiction to the main campus.
7.5 Consider assigning all officers to periodic crime prevention programming duties in the residence halls.
7.6 Address the lack of access city police officers experience in the residence halls during an emergency.
8. Goals and Objectives

Findings and Comments:

For a university police department to perform its function adequately it must be able to define and understand its proper objectives, translate these objectives into precise policies and operational procedures, and employ qualified professionals to carry out these objectives. There is a basic expectation that the department should make citizens feel secure in their community. Whether or not the department is fulfilling this responsibility, the public needs to know what the police department has defined as its objectives and goals. Annual reports summarizing the department’s activities, crime statistics, and operational expenditures provide the indices by which to measure these achievements.

The department must establish goals to ensure its mission is being met actively and the services provided are necessary, adequate, and of a level and quality to meet the university’s expectations. A department does this through preparing a mission statement that is reviewed and agreed upon by the university administration and the department.

A long-range or strategic plan should be written to outline the direction the university desires the police department to go, and priorities should be set. Additionally, it is necessary to prepare an annual document outlining goals and objectives for the coming year. Such a working document — with measurable objectives for the coming year — is an extremely useful and necessary tool.

The LEMAP Team requested police department goals and objectives for the current year but was informed that they had not been completed. Detailed and organized notes from an annual department retreat conducted in August 2005 were presented with the explanation that they would be used to prepare the annual strategic report, but there had not been time to do so. The notes included input from personnel representing a broad spectrum of the department including patrol, dispatch, front office, parking and community services. The last available annual strategic report was several years old; it had been prepared by a department member who had been promoted and no longer had time to prepare the report. The previous reports started with the department mission statement, were highly detailed and tracked progress in the completion of annual goals and objectives. It is recommended that the department goals and objectives, when completed for this year, be shared with the university central administration and members of the department leadership team so that everyone is in unison about what the department is attempting to accomplish. For this to be achieved in a timelier manner, responsibility for completing the annual strategic report should be delegated to a department manager with the necessary time to devote to its completion.

During the on-site review, LEMAP Team members found no indication that the department’s progress toward attaining goals and objectives received any formal periodic review, although some goals and objectives identified in the annual retreat notes had already been achieved and others were in the process of being addressed. Regular and frequent reviews should be conducted to measure how well employees are meeting the goals and objectives identified in the strategic report and supporting the department mission statement. Monthly reviews are often the most effective as
they allow opportunity to adjust resources and effort when needed to achieve the stated goals and objectives. A final evaluation of the department’s progress in attaining the goals and objectives for the year should be documented in an annual report. An annual report of performance has historically been included in the department’s strategic report.

Although there were some discussions with the LEMAP Team members of long-range plans for the department, there was no indication of an actual long-range plan for the department or any document that outlined a long-range plan. The long-range plan for the department could easily be incorporated into the department’s annual strategic report that would address department needs, goals and objectives for the next five years. Distribution of such a document to the department leadership team and university administrators would provide a template to be used for department development and budgeting processes.

**Recommendations:**

8.1 Delegate responsibility for completion of annual strategic report to a department manager with time to devote to its completion.

8.2 Update department goals and objectives annually.

8.3 Continue to involve department members in developing department goals and objectives.

8.4 Review progress toward achieving department goals and objectives regularly to determine if adjustments are necessary to attain the goals and objectives.

8.5 Share the department’s goals and objectives with the university administration and the department leadership team so that everyone understands what the department is working to achieve.

8.6 Conduct periodic reviews to measure how well employees are meeting the department goals and objectives in support of the department mission statement.

8.7 Evaluate the progress toward achieving department goals and objectives monthly and continue to include the final annual evaluation in the annual strategic report.

8.8 Develop a long-range (three- to five-year) plan that addresses facility, equipment and manpower needs and changes in the department mission based on institutional growth and development.

8.9 Evaluate and update the long-range plan annually.

8.10 Prepare and distribute an annual strategic report that includes the department’s long-range plan, the annual goals and objectives, and describes the activities the department performs to achieve the goals and objectives established to meet the department’s mission.
9. Relations with Other Criminal Justice Agencies

Findings and Comments:

Any criminal justice agency responsible for the safety and well being of its community should clearly understand its service area. However, because few agencies are able to respond adequately to the full range of emergencies that can arise, they must expand their agency’s range through relationships with other criminal justice agencies. These relationships are both formal and informal and, as such, require formal documents that clearly define each agency’s role and the goodwill between the various departments’ personnel and operational units to make collaborative interagency operations successful.

Upon review of the department policy manual, the LEMAP Team found there was no department policy defining the service area for the police department. However, California Education Code Section 89560 authorizes California State University peace officers to exercise their authority within one mile of the exterior border of each campus. Additionally, California Penal Code Section 830.2 extends their authority statewide, which enables any California State University peace officer to serve as a peace officer at any campus in the California State University System. The chief of police of Turlock has signed a notice of consent providing California State University at Stanislaus peace officers authority at all times within the city of Turlock.

The city of Turlock and the California State University at Stanislaus Police Department have executed an administrative agreement to provide for mutual aid, including the provision of dispatch services to the university police department by the city police department at times when the university does not have its own dispatchers. Each agency’s dispatch center serves as a back-up dispatch center for the other agency in the event their dispatch center becomes disabled. Functionally, university police officers are dispatched by the city police department at night and on weekends.

The California State University at Stanislaus Police Department has entered into a Kristen Smart Part I Crime Response Agreement with the city of Turlock Police Department, the Stanislaus County Sheriff’s Office, the City of Modesto Police Department and the Modesto Area District of the California Highway Patrol to provide investigative resources in the event of major incidents to include, but not limited to: homicides, rapes, robberies, aggravated assaults and arsons.

The LEMAP Team interviewed the chief of police for the Turlock, Lonald Lott, who stated that the relationship between his department and the university police department works well and is a “role model” for city and university police departments. The acting county sheriff, Mark Puthuff, in an interview with the LEMAP Team, described the relationship between the sheriff’s office and the university police department as “symbiotic.” When speaking with the LEMAP Team, Deputy Chief District Attorney John Gould said that the attorneys in his office feel the university police department prepares good cases with better, more thorough reports than most agencies and that the officers do good follow-up on requests from the district attorney’s office. He also said there is never a problem contacting the university police officers and they testify well.
While interviewing police officers and observing them work, the LEMAP Team noted that the university police officers have a very good relationship with the city police officers when interacting in the field. They not only work together well on calls, but they exchange information by computer terminals in the vehicles. There was a sense on the evening shift that the university officer was just a part of the city patrol shift covering the university beat. The university police officers are very aware of the “one mile from the border of campus” authority allowed them by the California Education Code and operate with that as their service area, often arriving at city police department calls in this area before the city police officers. A department policy defining the service area that the university would like covered would help to focus their efforts on the university campus.

**Recommendation:**

9.1 Develop a department policy that clearly defines the service area the university police department is to cover.
10. Patrol Operations and Enforcement

Statistics:
The Bureau of Justice Statistics, Law Enforcement Unit performed a study – *Campus Law Enforcement Agencies, 1995*. In a survey of 682 four-year institutions with 2,500 or more students, BJS found the following regarding special units or programs operated by campus law enforcement agencies.

**Selected special units or programs operated by campus law enforcement agencies, percent of total respondents, 1995:**

- Crime Prevention – 85%
- Stranger Rape Prevention – 60%
- Alcohol Education – 50%
- Victim Assistance – 37%
- Date Rape Prevention – 68%
- Student Security Patrol – 60%
- Self-Defense Training – 40%
- Hate Crimes – 23%

(Table 44, Page 27)

**Special public safety functions of campus law enforcement agencies, percent of total respondents, 1995:**

- EMS – 36%
- Fire Inspections – 30%
- Environmental Health and Safety – 25%
- Animal Control – 35%
- Search and Rescue – 29%
- Emergency Fire Service – 19%

(Table 28, Page 19)

Findings and Comments:
The day-to-day operation of a public safety department, which involves vehicular and foot patrols, investigating reports of criminal activity, and parking enforcement, is the barometer used to measure department effectiveness. Visibility of officers on campus is important not only as a deterrent to criminal activity, but also as a means for reassuring the community.

To maintain 24-hour coverage, there should be a procedure for continuous patrol coverage during shift change. In addition, a system for assigning officers to regular shifts and days off helps ensure impartiality. However, management should retain the final authority to assign officers to shifts in order to provide coverage and accountability. Policies and procedures to clarify patrol, response to calls, accident investigation, and medical emergencies are essential components of a professional public safety department.

