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I. Introduction

This general review of the Pima Community College Police Department (PCCPD) was conducted at the request of Chief Christopher Albers. Under the auspices of the International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators (IACLEA) Loaned Executive Management Assistance Program (LEMAP), this review was conducted during the period of March 26, 2017 through March 29, 2017. The LEMAP Team was led by Larry K. James, Associate Vice President and Chief of Police (retired), University of Central Arkansas, Conway, Arkansas. Team members who assisted in the assessment were Terry McCauley, Director of Public Safety and Risk Manager, Oakland Community College, Auburn Hills, Michigan, and Gerald W. Schoenle, Chief of Police, State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, New York.

The charge from Chief Albers, who was appointed to the college approximately seven months ago, was to conduct a general assessment of the PCCPD in order to make recommendations that would lead to a more effective, efficient, and professional law enforcement and security operation with consistency throughout the six campuses of the college. Additionally, and more specifically, Chief Albers asked the LEMAP Team to review and provide recommendations in the areas of (1) enhancing community policing through the best deployment models; (2) policy and procedure best practices; (3) emergency action planning; (4) organization, staffing and departmental climate; and (5) preparation for IACLEA Accreditation.

In order to accomplish this task, the LEMAP Team reviewed the following administrative, operational and technical areas within the PCCPD:

- Status and Authority
- Organization and Management
- Goals and Objectives
- Policies and Procedures
- Complaint Processing and Internal Discipline
- Performance Evaluation
- Recruitment and Selection
- Training
- Records System
- Operations and Enforcement
- Property and Evidence
- Facilities and Equipment
- Communications and Dispatching
- Community Interaction
- Crime Prevention and Physical Security
- Space and Facilities
- Emergency Operations Planning and Special Events
After discussions with Chief Albers it was determined that the review would not be made of parking and traffic operations and Clery Compliance would receive only a cursory review.
II. Methodology

The following methods and techniques were used in gathering and evaluating information relevant to the PCCPD. The information, which was reviewed either before or during the site visit, included:

• Campus maps
• Tour of all campuses
• General campus demographic information (enrollment, locations, special programs, etc.)
• PCC/Campus organizational charts
• Review of PCC and PCC Police Department websites
• College Catalog (2016-17)
• Campus facility information for the campuses and centers
• Security Assessment Report and Recommendations - Security Risk Management Consultants, LLC, December 2013
• Threat Assessment Process Review and Recommendations - Security Risk Management Consultants, LLC, January 2014
• Executive Summary, Clery Act Review - D. Stafford and Associates, April 2015

• PCCPD information as provided by the department and/or requested during the site visit:
  • Organizational Climate Report
  • Administrative and Operational Procedures
  • PCC job descriptions for all PCCPD positions
  • Emergency Response Plan
  • Selection, hiring, and promotion procedures
  • Clery Annual Security Report for 2015
  • UCR Annual Crime Statistics for 2015
  • Mutual Aid/Relationship Agreement with Local Law Enforcement (MOUs and IGAs)
  • Description of programs that the department coordinates or participates in, such as orientation, campus training, etc.
  • PCCPD FY14 to FY16 Budget to Actuals
  • Summary of community policing activities/efforts
  • State laws and college policies that define statutory authority
  • Scope of authority for PCCPD officers
  • Samples of crime log, campus advisories
  • Staff work schedules
During the on-site visit to the campus, members of the LEMAP Team familiarized themselves with the campus property and conducted open-ended interviews with persons involved in the day-to-day activities of the institution. Among these were:

- Chancellor
- Executive Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration
- Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Services
- Vice Chancellor for Facilities
- Vice Chancellor of Human Resources
- Vice Chancellor for External Relations
- President, Downtown and Northwest Campuses
- President, Community and East Campuses
- President, Desert Vista and West Campuses
- VP of Student Affairs and Engagement, Downtown/Northwest Campus
- VP of Student Affairs and Transitions, Desert Vista/West Campus
- VP of Instruction and Transfer Pathways, Desert Vista/West Campus
- VP of Student Affairs, Academic Advising and Retention, Community/East Campus
- VP of Instruction and Academic Operations, Downtown/Northwest Campus
- Campus VP, Desert Vista Campus
- Various campus administrators, faculty and staff
- Dean of Mathematics and Student Affairs, Downtown/Northwest Campus
- Director of Environmental Health and Safety
- Managers and supervisors of the Facilities Department
- Representatives of PCCPD supervisory and line officers
- Representatives of PCCPD administrative, communications, and support personnel

All members of the college community were extremely candid and helpful in all aspects of the review.
III. Institution and Agency Description

The College

Pima Community College is a two-year college serving the greater Tucson metropolitan area at six locations and multiple learning and education centers throughout Pima County. PCC serves nearly 26,880 students (8,686 FTE) and employs 1,351 full-time employees as well as 822 part-time employees. All students commute to the college as there are no residence halls on the campuses. The college comprises 79 buildings and 20 parking lots totaling 8,632 spaces on a total of 460 acres.

Founded in 1966, Pima’s credit courses award certificates and associate’s degrees in a variety of fields. PCC also provides workforce development, career training programs, continuing education, and adult education. Most Pima students take classes at multiple campuses and are welcome to use student services centers, libraries, and other services at any PCC campus.

Campus Locations

- **West Campus:** The college’s first classes met in the fall of 1969 at Tucson Medical Center, Villa Maria, and Marana. In the fall of 1970 Pima College officially opened its doors to 3,543 students. Classes were held in unlikely quarters, a hangar at Tucson International Airport. By January 1971, students in all programs attended classes in the 11 buildings on Anklam Road, today’s West Campus, which has expanded to include a center for the arts to serve about 15,000 students annually. Expansion and evolution soon began. In 1972 the board renamed the institution Pima Community College to better reflect its mission of service to the community. It began to offer greater access through additional campuses.

- **Downtown Campus:** In 1974 the college opened the Downtown Campus at Stone Avenue and Speedway Boulevard. The first classes were held in a remodeled post office building. With the purchase of neighboring structures and the construction of the campus center and classroom technology building, the campus grew to 10 buildings. The campus currently serves about 13,000 students annually.

- **Community Campus:** In 1975 the college established the Community Campus to supplement traditional on-campus education. After occupying several sites, the permanent Community Campus facility opened in 1997 near St. Mary’s Road and Interstate 10 and serves about 16,000 students annually.

- **East Campus:** The college established the East Education Center in 1976, which became the East Campus in 1980. Located on a desert site east of Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, the campus doubled in size in the fall of 1989 with the construction of the student union and library. It has since expanded to accommodate more than 10,000 students annually. In 2004, the college and Tucson Parks and Recreation built a 21-acre park on the northwest edge of the campus, with soccer and softball fields, and a fitness facility for students.

- **Desert Vista Campus:** The South Education Center opened in 1986, and by 1993 had grown into the Desert Vista Campus, located near Interstate 19 and Valencia Road. Annually, the campus serves 7,000 students, including many who use the training and student services of the Center for Training and Development. The campus also houses a charter high school serving American Indian students.
• **Northwest Campus:** The Northwest Community Learning Center opened in 1998 and in fall 2003 was replaced by Northwest Campus on North Shannon Road. The Northwest Campus offers a full spectrum of educational, recreational, and cultural programs and services to more than 8,000 students annually. Major areas of study include the arts and sciences, health careers, and hotel and restaurant management.

PCC administrative offices are located off campus in downtown Tucson and the maintenance and security facility is also located off campus near the Tucson International Airport.

**PCC Police Department**

The PCCPD is a sworn, certified, and armed law enforcement organization that provides law enforcement and security services for all campuses and centers within the college. Department staffing includes police officers, community service officers, dispatchers, and administrative support staff. The organizational structure is centralized with no campus-based police officers on any of the campuses. Community service officers, who perform non-sworn security services, are campus-based. Police personnel report to the central security facility and are deployed on a random basis for patrol and enforcement. The PCCPD staff are responsible for providing uniform patrol, crime prevention, facility security, and follow-up investigations on all college campuses. Internal support functions including records management, evidence and lost property processing and storage, police communications and dispatching, special event security, training, Clery and other compliance, as well as other administrative functions.

The PCCPD is authorized a total of 52 positions including 33 sworn officers, eight police dispatchers, one dispatch supervisor, 17 full-time and 13 part-time community service officers, and three additional administrative staff. At the time of the LEMAP Team visit, approximately seven sworn officer, three dispatcher, six community service officer, and 10 part-time community service officer positions were unfilled or in the recruitment process.
IV. General Observations

The goal of the LEMAP Team in approaching this review is to help the Pima Community College Police Department build a state-of-the-art campus police department by reviewing current practices, gathering community feedback, and recommending changes where appropriate. Although the LEMAP Team conducted a thorough evaluation of the review criteria, each person reviewing this report must remember that observations, findings, and recommendations are based on a “small window” in the history of the department.

The LEMAP Team recognizes that implementation of the recommendations outlined herein will not be easy. It will take time and effort as well as support from all segments of the college community. Such an effort is critical to the overall safety of the campus, as well as to the self-respect of officers and staff charged with the protection and safety of the PCC community.

The public safety challenges in today’s environment, as well as the civil liability risks attendant to those challenges, require that campus law enforcement agencies be organized and operated in accordance with established and recognized professional standards. Failure to do so invites not only community dissatisfaction but the real potential for civil liability in such areas as Negligent Hiring, Failure to Train, Failure to Direct, Negligent Entrustment, Negligent Retention, Negligent Supervision, and Failure to Protect. Colleges and universities across the country have been deemed responsible for such breaches and have incurred losses, both financial and to their reputations.

The campus community has the right to expect that their security is reasonably and effectively protected within the campus environment. The college campus is no longer the safe haven that it was for centuries but rather a reflection of the society in which we live. The role of campus law enforcement and security on the college campus must address these unfortunate circumstances and meet the challenge. It was clear to the LEMAP Team that the PCC administration recognizes the importance of overall public safety to the campus community. This is reflected in the decision made by Chief Albers to have the PCCPD reviewed by an outside agency and the support for doing so that he received from his immediate supervisor, Vice Chancellor for Facilities and College Police, Mr. Bill Ward. From all observations made by the LEMAP Team it is clear that Chief Albers and Mr. Ward recognize and support the need to build a strong campus police department that meets the highest professional standards and one capable of delivering quality service to the students, faculty, and staff at PCC.

During the on-site visit the LEMAP Team interviewed a cross section of college administrators, faculty, and staff including members of the PCCPD. Prior to arrival of the LEMAP Team, Chief Albers and Esther Federico, Support Coordinator for the Division of Facilities and College Police, were designated as the LEMAP coordinators for the purpose of preparing for the on-site assessment. They responded effectively in a timely manner to all requests made by the LEMAP Team and provided extensive digital documentation well in advance to assist its planning effort. This is particularly noteworthy given the short time frame between the execution of the LEMAP contract and the site visit. They worked extensively with campus constituents and the LEMAP Team Leader to efficiently schedule interviews with campus constituents.

Administrators, faculty, and staff were forthcoming, engaged, and candid in their responses to interview questions posed by the LEMAP Team. Constituencies across the campus appeared genuinely proud of their institution and interested in issues regarding safety and security and in the success of PCCPD. It is noteworthy to mention the high regard that PCC administrators and staff have for their police officers, community service officers, and public safety dispatchers. Seldom has this LEMAP Team found so much support and appreciation for the work done by a police department.
Thus, it is easy to understand why the PCC community overwhelmingly voiced their desire to see more police on the campus and on foot, rather than in police cars cruising parking lots and city streets.

While community support for the police is high and their expectations were made clear to the LEMAP Team, turnover in PCCPD leadership over the last several years has led to a degree of management and operational ineffectiveness and inefficiency and lack of accountability within the chain-of-command. A clear direction for the department has yet to be established and communicated to department employees and to the PCC community. The internal malaise has obstructed efforts by the college and past police leadership to change a culture of traditional policing within PCCPD to a more contemporary campus community-oriented policing philosophy. Distrust, disagreements, and insecurity within the ranks of the department, in the opinion of the LEMAP Team, have resulted in past leadership’s demonstrated hesitation to make command decisions, establish direction, and hold department staff accountable, thus relegating the organization to a quasi-static state.

The LEMAP Team strongly believes that because of the lack of direction and focus on mission and community-oriented delivery of police and public safety services and direction, PCCPD employees have tended to turn their attention internally. Concerns about internal operational practices, disparate treatment, staffing levels, mandatory overtime, long-term vacancies and interim appointments, and officer safety tend to dominate the minds of employees. While few supervisory and line staff were able or willing to meet with the LEMAP Team, internal morale and employee relations issues within the department are well documented in the “Public Safety Climate Survey Report” completed in February 2017. The LEMAP Team reviewed this report thoroughly and found it to be very compelling. Rarely can an on-site review garner so much information about internal issues and perceptions within a department, even when a vast majority of staff are interviewed.

The newly appointed police chief, with a strong background in organizational leadership, is prepared to focus his attention on issues addressed in this report and the climate survey which, if successfully resolved, will go a long way toward eliminating the internal obstacles and challenges that have distracted PCCPD from its mission. The chief stated to the LEMAP Team that changing the culture of the department to provide a community-engaged delivery of police services will be the foundation from which he will address lingering management and operational issues.

The LEMAP Team concludes, and the police chief and executive management agree, that a concerted effort needs to be made to better incorporate the philosophy of community-oriented service within the department. The community-oriented philosophy on a college campus is based on the concept that PCCPD and community constituents can work together in creative ways to provide a safe and secure environment.

PCCPD should focus on co-active approaches toward campus safety and security, and rather than reactive policing, move toward a proactive approach where problem solving and community engagement are just as important as responding to calls for service. The chief of police must seek direct participation from the community, organizations, divisions, and departments through:

- Engagement with the community
- Service on committees
- Community outreach programming
- Participation in workshops and focus groups
- Contribution to all aspects of campus life
Problem identification and problem solving can only occur when the police department shares information with the community.

Although this report contains recommendations in many areas, four areas are priority. The observations and recommendations contained within the chapters on Community Interaction, Organization and Management, Operations and Enforcement, and Policy and Procedures must be addressed before many of the recommendations in other sections can be effectively implemented. In considering the recommendations within this report the police leadership, working in collaboration with the Vice Chancellor for Facilities and College Police, should take the following actions:

- Work with the college administration, advisory groups, campus safety committees, and various councils and senates to develop quantifiable goals reflecting community service priorities that are aggressive yet obtainable within available resources.
- Develop strategic and operational plans to achieve the established goals and to address campus safety and security issues and perceptions.
- Establish systems to hold individuals and groups within the department accountable for achieving desired goals while also providing managers and supervisors with the authority and resources needed to be successful.
- Improve open consultation with campus community constituents on safety and security issues.
- Ensure the overall organizational structure of PCCPD and the organization of individual operational and support units facilitate efforts to achieve desired goals.
- Establish a commitment to employing high quality police and public safety personnel who are committed to working within the unique and diverse college environment.
- Provide ongoing training to build needed skills and expertise among staff at all levels within PCCPD with the recognition that each member of the department is a member of the college community.
- Develop approaches to building the management and leadership capacity needed to address the department’s future needs.
- Revamp and/or implement policies and procedures to reflect the mission of PCCPD, consistent with community expectations and complementing PCC’s mission.

The police chief and his superiors expressed their strong interest in seeking IACLEA Accreditation of the police department. Accreditation embodies the precepts of community-oriented policing. It creates a forum in which the PCCPD and the campus community work together to prevent and control challenges confronting law enforcement and provides clear direction about community expectations. Universities and colleges have embraced the processes and attributes involved in accreditation programs for years. Academia has long recognized that certification through accrediting organizations provides the institutionalization of program review, proof of excellence, and the standardization of professionalism. Accreditation comfortably fits within the academic world. University and college leaders do not require an explanation of the principles of accreditation because they already understand the value of the journey.