The California State University at Stanislaus Police Department has a patrol force of nine peace officers: two sergeants, two corporals and five police officers. The corporals and officers work four ten-hour days each week with the overlap day being Wednesday. The shifts are 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., 3:00 p.m. to 1:00 a.m., and 9:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m., which provides two hours of overlap each afternoon and four hours of overlap each evening. The sergeants work five eight-hour days with one sergeant working days with Saturday and Sunday off and the other working evenings with Sunday and Monday off. The corporals work the night shift. Officers who work overtime on patrol or work days off to cover for other officers to be on vacation, at
training or on special assignments receive compensatory time. Although, by the
schedule, there should be two officers on duty for periods each day and four officers
on duty at times on Wednesdays, the minimum staffing requirement for the
department is one peace officer on duty, and officers frequently use the overlaps to
use up some of their accumulated compensatory time. Thus the benefit of the
overlaps resulting from the four ten-hour shifts is lost. Sergeants are largely tied up
with administrative or other functions and are not seen as an actual part of the patrol
force in the field and do not have specific supervisory responsibility for individual
officers and corporals. Officers and corporals are not sure who is in charge as they
operate independently most times. On those occasions when there are multiple
officers on duty, they may all show up at a call on or near the campus.

The police officers that the LEMAP Team interacted with were professional,
competent, self-motivated, sensitive to the members of the campus community and
enthusiastic about working at the university police department. They enjoy the
autonomy they had but felt that their input does not reach the department command
staff and that they do not receive information. They were not sure who made the
decisions that affected them. There was uncertainty as to the role of corporals who
currently serve as field training officers. The police officers did not see that they had
a role in crime prevention, which they perceived as the responsibility of a civilian
crime prevention specialist rather than as an overall department function. The
officers stated that they have received training and new policies on new equipment
issued to them, specifically tasers.

Officers on patrol are responsible for conducting investigations of the incidents to
which they are dispatched, with the exception of a major investigation, which would
be assigned to a supervisor. Police officers are also responsible for locking and
unlocking buildings scheduled to be opened on weekends and for key services when
requested by a responsible party.

When there is only one officer on duty and that officer is tied up with an incident or
transporting a prisoner to the county jail, the university police department relies on
police officers from Turlock to provide services to the university. City of Turlock
police officers do not have keys to the university buildings or knowledge of the
campus. Although the president of the student association stated that the city police
officers that work in the area surrounding the campus seem to be sensitive to
students, they are not likely to provide the type and level of service the members of
the campus community expect from university police officers. University officers
have had to provide directions over the radio to city officers responding on campus.

Because there is frequently only one police officer on duty at a time, they stay in or
near the patrol vehicle most of the time. Since the Residence Life Village is fenced,
officers make foot patrols through this area. During the evening and night hours,
most internal campus patrol is done by vehicle on the pedestrian pathways. The
police department has three patrol bicycles, but in interviews with members of the
university community, no one could recall seeing an officer on a bicycle. In fact,
some community members said that they did not feel the university police officers
were as visible overall as they had been. Some members of the university community
referred to the escort carts operated by the police department, but driven by students,
as the most visible university police presence on campus.
During the day shift, one police officer spends much of his time trying to locate misplaced and lost university property because inventory control cannot locate it and does not work with the department responsible for the property to locate it. The university police should not be called upon to investigate missing property until a reasonable effort is made to find the property.

To supplement the police officers, the police department also employs community service officers and students for both community services and parking enforcement ticket writing. There is a community service supervisor, a day-time community service officer and an evening community service officer. These individuals are responsible for parking enforcement, parking meters and devices, locking the campus buildings in the evenings, lost and found property, evidence control, training and supervision of student workers for escort services and parking enforcement, and conducting livescan electronic fingerprints for the university community. Because of the volume of livescan electronic fingerprints to be done, it is difficult for the existing staff of community services officers to effectively handle all of their responsibilities. Community service officers work Monday through Friday, as most of their work is needed on days when the university offices are open and classes are in session.

The LEMAP Team interviewed members of the community and observed officers during their hours of duty. The university police department does a very good job of providing service to the community and keeping the university a safe and secure environment. The department provides many services even though understaffed and does it so well that the personnel shortage is not readily apparent. However, should a major incident occur at the wrong time or multiple incidents occur that need attention at the same time, the resources and ability of the police department to respond satisfactorily could be overextended.

**Recommendations:**

10.1 Pay peace officers for overtime worked in the pay period they work overtime to eliminate build-up of compensatory time that must be taken off or paid at a later date.

10.2 Add another sergeant position and make each sergeant responsible for a shift and for the personnel on that shift.

10.3 Reapportion administrative responsibilities among the sergeants to allow them time to supervise personnel in the field.

10.4 Add two police officers to bring minimum patrol staffing levels to two peace officers at all times.

10.5 Increase the number of community service officers by one so there is adequate staff to perform all assigned tasks effectively.

10.6 Clarify the role of corporal.

10.7 Enhance police officer involvement in the department’s crime prevention function.

10.8 Require inventory control to conduct a more thorough search for missing equipment before requesting an investigation by the police department.
10.9 Realign the shift schedule to optimize the police presence at the most needed times and the visibility of sworn police personnel on campus.
10.10 Increase the use of the police patrol bicycles on campus.
10.11 Train supervisors in effective communication techniques.
10.12 Institute a clear written policy regarding the responsibility for investigations.
11. Records System

Statistics:
The Bureau of Justice Statistics, Law Enforcement Unit performed a study – *Campus Law Enforcement agencies, 1995*. In a survey of 682 four-year institutions with 2,500 or more students, BJS found the following regarding types of computerized information files.

**Selected types of computerized information files maintained by a majority of campus law enforcement agencies (total):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Arrests</th>
<th>Vehicle Registration</th>
<th>Calls for Service</th>
<th>UCR Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**By Size of Campus:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Arrests</th>
<th>V. Reg.</th>
<th>Srv. Call</th>
<th>Alarms</th>
<th>Traffic Cit.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30,000+</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000-29,999</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000-24,999</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000-19,999</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-14,999</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000-9,999</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500-4,999</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table 41, Page 24)

**Selected types of computerized information files maintained by less than half of campus law enforcement agencies, 1995 (total figures):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agency Personnel</th>
<th>Criminal Histories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stolen Property</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Accidents</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrants</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen Property</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Accidents</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrants</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table 42, Page 25)

Findings and Comments:
Efficient paperwork recording and flow are essential to the successful operation of any police agency. The records function is important in retrieving and using information about accidents, crimes, events, investigations, and rendered services. 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 classifications.

Several years ago, the California State University at Stanislaus Police Department participated in an intergovernmental agreement with Turlock to acquire a computer aided dispatch (CAD) records management system. Prior to that time the university police department used a system called ARMS acquired through a vendor specializing...
in campus law enforcement records systems. Since the university police department does not operate a 24/7 dispatch center and relies on the city to provide dispatch services nights and weekends, it was thought that utilizing the same CAD records system would simplify the combined dispatch operations and the records that came with the package would provide at least a comparable level of service for the university. Shortly after installation of the new CAD records management system, the department realized that the report writing portion was much more cumbersome than the ARMS system and that it did not provide the same statistical and management reports they preferred or needed to meet federal requirements. After about eighteen months of trying to get the records system to work effectively for the department, it was decided to use the CAD for dispatching and to go back to the ARMS system for the departmental records.

The CAD system generates a unique number for university police department calls that can be entered into the ARMS records system to track records. ARMS is used for report writing, crime stats, tracking events, lot restrictions, door unlock schedules, Uniform Crime Reporting and to retrieve statistics to meet the requirements for Clery Act compliance. The laptop computers in the university police vehicles tie into the city CAD system and officers can run checks on persons and vehicles from their patrol units. Although this dual system functions, it is not a desirable situation. It would be much simpler and more efficient if everything were combined into a single system. Two things may occur that will have an impact on the current system for records. First, the university police department is moving toward having its own twenty-four hour, seven-day a week dispatch center. Second, the city is not pleased with the current CAD system and may acquire a new CAD system. The university police department should have its own single system for computer aided dispatch and records generation, preparation and retention.

The LEMAP Team found that the university police department has and follows a records retention schedule. They contribute crime data to the Uniform Crime Reporting system of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. ARMS is a computer-based records management system that accounts for the status of reports and provides an alphabetical master name index. The ARMS system maintains records information to include: incidents by location; incidents by date and time; and stolen, found, recovered and evidentiary property. The paper versions of records are maintained in a central location in the support supervisor’s office and can be accessed by the university police dispatchers when they are on duty. Officers can access the electronic version of records at anytime through the terminal in the workroom.

The LEMAP Team determined that juvenile records are not maintained in a separate and secure location with limited authorized access.

Overall, the records system used by the university police department is quite effective and follows department policies and procedures.

**Recommendations:**

11.1 Place juvenile records in a separate secure location with limited authorized access.
11.2 Implement a single computer aided dispatch/records management system that provides the necessary data collection and retention needed by the university police department.
12. Property and Evidence

Findings and Comments:

Impounding property and evidence found or confiscated is a necessary function of most campus law enforcement, public safety and security agencies. It allows the university to return property to the rightful owner, maintain a consistent chain of possession and produce evidence to be used later in internal hearings as well as the criminal justice system.

Review of the property and evidence process by the LEMAP Team found a very comprehensive record keeping system in place for receiving and tracking of all property coming into the possession of university police personnel. All property, including evidence, is appropriately marked, with evidence having necessary identifiers to reference it to department incident or crime report numbers. A policy requires documentation in incident reports detailing how the evidence came into the department’s custody and describing each item of evidence obtained.

Department policy is very detailed in describing the proper packaging and marking of evidence. The items observed by the LEMAP Team were packaged in accordance with the department policy. The police department documents the chain of custody whenever an evidentiary item changes custody. There is a written policy and appropriate documentation for the return or destruction of evidentiary items when the legal requirements have been met.

When the LEMAP Team inspected the facility for receiving and storing evidence, it found that the room for storing evidence was shared with the department firearms equipment and supplies and that the department firearms instructors possess keys to gain entry to the room. Inside the room a number of storage cabinets, safes and shelving units lined the walls. Evidence was retained in one locked storage cabinet and the safe was used to store items such as firearms, drugs, money, jewelry and other valuables. However, there were also approximately twenty items of packaged evidence on the floor of the room or on top of the safe. These items were accessible to the firearms instructors whenever they entered the room.

The cabinets designed for police officers to drop evidence and transfer possession to the property custodian had a latch system on the exterior door that locks the evidence in. However, the interior door to the cabinet inside the evidence room has a simple thumb release latch that would allow anyone who had access to the room, such as the firearms instructors, access to the evidence in the drop lockers. Two lockers intended for found property, located next to the two evidence drop lockers, do not open into the evidence room or lock from the front. Some police officers do not understand the purpose of these two lockers and sometimes use them for evidence.

The community services supervisor acts as the department property and evidence custodian. He controls all property turned into or seized by the police department and maintains all necessary records and documentation. He arranges for the release or destruction of all evidence and found property. He has the key to the evidence storage room shared with the firearms instructors.

Although the community services supervisor annually inspects and audits the evidence and property in the possession of the police department, there is no
procedure to inspect the evidence and property retention areas and records on a routine basis by the police lieutenant who supervises the community services supervisor or for regular unannounced inspections as directed by the chief of police.

Recommendations:

12.1 Locate a new secure storage area for the department firearms equipment and supplies and remove these items from the evidence room.

12.2 Re-key the evidence room and issue the only key to the community services supervisor; conduct an inspection of evidence at the time the evidence room is resecured.

12.3 Establish a procedure for the police lieutenant to conduct quarterly inspections of the evidence room and property storage area.

12.4 Initiate unannounced regular inspections of the evidence room directed by the chief of police.

12.5 Clearly label the two found property lockers and conduct training for the police officers regarding their location and purpose.
13. Parking Operations

Statistics:

The Bureau of Justice Studies, Law Enforcement Unit performed a study – Campus Law Enforcement Agencies, 1995. In a survey of 682 four-year institutions with 2,500 or more students, BJS found the following regarding parking functions.

Parking and Transportation Functions of Campus Law Enforcement Agencies, Percent of Total Reporting, 1995:

Percent of agencies with primary responsibility for:

- Parking Enforcement – 85%
- Parking Administration – 72%
- Campus Transportation – 25% (Table 25, Page 17)

It is interesting to note that the smaller the school, the more likely that parking and transportation services were offered.

Findings and Comments:

The parking function is a vital aspect of university operations. Parking operations include assigning vehicles to various areas of the campus for parking, planning for changes in the campus physical plant that could impact the smooth flow of traffic, as well as enforcing parking rules. These operations require management skills in the office and should be considered in construction planning and facilities placement throughout the campus. Parking should not be an afterthought of the university; therefore, the management structure of the parking department should be an ordinary part of a campus planning program, as well as a police operation. Interaction between the two functions when physical plant considerations are made will help to make the campus more user friendly.

The California State University at Stanislaus Police Department has responsibility for parking administration, parking enforcement and transportation services in the form of an evening escort shuttle. The parking operation is predominantly the responsibility of the community services supervisor and his staff of two community service officers and student community service officers and ticket writers. The community service officers hire, train and supervise the students who drive the electric and gas carts used for the evening escort service and write tickets for vehicles that violate university parking rules.

A component of the parking operation is also responsible for processing citations, including appeals, adjudication and fine collection. This is staffed by the police department administrative support coordinator and several student employees. This unit is so successful with this process that other state universities contract with the California State University at Stanislaus Police Department to handle their appeals and collection processes. Some of the funds generated by this unit have gone toward student scholarships. This operation is challenged by a shortage of staff to process the citations.

In conversations with the LEMAP Team, members of the university community indicated that parking enforcement was conducted routinely, but there was concern
that there may be some inconsistency in the enforcement. This is indicative of the shortage of full-time community service officers to perform the parking enforcement function and supervise the student ticket writers.

Revenues from the parking meters on campus are collected by a student worker. The pay and display parking machines are serviced by the community services supervisor. One time in the past a student worker tried to skim money from the parking meters, but the revenue records kept by the community services supervisor quickly detected the activity. There have been no other irregularities in the collection of revenues from the paid parking devices on campus.

The police department has no written policy that governs the department’s parking operations or enforcement activities. Such a policy would clarify areas of responsibility and expectations for the performance of the various parking operation functions.

The police department publishes and distributes a pamphlet that includes campus parking rules and a map showing parking lot locations and any restrictions. This pamphlet also provides information on the vehicle assistance services available from the police department.

By driving and walking through the various campus parking lots, the LEMAP Team observed that the parking lots were generally well marked and the restrictions on some portions of lots and on specific spaces were adequately identified by signage. A faculty member expressed some concern regarding the lack of parking signage in a service drive for a recently opened building; the resulting parking of vehicles in the drive blocked access to the loading dock of an adjacent laboratory building. In discussion with the community services supervisor, it was learned that arrangements were underway to install the appropriate signage in the service drive to eliminate the parking abuses occurring in the service drive.

The overall parking operation in the university police department is well run and efficient, although it is understaffed to provide consistent enforcement and keep up with citation processing requirements.

Recommendations:

13.1 Develop a written policy that governs the department’s parking operation activities.

13.2 Increase the number of community service officers by one to provide consistent parking enforcement and supervision of student workers.

13.3 Employ a full-time staff person to assist with the citation appeals process, which generates revenue for the police department.

**Clery Act Overview:**

The Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act, codified at 20USC 1092 (f) as a part of the Higher Education Act of 1965, is a federal law that requires colleges and universities to disclose both timely specific information and annual summary information about campus crimes and security policies. All public and private institutions of postsecondary education participating in federal student aid programs are subject to the Clery Act. The law was originally enacted by Congress in 1990 as the Crime Awareness and Campus Security Act, and has been the subject of an ongoing series of amendments. The following standards reflect the regulations adopted and guidance provided by the U.S. Department of Education through March 2001. Consult the department of Education’s Campus Security Web site at http://www.ed.gov/offices/OPE/PPI/security.html for the most current information.

Although the ultimate burden of compliance with the Clery Act is institutional in scope, it is to be expected that the campus security, law enforcement or public safety agency of any postsecondary school will play a significant role in the achievement of compliance. Overall, the information dissemination requirements of the Clery Act exceed any standards that have been statutorily imposed on state or local law enforcement agencies. The responsibility for the performance of certain functions mandated by the Clery Act will typically have been assigned to institutional units other than the campus security, law enforcement or public safety agency. Key to the achievement of compliance, therefore, is ensuring that all of the elements of the law are being addressed and that the responsibilities of and relationships among the various on and off campus units have been clearly documented.

An institution must comply with the requirements regarding the Annual Campus Security Report for each separate campus. This may be accomplished by specifying the separate campus locations of the required crime statistics and by noting any geographic differences in campus security policies, procedures and resources; or by preparing separate complete annual report documents for each branch campus. A wholly-owned campus outside the United States would be treated as a separate campus.