Adherence to the highest standards of professionalism and excellence is a vital goal to the success of the PCCPD in fulfilling its mission to protect students, faculty, staff, and visitors on the PCC campuses and centers. Accreditation constitutes recognition that the police department conforms to the highest professional standards for campus law enforcement. Accreditation assures the public, parents, and the college community that the PCCPD adheres to the highest professional standards.
The accreditation process requires considerable time and attention in the development, implementation, distribution, and training of clear policies governing every segment of the department’s management, administration, and operations. **The LEMAP Team believes that by addressing the key management and organization recommendations in this report, PCCPD would better position itself for success in the accreditation process.**

It is the opinion of the LEMAP Team that the PCCPD may be at a crossroads with significant opportunities within reasonable grasp. Despite past leadership voids and the absence of clear departmental direction and priorities, PCCPD has not lost the confidence of the PCC community as a whole. As stated earlier, PCCPD police and community service officers are widely accepted and appreciated as part of the campus community and are seen in a positive, supportive role. The officers respond to calls for service in a timely fashion and deliver services in a professional, knowledgeable and helpful fashion. They are able to act decisively and effectively when responding to criminal or other critical incidents, and they demonstrate competence in contemporary police methods and practices.

The LEMAP Team left with a feeling that with sound and effective departmental leadership; appropriate and clear strategic direction for the department; a commitment to excellence in the delivery of contemporary, campus-based community-oriented policing services; and officers and staff who understand and deliver on the expectations of the PCC community, PCCPD will be an incredible community partner and well positioned for accreditation.
V. Summary of Recommendations

Based on written documents provided, a physical tour of the campus facilities, and personal interviews conducted with the Pima Community College employees, faculty, staff, administration officials, other college community members and related agencies, the LEMAP Team offers the following recommendations to enhance the Pima Community College Police Department.

1.0 Status and Authority
1.1 Update and enforce directives regarding the operational jurisdiction of PCCPD police officers.
1.2 Update the Intergovernmental Agreement on mutual aid with the City of Tucson.
1.3 Develop, with the Pima County Sheriff’s Department, an Intergovernmental Agreement on mutual aid.
1.4 Develop, with the Tucson Police Department, and for campuses outside of the city, with the Pima County Sheriff’s Department, a Memorandum of Understanding regarding law enforcement operations and responsibility for and cooperation with investigations of criminal incidents, especially sexual assaults and other serious felonies, occurring on the campuses including cooperation and coordination in Clery notification requirements.
1.5 Develop and cultivate communications and relationships with the chiefs and senior command of the Tucson Police Department and Pima County Sheriff’s Department in order to ensure that proper plans are in place for multi-agency response to campus critical incidents.

2.0 Organization and Management
2.1 Transition to a campus-based policing model under central leadership with patrol and community service functions integrated within each campus and police support services maintained at the central headquarters.
2.2 Develop procedures to ensure that each level of the chain of command is responsible for the proper flow of information and communication both up to the next level and down to the subordinate level.
2.3 Establish an updated policy describing the PCCPD organizational structure, staffing, and personnel assignments that is current and consistent with a graphical depiction on an organization chart, and update it regularly as changes are made.
2.4 Develop an organizational structure and assign functional responsibilities to organizational components that most effectively and efficiently accomplish the management, administrative, technical, and operational mandates required of PCCPD.
2.5 Critically assess the job tasks currently being performed by the police chief and the commander(s) and, based on this assessment, reassign duties to best complement the police chief’s need to be accessible and engaged in the community and the commander(s)’ need to manage the day to day operational functions of the department.

3.0 Goals and Objectives
3.1 Involve department members in the development of a contemporary mission statement, strategic plan, and departmental goals and objectives to purposely complement the college’s mission, vision, and values.
3.2 Incorporate information from crime statistics, community surveys, focus groups, committees and other forms of feedback into the planning process.

3.3 Update goals and objectives annually.

3.4 Develop timelines and measurements for each goal.

3.5 Actively measure attainment of each goal and objective.

3.6 Develop a three-to-five-year strategic plan, reviewed annually, addressing capital needs, staffing, equipment, and program objectives.

3.7 Keep personnel engaged and fully informed of success and failure throughout the implementation of the strategic plan.

3.8 Develop an annual PCCPD report that is a comprehensive summary of activities occurring during each academic year. Use the report as a marketing tool, disseminate it to key college officials in hard copy, and make it available through the departmental website.

4.0 Policies and Procedures

4.1 Identify and train an accreditation manager. Consider sending this individual and the chief to training at the next IACLEA Annual Conference, scheduled in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, June 23-26, 2017.

4.2 Actively pursue obtaining IACLEA Accreditation using the process as a template for implementing change in the department. The effort will require an intensive review of all policies and procedures to verify they are consistent with agency requirements and comply with the best practice standards.

4.3 Create an Accreditation Committee to review policies and procedures in accordance with accreditation requirements and to assist in writing policy. Ensure that policies accurately reflect departmental operations.

4.4 Actively train all members of the department in the content, intention, impact, scope, and dimension of each policy and test to determine knowledge and understanding. Document that such training has occurred. Roll call training works well for review and discussion of most policies.

4.5 Develop or subscribe to a program that tracks and records department members’ receipt, acceptance, and understanding of policies when they are issued.

4.6 Develop a procedure to review policies annually and add a reviewed signature block to the directive that indicates when it was reviewed last by the chief.

4.7 Continue to develop and revise policies and procedures as methods and practices change to ensure they reflect current best practices in policing.

4.8 Review the Police Executive Research Forum’s (PERF) “30 Guiding Principles on the Use of Force” and implement them into policy and training as appropriate (http://www.policeforum.org/assets/30%20guiding%20principles.pdf). This includes developing an officer-involved shooting policy.

4.9 Review the “President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing” recommendations (http://www.cops.usdoj.gov/pdf/taskforce/taskforce_finalreport.pdf) and implement them into policy and training as appropriate.
4.10 Develop procedures and policy on when and how investigations are accomplished to include calling outside agencies for assistance and when to call in an off-duty investigator.

4.11 Identify which policies (e.g., high liability issues) should be forwarded to campus counsel or other administrators for review.

4.12 Develop a policy to provide guidance to officers and detectives on investigating sexual assaults, as well as when to notify the Title IX Officer.

5.0 Complaint Processing and Internal Discipline

5.1 Update and adhere to policies on the rules of conduct, disciplinary process, and investigation of citizen complaints.

5.2 Develop an internal tracking system for recording citizen complaints as well as an “early warning system” that would alert the central director of potential employees of concern on any of the campuses.

5.3 Develop and implement a discipline matrix outlining the expected level of discipline for violation of specific policies on one, two or more occasions.

5.4 Establish a policy specifying the role of supervisors in the disciplinary system and the authority attendant to each level of supervision.

5.5 Ensure that all citizen complaints are investigated with appropriate sanctions and consistently documented with reports properly filed.

6.0 Performance Evaluation

6.1 Review and revise job descriptions for each employee classification within the police department as appropriate. Include specific duties and tasks to establish a clear understanding of the entire scope of responsibilities expected from the employee and clear expectations for appraisal of performance. Provide the CSOs with clearer guidance.

6.2 Develop job standards that will serve as the basis of measurement for the evaluation of productivity and performance.

6.3 Articulate the roles and responsibilities of department supervisors and their accountability for the performance of staff.

6.4 Provide appropriate training for all raters.

6.5 Revise and reinstitute the department awards and recognition program for all department employees.

7.0 Recruitment and Selection

7.1 Review the written testing tool used for candidates to ensure it is job-related.

7.2 Review and update PCCPD Directive 82 regarding the performance of background investigations.

8.0 Training

8.1 Develop and implement a comprehensive training program. Once department goals and objectives are established, then develop training in support of those goals and objectives.
8.2 Develop and implement a structured law enforcement training program for police supervisors that exceeds minimal supervisory training available through the college.

8.3 Create a team to establish the training goals that includes identifying and prioritizing the most important needs for the PCCPD and how best to see that these needs serve the college community.

8.4 When the training goals are in place, request specific PCCPD training funding on an annual basis.

8.5 Review and update all polices within PCCPD that have a strong training element.

8.6 Ensure there is a method for tracking all training of all PCCPD members.

8.7 Develop a standard training module for all dispatchers.

8.8 Reach out to local law enforcement for joint training initiatives to build relationships. This is an area where Crisis Intervention Training would be beneficial.

8.9 Provide NIMS and ICS training to all members of PCCPD, including community services officers, and to the executive leadership at the college.

9.0 Records System

9.1 Immediately update PCCPD Directive 120 and hold supervisors accountable for consistency in adherence to all provisions of the directive.

9.2 Train all employees in and reinforce the importance of Directive 120 and related directives especially in the areas of report origination, submitting and processing reports, requirements for supervisory review of reports, reporting and capturing relevant data and statistics, origination of supplemental and follow-up reports, case disposition, and report maintenance and distribution.

9.3 Conduct a job audit of the records manager’s position and identify those records and evidence duties and responsibilities that should/could be reassigned to other functions/components of the department and whether an additional position, with police records management experience, should be considered.

10.0 Operations and Enforcement

10.1 Work with campus stakeholders to develop a community policing and problem solving model for PCC including a campus-based deployment of officers. This will include having all members of the department from the police chief to the community service officers attend various meetings and engage actively in the campus community. Explore implementing programs such as “Coffee with a Cop.”

10.2 Review the existing organizational structure and work toward having a sergeant position and a corporal position assigned to each of the six main campuses.

10.3 Review and explore opportunities for police officers, community service officers, and contract security to integrate more fully. This could permit someone to be available 24/7 to respond to all campuses.

10.4 Consider adding an investigator position on the second shift, after supervision and patrol functions have been staffed adequately.
Switch to two eight-hour shifts, 7:00 am to 3:00 pm and 3:00 pm to 11:00 pm.

Use contract security to cover Sunday with roving patrols and consider using them after 11:00 pm Monday-Friday, and after normal business hours on Saturday.

Provide the opportunity for police bike patrols on each campus. Use one patrol car and one bike patrol or golf cart on each campus. Rotate walking posts, but assignments must get officers out of the car and into the core of the campus community.

Fill an additional detective position and make these positions permanent as opposed to rotating. Assign detectives the property and evidence function which, in most departments, is performed by a sworn officer.

10.5 Switch to two eight-hour shifts, 7:00 am to 3:00 pm and 3:00 pm to 11:00 pm.

10.6 Use contract security to cover Sunday with roving patrols and consider using them after 11:00 pm Monday-Friday, and after normal business hours on Saturday.

10.7 Provide the opportunity for police bike patrols on each campus. Use one patrol car and one bike patrol or golf cart on each campus. Rotate walking posts, but assignments must get officers out of the car and into the core of the campus community.

10.8 Fill an additional detective position and make these positions permanent as opposed to rotating. Assign detectives the property and evidence function which, in most departments, is performed by a sworn officer.

11.0 Property and Evidence

11.1 Update department policy in accordance with IACLEA Accreditation Standards related to Property and Evidence.

11.2 Begin a systematic process of inventory and audits of all property and evidence as soon as possible.

11.3 Provide training and equipment to all personnel in the proper collection and management of property and evidence with specialized training for the evidence custodian.

11.4 Ensure that property and evidence procedures comply with local, state, and federal laws.

11.5 Consider assigning a sworn officer as the evidence custodian, relieving the civilian staff member to concentrate on records management and related duties.

12.0 Facilities and Equipment

12.1 Develop a replacement policy for mobile computers, possibly with notebooks.

12.2 Upgrade Tasers to a model with cameras.

12.3 Inventory and replace police bikes as appropriate.

12.4 Purchase an adequate number of patrol rifles so officers do not have to use their personal weapons.

12.5 Upgrade individual campus substations so that all computers can access the county RMS.

13.0 Communications and Dispatching

13.1 Develop a training program for all dispatchers. Consider training and certification for all through the American Public Communication Officers Association (APCO).

13.2 Involve the Vice Chancellor of External Communications in the development of predetermined language to be used in emergency notifications.

13.3 Improve the MOU and/or general agreement with other PSAPs, so that fire and medical calls on the campuses are communicated with the Communications Center. See Section 19 for an additional recommendation on this.

13.4 Consider the development of a text to 911 option for the college community.
Investigate the capabilities of GETS (Government Emergency Telecommunications Service) and WPS (Wireless Priority Service) https://www.dhs.gov/wireless-priority-service-wps as a part of the PCCPD emergency communications plan.

Review the noted dead zone and consider placing a bi-directional amplifier (BDA) at this location.

14.0 Parking and Traffic Services

The scope of this LEMAP review, as determined from conversations with PCCPD and the LEMAP Director, does not include a review of parking and traffic services. Accordingly, the LEMAP Team offers no recommendations in this area.

15.0 Community Interaction

15.1 Improve efforts and establish initiatives to move from a predominantly reactive law enforcement agency to a proactive, collaborative, and engaged community-oriented organization.

15.2 Adopt community-oriented policing as the predominant public safety strategy and engage in community relations, crime prevention, and outreach activities as frequently and routinely as possible.

15.3 Develop a proactive posture regarding police/community relations and market, within the campus community, the services of the PCCPD.

15.4 Develop improved relationships with Facilities Department management through campus engagement, improved communication, and new partnerships to improve safety and security on the campuses.

15.5 Identify a sworn staff member and assign that person the responsibility for coordinating community outreach programming on the campuses.

15.6 Develop additional initiatives to partner with campus organizations and other groups to engage in crime prevention and awareness strategies and to improve understanding of mutual concerns and challenges.

15.7 Establish collaborative relationships with the college’s public information office and the student media to routinely disseminate information to community members.

15.8 Update and significantly improve the department’s web presence and the scope and dimension of information available on the website.

15.9 Use social media to enhance the department’s outreach efforts, improve communication and partnerships with all campus constituents, and assist emergency messaging during critical incidents.

15.10 Work with the appropriate office on campus to develop goals and strategies for performing campus-wide surveys on the effectiveness of the department and the community’s perception of safety.

16.0 Crime Prevention and Physical Security

16.1 Expand the offering of crime prevention programs and instruction, such as RAD, to the students, faculty, and staff.
16.2 Take advantage of the offerings from the Vice Chancellor of External Affairs to promote crime prevention programs and develop a community engagement strategy.

16.3 Actively market the crime prevention programming offered by the police department.

16.4 Develop panic alarm criteria, including justifications for installation and testing protocols.

16.5 Consider moving the PCCPD offices on the campuses to physical locations that afford them high visibility and place them where there can be an increased perception of security.

16.6 Ensure the committee reviewing all of the physical security attributes noted has a sufficient mandate and funding to accomplish their goals. Other considerations include:
   • Measure the Key Track system concept against what the physical security committee envisions for key management;
   • Identify what doors are not able to be locked from the inside (offices and classrooms), determine necessity for such control, and establish a process to ensure consistency across all campuses;
   • Review the efficacy of the card access system and repair where it is not working;
   • Install intrusion alarms at all necessary locations.

16.7 Work to strengthen the relationship with the Tucson Police Department and the Pima County Sheriff’s Department in areas of crime prevention, education, and community policing.

16.8 Educate and train all police and community service officers on crime prevention and community policing methods and practices.

16.9 Create an active public safety/crime prevention advisory committee and task this group with meeting regularly to address safety and security issues and address campus problems and concerns. Involve students, faculty, and staff members who represent areas such as Student Government, Athletics, Facilities Management, Human Resources, Academic Affairs, etc.

16.10 Identify personnel who are or can become accomplished presenters and enroll them in crime prevention (CPTED) and/or community policing coursework to reestablish a more formalized role and understanding within the PCCPD.

17.0 **Space and Facilities**

17.1 In long-term planning, work toward relocating campus substations to the heart of campus closer to student activities and that would be inviting for students to walk into.