A great deal of detail is required regarding the occurrence of the enumerated crimes. An institution must record a crime statistic in its Annual Campus Security Report for the calendar year in which the crime was reported to a campus security authority. A campus security authority is defined as: (1) a campus police department or a campus security department of an institution, (2) any individual or individuals who have responsibility for campus security but who do not constitute a campus police department or a campus security department, such as an individual who is responsible for monitoring entrance into institutional property, (3) any individual or organization specified in an institution’s statement of campus security policy as an individual or organization to which students and employees should report criminal offenses, or (4) an official of an institution who has significant responsibility for student and campus activities, including, but not limited to, student housing, student discipline, and
campus judicial proceedings. If such an official is a pastoral or professional counselor, the official is not considered a campus security authority when acting as a pastoral or professional counselor. An institution is not required to report statistics for crimes reported to a pastoral or professional counselor.

In complying with the statistical reporting requirements, an institution must make a reasonable, good faith effort to obtain the required statistics and may rely on the information supplied by a local or state police agency. If the institution makes such a reasonable, good faith effort, it is not responsible for the failure of the local or state police agency to supply the required statistics.

The Annual Campus Security Report must provide a geographical breakdown of required crime statistics the following categories: (1) on campus, (2) of the crimes that occurred on campus, the numbers that occurred in dormitories or other residential facilities for students, (3) in or on a non-campus building or property, and (4) on public property. In complying with the statistical reporting requirements, an institution may provide a map to current and prospective students and employees that accurately depicts its campus, non-campus buildings or property, and public property areas.

The required statistics may not include the identification of the victim or the person accused of committing the crime. The required crime statistics must be compiled using the definitions of crime provided in Appendix E to 34CFR section 668 and the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s Uniform Crime Reporting Hate Crime Data Collection Guidelines and Training Guide for Hate Crime Data Collection. For further guidance concerning the application of definitions and classification of crimes, an institution must use either the UCR Reporting Handbook or the UCR Reporting Handbook: NIBRS Edition, except that in determining how to report crimes committed in a multiple-offense situation, an institution must use the UCR Reporting Handbook.

By October 1 of each year, each institution must distribute, to all enrolled students and current employees, its Annual Campus Security Report. Distribution may be effected through any combination of appropriate publications and mailings, including the direct mailing of the Report to each individual through the U.S. Postal Service, campus mail, or electronic mail; the inclusion of the Report in a publication or publications provided directly to each individual; or posting the Report on an Internet or Intranet Web site. If an institution chooses to distribute its annual security report to enrolled students and/or current employees by posting the disclosure on an Internet or Intranet Web site, the institution must, by October 1 of each year, distribute to all currently enrolled students and/or employees a notice that includes a statement of the report’s availability, the exact electronic address at which the report is posted, a brief description of the report’s contents, and a statement that the institution will provide a paper copy of the report upon request.

The institution must provide a notice to prospective students and prospective employees that includes a statement of the Annual Campus Security report’s availability, a description of its contents, and an opportunity to request a copy. An institution must provide its Annual Campus Security Report, upon request, to a prospective student or prospective employee. If the institution chooses to provide its Annual Campus Security Report to prospective students and prospective employees
by posting the disclosure on an Internet Web site, the required notice must include the exact electronic address at which the report is posted, a brief description of the report, and a statement the institution will provide a paper copy of the report upon request.

The geographic breadth of the timely warning requirement is greater than for the Annual Campus Security Report, in that it applies to any of the enumerated offenses that have been reported to local police agencies and that could represent a threat to students and employees of the institution. The campus agency should therefore ensure that information is gathered daily from local police agencies so that the necessary determination of any need to provide timely warnings can occur. An institution is not required to provide a timely warning with respect to crimes reported to a pastoral or professional counselor.

The breadth of the daily crime log requirement is greater than for the Annual Campus Security Report, in that it applies to any and all crimes that have been reported to the campus agency, not only to those categories that are subject to annual statistical disclosure. The daily crime log may be created and posted electronically, in hard copy, or both, but all log entries for the most recent sixty-day period must be available for public inspection during normal business hours. If the log is maintained in an electronic format, provisions should be made on site for public access to a viewing terminal or a hard copy printout upon request. The agency must make any portion of the log older than sixty days available within two business days of a request for public inspection.

**Findings and Comments:**

The Annual Campus Security Report prepared by the police department’s assistant director for environmental health and safety and emergency management is a comprehensive and well written document. It includes:

- A statement of policy regarding procedures for students to report criminal actions or other emergencies occurring on campus, including a list of the titles of persons and organizations to whom students and employees should report criminal offenses.
- A statement of policy governing the making of timely warning reports to members of the campus community regarding the occurrence of the designated categories of crime.
- A statement of policy regarding the preparation of the annual disclosure of crime statistics.
- A statement of the institution’s policies and procedures that allow victims or witnesses to report crimes on a voluntary, confidential basis for inclusion in the annual disclosure of crime statistics and a description of those procedures.
- A statement of policy concerning security of and access to campus facilities, including the residential complex, and the security considerations used in the maintenance of campus facilities.
- A statement of policy concerning the enforcement authority of the university police officers, their authority to arrest individuals, and their
relationship with the federal, state, county and city law enforcement agencies.

- A statement of policy that encourages accurate and prompt reporting of all crimes to the university police and appropriate off-campus law enforcement agencies.
- A description of procedures that allow pastoral and professional counselors, with the consent of the victim, to report crimes on a voluntary, confidential basis for inclusion in the annual disclosure of crime statistics.
- A description of the type and frequency of programs presented to the university community informing students and employees about the prevention of crimes, campus security procedures and practices, and encouraging students and employees to be responsible for their own security and the security of others.
- A statement of policy concerning the monitoring and recording of information regarding criminal activity in which students engaged in at off-campus locations.
- A statement of policy regarding the possession, use and sale of alcoholic beverages and the enforcement of the California underage drinking laws.
- A statement of the policy regarding the possession, use and sale of prescription and illegal drugs, and the enforcement of federal and California drug laws.
- A description of the university drug and alcohol abuse education and treatment programs.
- Statements of policy regarding the university’s campus sexual assault programs to prevent sexual offenses, and procedures to follow when a sex offense occurs.
- A description of educational programs to promote the awareness of rape, acquaintance rape, and other forcible and non-forcible sex offenses.
- Procedures students should follow if sexual offense occurs, including: who should be contacted, the importance of preserving evidence and to whom the offense should be reported.
- Information regarding the student’s option to notify the appropriate law enforcement agency regarding a sexual offense.
- Notification to students of existing on- and off-campus counseling, mental health, and other services for victims of sexual offenses.
- Notification to students that the university will change a victim’s academic or living situations after an alleged sexual offense if a victim request changes and the accommodations can be made reasonably.
- A statement of university disciplinary procedures that provide for the victim of an alleged sexual offense to be notified of results of a disciplinary action or an appeal.
- A description of the sanctions the university may impose following the final determination in a university disciplinary action for a sexual offense.
- A report of statistics for the three most recent calendar years concerning the occurrence on campus, in the residential village at the Stanislaus campus,
and on public property of the offenses, arrests and referrals required by the Clery Act that are reported to the local police, the university police, or a campus security authority other than the university police.

- Notices that there were no hate crimes reported at either the Stanislaus campus or the Stockton satellite campus.
- A statement defining the role of the university police in facilitating the publication and dissemination of the Annual Campus Security Report.

Other than the report of statistics for the Stockton satellite campus, there is no other information in the Annual Campus Security Report specifically for that campus. Additional information, such as how to report a crime, should be included in this report so that it complies with the Clery Act requirements for the Stockton satellite campus. An alternative would be to have a separate Annual Campus Security Report for that campus.

The Annual Campus Security Report also discusses the daily crime log although it is referred to as the “Public Access Arrest Log.” It also states that crime logs older than sixty days may be accessed within two business days of a request for such crime log. The crime log is maintained at the dispatch center and is available to the public during the dispatch center’s hours of operation. Concern was expressed by some university police staff that the entries and required updates to the daily log were not always made within the two business days required by the Clery Act.

There is no directive that specifies the university police department’s procedures for temporarily withholding information from the daily crime log. The department policy manual, in section 11.03, Release of Reports, notes that all information required by California law must be released “except, to the extent that the disclosure of a particular item of information would endanger the safety of a person involved in an investigation or would endanger the successful completion of the investigation or related investigation.” The Clery Act also allows withholding information in situations where disclosure might cause a suspect to flee or evade detection, or result in the destruction of evidence.

There have been very few instances when it has been necessary to issue timely warnings. The university police will periodically send out warnings to the campus community regarding criminal activity or acts that do not fall under the Clery Act requirements for timely warnings. There is no written directive that sets out the procedure for providing timely warnings to the campus community regarding reported crimes to aid in the prevention of similar crimes. Such a directive should include a protocol for reviewing all offenses that are subject to disclosure in the Annual Campus Security Report and have been reported to campus security authorities or to local police agencies, to determine if they represent a threat to students and employees.

Although the police department submits the crime statistics included in the Annual Campus Security Report to the U.S. Secretary of Education on behalf of the university, there is no written directive that sets out this responsibility.
**Recommendations:**

14.1 Add information to the Annual Campus Security Report so that the document meets the Clery Act requirements for the Stockton satellite campus.

14.2 Ensure that entries and updates to the public access daily crime log are made within two business days.

14.3 Prepare a written directive that specifies that information may be withheld from the daily crime log in accordance with California law and include this in the Annual Campus Security Report.

14.4 Prepare a written directive that sets out the police department’s role in submitting the university’s Annual Campus Crime Report statistics to the Secretary of Education.
15. Policing the University: Police/Community Interaction

Findings/Comments:

For a law enforcement agency to effectively deter crime or investigate criminal acts, it must rely on the community it serves for cooperation and collaboration. The degree of participation from the community in deterring and solving crime is directly proportionate to the relationship the police department has cultivated with the community. The constant interaction with the community on safety and security matters is imperative if law enforcement is to gain the respect of community members. The consistent display of expertise, courtesy, and professionalism creates a bond between the police department and the community in the continued effort to provide a safe environment for its academic endeavors.

The California State University at Stanislaus Police Department has presented itself to facets of the university community in a collaborative manner in its problem solving efforts. Those who remarked positively were able to recall a specific instance where the department’s assistance was requested and an effective remedy was provided. However, in instances where specific problems were not yet identified, many community members had very little or no interaction with the department. Community members who commented about the presence of patrol, when questioned further, elaborated specifically about escort services, not the sworn staff. One person, for example, discussed not knowing for some time that the campus had its own police department.

The department’s sworn staff does not interact routinely with campus organizations or with other groups. Some of this inactivity can be attributed to a lack of patrol staff. In other instances, it would appear that department officials have not taken the initiative. With its eleven member sworn team, the department is often left with only one officer on duty. In many cases, the on-duty officer is patrolling streets adjacent to the campus. A uniform appearance on campus creates visibility, which is necessary in the growing university community. It also instills a sense of safety given the expanding campus environment and growing residential population.

Overall, the LEMAP Team found that the department lacks a formal community relations function, and that officers lack buy-in to the community-oriented policing philosophy. This is not uncommon for campus law enforcement operations. The department took the initiative of appointing a liaison to the residential community. A full-time, non-sworn manager is charged with crime prevention education. The department needs a methodology to provide for consistent interaction with the community to identify safety related shortfalls and potential liabilities.

The evening escort service consists of students driving electric and gas multi-passenger carts around the outer loop roads of the campus and picking up and dropping off individuals waiting at bus stops along the route. The carts operate on this route continuously during the evening when the university is in session. Comments made to the LEMAP Team by university community members indicated that it was one of the most visible facets of the department.

Several interview participants commented that the department assists on occasion with training of members in other departments. This training might include bomb
detection, student orientation, and others. The department has established itself favorably with several key campus departments, whose members would desire more presence of patrol staff on campus. There appears to be a tendency to justify the absence of patrol officers due to their anticipated and expected level of interaction with Turlock police officers. This was somewhat justified by respondents whose perceptions were that more of the sworn staff is needed with off-campus incidents. But as one respondent articulated, “officers need to know that their first priority is on campus.” Even those who supported the department on off-campus activities recognized that the department should be more visible on campus, particularly in the evening hours. The gaps could be the result of a lack of staffing, inappropriate scheduling given current personnel allocations, or field activities being focused on off-campus activities during the evening hours. Re-institution of the department’s campus climate surveys and assessments would help measure campus needs.

The department has made good use of resources during increased demands. Additional effort should focus on more daily crime prevention and deterrence activities on campus, while implementing basic community-oriented policing concepts and formalizing a community relations program.

**Recommendations:**

15.1 Develop a proactive posture regarding police/community relations to create the impression across the campus community that the department provides one-stop shopping for all public safety-related issues.

15.2 Initiate activities to develop working relationships with various departments, groups, and administrative personnel on campus through scheduled meetings and more frequent training sessions.

15.3 Provide pamphlets and/or flyers that cover a variety of safety and security topics and encourage the publication of safety tips and other crime prevention information in the student newspaper.

15.4 Allocate additional funding to increase staffing to allow for a minimum of two officers on duty.

15.5 Encourage department staff to participate in campus committees, i.e., student activities, women’s awareness month programs, residential housing training sessions, etc.

15.6 Increase community relations efforts by providing information to faculty and administrators on campus through increased crime prevention presentations during department meetings.

15.7 Work with the office of the vice president for administration to develop goals and strategies for performing campus-wide surveys of the police department.

15.8 Engage in police/community relations activities and community-oriented policing concepts where possible.

15.9 Revise shift schedules to allocate more patrol time for on-campus activities.
16. Equipment

Findings and Comments:

Upon initial inspection, it is evident that the California State University at Stanislaus Police Department’s staff appreciates and is accountable for its equipment and resources. This inspection included a review of patrol cars and other vehicles, department equipment, uniforms, and their storage and upkeep.

Over the last few years the department has gradually replaced patrol vehicles and has acquired specialty vehicles for emergency preparedness and supervisory staff. Additionally, the department operates a night escort service with the use of carts. All vehicles appeared clean and well maintained. Several black and white patrol cars had new logos and were equipped with mobile vehicle data terminals (MDTs) for retrieving criminal history information via the city of Turlock. Patrol vehicles were also equipped with rechargeable flashlights, LED emergency lights, siren, fire extinguisher, flares, fire aid kits, defibrillator devices, alternative weapons, and two-way radio for communicating with limited in-house dispatch during the day and Turlock Police Department during non-business hours. All of the equipment appeared well-maintained and in good working order. There is a department policy that pertains to intended uses of equipment, but it does not specify what the intended uses are or potential discipline for violations of this policy.

A police sergeant oversees the inventory program for sworn officers. Personal equipment assigned to the patrol staff did not appear worn or outdated. The equipment sergeant tracks equipment assigned to each officer, and some items are kept neatly arranged and organized in the storage/evidence room. This poses some logistical problem due to access issues and the sensitivity and need for tighter restrictions to stored evidence. However, the department has a fairly new building with additional space yet to fill. By reassessing administrative and work needs, space is available to separate general equipment from evidence storage.

Other department equipment is organized and maintained by functional area. For example, homeland security funded items and other related equipment are maintained by the emergency manager. A senior community service officer maintains inventory of the department’s general assets and parking equipment. Capital expenses over $500 are logged and tracked annually. Police equipment is inventoried and a total of the equipment item and type is provided to the chief of police. However, the equipment is not reconciled with the previous year’s inventory to provide a quick glance of what has changed or what is missing.

There appears to be much satisfaction that the staff possesses ample equipment and resources to effectively carry out its duties and the department mission, including technological resources.

Of particular interest is the department’s procurement of tasers as a non-lethal defense alternative. Prior to carrying the device, officers received training and a new use of force policy was implemented to assure the proper use thereof.

Other items, such as the condition of the office space, are extremely important to the professional delivery of law enforcement services in a university setting. The facility used by the department was found to be well kept and well utilized by personnel and
the general public. However, there are minor exceptions for the communications office, which would require attention to ergonomic enhancements and technological updates if the department chooses to adopt a 24-hour, in-house dispatching program.

The department equipment and facilities at present are excellent and well maintained, and the procedures presently used to maintain, replace, and upgrade equipment should be continued. The space used by the department is presently adequate.

Recommendations:

16.1 Revise the annual equipment inventory program to include a net asset list that compares previous year’s inventory with the current year report.

16.2 Limit access to the police equipment by separating inventory from evidence and control access to storage units.

16.3 If twenty-four hour dispatching is implemented, upgrade dispatch equipment to meet current ergonomic standards and operational needs.

16.4 Revise department equipment use policy that clarifies intended equipment uses.
17. Performance Evaluation Process

Findings and Comments:

To achieve its stated objectives, a campus law enforcement agency must be able to depend on satisfactory work performance from all employees. Performance evaluation is the measurement by the employee’s supervisor of his or her on-the-job performance of assigned duties. The appropriate principles of evaluation must be applied to ensure the best use of human resources available, that personnel problems are identified and dealt with promptly and fairly, and that each employee receives optimum job satisfaction.

Effective employee evaluation requires considerable skill and training. To be most effective, those conducting the evaluations should be trained in administering the instrument used by the department to explain the evaluation. More important, the supervisors need to know how to provide continuous feedback to employees and how to summarize that information when completing the formal evaluation instrument.