17.2 In long-term planning, include interview rooms in substations.

17.3 Equip all substations with upgraded technology so they can access the county-wide RMS.

17.4 Review and consider if space is adequate within the Communications Center for the long term while examining the possibility of the PCCPD dispatchers becoming part of the county-wide Communication Center.

17.5 In long-term planning, provide larger substations, with adequate space to provide the campus sergeant an office.
18.0 **Clery Act Compliance**

18.1 Organize a comprehensive Clery Act Compliance Committee with appropriate membership:
- Use the white paper noted above as a model
- Include the Title IX law as an expanded/complementary role to the committee
- Organize in a fashion that assignments are made and completed in a timely manner

18.2 Include in the annual letters to the local law enforcement agencies a paragraph that requests them to make direct contact with the PCCPD Communications Center anytime there is either an emergency of any nature occurring on campus or some event (criminal or otherwise) that might impact the PCCPD.

19.0 **Emergency Operations Planning and Special Events**

19.1 Conduct continual training and tabletop exercises for campus leadership, as well as specialized units and teams, including Campus Action Teams.

19.2 Provide training related to roles and responsibilities of senior leadership in a crisis.

19.3 Plan periodic training and/or exercises with outside agencies that would respond in a critical incident.

19.4 Provide for an annual review of the emergency plan.

19.5 Conduct a comprehensive review of emergency communications plans.

19.6 Develop an emergency notification checklist with clear guidelines for sending out communications and for upward notifications.

19.7 Develop a process for issuing emergency notifications and add to policy. Create prescribed messages and identity who has the authority to disseminate them. Identify alternate authorities designated to issue emergency notifications in the absence of the principals.

19.8 Provide authority for the PCCPD Communications Center to send out emergency messaging and ensure that all dispatchers receive ongoing training in properly discharging this responsibility.

19.9 Create the position of Emergency Planner/Manager.

19.10 Designate an Emergency Operation Center on each campus.
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 19 different areas.

1. Status and Authority

Statistics:

The Bureau of Justice Statistics, Law Enforcement Unit performed a study published in January 2015 – *Campus Law Enforcement, 2011-2012*. In a survey of more than 900 four-year institutions with 2,500 or more students, BJS found that about two-thirds (68 percent) of the colleges and universities used sworn police officers with full arrest powers to provide law enforcement services. A majority (92 percent) of public institutions used sworn officers, compared to 38 percent of private campuses. Nearly all sworn campus police officers were armed. Most sworn campus officers were authorized to use a sidearm (94 percent), chemical spray (94 percent) and a baton (93 percent).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type and size of 4-year campus</th>
<th>Number of campuses</th>
<th>Total Sworn</th>
<th>With nonsworn officers</th>
<th>Without nonsworn officers</th>
<th>Nonsworn officers only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All campuses</strong></td>
<td>905</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000 or more students</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000–14,999</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000–9,999</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500–4,999</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000 or more students</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000–14,999</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000–9,999</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500–4,999</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding.

Findings/Comments:

Any agency responsible for the safety and well-being of its community should clearly understand its authority and 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 agencies.

The PCCPD is a legally-constituted governmental entity having mandated responsibilities to enforce laws. Police officers of the department are certified by the Arizona Peace Officer Standards and Training Board and have full police powers and authority in the State of Arizona (A.R.S. §13-3871).

Arizona Revised Statutes (A.R.S.) §13-2911 requires that the governing board of every educational institution adopt rules for the maintenance of public order upon all property under its jurisdiction and provide a program for the enforcement of such rules. A.R.S. §15-1444 authorizes Community College District Governing Boards to appoint police officers who shall have the authority and power of Peace Officers. A.R.S. §1-215 defines Peace Officers as police officers who have received a Certificate from the Arizona Peace Officer Standards and Training Board.
The Board of Governors and the Chancellor of Pima County Community College District, in and by the authority vested in them by the legislature of the State of Arizona, are empowered to organize, provide law enforcement for, and operate a Campus Police agency within the Pima County Community College District as per A.R.S. Title 15, Article 3, Community College District Boards and A.R.S. §15-1444, Powers and Duties.

Pima County Community College District Board Policy BP-8.05 states in part: “To promote a safe environment and to meet its formal statutory obligations and responsibilities for protecting the property, health and safety of its students, employees and visitors, the College shall employ police officers who have been certified as peace officers by the Arizona Peace Officer Standards and Training Board. At all times State of Arizona statutes defining peace officers and their authority shall apply.”

ARS 13-3871 extends police officer authority where he/she has the prior consent of the chief of police or other agency head with peace officer jurisdiction. This grants the PCC chief of police broad discretion in determining the scope and extent of PCCPD jurisdiction. However, PCCPD Directive 12, issued in 2010 and revised in 2015, defines the operating jurisdiction as follows: “Pima Community College Police Department officers are authorized to use their sworn peace officer powers and authority on property owned, leased, or controlled by the Pima Community College District and property immediately adjacent thereto such as sidewalks, parking lots, and streets used by the College community, or as outlined in PCCPD Directive 305, General Patrol Procedures, with the following exceptions:

- At the direction of the Chief of Police or a command level supervisor during emergency situations.
- Upon receipt of a specific request for assistance by another sworn peace officer in person or through the Dispatch Center. Assistance can be rendered to the level requested. If at all possible, the officer should have the approval of the on-duty supervisor. This should normally only involve situations where the requesting officer or third party is in harm’s way or the situation is related to Pima Community College interests.
- When a PCC officer comes upon a traffic accident while in route from one PCC location to another on a designated patrol route, they may render aid to the injured and initiate traffic control. The scene will be released to the responsible agency as soon as possible.
- When a PCC officer is in route from one PCC location to another on a designated patrol route and is flagged down by a citizen, the officer will render whatever immediate emergency assistance is required, but will refer the situation to the responsible agency as soon as possible.
- Under the provisions of ARS, Title, 13-3883 PCC officers will do their sworn duty. However, they will not routinely enforce rules of the road off PCC property under ARS Title 28 except in life threatening situations or hazardous traffic conditions such as excessive speed or running a red signal light where to ignore the situation could potentially cause harm to others. They will not proactively seek out situations of a criminal or traffic nature off PCC property that are clearly not within the patrol map boundaries and enforcement is not directly serving the interests of the College community.
- When officers are working off duty, at locations approved by the Chief of Police, they may act as peace officers under the law.
- Officers on temporary duty working at or with other agencies, approved by the PCC Board of Governors, may act as peace officers under the law.
PCCPD Directive 12 defines in detail the geographical boundaries for operating jurisdiction for each campus. It also broadens the operating jurisdiction through the establishment of a school safety zone: “A School Safety Security Zone will be established for the purpose of preventive patrolling and to impede criminal activity and potentially hazardous incidents before they reach College properties and boundaries. The School Safety Security Zone will be approximately one (1) block in either direction from the above listed boundaries at each campus (excludes learning centers). This established zone should be a part of the patrol patterns; however patrol officers should not spend an inordinate amount of time in this zone and off campus if it does not serve the direct interest of the college community.”

The department has a mutual aid agreement with the Tucson Police Department but with no other designee, CEO or agency. That agreement refers only to the mutual provision of aid upon request of the department and was last entered into on October 22, 1996. There have been no further updates since that time.

The department does not have a Memorandum of Understanding regarding law enforcement operations and responsibility for and cooperation with investigations of criminal incidents, especially sexual assaults and other serious felonies, occurring on the campuses including cooperation and coordination in Clery notification requirements.

Interviews conducted by the LEMAP Team identified a majority of college administrators and staff members who were unsure as to the jurisdiction of the PCCPD officers and found a general lack of understanding regarding traffic enforcement authority and the propriety of traffic stops conducted by officers. The vast majority of persons interviewed had observed PCCPD traffic stops off campus but were unsure of the department’s objectives regarding such enforcement activity.

The LEMAP Team found, through interviews with command, supervisory, and line staff that PCCPD maintains good working relationships with the Tucson Police Department and Pima County Sheriff’s Department, as well as the Arizona Department of Public Safety. However, there is a lack of routine communication between PCCPD command and the command of the other agencies. The LEMAP Team was told that there have been occasions when the Tucson Police Department responds to a 9-1-1 call on campus without communicating the reason for, or their presence on, the campus.

**Recommendations:**

1.1 Update and enforce directives regarding the operational jurisdiction of PCCPD police officers.

1.2 Update the Intergovernmental Agreement on mutual aid with the City of Tucson.

1.3 Develop, with the Pima County Sheriff’s Department, an Intergovernmental Agreement on mutual aid.

1.4 Develop, with the Tucson Police Department, and for campuses outside of the city, with the Pima County Sheriff’s Department, a Memorandum of Understanding regarding law enforcement operations and responsibility for and cooperation with investigations of criminal incidents, especially sexual assaults and other serious felonies, occurring on the campuses including cooperation and coordination in Clery notification requirements.

1.5 Develop and cultivate communications and relationships with the chiefs and senior command of the Tucson Police Department and Pima County Sheriff’s Department in order to ensure that proper plans are in place for multi-agency response to campus critical incidents.
2. Organization and Management

Findings/Comments:

The successful provision of public safety services to the college/university community in large part depends on a well-defined and clearly articulated organizational structure. The management and administration of an agency is enhanced when basic organizational principles are followed. While there may be considerable variation in the form of organizational structure adopted by different campus law enforcement agencies, they should all be characterized by the same essential elements, including organizing by function, ensuring unity of command, and delineating responsibility.

PCCPD is centrally organized under a “municipal” policing model where all departmental functions are housed at the PCCPD headquarters located at the off-campus Maintenance and Security facility. All functions and activities originate from the central headquarters with the exception of the community service officer program, which is campus-based. The chief of police reports directly to the Vice Chancellor for Facilities and College Police who, in turn, reports directly to the Chancellor of the PCC District.

The PCCPD organizational structure and functions are described in written PCCPD Directive 10, Organization of the Department, as revised in May 2007.

The LEMAP Team had the opportunity to make a number of first-hand assessments regarding the organization and management of PCCPD. The LEMAP Team observed campus patrol practices, reviewed calls for service, and became familiar with the campus geography. It is the opinion of the LEMAP Team that the department’s organization under the “municipal” deployment model is ineffective in providing highly visible police patrol both inside and outside of campus facilities, conducting crime prevention programming and building collaborative relationships, conducting security services such as building access, and providing for immediate action, rapid deployment responses to potential critical incidents on the campuses.

According to documents reviewed by the LEMAP Team, the mission of the PCCPD is “to provide and maintain a safe and secure environment for students, faculty, staff and guests and to promote the ideals relevant to learning by practicing a College community centered policing philosophy.” However, having heard recurring themes in all interviews conducted externally and internally, the LEMAP Team concludes that PCCPD is not meeting this mission and that it cannot be achieved under the centralized “municipal” policing model (reporting to an off-campus central facility and deploying squads of officers to rove the district geographical footprint, respond to calls for service, and randomly patrol campus sites) that restricts and inhibits the application of every tenet of community-oriented policing. To maintain this organizational philosophy only begs the questions, “Why have a professional college-based police department in lieu of Tucson police responding to the law enforcement needs of the college?” and “Why have a sworn police department in lieu of a security department?”

Typical organizational models for police and public safety operations on multi-campus community colleges suggest one central director of public safety/chief of police with oversight of campus-based police units and central support services. Usually the central office is strategically based either on the largest campus or the campus experiencing the higher crime rates. While, in this case, PCCPD headquarters being off campus would not directly inhibit efficiency, consideration in the long term should be given to moving the headquarters to either the West or Downtown campus.
The LEMAP Team recommends that PCCPD move toward a centralized community-oriented policing model that incorporates campus-based policing, the assignment of decentralized patrol operations with supervisors who have responsibility for providing services to specific campuses, who are responsible and accountable to the chief of police and indirectly responsible to campus presidents. The sergeants would supervise a team of police and community service officers on their respective campuses. This organizational change would provide the flexibility necessary for PCCPD to integrate with the individual campus communities thus ensuring that PCCPD enjoys campus community support. The LEMAP Team was told that the PCCPD operated under a campus-based model some years ago, but it was changed to the current “municipal” model by a former police chief who came to PCC from the Tucson Police Department.

The LEMAP Team heard from the vice chancellors and campus presidents consistently that the police chief needs to be more engaged with the various campus communities. Some executives related that they have never met the new police chief. Key to the success of the community-oriented organizational model is a clear delineation in roles within the command and supervisory staff of the police department. The chief of police must serve as the department’s executive and should limit his time and attention with those tasks and duties more appropriately carried out by others in the organization. Achieving the department's mission must be the primary responsibility of the police chief. Success in meeting the mission is best achieved through assertive efforts by the police chief to actively assess community climate, seek out and fully understand community expectations, and translate those expectations to goals and objectives of the organization. The responsibility of the police chief, therefore, is to develop a vision, philosophies, principles, policies and strategies that are supported by the community and the department and that afford the department the capacity to fulfill its agreed-upon mission.

While the chief of police focuses on, defines, and communicates community expectations, the commander(s) should focus their attention on the administration and operations of the police department. It should be the responsibility of the commander(s) to translate the goals established by the police chief into policies, procedures, and strategies that ensure quality service delivery and to organize the work efforts of staff and peers to ensure operational effectiveness and to achieve desired results.

The LEMAP Team, in reviewing the organizational structure of the department and considering a campus-based model, believes the current commander is tasked with oversight responsibility of more units and functions than can be handled effectively. One common structure is to organize functional assignments under two commanders of equal rank to oversee operations and administrative divisions. The operations division might include patrol, investigations, crime prevention, facility security, and special events while the administrative division might include planning and policy development, training, budget, recruitment, personnel, and other support functions. Consideration could be given to a third information management division responsible for police communications, records management, data analysis, Clery compliance, and internal information technology, which might report under a manager who reports to the chief of police. The LEMAP Team found it interesting that Directive 10, Organization of the Department, depicts an organizational structure not unlike the one recommended. Apparently, a two-division structure was in place in 2007 and should be reconsidered at this time.

**Recommendations:**

2.1 Transition to a campus-based policing model under central leadership with patrol and community service functions integrated within each campus and police support services maintained at the central headquarters.
2.2 Develop procedures to ensure that each level of the chain of command is responsible for the proper flow of information and communication both up to the next level and down to the subordinate level.

2.3 Establish an updated policy describing the PCCPD organizational structure, staffing, and personnel assignments that is current and consistent with a graphical depiction on an organization chart, and update it regularly as changes are made.

2.4 Develop an organizational structure and assign functional responsibilities to organizational components that most effectively and efficiently accomplish the management, administrative, technical, and operational mandates required of PCCPD.

2.5 Critically assess the job tasks currently being performed by the police chief and the commander(s) and, based on this assessment, reassign duties to best complement the police chief’s need to be accessible and engaged in the community and the commander(s)’ need to manage the day-to-day operational functions of the department.
3. Goals and Objectives

Findings/Comments:
For a campus 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 police department should make citizens feel secure in their community. Whether or not the department is fulfilling this responsibility to the campus community, the public needs to know what the police administration has defined as its goals and objectives. The police department must establish goals to ensure that the agency’s role is actively being met and the services provided are necessary, adequate, and of a level and quality to meet the college’s expectations. The department does this through preparing a mission statement that is reviewed and agreed upon by the college administration and the department.

Campus communities usually have basic expectations of their campus police agencies and how they expect them to perform. These expectations should be sought and interpreted by the chief of police into goals, objectives, and operational procedures. A long-range or strategic plan should provide overall direction and priorities for the department, and department leadership should ensure that all components of the organization virtually “own” a piece of the plan. A strategic plan is a working document (with measurable objectives) that can be extremely useful to help the department find focus and direction. Strategic planning should also address short-term and long-range facility, staffing, and equipment needs as they relate to the goals, objectives, mission statement, and anticipated institutional growth. Operational and strategic goals should be established and periodically reviewed by the chief of police and his commanders.