The California State University at Stanislaus Police Department has two collective bargaining employee groups. The collective bargaining groups include State University Police Association (SUPA) and the California State University Employee Union (CSUEU). Police lieutenant and higher ranking members are members of the Management Personnel Plan (MPP). The department’s community service officers, parking officers, and dispatchers are classified under the CSUEU bargaining unit. Police officers through sergeant rank are included under the SUPA collective bargaining agreement.

There is similar language in all collective bargaining agreements that specifies guidelines under which performance evaluations shall be conducted, including timelines for first-year employees, and annual evaluation processes for nonprobationary employees. It appears that all represented employees in the department received an annual review of the previous year’s performance and expectations for the next year in accordance with LEMAP guidelines. These include the supervisor who provides staff members with the results of the annual performance evaluation, the level of performance expected, and the individual’s future career goals. However, the department does not appear to have an internal policy on performance evaluations.

Employees responded that periodic review of expectations and corrections was provided throughout the year. They also believed that the rating of employees’ work was done fairly and consistently for all workers. An internal policy that addresses the performance review process or one that references detailed procedures would strengthen the positive perceptions about the department’s position on the review process and solidify responsibilities.

Employees are given an opportunity to sign the evaluation if they agree or attach a rebuttal if they dispute any item. Furthermore, the evaluations are reviewed and counter-signed by the direct supervisor and chief of police. In addition, training is available to all raters on the elements of the performance evaluation process, the positive side to performance evaluations, and pitfalls to avoid.
Further inquiry revealed that a potential deficiency exists for consistency of evaluators. The two shift sergeants alternate whose evaluation will be done by whom. This might create a “shopping effect” amongst supervisors.

Another area evaluated is the nexus between employees’ performance expectations and the department’s annual work plan. Currently, employees are provided a list of individual goals and expectations, but these goals should more closely correspond to department goals.

Overall, employees believe that the performance evaluation process in the department is done in a collaborative fashion, that employees are solicited for input, and that the department follows university performance evaluation procedures.

**Recommendations:**

17.1 Establish clear reporting lines with supervisors to ensure accountability and a consistent performance review process.

17.2 Establish a written policy that outlines performance review procedures, and expectations and that references established policies and relevant university guidelines.

17.3 Ensure that all employees involved in the process receive training in performance evaluations for reviewers to gain a deeper understanding of the review process, which might help in organizing records and linking expected outcomes to the department’s mission.
18. Complaint Processing and Internal Discipline

Findings and Comments:

Effective campus law enforcement requires a feasible, reliable procedure for accepting and investigating complaints against campus law enforcement officers. Such a procedure is necessary to ensure that officers do not abuse their authority or engage in unlawful activities. A reliable internal investigation procedure upholds the integrity of the campus law enforcement agency and instills public trust in the justice system.

Generally two types of complaints are investigated. The first is administrative, which is generally a complaint initiated internally by a member of the department for violations of a department policy or procedure. The second type is a personnel complaint made by a member of the general public against a member or members of the department.

Citizens should be encouraged to bring forth legitimate grievances about misconduct by department employees. These complaints should be received courteously and handled professionally and expeditiously.

The California State University at Stanislaus Police Department has satisfactory written policies on appearance and code of conduct for all personnel that are available to all department members. Complaints against peace officers are investigated in accordance with state law and the Peace Officer Bill of Rights. Complaints against non-sworn personnel are processed more informally. Typically Management Personnel Plan staff would review and process the complaint, but there does not appear to be any clear methodology for processing complaints against non-sworn personnel.

The department does not have a policy for rewarding employees with the appropriate commendations, compensation, etc., for exemplary performance. Rewards and accommodations are addressed informally during special events or other times during the year.

The department has a detailed written California State University policy on processing work complaints (grievances) from employees, and these procedures are outlined in the collective bargaining agreements for represented employees. There is no department policy for taking punitive, disciplinary action, to include oral reprimands, reduction of leave, suspension, demotions, dismissals and no position taken on progressive discipline or the like. There is no record of follow-up on disciplinary actions by the department to ensure corrected performance, or on the use of training and counseling as a function of discipline.

Recommendations:

18.1 Establish a written policy for reviewing and processing complaints received about non-sworn employees, including potential discipline, to whom complaint will be directed, and who will serve as lead and back-up investigator.
18.2 Establish a formal rewards and recognition program to provide a continued process and opportunities for recognizing stellar employees on a more consistent basis.

18.3 Advise employees annually of the complaint policy and appeal process, and provide copies of the policies to all employees.
19. Training

Findings and Comments:

Training has often been cited as one of the most important requirements for any campus law enforcement, public safety, or security department. Training serves three broad purposes:

1. Well trained officers are generally better prepared to act decisively and correctly in a broad spectrum of situations;
2. Training results in greater productivity and effectiveness;
3. Training fosters cooperation and unity of purpose. Moreover, agencies are now being held legally accountable for the actions of their personnel and for failing to provide initial or remedial training.

Training programs should ensure that department needs are addressed and that there is accountability for all training provided. In particular, training should be consistent with the department’s goals and objectives. There should be parallel increases in the level of education and training required for public safety and security officers so that a department can deal effectively with campus public safety or security problems in an increasingly complex and sophisticated society.

The department prescribes to the California Peace Officers Standards and Training (POST), which regulates training requirements for all state peace officers. The POST-sponsored courses are reimbursed by the state. The POST online database tracks peace officer training. The department follows POST guidelines with respect to initial orientation for newly hired peace officers and dispatchers. Continued development training for these groups is decided mostly ad hoc and based on the availability of courses and having officers meet minimum training hours.

Non-POST employee groups receive some training, but the training does not appear to be conducive to current assignments. For example, the non-sworn, crime prevention officer received no formal crime prevention education or certification for the expected expertise. A relevant staff development program for all employees would be useful in tuning skills and validating department experts.

Last July, POST mandated that all subscribing departments update their department Field Training and Observation (FTO) manual. The department submitted a revised training manual, but has yet to receive POST approval. Follow-up and final approval from POST should be obtained prior to training new personnel.

The department has done a satisfactory job in making training available and tracking training provided. However, the department falls short of ensuring that the right training is provided to specific persons, that professional development training is identified and predetermined by classification, and that such training is provided within a reasonable timeframe in respect to an employee’s tenure.

Recommendations:

19.1 Develop and formalize progressive staff training for department members and include timelines for priority courses. Some training topics to be considered are verbal judo, report writing, crime scene detainment and investigation,
active shooter, defensive driving, emergency management, physical fitness and wellness, campus peace officer, advanced dispatcher, hazardous materials, advanced sexual assault investigations, legal updates for peace officers, and powers of arrest for community service officers.

19.2 Encourage the patrol staff to adopt the principles of community-oriented policing, which requires that officers be trained in community policing methodologies and concepts. Consider sending officers to non-POST funded training.

19.3 Ensure that other department specialists are certified in their area of expertise, particularly in the areas of crime prevention, emergency management, investigations, and records management.

19.4 Follow-up with POST to ensure that the field training manual for new employees meets state guidelines and is approved by POST prior to training new personnel.
20. Crime Prevention

Findings and Comments:

Crime prevention activities are central to a safe campus. Most municipalities can achieve excellent results with a comparatively modest investment in crime prevention activities. However, colleges and universities have some characteristics that provide unique challenges to crime prevention efforts. Foremost among these is that a college community is an artificially created and temporary community of young scholars whose population changes dramatically each year. In addition, this population typically is not especially concerned with safety until something affects them. Crime prevention must be an ongoing and integral part of any viable public safety program.

The campus law enforcement agency should establish formal relationships with other campus departments, such as student life, housing, etc., to play an active role in organizing cooperative programming. By establishing links with the community, the department can learn of issues and respond to them before they become serious problems.

In addition to general crime prevention concerns, the applicable campus department needs to ensure that all residence halls are equipped with sufficient security hardware and safeguards to protect students around the clock. This would also include the use of patrols in and around the residence halls and the application of effective crime prevention programs and effective physical security measures in the halls.

As noted under Training, the department has a crime prevention unit (CPU) that coordinates crime prevention programs and conducts crime prevention related workshops. Until recently, this unit consisted of one full-time person. A new employee will begin shortly following this LEMAP review. The CPU will also focus on emergency management and the coordination of homeland security grants and activities. Recently, a police officer was assigned as liaison to the residential community. If the department wishes to continue with a dedicated crime prevention unit, it must be staffed beyond the normal workday to reach other constituents on campus.

The community perception of the police department appears positive; however, as noted earlier, many participants commented that crime prevention, from a deterrence perspective, is virtually nonexistent other than the above. Many of the participants in this assessment perceive that officers spend much of their patrol time either off campus in concert with Turlock Police Department or on the perimeter of campus. This long-standing practice is due to the need to work closely with local agencies and a perceived strategy to control unwanted access to the campus due to limited staffing. However, such practice creates a void in crime prevention activities on consistent basis.

Crime prevention and community-oriented policing are philosophies that must be accepted by all members of the department.

Smaller departments must use the most available resources for efficient distribution of services and the delivery of an effective crime prevention program. To accomplish this, those having direct access to the community must understand the basic tenets of community-oriented policing.
In addition to the allocation of personnel, lighting surveys are not completed on a regular basis, and work orders concerning related deficiencies require documenting for proof of submission and follow-up. Areas of concern typically include:

- Lighting
- Emergency telephone/call boxes
- Access systems
- Door alarms

The campus has several emergency phones and blue lights around the campus. Exterior lighting consists primarily of mercury vapor, metal halide, and low pressure sodium. Electronic access systems are limited to a few locations on campus. The department monitors campus burglar alarms, which are outsourced at night. These functions must be assessed on a consistent basis and at regular intervals. There is no clear process for reporting deficiencies. Generally, when someone reports a light out of service, or such is observed, someone notifies facilities of the deficiency. However, the service request is never recorded and the possibility of follow-up on previous reports is lost.

The department is represented at student orientation where a variety of crime prevention topics are covered with new students and parents, including personal safety, property identification, and alcohol and drug abuse. The department falls short in delivering regular programming for existing faculty and staff groups, which would be useful in fostering positive relationships throughout the campus community and aid in targeting programs to address perceptions or misperceptions about crime.

Overall, the department’s expansion of the crime prevention program by establishing a liaison with the growing residential community will go far to mitigate problems and improve relationships between the housing and police departments. The new crime prevention officer will relieve the existing MPP of current workloads and undoubtedly enhance the crime prevention program. Consideration must be given to the potential withdrawal of police and other uniformed personnel to engage in active community oriented policing and crime prevention activities because it is now “someone else’s job.” As many of the participants commented, they “would like to see more police patrolling on campus.”

**Recommendations:**

20.1 Establish a policy to balance patrol time to include on-campus foot and vehicle patrols.

20.2 Train all officers in basic campus crime prevention to gain better understanding of concept to gain buy-in, and so they are able to provide good advice when a residence needs security upgrading, and to provide crime prevention seminars periodically to residents and at employee staff meetings.

20.3 Consider holding group or individual programming on crime prevention addressing the following areas: rape and sexual assault awareness; new faculty/staff/student orientations; safety for commuter, residential or international students; alcohol and drug abuse prevention; personal, travel, and vehicle safety; property identification, and theft prevention.
20.4 Establish a program for weekly surveys and inspections of lighting, door hardware, emergency telephones, access systems and door alarms for deficiencies. Log these and report them to the physical plant department. Maintain a follow-up procedure.

20.5 Create a community policing and outreach program for employees, residents and commuter students that includes marketing of department services.
21. Investigations

Findings and Comments:

Although active patrolling of a jurisdictional area is important to deterring and preventing crime, how a law enforcement agency responds to calls, initiates and follows through on investigations serves as the agency’s mark of professionalism and evidence of expertise. Investigations into misconduct must be done with professionalism, fairness to all parties, awareness of perceptions, and must be completed expeditiously.

Criminal investigations must be performed in a professional manner to effectively adjudicate cases and establish a positive rapport with the local district attorney. The day-to-day operation of a campus law enforcement agency, which involves vehicular and foot patrols, investigating reports of criminal activity and parking enforcement, is the barometer used to measure department effectiveness. Visibility of officers on campus is important not only as a deterrent to criminal activity, but also as a means for reassuring the community.

To maintain effective investigatory services, the agency must have a written policy that establishes guidelines for completing reports when an officer is dispatched to a call, a procedure for conducting field interviews, and procedures for notifying the following offices:

- Medical examiner/coroner
- Investigators
- Street/highway department personnel
- Public utilities personnel
- News media
- Administrative personnel/chain of command

In addition, the agency must have a clear policy for specify responsibility for conducting preliminary and follow-up investigations.

The California State University at Stanislaus Police Department appears to have an excellent working relationship with the Turlock Police Department. A memorandum of understanding between the two agencies recognizes the university police department as having peace officer arrest powers within Turlock. The department also has a valid Kristen Smart Agreement on file, which is mandated under law and addresses investigatory responsibilities for different crimes that occur on campus.

With respect to such investigations, the community perceives the department as performing this function satisfactorily. Officers take ownership in cases during preliminary investigations. The community believes that the department is responsive to their needs during major investigations. Many instances, however, were when the police MPP staff were personally engaged in the activity and direct oversight was present. It is not clear, and there were some expressed concerns, that investigations in general are handled in the most expedient manner. Those who expressed concerns recognized that the department appears understaffed, but often gives priority to active investigations.
The department does not have an adequate system for reviewing officers’ reports, offering feedback and proofing cases prior to release. Reports are sometimes not adequately checked by a supervisor because of apprehensiveness of subordinate employees, the absence of a supervisor, a desire to get along or due to other work demands. The department needs to ensure that all investigations are given the appropriate level of attention. This might involve appointing a lead investigator, additional training in reporting writing, or reiterating the importance to supervisors of providing timely and adequately reviewed incident reports that are written in a manner appropriate for judicial and administrative follow-up.

**Recommendations:**

21.1 Establish a written policy that outlines who is in charge of investigations and responsibilities of investigators.

21.2 Establish a written policy on who is responsible for reviewing reports and the expected timelines for completion.

21.3 Establish procedures for follow-up on criminal investigations.
### Exhibit D

#### Business & Finance Balanced Scorecard Report

**Public Safety Performance Matrix**

**Actual vs. Target**

**2004/05**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure (Location)</th>
<th>Consolidation</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>STA-Public Safety Actual</th>
<th>STA-Public Safety Target</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;F-BUSINESS &amp; FINANCE DASHBOARD</td>
<td>This Year to Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;F Audit findings over 6 month</td>
<td>This Year to Date</td>
<td>Number-###</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;F B&amp;F forms/publications on Web</td>
<td>This Year to Date</td>
<td>Number-###</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>125.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;F Crimes</td>
<td>This Year to Date</td>
<td>Number-###</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>122.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;F Dept. meetings</td>
<td>This Year to Date</td>
<td>Number-###</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;F Dept. staff</td>
<td>This Year to Date</td>
<td>Number-###</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;F Dept. staff left university</td>
<td>This Year to Date</td>
<td>Number-###</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;F Dept. staff reassignments</td>
<td>This Year to Date</td>
<td>Number-###</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;F Emergency Drills</td>
<td>This Year to Date</td>
<td>Number-###</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;F Health &amp; Safety programs</td>
<td>This Year to Date</td>
<td>Number-###</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;F Health &amp; Safety training</td>
<td>This Year to Date</td>
<td>Number-###</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;F Model Practices Implemented</td>
<td>This Year to Date</td>
<td>Number-###</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;F Participants Health &amp; Safety events</td>
<td>This Year to Date</td>
<td>Number-###</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>161.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;F PS grant applications</td>
<td>This Year to Date</td>
<td>Number-###</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;F PS grants identified</td>
<td>This Year to Date</td>
<td>Number-###</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;F SEMS training</td>
<td>This Year to Date</td>
<td>Number-###</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;F Investment New Technology</td>
<td>This Year to Date</td>
<td>Number-###</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;F person training/development</td>
<td>This Year to Date</td>
<td>Number-###</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;F PS grant funding awarded</td>
<td>This Year to Date</td>
<td>Number-###</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;F % Dept. staff left or reassigned</td>
<td>This Year to Date</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;F % Staff satisfaction climate survey</td>
<td>This Year to Date</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Actual vs. Target**