The LEMAP Team was provided a copy of the PCCPD Mission Statement, which states, “The mission of the Pima Community College Police Department is to provide and maintain a safe and secure environment for students, faculty, staff and guests and to promote the ideals relevant to learning by practicing a College community centered policing philosophy.” In addition to the mission statement the department has established a Vision Statement, “The Pima Community College Police Department will strive to improve the educational experience of all members of the College community by providing for their safety, security, and assistance needs, and by being the leading innovators of new ideas and setting the standards for other law enforcement agencies,” as well as a Values Statement. These statements can be found in PCCPD Directive 00 and the LEMAP Team also observed the mission, vision, and values statements framed at several locations within the headquarters building. It is important to note that through the many observations made and interviews conducted the LEMAP Team concludes the stated mission is not being achieved at this time.

All PCCPD staff members interviewed by the LEMAP Team agreed that formal goals and objectives have not, at least in many years, been developed or promulgated. The department needs to establish benchmarks to ensure that its mission is being addressed and that its behavior and activity within the institution are adequate, desirable and meet campus and college expectations. It is important to have input from all areas of the department in setting goals and objectives, not from just the command staff. The police chief told the LEMAP Team that he realizes the importance of goals and objectives, both short- and long-term, to the success of the department in meeting its mission. He intends to use this LEMAP report to aid him in the process of strategic planning and goal setting.
The police chief should engage participation from many employees representing a cross-section of the department in developing and revising the mission, vision, and goals of the department. The following template outlines the questions that could be considered by the PCCPD team:

I. Mission and Integrity
   1. What are our purposes?
   2. Why do we exist as this department?
      a. What are our goals, how are they developed, and how do they relate to our mission?
      b. How well understood are our mission, vision, and goals within the organization?
      c. How do we disseminate our mission and vision statements to our constituencies?
   3. What do we do? How do we accomplish our mission?
      a. What functions do we perform?
      b. How do these functions relate to our mission?
      c. How are strategic decisions made within our organization?
      d. To what extent are strategic decisions driven by mission?
   4. How do we uphold and protect our integrity?
      a. What are our core values?
      b. How do we comply with standards of professional practice and integrity for our organization?
      c. What processes do we have in place to ensure that we are not in violation of laws and regulations?
      d. What evidence is there that our policies ensure fair treatment and due process for all constituencies?
      e. How do we respond to complaints or issues?
      f. How do we determine and evaluate our external reputation for integrity?

II. Preparing for the Future
   1. How effectively are we accomplishing our purposes?
      a. What do we do well? What do we do not so well?
      b. How do we demonstrate our effectiveness?
      c. How well do we plan for and implement information technology to address the needs of the organization and the campus?
      d. How do we effectively evaluate the staffing needs and quality of personnel in the organization?
      e. How well do we address career development opportunities for the organization’s employees?
2. Do we have an ongoing self-assessment plan to monitor our effectiveness?
   a. What are our main ongoing evaluation and assessment strategies and processes? What data are collected? How is the data analyzed, interpreted, and communicated?
   b. How are we using evaluation and assessment materials for continuous improvements?

3. How are decisions made regarding the future direction of the organization?
   a. How has our organization evolved over the past ten years?
   b. Have our purposes changed?
   c. Where would we like to be ten years from now?
   d. What changes need to take place?
   e. What is the process for periodically or continually re-evaluating these plans to focus on whether the goals are being met and whether the plans are continuing to fulfill the organization’s mission?

III. Engagement and Service

   a. To what extent does our organization serve our constituencies?
   b. What structures and alliances promote effective communication with internal and external constituencies?
   c. To what extent do the organization’s programs engage constituents?
   d. What are the formal bridges to our constituents? What are the informal bridges to our constituents?
   e. Where and how in our organization are these formal and informal bridges evaluated to determine the responsiveness to our constituent needs?
   f. How is the organization regarded in the community?
   g. What systematic methods do we have in place to assess value to our constituencies?

PCCPD should promote their planning efforts and vision for the future by publishing the annual goals and objectives for all external and internal constituencies to review. An annual report, summarizing the department’s activities, crime statistics, and operational initiatives provides the community with a means to measure achievement. Publishing and advertising the goals allows the community to readily see how PCCPD is dedicated to community safety and puts the objectives in the forefront of all department members’ minds, so they are able to act accordingly. As the department completes its strategic planning activities, it should also consider reviewing the mission statement, vision, and values to ensure these statements remain current with the changing environment and challenges.

**Recommendations:**

3.1 Involve department members in the development of a contemporary mission statement, strategic plan, and departmental goals and objectives to purposely complement the college’s mission, vision, and values.
3.2 Incorporate information from crime statistics, community surveys, focus groups, committees, and other forms of feedback into the planning process.

3.3 Update goals and objectives annually.

3.4 Develop timelines and measurements for each goal.

3.5 Actively measure attainment of each goal and objective.

3.6 Develop a three-to-five-year strategic plan, reviewed annually, addressing capital needs, staffing, equipment, and program objectives.

3.7 Keep personnel engaged and fully informed of success and failure throughout the implementation of the strategic plan.

3.8 Develop an annual PCCPD report that is a comprehensive summary of activities occurring during each academic year. Use the report as a marketing tool, disseminate it to key college officials in hard copy, and make it available through the departmental website.
4. Policies and Procedures

Findings/Comments:

Written policies and procedures are an integral part of any campus police department. All too often, campus law enforcement litigation revolves around the department’s written policies and procedures. The absence or inadequacy of written directives can result in increased liability. Written policies and procedures define the role of the department and provide operating guidelines for the department’s personnel. They serve to inform personnel of what is expected of them and provide a basis for establishing a disciplinary process. It should be made clear to all personnel that violations of policies, procedures, or regulations will be considered a basis for disciplinary action. These written policies and procedures should be under continuous review by the department and appropriate university staff.

Policies clearly communicate the philosophies, principles, and attitudes of management toward operational objectives and set the limits of discretion. Whenever policy is not provided, or adhered to and enforced, there can be little accountability assigned to personnel in the proper discharge of their duties and responsibilities. Policy reduces opportunity for subjective decision-making and minimizes the risk of communicating conflicting operating philosophies to the public. In addition, policy is critical in protecting the department in legal suits brought by the acts or omissions of members and guides supervisors and managers in making fair, just, and consistent evaluations of personnel performance through clearly communicated standards.

Just as important, procedures provide a specific outline for implementing and complying with organizational policy, and in so doing, reduce the amount of discretionary authority of members and the possibility for employee actions that deviate from management expectations. Clear and comprehensive policy sets the foundation for an efficient professional organization that understands the mission and goals of the larger organization. It should be made clear to all personnel that violations of policies, procedures, or regulations will be considered a basis for disciplinary action.

The PCCPD maintains Administration and Operations Manuals. Both manuals are prepared in electronic formats and posted on the department’s secure X-Drive. Every employee of the department has access to both manuals. All department employees are responsible for compliance with departmental directives upon issuance and/or notification of changes. However, in the LEMAP Team’s discussions with members of the department, there is a general lack of awareness of and adherence to the policies. Per agency policy, “Only the Chief of Police has the authority to issue, modify or approve the written directives of the Department.” Thus the police chief should sign/approve all policies; however, currently other command staff approve many of them. These written policies and procedures should be under continuous review by the department and appropriate university staff. A signature block could be added to the policies indicating the last reviewed-by date. In discussions with community service officers it was noted that they have very little guidance in the way of policy that is specific to their role. This appears to be true for other non-sworn positions as well.

The LEMAP Team strongly recommends the agency actively pursue IACLEA Accreditation. While the agency does have many sound policies and procedures, many of them need to be updated, and there are several recommended areas that are not currently addressed. The IACLEA Accreditation Program requires compliance with 214 standards that incorporate known best practices in campus law enforcement. An important part of the accreditation process is the self-assessment process that begins with a thorough review of operational practices and written policies. This
provides the police chief and the command staff a great opportunity to take a hard look at all facets of the department and effectively provides a blueprint for change. Going through the process in itself will make an agency a better department.

To start the accreditation process the department needs to designate and train an accreditation manager. It should consider sending the accreditation manager, along with the police chief, to IACLEA’s Annual Conference in June where both can receive the appropriate training for their positions. The accreditation manager will then need to set up a series of files for each standard. Many departments have found it helpful to set up a policy review team, which greatly assists in the accreditation process. Standards requiring new or revised policies can be assigned to team members or others within the department that might have a specific expertise. Going through the self-assessment phase, the department will be able to better determine which policies need revisions or updating. Since the majority of the PCCPD policies have not been reviewed or updated in several years, a number of them will need to be revised. The current IACLEA Accreditation Standards Manual is available on-line at (http://www.iaclea.org/visitors/PDFs/IACLEAStandardsManual-Ed1.4-Sept2016.pdf). It is recommended the PCCPD review the applicable standards as they start revising policy. A box can be added to the policy indicating which standard applies to the policy.

As the PCCPD pursues IACLEA Accreditation it is required to have an annual review process for all policies, procedures, and directives. It is equally important to have a process for updating and purging policies when required. In a cursory review of PCCPD policies it was noted that most have not been revised for many years. One example is the current use of force policy, written in 2008. The policy refers to a carotid hold and a use of force continuum that most departments have eliminated from policy. The accreditation process would assist in identifying such deficiencies and help in keeping the PCCPD current on best practices with an annual policy review. It is recommended that high liability policies be reviewed by legal counsel and senior administration as appropriate.

The LEMAP Team recommends that PCCPD review the Police Executive Research Forum’s “30 Guiding Principles on Use of Force” and the “President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing” recommendations. There is much useful information in these documents and the PCCPD would be well served to review them and implement policy and training changes as appropriate. This will further assist in putting the PCCPD in line with current best practices, especially when combined with the accreditation process. In recent years, departments have developed policy and training on de-escalation, which is also recommended in both of these sources.

The LEMAP Team was not able to identify policy or procedures used to identify which cases are referred to the investigations function nor how investigators are called in after normal business hours. Additionally, policy should be clear on when to call in outside agencies for assistance. The LEMAP Team was not able to identify a policy on investigating sexual assaults. While there are several areas that need new or revised policies, this is a critical one. The PCCPD should meet with the Title IX Officer and Judicial Affairs and create a policy on sexual assaults as soon as practical.

When the PCCPD initiates the accreditation process, it will likely find that some policies can be combined, some are redundant with state law or college policy, and some can be incorporated into another written directive system. Having sound policies is critical, but the policies must be relevant to the PCCPD and, in accreditation, the PCCPD must be able to document that they are operating in compliance with their policy. Training on policy is equally important especially on high liability issues, for even the best policies are not effective without rigorous documented training. The successful agencies have training programs to review and train on policies and procedures on a consistent basis. It would be helpful for the agency to acquire document management software, such as “PowerDMS,” which is helpful in the accreditation process for maintaining accreditation files and recording relevant training.
While the existing policies are generally sound and well written, it appears many of the administrative and operations directives have not been revised in the past several years, some as long as 12 years (see chart below for reference). For PCCPD administrative and operations directives, all policies should be reviewed and revised as appropriate. There cannot be accountability without policy and not being familiar with policy is the same as having no policy at all. The following areas should be evaluated as they are not common practices for campus law enforcement and could potentially have increased liability for the agency: officers trained as phlebotomists, permitting carrying of a back-up weapon, and permitting officers to carry personal weapons. If it is decided to continue with these practices the revised policies in these areas should be submitted to counsel for review and comment.

### OPERATIONAL DIRECTIVES REVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Sent</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIREARMS &amp; USE OF FORCE - Officer Szady</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 202: Firearms Procedures</td>
<td>June 21, 2005</td>
<td>July 18, 2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 203: Impact Weapons</td>
<td>Oct. 20, 2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 205: TASERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PATROL OPERATIONS - Sgt. Smart; Annual Review – February</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 302: Pursuit Driving</td>
<td>Oct. 21, 2005</td>
<td>Nov. 8, 2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 303: High Risk Vehicle Stops</td>
<td>Oct. 21, 2005</td>
<td>Nov. 22, 2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 305: General Patrol Procedures</td>
<td>Oct. 21, 2005</td>
<td>Nov. 30, 2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 306: Stolen Vehicles</td>
<td>June 7, 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 308: Non-Emergency Classroom Contact</td>
<td>Jan. 7, 2008</td>
<td>To Commander</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARREST PROCEDURES - Sgt. Aguilar</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 401: Arrest Procedures</td>
<td>June 20, 2005</td>
<td>Sent to Commander on 12/14/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 402: Transporting Prisoners</td>
<td>April 17, 2006</td>
<td>Re-sent 5/16/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 403: Disposition of Arrestee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 404: Constitutional Obligations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 405: Domestic Violence Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 407: Trespassing and Loitering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 408: Shoplifting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 409: Temporary Detention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRAFFIC PROCEDURES - Officer Mattocks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 503: DUI and Other Violations</td>
<td>Oct. 21, 2005</td>
<td>Dec. 23, 2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 504: Traffic Collisions</td>
<td>May 16, 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Recommendations:**

4.1 Identify and train an accreditation manager. Consider sending this individual and the chief to training at the next IACLEA Annual Conference, scheduled in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, June 23-26, 2017.

4.2 Actively pursue obtaining IACLEA Accreditation using the process as a template for implementing change in the department. The effort will require an intensive review of all policies and procedures to verify they are consistent with agency requirements and comply with the best practice standards.

4.3 Create an Accreditation Committee to review policies and procedures in accordance with accreditation requirements and to assist in writing policy. Ensure that policies accurately reflect departmental operations.

4.4 Actively train all members of the department in the content, intention, impact, scope, and dimension of each policy and test to determine knowledge and understanding. Document that such training has occurred. Roll call training works well for review and discussion of most policies.

4.5 Develop or subscribe to a program that tracks and records department members’ receipt, acceptance, and understanding of policies when they are issued.

4.6 Develop a procedure to review policies annually and add a reviewed signature block to the directive that indicates when it was reviewed last by the chief.

4.7 Continue to develop and revise policies and procedures as methods and practices change to ensure they reflect current best practices in policing.

4.8 Review the Police Executive Research Forum’s (PERF) “30 Guiding Principles on the Use of Force” and implement them into policy and training as appropriate (http://www.policeforum.org/assets/30%20guiding%20principles.pdf). This includes developing an officer-involved shooting policy.

4.9 Review the “President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing” recommendations (http://www.cops.usdoj.gov/pdf/taskforce/taskforce_finalreport.pdf) and implement them into policy and training as appropriate.

4.10 Develop procedures and policy on when and how investigations are accomplished to include calling outside agencies for assistance and when to call in an off-duty investigator.

4.11 Identify which policies (e.g., high liability issues) should be forwarded to campus counsel or other administrators for review.

4.12 Develop a policy to provide guidance to officers and detectives on investigating sexual assaults, as well as when to notify the Title IX Officer.
5. Complaint Processing and Internal Discipline

Findings/Comments:

Effective campus policing requires a workable, 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 police department in the minds of the campus community, general public, and the department employees.

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.


The LEMAP Team determined that although current directives were out of date, with minor editing and updating, the directives adequately address complaint processing and internal discipline.

It is imperative that the PCCPD operates in an atmosphere of transparency and is responsive to complaints alleging employee misconduct and external concerns regarding the operation of the department. The LEMAP Team found that members of the public are provided with a reasonable avenue for any redress of grievances they may have with the service received from department employees. The department’s policy on accepting complaints and procedures regarding the investigation of complaints are provided to the general public on the PCCPD website. The department generally follows the procedures outlined in PCCPD Directive 81, but discussions with departmental employees led the LEMAP Team to determine that inconsistencies in the application of the directive have eroded employee confidence that complaints are investigated in a fair and impartial manner. There is a general lack of formal tracking of complaints. A log of citizen complaints is not maintained, letters are generally not sent to complainants indicating receipt or disposition of their complaints, and the department does not maintain an annual accounting of complaints by disposition or type or department action.

A meeting with supervisors and staff yielded many comments regarding the lack of consistency in accountability to follow standards and in the application of the disciplinary process. At least three examples were cited and there was a strong belief among those interviewed that disparate treatment was a concern. After updates have been made to the directives mentioned above, the chief of police should focus attention on these directives, clearly communicate the directives to all employees, require compliance and accountability, and frequently audit and inspect the actions of supervisors to fairly apply them. Such actions by the chief will ensure that (1) complaints alleging employee or department misconduct are accepted and investigated in a consistent and reasonable manner to uncover the truth of the allegations; (2) areas of misunderstanding by the complaining party are properly resolved; (3) employees whose attitude, behavior or performance needs correction and supervisory intervention are identified; (4) department employees and the department are protected from erroneous complaints; and (5) department policies, training and/or practices needing evaluation, clarification and/or correction are identified.
While there appears to be adequate supervision of patrol shifts, the lack of accountability in operations and the absence of ongoing inspections seriously erodes confidence in the effectiveness and efficiency of patrol operations. The LEMAP Team believes that an ongoing inspection program is a vital element in maintaining the proper delivery of police services to the community. Staff inspections may be either formal or informal. A formal procedure of staff inspection, utilizing a chain of command with delegated responsibilities and expectations for conducting inspections, is most effective in maintaining operating standards. It cannot be assured that employees will do what is expected, as communicated through job descriptions and operating policies, without a formal program of staff inspection and compliance review. Therefore, at all levels within the department, supervisors must inspect the work of subordinates. This requires a proper balance in the span of control (i.e., sufficient supervisory oversight on all shifts) of supervisory staff so that inspections can be thorough and frequent, ensuring employees do not perceive a lack of attention to and importance of this function. Formal inspections should be announced in advance along with the objectives of the inspection. Informal inspections should be accepted by all members of the department as a routine procedure and should be conducted without advance notice and without formal consequences attached.

PCCPD is required to follow both college and state of Arizona personnel policies and procedures when administering discipline. According to several administrators, the college has been averse to disciplining employees, but when discipline is warranted, adheres to the application of progressive discipline in all but the most egregious cases. Termination of an employee is rare as is suspension without pay. Although the state of Arizona is a right-to-work state, PCC recognizes the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees in the representation of non-exempt employees.

In reviewing the disciplinary process, it is abundantly clear to the LEMAP Team that bureaucracy and a process balanced heavily in favor of the employee severely restricts the department’s swift and appropriate administration of discipline. Police officers are a very unique part of the PCC staff with awesome responsibility to protect life at the very risk of their own or take a life to protect the welfare of others. Every decision they make during any intervention may have enormous impact on the public liability, image, and reputation of the college and its executive leadership. Community safety can be compromised and the image of the institution seriously blemished if PCCPD does not have the authority and processes in place to investigate misconduct and swiftly administer discipline. A lack of attention paid to standards of conduct and the likely consequences of improper or unethical conduct, poor judgment, dereliction of duty, or illegal behaviors can result, too often, in an employee’s defense of reasonable, legitimate, and defensible discipline on the grounds they were not properly informed, trained, or supervised.

The LEMAP Team, in interviews with supervisors and staff, heard complaints that little attention was paid by the leadership in taking official notice of actions by employees when such actions deserve commendation or other appropriate recognition. (Refer to Section 6, performance evaluations). When a member performs at a level that exceeds those standards established by the department, it is important to give special recognition for a job well done. This recognition plays an important role in building professionalism, enthusiasm, and dedication into a member’s performance and attitude.

**Recommendations:**

5.1 Update and adhere to policies on the rules of conduct, disciplinary process, and investigation of citizen complaints.
5.2 Develop an internal tracking system for recording citizen complaints as well as an “early warning system” that would alert the central director of potential employees of concern on any of the campuses.

5.3 Develop and implement a discipline matrix outlining the expected level of discipline for violation of specific policies on one, two or more occasions.

5.4 Establish a policy specifying the role of supervisors in the disciplinary system and the authority attendant to each level of supervision.

5.5 Ensure that all citizen complaints are investigated with appropriate sanctions and consistently documented with reports properly filed.
6. Performance Evaluation

Findings/Comments:
To achieve its stated objectives, a campus police department must be able to depend on satisfactory work performance from all employees. Performance evaluation is the measurement of the worker’s on-the-job performance of assigned duties by the employee’s supervisor. 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.

Within the PCCPD there seems to be some role confusion between police and community service officers. This could be resolved by revising and distributing job descriptions. These descriptions should include clear standards that serve as a basis of measurement for evaluating performance. The roles and responsibilities of supervisors in the new organizational structure should also be clear.

PCC has a good college-wide form for accomplishing performance evaluations. PCCPD Directive 90 provides a good description of this program. The Pima Community College Evaluation forms are called Professional Development Plans and are provided for employees and supervisors. The Professional Development Plan for employees is used to evaluate the following factors:

- Quality of work;
- Quantity of work;
- Professional development;
- Compliance with College policies;
- Dependability;
- Sensitivity to diversity;
- Attitude and cooperation; and an additional seven essential duties may be entered by the rater that are within the job classification.

The forms provide a great deal of explanation and detail for each section. There is a review process, a discussion, and an opportunity to appeal the evaluations. There are separate forms for exempt and non-exempt employees. However, to be truly effective there needs to be training on the evaluation system and how to evaluate employees. There is an opportunity to significantly enhance this program with the appropriate supervisory training.

One other area for improvement is the issuance of awards and recognition. In meetings with employees, it was noted there has not been any employee recognition in several years. There is a huge opportunity in this area. The PCCPD should create an awards committee and awards could be distributed quarterly. This should include all employees, for it was noted that community service officers along with police officers feel they are not appreciated. The employee(s) of the quarter could also be noted on the PCCPD website. Several employees noted that there is very little positive feedback offered to rank and file officers. When a member performs at a level that exceeds
those standards established by the department, it is important to give special recognition for a job well done. This recognition plays an important role in building professionalism, enthusiasm, and dedication into a member’s performance and attitude.

Recommendations:

6.1 Review and revise job descriptions for each employee classification within the police department as appropriate. Include specific duties and tasks to establish a clear understanding of the entire scope of responsibilities expected from the employee and clear expectations for appraisal of performance. Provide the CSOs with clearer guidance.

6.2 Develop job standards that will serve as the basis of measurement for the evaluation of productivity and performance.

6.3 Articulate the roles and responsibilities of department supervisors and their accountability for the performance of staff.

6.4 Provide appropriate training for all raters.

6.5 Revise and reinstitute the department awards and recognition program for all department employees.
# 7. Recruitment and Selection

**Statistics:**

The Bureau of Justice Statistics, Law Enforcement Unit performed a study published in January 2015 – *Campus Law Enforcement, 2011-2012*. In a survey of more than 900 four-year institutions with 2,500 or more students, BJS found that most sworn (74%) and nonsworn (76%) campus officers worked for an agency that required them to have at least a high school diploma, but did not specify any college-level education requirement. About 1 in 5 sworn officers worked for an agency that had some type of college requirement for new sworn officers, compared to about 1 in 7 nonsworn officers. Typically, sworn officers must undergo a considerably more rigorous screening process prior to hiring than their nonsworn counterparts. Of the 20 screening methods included in the 2011–12 survey, a majority of sworn officers worked in agencies that used 12 methods for hiring sworn officers. Most nonsworn officers worked in agencies that used five of the screening methods for hiring nonsworn officers. The five screening methods generally used for both sworn and nonsworn officers included personal interviews, criminal record checks, reference checks, background investigations, and driving record checks.

**Findings/Comments:**

The goal of a sound recruitment and selection strategy is to ensure the campus police department is selecting and retaining the most qualified candidates for positions. The selection process must ensure the department is identifying those individuals who possess the appropriate knowledge, behaviors, and motivations for policing in a campus environment. The process should not merely screen out the least qualified but should identify the most qualified. The recruitment process should include a proactive strategy for identifying potential sources of campus public safety officers. These could include two- and four-year institutions with criminal justice programs, local not-for-profit agencies that employ individuals with proven attitudes and skills for a human service profession, and other companies that employ individuals with strong customer service proclivities.

The LEMAP Team recognizes that the goal of any recruitment plan must be to hire the best people to fill available positions. It is also “mission critical” that the department reflect, as much as possible, the diversity of the community it serves. The LEMAP Team found that PCCPD is representative of

---

**TABLE 20**

Minimum education levels required for entry-level officers in campus law enforcement agencies on 4-year campuses with 2,500 or more students, 2011–12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum educational level</th>
<th>Sworn officers</th>
<th>Nonsworn officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-year degree</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-year degree</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college*</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other requirement</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None stated</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding.

*Non-degree requirements only.


**FIGURE 12**

Methods used by campus law enforcement agencies to screen applicants for entry-level officer positions on 4-year campuses with 2,500 or more students, 2011–12

the diverse community they serve. Approximately 40% of departmental personnel are comprised of recognized minorities and 37% of the department is comprised of women.

**Recruiting and retaining officers who appreciate and understand their community-oriented role on a diverse college campus is absolutely essential to delivering on the department’s mission.** Interviews and background investigations should be geared to gaining insight into whether the applicants possess characteristics of a campus community policing officer. These characteristics include:

- **Community-Oriented Interest**
  - Able to focus on the goals and objectives of the police department
  - Intensive, systematic interest in the substantive problems they will deal with and in identifying solutions
  - Able to make use of time, talent, and imagination to work on substantive problems
  - Recognize the broader role of the department in providing a wide range of traditional and nontraditional police and public safety services

- **Job Satisfaction**
  - Derive satisfaction from seeing benefits of labor and receiving positive feedback from the job
  - Able to get rewards from the intrinsic nature of community policing and the job of a patrol officer
  - Enjoy working as part of a team and as a resource to others

- **Ability to Adopt Community Perspective**
  - Able to develop better ways for the department to deal effectively and efficiently with campus community problems
  - Recognition of the legitimacy and desirability of community involvement and to serve through interaction with people
  - Willing to work to get to know people who comprise the campus community
  - Willing to make contacts in the community
  - Able to understand and appreciate the values of diverse cultures
  - Able to be sensitive and understand how police practices affect the community

- **Creative and Resourceful**
  - Able to exercise broad discretion
  - Self-confident
  - Willingness to challenge, constructively, conventional wisdom
  - Open to dissenting viewpoints
  - Willing to explore a wide range of alternatives
  - Willing to make some decisions for themselves
  - Alert to recurring problems and willing to attempt to deal with them
In addition to the need to hire the most qualified applicants, it is equally as important to promote only the most qualified candidates. This minimizes the risk of negligent supervision. A promotional process should be multidimensional and require the candidate to demonstrate their knowledge, skills, abilities, and efficiencies. The process should include realistic tasks required by the job. The candidate's performance should be measured in an objective manner. The following dimensions should be incorporated into the process:

- Knowledge
- Work perspective
- Preparedness
- Problem solving
- Fact-finding skill
- Decision making (decisiveness and judgment)
- Follow-through
- Leadership
- Planning
- Organization
- Written and oral communication skills
- Command presence

Historically, PCCPD hasn't had difficulty in the recruitment and selection of a diverse pool of qualified applicants for police officer positions, and this continues today. The overall process is administratively managed by the Human Resources Department. PCCPD works with the Human Resources Department and has developed criteria for selection through a defined hiring process. This includes physical attributes and written testing. Much of the on-boarding process is specified by the State of Arizona for sworn police officers.

When an opening has been identified, Human Resources will post the position on their website and use a third party website for additional reach in their searches. This assists in ensuring a broad and diverse process is conducted. Subsequently the noted testing takes place.

It is reported that the currently used written testing tool has resulted in about a 50 percent failure rate. This is a high rate of rejection. Once a pool of candidates has passed the preliminary testing, interviews are begun. The interview teams are composed of PCC stakeholders, assuring a good cross representation. An example might be a team consisting of three different ranks within the PCCPD and an executive level, non-sworn team member.

When a candidate has been identified as possessing the qualities desired by the college, a comprehensive background investigation occurs. This is mandated by the state and carried out by the Training Sergeant. The Sergeant has attended a certified training course that is a requirement of the state. This assures a consistent review of credentials is carried out. If the candidate successfully passes the background check, they are made a conditional offer of employment. The conditional offer is based on the successful passing of a required psychological review and polygraph examination. Additionally, a drug screen is required.

PCCPD Directive 82, dated October 2008, describes in detail the background investigation procedure for new recruits. While the directive appears to meet standards it should be reviewed and updated. Most policies should be reviewed at least every two years.
**Recommendations:**

7.1 Review the written testing tool used for candidates to ensure it is job-related.

7.2 Review and update PCCPD Directive 82 regarding the performance of background investigations.
8. Training

Statistics:

The Bureau of Justice Statistics, Law Enforcement Unit performed a study published in January 2015 – *Campus Law Enforcement, 2011-2012*. In a survey of more than 900 four-year institutions with 2,500 or more students, BJS found the average training requirement for entry-level sworn officers was 1,027 hours, with approximately two-thirds of the training in the classroom and a third in the field. Nonsworn officers were required to complete an average of about 230 hours of training, which were split almost evenly between classroom and field training.

Findings/Comments:

Training has often been cited as one of the most important requirements for any campus police department. Training serves three broad purposes:

- Well trained officers are generally better prepared to act decisively and correctly in a broad spectrum of situations;
- Training results in greater productivity and effectiveness;
- 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 the needs of the department 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 police officers so that a department can deal effectively with campus public safety or security problems in an increasingly complex and sophisticated society. Training is handled by both the Human Resources Department and the PCCPD. Human Resources manages the non-law enforcement training while PCCPD is responsible for law enforcement training. This is a standard approach in college and university training. The LEMAP Team discovered there are no departmental goals and objectives; thus, the training is not appropriately tied to them. There are eight directives that either primarily cover training or have a considerable training element within them. They all need review and update, as only one of them has a revision or original issue date more recent than 2008.

Budgeting for training is a critical element in a comprehensive and sound training program. Over the last several years PCCPD has not budgeted for training, although a line item is available for this. In addition professional development funds are available to the department. This is an across-the-college funding source. PCCPD has taken and continues to take advantage of this resource.

The training Sergeant position has only recently been filled. Since then, PCCPD discovered that the training records for AZ POST, the state certifying agency, cannot be found. This is problematic in that a complete training program requires documentation of all training, particularly that which is
mandated or certified by the State. Additionally, the State annually reviews the AZ POST training records for all law enforcement agencies in Arizona.

The absence of a comprehensive training plan has made it difficult to budget and plan for training annually. The LEMAP Team found that PCCPD is also deficient in the training and career development of supervisory and command personnel. There is currently no required training for supervisors or managers. Furthermore, there is little expectation for supervisors and managers to be held accountable for applying accepted supervisory principles in their day-to-day interaction with subordinate staff. Supervisors communicate conflicting expectations to their subordinates and are not in common agreement as to the mission of the department. Supervisory personnel should communicate in a consistent, uniform manner the objectives of the organization and expectations of management as they discharge their daily responsibilities. This can be ensured most effectively through a structured and mandated supervisory training program developed around the needs of PCCPD. Failure to adequately train is a potentially serious liability concern.

There is an effective firearms training program in place. All officers practice 3-4 times per year and annually must qualify with their firearm. This frequency of training is fairly standard for law enforcement agencies.

Another critical element to training is having a comprehensive Field Training Officer (FTO) program. This is the most important training for a new hire. The PCCPD program is 16 weeks in duration and covers most of the critical elements in laying the groundwork for a successful career in law enforcement. It consists of five separate phases with rotating field training officers. Again, this is a good best-practices model.

Communications and Dispatch training is another very important area of training, especially for the safety of the entire campus community. Most of their training is done on-the-job.