**2005/06**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure (Location)</th>
<th>Consolidation</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>STA-Public Safety Actual</th>
<th>STA-Public Safety Target</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;F-BUSINESS &amp; FINANCE DASHBOARD</td>
<td>This Year to Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;F Audit findings over 6 month</td>
<td>This Year to Date</td>
<td>Number-###</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;F B&amp;F forms/publications on Web</td>
<td>This Year to Date</td>
<td>Number-###</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>125.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;F Crimes</td>
<td>This Year to Date</td>
<td>Number-###</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>122.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;F Dept. meetings</td>
<td>This Year to Date</td>
<td>Number-###</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;F Dept. staff</td>
<td>This Year to Date</td>
<td>Number-###</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;F Dept. staff left university</td>
<td>This Year to Date</td>
<td>Number-###</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;F Dept. staff reassignments</td>
<td>This Year to Date</td>
<td>Number-###</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;F Emergency Drills</td>
<td>This Year to Date</td>
<td>Number-###</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;F Health &amp; Safety programs</td>
<td>This Year to Date</td>
<td>Number-###</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;F Health &amp; Safety training</td>
<td>This Year to Date</td>
<td>Number-###</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;F Model Practices Implemented</td>
<td>This Year to Date</td>
<td>Number-###</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;F Participants Health &amp; Safety events</td>
<td>This Year to Date</td>
<td>Number-###</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>161.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;F PS grant applications</td>
<td>This Year to Date</td>
<td>Number-###</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;F PS grants identified</td>
<td>This Year to Date</td>
<td>Number-###</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;F SEMS training</td>
<td>This Year to Date</td>
<td>Number-###</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;F Investment New Technology</td>
<td>This Year to Date</td>
<td>Number-###</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;F person training/development</td>
<td>This Year to Date</td>
<td>Number-###</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;F PS grant funding awarded</td>
<td>This Year to Date</td>
<td>Number-###</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;F % Dept. staff left or reassigned</td>
<td>This Year to Date</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;F % Staff satisfaction climate survey</td>
<td>This Year to Date</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit E

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
2005 ANNUAL REPORT OF CRIME STATISTICS

Overview

As recognized California law enforcement agencies, each CSU Department of Public Safety is required to provide the state Department of Justice with a monthly report outlining reported Part I offenses, suspected incidents of arson, and recorded arrests and citations. This information is forwarded to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for inclusion in their annual publication, “Crime in the United States.”

The following report of systemwide statistics exceeds all mandated reporting requirements and is designed to assist CSU campuses in the preparation of campus crime reports. It likewise provides each campus with an updated profile of crime activity to assist in the planning and directing of future law enforcement/prevention activities.

The 2005 Annual Report of Crime Statistics is presented in two parts. The Annual Report includes systemwide statistics, a comparison between campuses and a summary of the statistics submitted annually from the campuses to the Chancellors Office is included as an attachment.

The chart on the next page is a comparative summary of Part I Offenses, Part II Offenses, and Arrests/Citations and other statistics reported during calendar years 2004 and 2005.
# THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
## ANNUAL REPORT OF CRIME STATISTICS
### 2004 - 2005 COMPARISON SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th># CHANGE</th>
<th>% CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PART I OFFENSES</td>
<td>5,404</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>-70</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL VIOLENT CRIMES</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PROPERTY CRIME</td>
<td>5,347</td>
<td>5,350</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>1,321</td>
<td>1,324</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny/Theft</td>
<td>4,332</td>
<td>4,302</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle Theft</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PART II OFFENSES</td>
<td>7,900</td>
<td>7,701</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple Assault</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>-8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>1,505</td>
<td>1,407</td>
<td>-98</td>
<td>-6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sex Offenses</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Abuse Violations</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>1,016</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving Under the Influence</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-32</td>
<td>-31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny</td>
<td>2,709</td>
<td>2,709</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlawful Conduct</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgery/Counterfeit</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>736.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-97</td>
<td>-87.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen Property</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Part II Offenses</td>
<td>2,018</td>
<td>2,150</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CRIMES REPORTED</td>
<td>17,044</td>
<td>16,966</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ARRESTS/CITATIONS</td>
<td>7,120</td>
<td>8,391</td>
<td>1,271</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Part I Arrests</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Part II Arrests</td>
<td>3,353</td>
<td>3,611</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Misdemeanor Violations</td>
<td>2,681</td>
<td>3,015</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Violations</td>
<td>1,009</td>
<td>1,021</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER CRIMES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HATE CRIMES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidents</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>296.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crimes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMESTIC VIOLENCE:</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-77</td>
<td>-64.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL MEDICAL ASSISTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol/Drug Related</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1,577</td>
<td>1,139</td>
<td>-438</td>
<td>-27.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part I Offenses:

Homicides, Rape, Robbery, Aggravated Assault, Arson, Burglary, Larceny/Theft, Motor Vehicle Theft

Total Part I offenses decreased by 78 incidents (-1.4%) in 2005 over the same reporting period in 2004.

- Total Violent Crimes increased by 39 incidents (28.5%)
  
  One homicide occurred in 2005
  Rapes decreased by six incidents (-12.5%)
  Robbery increased by 28 incidents (93.3%)
  Aggravated assaults increased by 18 incidents (31.6%)

- Total Property Crimes decreased by 117 incidents (-2.2%) in 2005
  
  Arson increased by five incidents (22.7%)
  Burglaries increased by 149 incidents (27.7%)
  Larceny/Thefts decreased by 280 incidents (-6.5%)
  Motor Vehicle Thefts increased by 9 incidents (2.0%)
Part II Offenses encompass: simple assaults, vandalism, weapons possession, sex offenses other than rape, drug abuse violations, driving under the influence, violations of liquor laws, drunkenness, disorderly conduct, forgery/counterfeit, fraud, embezzlement, and stolen property.

Total Part II Offenses increased by 841 incidents (11.4%) in 2005.

- Decreases were shown in five categories: simple assaults, vandalism, other sex offenses, forgery/counterfeit and embezzlement.
Total Systemwide Crime Reported

2001 - 2005 Total Systemwide Crime
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2003 - 2005 Comparison Between Campuses
Total Crimes Reported

Number of Crimes Reported

2003  2004  2005

Bakersfield  1,156  1,285  1,317
Channel Islands  326  366  427
Chico  1,378  1,440  1,190
Davis  73  305  610
East Bay  483  596  709
Fresno  260  270  119
Fullerton  522  528  538
Humboldt  785  776  780
Long Beach  1,107  1,219  1,172
Los Angeles  2,158  2,065  2,147
Marine Academy  169  169  169
Monterey Bay  77  78  78
Norridge  249  249  249
Pomona  1,277  1,233  1,267
Sacramento  913  913  913
San Bernardino  777  817  989
San Diego  1,319  1,183  1,153
San Francisco  77  417  77
San Jose  1,277  1,233  1,267
San Luis Obispo  37  57  57
San Marcos  78  80  80
Sonora  1,277  1,233  1,267
Stanislaus  1,277  1,233  1,267

Total crime reported has increased by 763, with 12,844 crimes reported in 2004 compared to 13,607 reported in 2005 (5.9%).

Total Arrests/Citations increased by 1271 incidents (17.9%) in 2005.

Arrests and Citations - Total number of arrests and/or citations recorded in the following categories:

- Penal Code Violations - The number of arrests for both felony and misdemeanor penal code violations showed an 8.1% increase in misdemeanor arrests and a 2.2% increase in felony arrests for 2005.

- Vehicle Code Violations

- Health and Safety Violations (drug possession, drug selling, possession of dangerous and/or toxic materials, etc.)

- Business and Professions Violations (minor in possession of alcohol, purchase of alcohol by a minor, alcohol on school grounds)

- Local Code Violations (Municipal, Education, or Administrative Codes)

- Outside/Bench Warrants (failure to appear, failure to pay fines, warrants for arrest for previous violations)
Other crimes also reported include hate crimes, hate incidents and domestic violence calls. In 2005, hate crimes decreased by two incidents (-11.8%) and hate incidents increased by ten incidents (37.0%). Domestic violence calls decreased by 37 (-30.8%).
Medical Assists

2003 - 2005 CSU Systemwide Medical Assists
(Relating to Drugs and Alcohol)

Medical Assists relating to drugs and alcohol decreased by 52 assists (27.5%) in 2005.
Drug Abuse Violations

2003 - 2005 CSU Systemwide Drug Abuse Violations

Drug abuse violations increased by 131 (14.8%) in 2005, rising from 904 violations in 2004 to 1015 violations in 2005.
Alcohol-related Violations

2003 - 2005 CSU Systemwide Comparison
(Consisting of Alcohol, Driving Under the Influence and Drunkenness Violations)

Violations of liquor laws increased by 150 violations (26.8%) from 2004 to 2005 and driving under the influence increased by 27.0% or 167 violations in the same time period. Drunkenness violations climbed to 693 in 2005, up from 647 in 2004, a 7.1% increase.
Systemwide Comparison of Alcohol Violations, Medical Assists and Drug Violations

2003 - 2005 CSU Systemwide Comparison
(Consisting of Alcohol Violations, Medical Assists, Drug Violations)

![Bar graph showing alcohol violations, medical assists, and drug violations from 2003 to 2005.]

After showing a decrease in alcohol violations in 2004, alcohol violations climbed to 2188 in 2005. Drug violations also increased in 2005 with 131 more violations than 2004. Medical assists relating to drugs and alcohol continue to remain relatively low, dropping to 137 in 2005.