Two additional areas where substantial training is provided to PCCPD staff are on Title IX and the Clery Act. These are significant federal mandates that help ensure a safe campus and equal treatment of constituents. Other recent training or training that is scheduled soon includes: defensive driving, first aid, Taser, dignitary protection, drug interdiction, and Campus Security Authority. Largely, these are appropriate areas in which to receive training. The LEMAP Team was unable to discover any joint training with local law enforcement. This is always a good practice, as it creates comradery, familiarity, and an appreciation that can transcend when the two departments may be required to work together in an emergency.

National Incident Management System (NIMS) and Incident Command Systems (ICS) are national models that assist in responding to emergencies of any scale. It was discovered that very few of the personnel in the PCCPD have taken the myriad of courses offered, free of charge via the web. It was recognized that a few of the executives have taken and are aware of this important training that transcends the police department.

**Recommendations:**

8.1 Develop and implement a comprehensive training program. Once department goals and objectives are established, then develop training in support of those goals and objectives.

8.2 Develop and implement a structured law enforcement training program for police supervisors that exceeds minimal supervisory training available through the college.

8.3 Create a team to establish the training goals that includes identifying and prioritizing the most important needs for the PCCPD and how best to see that these needs serve the college community.
8.4 When the training goals are in place, request specific PCCPD training funding on an annual basis.
8.5 Review and update all polices within PCCPD that have a strong training element.
8.6 Ensure there is a method for tracking all training of all PCCPD members.
8.7 Develop a standard training module for all dispatchers.
8.8 Reach out to local law enforcement for joint training initiatives to build relationships. This is an area where Crisis Intervention Training would be beneficial.
8.9 Provide NIMS and ICS training to all members of PCCPD, including community services officers, and to the executive leadership at the college.
9. Records System

Findings/Comments:

Efficient paperwork recording and flow are essential to the successful operation of any law enforcement 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 classification systems so that this information is accessible for future use. It is also important to ensure that confidential information is retained in a secure manner.

There is one administrative support position responsible for the records management function and serves as the custodian of records. Within this report, the LEMAP Team will refer to this person as the “records manager.”

There is a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and user agreements with the Pima County Sheriff’s Department that authorize PCC to use a wide area computer network and the Spillman Data Systems law enforcement software as their police records management system (RMS). The RMS allows PCCPD to enter crime report information, which is identified as a PCCPD record, and allows the department to search Pima County and Tucson area crime data. The RMS brings substantial benefit to the department as the communications dispatchers, investigators, and officers can search criminal records information maintained by the department and local police agencies simultaneously.

PCCPD Directive 120, dated July 2001, puts forth detailed procedures for all aspects of report writing and police records management. Further guidance to officers is available in the PCCPD Report Writing Manual. The LEMAP Team reviewed these procedures and found them to be substantially adequate in addressing report origination, data collection, supervisory review, follow-up investigation, access, and security.

Officers prepare handwritten reports under a case number automatically generated through the computer-assisted dispatch element of the RMS. The reports include incident data such as date and time of report; date and time of occurrence; name, address, and phone number of the complainant; location of incident; names and identifying information of other persons involved; type of incident/offense; details of the incident; tag numbers of vehicles; and other relevant data. The officers also prepare a written narrative explaining the incident and actions taken. The report is then forwarded to the supervisor for review and approval and then on to the records manager for hand-entry into the RMS and collection of required statistical information.

Cases requiring review or follow-up may be forwarded by the reporting officer, supervisor, commander, or the records manager to the attention of the detective. There is no clear responsibility, however, placed on any of these parties to do so. The detective has access to the RMS and does review the cases that have been entered to ensure that cases requiring follow-up are acted upon.

The department is in transition away from written reports to direct input of crime report data and narratives into the RMS. This should improve efficiency and reduce the current burdensome responsibilities on the records manager.

The security of records appears sufficient with all records maintained in the records manager’s office. Only she and one other member of the department have keys to her office. Therefore, when she is off duty, access to the records is limited.
Arizona has established records retention guidance for law enforcement agencies. However, at this time, the PCCPD has not implemented a retention and purge program. The records manager is responsible for collecting statistical information and submitting crime data to the state of Arizona and the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) program of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The LEMAP Team was told that, while officers and supervisors generally have a fair understanding of report procedures, there are questions regarding adherence to and consistency in the application of the procedures throughout all shifts. According to staff, strict requirements in the areas of records security, access, after-hours availability of reports, release of records, when reports are required, filling out reports, processing reports, supervisory review, timeliness for logging in evidence, and updating status of evidence and cases need to be established. Generally, these functions are currently performed in accordance with past practice and supervisory discretion.

The LEMAP Team is concerned that lack of clear procedures and accountability may, if not corrected, bring question to the reliability of the information collected by police officers and the quality of statistics compiled by the department. The chief of police and commander must place strong emphasis on the importance of an effective, efficient, and accurate system of incident reporting and records management.

The scope of responsibility and daily duties assigned to the records manager is overly burdensome and lacking proper oversight and supervision. She is responsible for entering all reports into the RMS, quality control of all reports, fulfilling all requests for release of reports, and filing and maintaining all police records. She also manages the evidence room, logs in all evidence, and maintains all lost and recovered property. The records manager has no back-up when she is sick or on vacation, causing delays in processing reports and statistics. She is also responsible for backing up the chief's administrative support and occasionally serves as a communications dispatcher. The chief of police and commander should perform a job audit and identify those duties and responsibilities that should/could be reassigned to other functions/components of the department.

Police reporting reliability is not only a function of policy and procedure development and implementation but also of training. Appropriate attention must be given to the proper training of police officers in crime reporting. Continuous attention should be given to instruction in the completion of reports, the identification of factors which need to be present to constitute the commission of a crime, the standards for recording certain contacts in the field, and the purpose and benefits of accurate reporting.

**Recommendations:**

9.1 Immediately update PCCPD Directive 120 and hold supervisors accountable for consistency in adherence to all provisions of the directive.

9.2 Train all employees in and reinforce the importance of Directive 120 and related directives especially in the areas of report origination, submitting and processing reports, requirements for supervisory review of reports, reporting and capturing relevant data and statistics, origination of supplemental and follow-up reports, case disposition, and report maintenance and distribution.

9.3 Conduct a job audit of the records manager’s position and identify those records and evidence duties and responsibilities that should/could be reassigned to other functions/components of the department and whether an additional position, with police records management experience, should be considered.
10. Operations and Enforcement

**Statistics:**

The Bureau of Justice Statistics, Law Enforcement Unit performed a study published in January 2015 – *Campus Law Enforcement, 2011-2012*. In a survey of more than 900 four-year institutions with 2,500 or more students, BJS found that between the 2004–05 and 2011–12 school years, the increase in full-time campus law enforcement employees (16%) outpaced the increase in student enrollment (11%). Agencies serving campuses with 2,500 or more students had an average of 37 full-time employees, the equivalent of 4.1 employees per 1,000 students. On campuses with sworn personnel, an average of 24 full-time sworn officers were employed, the equivalent of 2.4 officers per 1,000 students.

**Findings/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 avoid lapses in 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. Clear and comprehensive written policies and procedures directing the activities of patrol, response to calls, the investigation of motor vehicle accidents and crimes, and medical emergencies are essential to a professional public safety department.

As a result of understaffing and vacant positions, remaining police officers may be called upon to provide services in an overtime capacity. This additional service, if not properly regulated and assigned, could easily lead to on-duty fatigue beyond what is reasonable for a critical and stressful position in the department. In the event that poor decision results in injury, officers could blame the organization for fatigue arising from overwork.

In meetings with faculty and staff the LEMAP Team found a general consensus that there are definite opportunities to improve police visibility on campus. In all meetings it was first noted that everyone respects and appreciates their police department, officers are very professional and responsive, and interactions are almost always positive. A great deal of the concern regarding visibility may be attributed to the current policing model of everyone responding from a central headquarters. This agency would be well served to have an active bike patrol, walking posts, and golf cart patrols as appropriate. PCC has great use of technology; shift briefings could be done in a PowerPoint format and broadcast to each campus at roll call.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type and size of 4-year campus</th>
<th>All agencies</th>
<th>Agencies employing sworn personnel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full-time employees</td>
<td>Per 1,000 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All campuses</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000 or more</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000–14,999</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000–9,999</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500–4,999</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000 or more</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000–14,999</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000–9,999</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500–4,999</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: See appendix table 4 for the 25 largest agencies ranked by number of full-time employees. See appendix table 5 for the 25 largest agencies ranked by number of full-time sworn officers.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics; Survey of Campus Law Enforcement Agencies, 2011–12.
The statistics concerning staff deployment cited from the Bureau of Justice Statistics survey are helpful as a general guide. However, there are numerous unique variables affecting each institution that must be considered. The number of properties and campuses that must be patrolled, the surrounding community, the number of buildings, and hours of operation are just some of the variables that have a significant effect on optimal staffing.

In the PCCPD climate survey officers allude to the concern that patrol coverage at individual campuses is sporadic at best, basically left up to the officers themselves. This same concern was also noted in all interviews with campus stakeholders. The perception is that officers are very responsive when called, but, under the current policing model officers may not be observed on some campuses during a given tour of duty. A constant theme from administrators, faculty and staff was that officers are generally only seen on the perimeters of campus in their vehicles and rarely in buildings or walking around unless responding to calls. Additionally, there were several concerns raised regarding officers conducting traffic enforcement away from campus that keeps them from protecting the campus community. The LEMAP Team believes that the concern that officers are not visible enough, which may impact the perception of safety, provides an opportunity to more fully integrate the community service officers and private security with the PCCPD.

There are certainly some significant opportunities here. A comprehensive review of the organization’s structure is clearly warranted. When reviewing staffing requirements the PCCPD’s mission must be considered, while examining all relevant variables (e.g., workload, peak times, hours of operations, community policing functions, officer safety, special events, etc.). This would seem to be an ideal “Six Sigma Project.” Six Sigma at many organizations simply means a measure of quality that strives for near perfection. Six Sigma is a disciplined, data-driven approach and methodology for eliminating defects in any process and such a process would seem ideal for reviewing the PCCPD’s organizational structure. It would appear that some faculty on campus could lead the department in such a study. It also could be accomplished within the leadership of the department, or such a study could be outsourced an external consultant.

The LEMAP Team concurs with the campus community that a reorganization of the PCCPD, along with staffing and scheduling changes, is clearly warranted. Additionally, the LEMAP Team feels it would be in the best interests of the campus community to fully embrace a community policing and problem solving approach as the main policing philosophy. As previously noted, the current reactionary, centralized response model is not efficient. Officers spend a significant amount of time driving from campus to campus each day resulting in one hour or more of lost time. This also results in officers coming across situations where they may take police action that isn’t necessarily related to their primary mission of keeping the campus safe. In meetings with staff members, it was also noted that there is a strong perception that the current ten hour schedule is not efficient and there are some opportunities to greatly improve efficiency with an eight-hour shift that the rest of the campus works. Many efficiencies will be improved with officers reporting directly to their assigned campuses.

Determining how many officers are required to handle all the responsibilities of a public safety agency has always been a challenge for public safety directors. While methods exist for calculating the number needed to carry out a measurable workload, such as responding to calls for service, most community policing work is difficult to measure and the time required to do it is similarly difficult to calculate. Ultimately, the police leadership will have to use professional judgment as to how PCCPD, within the financial constraints of its budget and within the uniqueness of PCC and its campuses, can best provide a service to its community and manage a reasonable and equitable workload for its staff. Ideally, the police chief should be able to come to an agreement with his PCC administrators on the services that should be provided in order to meet the institution’s requirements, and then be furnished with funds to match those requirements. Considerable guidance can be found
in the publication, “Establishing Acceptable Staffing Levels for Campus Public Safety Departments,” published by the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community-Oriented Policing Services, in collaboration with the International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators. The publication can be found at the following address: https://cops.usdoj.gov/pdf/vets-to-cops/e061122378_Est-Approp-Stfg-Levels_FIN.pdf.

As noted in earlier sections of this report, the LEMAP Team firmly believes the department should move to a “campus-based” community policing model prior to the start of the fall 2017 semester. It might be helpful to develop a Police Chief’s Advisory Board or similar committee to make recommendations. There is much work to be done to determine the best options. Areas such as calls for service by location, hours of operation, reported crime on individual campuses and the surrounding community, special events, and student population by campus should be examined. The following are some suggestions for consideration when reviewing reorganization options:

- Add two sergeants and two corporals. These positions could be funded by eliminating some of the vacant CSO positions. This would permit having one sergeant at each main campus during the day and one corporal at each campus on the afternoon shift. Police officers and CSOs would be assigned to campuses based on various needs as noted above. The sergeant would function like a chief law enforcement officer for each individual campus and, while all PCCPD staff would report upward through the chain of command, the sergeant and corporal would keep each campus president or vice president aware of occurrences in their assigned campus community.

- Consider switching to eight-hours shifts, possibly 7:00 am to 3:00 pm and 3:00 pm to 11:00 pm. This would eliminate the two-hour overlap time and could save an hour at the beginning and end of each shift where coverage may not be required.

- One option would be to have two squads working these eight-hour shifts Monday-Friday, which would provide maximum coverage and effectively doubling existing coverage. In this model provisions would have to be made for weekend coverage, which would be an added expense. It could be done with a mix of officers and private security, including possibly part-time officers or officers on overtime.

- Another option would be to stagger the scheduling of the two shifts to provide Saturday coverage (a small number could work Tuesday through Saturday) and have private security cover Sunday.

- Consideration might be given to having private security provide mobile patrols after hours and on Sunday where there is little need for police service.

- Officers need to spend their time on campus. Policy should be clear regarding geographical area of deployment and patrol, and discouraging officers from conducting traffic stops away from campus, which are not directly related to keeping the campus safe. The policy might be that officers are authorized to enforce traffic laws on campus, on surrounding streets, and on adjoining intersections. Patrol maps for each campus should be developed that clearly outline operating jurisdiction, and this must coincide with Clery Act reporting requirements.

- When patrol staffing is adequate, the role of the civilian in charge of records and property and evidence should be examined. In most agencies, the evidence custodian is a sworn position. There is a need for an additional detective who could also assume responsibility for this function as it commonly falls within the detective unit. This would free up the civilian position for other administrative duties, which is clearly needed.
**Recommendations:**

10.1 Work with campus stakeholders to develop a community policing and problem solving model for PCC including a campus-based deployment of officers. This will include having all members of the department from the police chief to the community service officers attend various meetings and engage actively in the campus community. Explore implementing programs such as “Coffee with a Cop.”

10.2 Review the existing organizational structure and work toward having a sergeant position and a corporal position assigned to each of the six main campuses.

10.3 Review and explore opportunities for police officers, community service officers, and contract security to integrate more fully. This could permit someone to be available 24/7 to respond to all campuses.

10.4 Consider adding an investigator position on the second shift, after supervision and patrol functions have been staffed adequately.

10.5 Switch to two eight-hour shifts, 7:00 am to 3:00 pm and 3:00 pm to 11:00 pm.

10.6 Use contract security to cover Sunday with roving patrols and consider using them after 11:00 pm Monday-Friday, and after normal business hours on Saturday.

10.7 Provide the opportunity for police bike patrols on each campus. Use one patrol car and one bike patrol or golf cart on each campus. Rotate walking posts, but assignments must get officers out of the car and into the core of the campus community.

10.8 Fill an additional detective position and make these positions permanent as opposed to rotating. Assign detectives the property and evidence function which, in most departments, is performed by a sworn officer.
11. Property and Evidence

Findings/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 college 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.

Generally, the PCCPD has a good, secure, alarmed facility with adequate procedures in place. The PCCPD policy provides for the security and control of seized, recovered, evidentiary, abandoned, and lost or found property. The department provides storage, maintenance, and control of all physical evidence and property collected by officers with the agency. The evidence and property room is addressed in PCCPD Directive 1002, last revised in 2006, which needs to be updated. Additionally, the state of Arizona has statutes addressing Evidence Submission Guidelines in addition to agency policy. State and agency requirements for processing evidence are addressed in PCCPD Directive 1001.

The LEMAP Team recommends that when the PCCPD revises policy it refer to the IACLEA Accreditation Standards on Property and Evidence. This will include adding guidelines on the chain of custody and any related forms, records showing the status of evidence, guidance on collecting computer-related and other electronic device evidence, a directive identifying the custodian, and required training. IACLEA Accreditation also requires policy identifying the property room security and additional safeguards for firearms, cash, drugs, and high value items. It should be noted that PCCPD already has much of this in place. The revised policy just needs to reflect actual practices.

The PCCPD has an evidence property room and temporary evidence lockers that are used by officers to transmit property and evidence to the evidence custodian. While the actual property room and security are adequate for this agency, there are a few opportunities to improve. The most significant is the department is not following policy in regard to conducting evidence room audits; in fact, this has not been done in several years. The current paper-based tracking system is adequate; the PCCPD may wish to look into a modern evidence room program that ties into the RMS and provides bar codes for evidence. As the PCCPD pursues accreditation, they will need to provide training for the evidence custodian and continuing evidence collection training for officers. State standards should be reviewed to verify if a civilian can be an evidence custodian.

Recommendations:

11.1 Update department policy in accordance with IACLEA Accreditation Standards related to Property and Evidence.

11.2 Begin a systematic process of inventory and audits of all property and evidence as soon as possible.

11.3 Provide training and equipment to all personnel in the proper collection and management of property and evidence with specialized training for the evidence custodian.

11.4 Ensure that property and evidence procedures comply with local, state, and federal laws.

11.5 Consider assigning a sworn officer as the evidence custodian, relieving the civilian staff member to concentrate on records management and related duties.
12. Facilities and Equipment

Findings/Comments:
Any public safety/police department needs equipment sufficient to meet its operational needs. IACLEA does not suggest rigidity in terms of equipment. Instead, the needs of each agency are unique to its mission and responsibilities. Typically, one in ten dollars for police agencies is dedicated to the acquisition and replacement of equipment with vehicle purchase and maintenance accounting for most of the expenses. Other major expenses involve communications equipment, CCTV, card access, weapons and related equipment, and training needs.

PCCPD Directive 31 covers general uniform requirements and PCCPD Directive 44 covers inspections of equipment. The PCCPD appears to have an adequate fleet, with 19 marked and 3 unmarked vehicles. The fleet manager does a good job of maintaining the vehicles. The department has patrol rifles and Tasers. However, the Tasers do not have cameras. It would be appropriate moving forward if the PCCPD desires to keep Tasers to consider purchasing the type equipped with cameras. As the PCCPD moves to start using bike patrols, the bikes and equipment currently in inventory should be reviewed and upgraded as appropriate. It would also be desirable for the department to purchase the required number of patrol rifles so officers do not have to bring in their own. There could be potential liability issues in this regard.

All the patrol vehicles have mobile computers; however, there is not an adequate plan for replacing them. It is recommended the department consider budgeting for this and consider moving towards notebooks which are now more affordable. Some of the campus police offices do not have computers that can access the records management system. This will need to be addressed as the department moves to a campus-based model so each campus can operate effectively.

Recommendations:

12.1 Develop a replacement policy for mobile computers, possibly with notebooks.
12.2 Upgrade Tasers to a model with cameras.
12.3 Inventory and replace police bikes as appropriate.
12.4 Purchase an adequate number of patrol rifles so officers do not have to use their personal weapons.
12.5 Upgrade individual campus substations so that all computers can access the county RMS.
13. Communications and Dispatching

Findings/Comments:

The fundamental function of a communications system is to meet the needs of the community it serves in conducting normal daily activities. That system, or certainly a part of it, also needs to meet the demands placed upon it during emergencies. This latter role will ultimately gauge the effectiveness of the entire system.

Staffing the communications center is not as simple as assigning people to answer telephones. The staff members must be trained in normal law enforcement and security procedures and in emergency responses. They must know college policies such as parking, maintenance reporting, and locking schedules. They must clearly understand the role, duties, and responsibilities of the department in order to provide quality service to the campus community.

Dispatchers should have a procedure to document all calls to the campus police department, including the time and date of the call, the name and number of the caller, and the nature of the complaint. Documentation should also include any pertinent information about the call and whether an officer was dispatched to the call, including time of dispatch, and time the officer arrived at the location of the complaint.

Interoperable communications is an absolute must for effective critical incident response. Interoperable communication systems allow two or more responding agencies, even those using disparate communications systems, to exchange information directly. With interoperability, on-scene personnel can quickly access each other and coordinate needed resources and emergency services.

The Communications Center for the PCCPD is not a Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP), which simply means it does not directly receive 911 calls. It does answer incoming emergency calls, transferred from the regional 911 center, as well as non-emergency calls. The Communications Center is equipped with an emergency back-up power system, which is tested annually. The radio system has interoperability with the local law enforcement and all calls for service are logged. Dispatchers monitor proprietary alarms (fire, panic, elevator phones, and blue phones/red phones) and closed circuit television. Radio frequencies for law enforcement operations are adequate.

Dispatchers have access to necessary resources, such as a duty roster of personnel, visual maps, officer status indicators, and appropriate policies. The phone number to reach the dispatcher is well known and communicated effectively to the community.

The radio system is a computer assisted dispatch (CAD system) model. All police vehicles and all mobile radios have GPS. This allows the dispatchers to know where the vehicles are at all times. Dispatchers have connectivity to all the appropriate State and Federal law enforcement databases. They have an appropriate policy on use of those proprietary databases and criminal history information (all critically important to the continuing access to the system). All radio dispatches and phone calls are recorded. They have two back-up cell phones. Redundancy within these systems and access to the immediate play-back of emergency messages all reflect best practices.

It has been reported to the LEMAP Team that the dispatchers lack training. Most of the training received by dispatchers occurs on the job.

The PCC uses the e2Campus emergency notification system for campus-wide emergency alerts. They are a well-recognized firm in the industry, offering a quality product. It is common practice in higher education that any emergency message that would need to be distributed to the college community would be administered by the police communications center. That is not the case at PCC.
The college uses a procedure that involves a group of three individuals (all PCC police personnel) who would make the decision, create the wording, and send it out. This has the potential to be less efficient, as those three individuals would all be expected to be performing other duties during an emergency. Additionally, the current emergency communications process does not involve the Vice Chancellor of External Communications. It is generally considered a best practice model for the principal public information officer to have input on the language of predetermined emergency messages (but not at the expediency of getting the message out).

Although the Communications Center receives transferred emergency calls, they do not receive notification when calls involve a fire or medical emergency. These calls are directed to the appropriate responsible first responder agency, either the fire department or emergency medical services.

There is a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and user agreements with the Pima County Sheriff’s Department that allows the PCCPD to use a wide area computer network and the Spillman Data Systems law enforcement software.

Currently, there is no plan to develop a text 911 to dispatch. The LEMAP team views this as a trending issue across the country. It is beneficial to have the ability to send a text message in an emergency when other forms of communications are either unavailable or not appropriate given the circumstances.

During emergencies, the public telephone network can experience congestion due to increased call volumes and/or damage to network facilities, hindering the ability of emergency preparedness personnel to complete phone calls. There is a national program that can improve this capability: Government Emergency Telecommunications Service (GETS). The cost is minimal at 7 to 10 cents per minute. There is also a companion service for wireless systems: Wireless Priority Service (WPS) that has monthly charges.

Historically, there have been radio “dead zones” on the campuses, which refer to places where radio traffic cannot penetrate, for whatever reason. There is one identified dead zone still in existence at the West Campus. This sets up the possibility of ineffective communications at that location. The inability to receive or transmit radio communication from that site represents a potential hazard to the public and first responders. Also, this campus has poor cellular reception.

Although emergency drills are reported to be infrequent, it is customary that the Communications Center would be involved, as they are a critical component of any emergency response.

**Recommendations:**

13.1 Develop a training program for all dispatchers. Consider training and certification for all through the American Public Communication Officers Association (APCO).

13.2 Involve the Vice Chancellor of External Communications in the development of predetermined language to be used in emergency notifications.

13.3 Improve the MOU and/or general agreement with other PSAPs, so that fire and medical calls on the campuses are communicated with the Communications Center. See Section 19 for an additional recommendation on this.

13.4 Consider the development of a text to 911 option for the college community.

13.5 Investigate the capabilities of GETS (Government Emergency Telecommunications Service) and WPS (Wireless Priority Service) https://www.dhs.gov/wireless-priority-service-wps as a part of the PCCPD emergency communications plan.
13.6 Review the noted dead zone and consider placing a bi-directional amplifier (BDA) at this location.
14. Parking and Traffic Services

Findings/Comments:
The parking operation is a vital aspect of college operations. These 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 college; 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.

Recommendations:
The scope of this LEMAP review, as determined from conversations with the PCCPD and the LEMAP Director, does not include a review of parking and traffic services. Accordingly, the LEMAP Team offers no recommendations in this area.
15. Community Interaction

Statistics:
The Bureau of Justice Statistics, Law Enforcement Unit performed a study published in February 2008 – Campus Law Enforcement Agencies, 2004-2005. In a survey of 750 four-year institutions with 2,500 or more students, BJS found the following regarding status/authority of campus police departments:

Community policing activities were more prevalent on public campuses than on private campuses. About two-thirds (69%) of campus law enforcement agencies had incorporated community policing into their campus security policy (table 9).

More than 80 percent of agencies met regularly with faculty, staff, and student groups. Regular meetings with various groups played an important role in campus community policing efforts. During the 2004-05 school year, more than 80 percent of agencies serving public and private campuses met regularly with other law enforcement agencies (88%) and with on- and off-campus groups and organizations—such as student housing groups (86%), faculty/staff organizations (84%), and student organizations (83%)—to discuss crime and safety-related problems on campus (table 10).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of activity</th>
<th>All 4-year campuses*</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Included in campus security policy</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic patrol assignments</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgraded technology</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnered with citizen groups</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student ride-along program</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written community policing plan</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer problem-solving projects</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental crime analysis</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus police academy</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See appendix table 3 for percentages by type and size of 4-year campuses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of group</th>
<th>All 4-year campuses*</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other law enforcement agencies</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student housing groups</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/staff organizations</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student organizations</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternity/sorority groups</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy groups</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence groups</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local public agencies</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood associations</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business groups</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious groups</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See appendix table 4 for percentages by type and size of 4-year campuses.

Appendix table 4. Types of groups that campus law enforcement agencies met with regularly to discuss crime and safety-related issues, 2004-05
Findings/Comments:

Given the increasing expectation on the part of students and their parents that colleges and universities will do their utmost to provide reasonably safe environments, the nature and role of the campus law enforcement agencies are of critical importance.

Campus safety and security are not the exclusive responsibilities of the campus police department. The quality of the safety and security program on any college campus is directly related to the effectiveness of the partnership that exists between the police and other administrative units both on and off campus.

Key to success in sustaining a vibrant, exciting college environment is the arguably indisputable need to maintain a perception of safety and security within the community. The problems of crime and violence, disorder, behavioral issues, and harassment continue to grow on college campuses. These conditions have escalated the anxiety level of students, staff, and faculty who spend considerable time during the day and evening on campus. A strong relationship with the community is one of the fundamental pillars of exceptional campus public safety. PCCPD can operate effectively only with the consent of the community and must rely on the community it serves for information to assist it in deterring crime, investigating criminal acts and student code violations, addressing disorder, and enhancing safety and security. The degree of participation from the community is directly proportional to the relationship the department has cultivated with the community.

The LEMAP Team found that the PCC police and community service officers are overwhelmingly accepted and appreciated as part of the campus community and are generally seen in a positive, supportive role rather than an oppressive authority presence on campus. The officers respond to calls for service in a timely way and deliver services in a professional, knowledgeable, and helpful fashion. One vice president commented that the PCCPD staff are “more professional and competent than any police force” he has interacted with and another related that “officers go above-and-beyond in their handling of situations.” Other vice presidents, deans, and managers used terms such as “outstanding,” “exemplary,” “first-class,” “exceptional,” and “committed.”

The LEMAP Team found that the department, despite its community-oriented mission statement, is seen by nearly all constituents as more reactive than proactive in its approach to campus safety and security. It is clear from interviews with members of the staff, faculty, and administration that although the department is responsive to calls for service, there is a desire to see the PCCPD interact more collaboratively or routinely with campus divisions and organizations. Throughout the LEMAP Team’s visit, constituents raised concerns regarding inadequate staffing and the lack of police visibility. Campus community members want to see more police in the interior of campuses and most urged a change from off-campus traffic enforcement to internal campus patrols on foot.

The LEMAP Team found the community expectation is that the PCCPD have a high profile campus presence that enhances the feeling of safety and security on all PCC campuses. The purpose of the PCCPD, as perceived by constituents, is to deter or mitigate criminal or disruptive behavior, serve as first responders to emergencies or critical incidents, and provide a substantial proactive public safety presence on the campuses. Specific concerns from student services constituents centered on their exposure to at-risk youth with behavioral or mental health issues and the desire to have law enforcement officers readily available. Community expectations of the PCCPD also include providing a favorable climate and image to the campuses that encourages student patronage both day and night, promoting community-oriented services that enhance community relations and foster a sense of safety on the campuses, providing information and assistance to campus constituents and visitors, and providing the linkage necessary with local emergency first responders. The quality of life on a college campus is seriously jeopardized when constituents and visitors perceive a need to alter their habits, educational experience, mobility or involvement out of a concern for personal safety.
An organizational philosophy that combines community-oriented policing, highly visible police and security patrols, and community partnerships provides a balanced and comprehensive approach to addressing campus safety. Community policing generally includes four key elements: (1) increased visible police and security presence on and around the campus, (2) increased problem solving to improve quality of life issues on campus through community participation and awareness, (3) increased partnership between police and communities (traditional and nontraditional students, full-time and part-time faculty, and professional and classified staff) in addressing campus safety and security issues, and (4) increased emphasis on crime prevention rather than crime reaction.

The LEMAP Team believes strongly that the community expectations cannot be met without a substantial change in organizational philosophy to that of a campus-based, community-oriented policing model. This model has shaped the success of university and college policing across the country.

A move toward campus-based community policing will provide the police leadership ways to cultivate opportunities and develop initiatives that would significantly enhance police-community relations, police engagement and interaction, and information dissemination. While the department does engage in brief public relations types of greetings and crime prevention sessions, long-term working relationships can only be developed through meaningful collaboration on shared activities or projects. The LEMAP Team determined that improvement can be made in the PCCPD’s involvement in meaningful dialogue with campus administrative units, faculty groups, and student organizations regarding crime prevention, emergency preparedness, and student behavioral issues. Such improvement can be made to an even greater degree on the smaller and more isolated campuses, centers, and facilities where the police presence is reduced to rare interactions and there is a greater reliance on community service officers.

The only negative public comments regarding the PCCPD came from a majority of the approximately 20 managers and supervisors of the Facilities Department. The LEMAP Team believes most of the concerns brought up during the interviews were the result of role misunderstanding, lack of communication between the two entities, and differences in delivery of services. Facilities staff, with the exception of specialized centralized services, are campus-based and responsible to their campus constituencies as well as to the facilities leadership. This is in sharp contrast to the centralized policing model currently employed by the PCCPD where there is little campus-based engagement and a lack of opportunity to build professional relationships with a central focus on the campus. There is an excellent opportunity for the police leadership to strengthen relationships and mitigate unwarranted negative perceptions through a campus-based policing model that will result in greater partnerships between police and facilities personnel.

It is apparent to the LEMAP Team that the college’s new police chief, as a result of his experience at other campus police agencies, thoroughly embraces the concepts of community policing. It is important to the overall perception of safety on a large, sprawling college district that the police department, college administration, and campus constituents each consider the other two as partners when assessing and addressing the public safety needs of the campus community. Moreover, they must work to understand the roles of the other two entities in the community and, if necessary, adjust their assessment of their own role. The public safety demands on colleges today are numerous.

The PCCPD enjoys a good working relationship with the college’s external relations office and, for the most part, the college’s student newspaper. The Vice Chancellor for External Relations advised the LEMAP Team that her office would be very supportive of the development of more proactive partnerships that would assist the PCCPD in marketing its services and engaging the community in crime prevention initiatives and emergency preparedness.
The LEMAP Team recommends appointing a sworn member of the staff to coordinate community outreach efforts on the campuses. This individual would be responsible for ensuring that departmental programs and functions and the delivery of police services are aligned with the college community’s needs and expectations. Duties might include addressing public information and media issues that impact safety and security; developing police/citizen partnerships to maximize community support for police department activities and programs; developing and conducting community surveys; and assisting with short- and long-term strategic planning.

The PCCPD has not developed a comprehensive public safety services community survey. Measuring the levels of the college community’s satisfaction with the PCCPD and the community’s perception of safety on the campuses are the most important and substantive means of measuring the department’s effectiveness in delivering community-oriented policing services. A comprehensive survey would be instrumental in providing feedback to the PCCPD and the college administration regarding the community’s perception of safety and satisfaction with the delivery of public safety services as well as the issues they consider important to the college’s overall approach to crime prevention.

The LEMAP Team considers the information posted on the PCCPD website as a marginally effective internet presence, but the website lacks the substance typically found on campus police and public safety websites.

Social media provides a new and potentially valuable means of assisting campus law enforcement and its personnel in meeting community outreach, problem-solving, investigative, crime prevention, and related objectives. The PCCPD should investigate the use of social media to enhance communication, collaboration, and information exchange; streamline processes; and foster productivity.

**Recommendations:**

15.1 Improve efforts and establish initiatives to move from a predominantly reactive law enforcement agency to a proactive, collaborative, and engaged community-oriented organization.

15.2 Adopt community-oriented policing as the predominant public safety strategy and engage in community relations, crime prevention, and outreach activities as frequently and routinely as possible.

15.3 Develop a proactive posture regarding police/community relations and market, within the campus community, the services of the PCCPD.

15.4 Develop improved relationships with Facilities Department management through campus engagement, improved communication, and new partnerships to improve safety and security on the campuses.

15.5 Identify a sworn staff member and assign that person the responsibility for coordinating community outreach programming on the campuses.

15.6 Develop additional initiatives to partner with campus organizations and other groups to engage in crime prevention and awareness strategies and to improve understanding of mutual concerns and challenges.

15.7 Establish collaborative relationships with the college’s public information office and the student media to routinely disseminate information to community members.
15.8 Update and significantly improve the department’s web presence and the scope and dimension of information available on the website.

15.9 Use social media to enhance the department’s outreach efforts, improve communication and partnerships with all campus constituents, and assist emergency messaging during critical incidents.

15.10 Work with the appropriate office on campus to develop goals and strategies for performing campus-wide surveys on the effectiveness of the department and the community’s perception of safety.

Statistics:

The Bureau of Justice Statistics, Law Enforcement Unit performed a study published in January 2015 – Campus Law Enforcement, 2011-2012. In a survey of more than 904 four-year institutions with 2,500 or more students, BJS found that during the 2011–12 school year, most agencies met regularly with campus administrators and officials (97%), other law enforcement agencies (93%), faculty and staff organizations (87%), student housing groups (86%), student organizations (81%), and student government leaders (80%) to discuss crime-related problems. A majority also met regularly with sexual violence prevention groups (69%), domestic violence prevention groups (60%), and advocacy groups (55%).

Findings/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 police department should establish formal relationships with other campus departments 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.

The crime statistics for the Pima Community College are low. Even though the incidence of crime is not significant, the perception of safety is real and it is still important to practice crime prevention. Although there is not a dedicated person or function for crime prevention programming, it is practiced to varying degrees within the department. The PCCPD actively does this in several ways. They have four officers trained in Rape Aggression Defense (RAD), which is a well-received program on the campuses. They have held and continue to offer DUI (driving under the influence) simulation training to students. The Meet-a-Cop Program affords students the opportunity to sit down and speak to a police officer and safety escorts. The PCCPD staff participate on various committees and it was reported by several deans and vice presidents that the officers give presentations to students in the classroom setting. However, they said if more officers were on campus, it would present more opportunities for this type of student-police interaction. A strategic marketing plan would serve as an educational opportunity to both students and employees about the many services offered by the police department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of group</th>
<th>All 4-year campuses</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus administrators/officials</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other law enforcement agencies</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/staff organizations</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student housing groups</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student organizations</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student government</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual violence prevention groups</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local public officials</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence prevention groups</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy groups</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternity/sorority groups</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood associations</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business groups</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious groups</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The strongest crime prevention program across the country is that of community-oriented policing. If adopted as recommended in this report, some activities on the campuses might include bicycle patrol, social media interaction, involvement in student life, athletics, civility training, interactions with other law enforcement agencies, safety seminars/presentations, and safety communication through various media. There is no existing public safety/crime prevention committee established at the college, and this would be an excellent opportunity for the police chief to establish improved communication on the campuses.

From a physical perspective, PCC offers significant advantages. The college has the beginnings of a closed circuit television (CCTV) system with approximately 30 pan, tilt, and zoom cameras. There is a “blue light phone” emergency communication system installed throughout the campuses that permits anyone to speak directly with the PCCPD communications center, particularly from parking lots. Similarly, red phones are available outside of all the various campus police offices. All of these programs have regular maintenance reviews; a good best practices model assuring reliable service.

Panic or duress alarms are present at the Cashier’s offices only. However, there are numerous pending requests to have alarms installed in various locations. The LEMAP Team recommends managing any expansion of the use of panic alarms by developing criteria justifying their installation. It helps in setting the stage as to how they can be effective and the fact that they are not a panacea. Furthermore, there should be regular documented tests of each alarm and a periodic evaluation of the security situation that prompted its installation to ensure the security need remains relevant and is being met.

From both a physical security and crime prevention perspective there is a concern about the locations of the PCCPD offices on the campuses. The LEMAP Team recognized that most of the offices are in isolated and often difficult-to-find locations that do not provide high visibility or easy access for the college community to take advantage of their services.

There is a limited system of card access control at each campus, with about 10-15 readers at each site. There is an active committee reviewing CCTV, access control, blue light phones, public address system, and key management and control. In reference to key management, it was related to the LEMAP Team by numerous individuals that there is no active management of keys and that “hundreds” and “maybe thousands” of keys are unaccounted for. The college utilizes an access control system provided by Traka USA. There are key storage boxes installed at a few locations, with the intention of installing several more. When the system is fully deployed, the key storage boxes will be networked and managed through a central software system, significantly improving access management and security.

The physical security of many classrooms and offices, where access doors cannot be easily locked from the inside, is a concern expressed by members of the campus community.

Another opportunity to increase safety on campus is through a program called Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED). This program is a multi-disciplinary approach to deter criminal behavior through altering the physical design of facilities to influence offender decisions that precede criminal acts. CPTED promotes and prioritizes increased visibility in and around a property to deter offenders who frequently target areas and facilities with low visibility. This can be counteracted through improved lighting, trimming of landscaping, installation of fencing that does not obstruct visibility, and maximizing visibility of windows and building access points. Training in CPTED is available through a number of resources.
It was reported that some of the buildings have intrusion alarms but others are not alarmed. There should be consistency in this area. For example, the Aviation Center is fully gated and padlocked; however, there is no CCTV and it is not currently alarmed. A plan is in place and a walk-thru had recently been completed at Aviation to begin the process of installing cameras, card readers, and alarms.

**Recommendations:**

16.1 Expand the offering of crime prevention programs and instruction, such as RAD, to the students, faculty, and staff.

16.2 Take advantage of the offerings from the Vice Chancellor of External Affairs to promote crime prevention programs and develop a community engagement strategy.

16.3 Actively market the crime prevention programming offered by the police department.

16.4 Develop panic alarm criteria, including justifications for installation and testing protocols.

16.5 Consider moving the PCCPD offices on the campuses to physical locations that afford them high visibility and place them where there can be an increased perception of security.

16.6 Ensure the committee reviewing all of the physical security attributes noted has sufficient mandate and funding to accomplish their goals. Other considerations include:

- Measure the Key Track system concept against what the physical security committee envisions for key management;
- Identify what doors are not able to be locked from the inside (offices and classrooms), determine necessity for such control, and establish a process to ensure consistency across all campuses;
- Review the efficacy of the card access system and repair where it is not working;
- Install intrusion alarms at all necessary locations.

16.7 Work to strengthen the relationship with the Tucson Police Department and the Pima County Sheriff's Department in areas of crime prevention, education, and community policing.

16.8 Educate and train all police and community service officers on crime prevention and community policing methods and practices.

16.9 Create an active public safety/crime prevention advisory committee and task this group with meeting regularly to address safety and security issues and address campus problems and concerns. Involve students, faculty, and staff members who represent areas such as Student Government, Athletics, Facilities Management, Human Resources, Academic Affairs, etc.

16.10 Identify personnel who are or can become accomplished presenters and enroll them in crime prevention (CPTED) and/or community policing coursework to reestablish a more formalized role and understanding within the PCCPD.
17. Space and Facilities

Findings/Comments:
A campus public safety or security office should be centrally located and easily accessible on the campus it serves. The location of the office should also be prominently noted in all campus publications and on appropriate signs. Office space should include, at a minimum, a small public area with a counter for walk-in contacts, an office operations area, a private office for the departmental director, a small room for private interviews, and a squad room for officers and their equipment. The squad room could also double as a classroom for training purposes while the front office could also double as the dispatch area. Access to all but the public area should be limited to department personnel. As the PCCPD moves to a campus based police model, an office for the sergeant in the substation would be highly desirable.

Police facility planning guidelines are published by the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP). Further information is available at their website, http://www.theiacp.org/Portals/0/pdfs/Publications/ACF2F3D.pdf

Generally, the main police facility is adequate for the department’s needs. This will remain the case when the department moves to a campus-based operation. Staff members did express concerns about the facility, including noting that the Communication Center is a bit crowded with all of the required technology and that there is a lack of sufficient storage space. As for the substations on the campuses, there are also some expressed concerns. These facilities could use additional space for interviews and short-term detentions. Furthermore, the location of the campus substations are not ideal. They are often in the back of campus, adjacent to a facilities operation. In long-term planning, consideration should be given to placing these facilities in the heart of the campus where students would be more likely to walk in. Some of the substations cannot access the county-wide RMS.

Recommendations:

17.1 In long-term planning, work toward relocating campus substations to the heart of campus closer to student activities and that would be inviting for students to walk into.

17.2 In long-term planning, include interview rooms in substations.

17.3 Equip all substations with upgraded technology so they can access the county-wide RMS.

17.4 Review and consider if space is adequate within the Communications Center for the long term while examining the possibility of the PCCPD dispatchers becoming part of the county-wide Communication Center.

17.5 In long-term planning, provide larger substations, with adequate space to provide the campus sergeant an office.
18. Clery Act Compliance

The Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act, codified at 20 USC 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 most current requirements and interpretations are available at the Department of Education’s Campus Security website at http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/safety/campus.html.

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 may be 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 and understood.

The requirements of the Act fall into three categories based on the configuration of an institution: (1) Clery crime statistics and security-related policy requirements that must be met by every institution; (2) an additional Clery crime log requirement for institutions that have a campus police or security department; and (3) missing student notification and fire safety requirements for institutions that have at least one on-campus student housing facility. The United States Department of Education can impose financial penalties of up to $27,500 per violation for a substantial misrepresentation of the number, location, or nature of the crimes required to be reported or for a violation of any other provision of the safety- and security-related regulations.

A principal requirement of the Clery Act mandates that, by October 1 of each year, institutions disclose statistics for the three most recent calendar years concerning the occurrence of the nine Clery crimes, hate crimes, and arrests and referrals for disciplinary action for weapons, drug abuse, and liquor law violations. Institutions must disclose such statistics for reported incidents that occur on campus, on public property within or immediately adjacent to the campus, and in or on noncampus buildings or property that the institution owns or controls. Understanding each of these geographic categories as defined by the Clery Act is vital to being in compliance with the law.

The Clery Act also requires that campus security authorities (CSA) report crime statistics for inclusion in the Annual Safety and Security Report. A CSA is an official of the institution who has significant responsibility for student and campus activity, and any individual or organization specified in the statement of campus security policy as one to which students and employees should report criminal offenses. This includes advisors to student organizations, athletic team coaches, members of the public safety department, and offices within Student and Academic Services. If a CSA becomes aware of any of the Clery Act reportable crimes, or if any person reveals to a CSA that he/she learned of or was the victim of, perpetrator of, or witness to any Clery Act crime, it must be immediately reported to the police and/or appropriate authority. An incident report form must be completed and sent to the institution’s police or security department.
The timely warning requirement is intended to alert the campus community to certain crimes in a manner that is timely and will aid in the prevention of similar crimes. 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 public safety agency should therefore ensure that information is gathered from local police agencies on a daily basis so that the necessary determination of any need to provide timely warnings can occur.

A daily crime log of all incidents reported must be kept and maintained by campus law enforcement or security departments and made readily available for public inspection. The log must contain the nature, date (occurred and reported), time, general location of each crime, and the disposition of the complaint, if known. 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 60-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 60 days available within two business days of a request for public inspection.

**Findings/Comments:**

In 2014, through a Financial Aid review from the Department of Education, the PCC was asked for Clery-related information. Although this is a typical approach as to how an official Clery audit may begin, it doesn’t necessarily mean that the department is being audited for Clery compliance.

Also, in 2014, the PCC brought on a well-known and respected professional firm to review their Clery Act compliance. This not only includes their day-to-day activities in compiling statistics and ensuring policy development but also focuses on the completion of the Annual Security Report (ASR). This firm is still on retainer for annual review of the ASR. Bringing in an outside resource to review this important federal mandate helps prevent the institution from receiving fines of up to $35,000 per violation.

Annually, the PCCPD writes letters to the local law enforcement agencies, per the Clery Act, to obtain various crime statistics in their possession that impact the PCC’s compliance with the Clery Act.

The college is compliant with the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act (DFSCA). Although not a part of the Clery Act, it is mandated that information regarding this policy be part of the Annual Security Report. The LEMAP Team learned that the DFSCA policy information is being sent out each semester. Again, this is not a legal requirement, but from previous federal audits, it is clear to the LEMAP Team that this is the Department of Education’s expectation. Also, impressively, the LEMAP Team was provided a list of alcohol and drug workshops put on at the campuses. This shows an engaged program of education and awareness.

The PCC is one of the more active institutions that provide Campus Security Authority training. This is a critical element of the law and is thoroughly covered in any audit. The Daily Crime Log was reviewed and it meets Clery standards, is up-to-date, and covers all applicable issues. Although the log was not available on-line, it was produced upon request, which demonstrates another aspect of compliance. PCCPD Directive 4, issued in 2015, addresses Clery Act compliance procedures. The LEMAP Team recommends that the directive be reviewed and updated yearly due to the history of frequent changes to the Act and ever-changing interpretation to the provisions of the Act.
What the LEMAP Team sees developing across the country are Clery Act Compliance Committees which have become a best practice model and are composed of all the stakeholders involved in ensuring college compliance with the Act. Thus, they are a cross-reference of department heads that directly manage the provisions of the Clery Act. For example, departments that should be engaged in such a committee include police, human resources, student services, resident life, risk management, legal counsel, and external relations. Consideration should also be given to include a student and faculty representative on the committee. The LEMAP Team has found that it becomes readily apparent to members of such a committee that managing a Clery compliance program is not the sole responsibility of the police or campus public safety department. Many functional roles across the college community are necessary to ensure compliance. Additionally, another recent development is combining the management of Clery Act with Title IX requirements, as there are many intersecting conditions among the two laws.

A white paper on this concept was developed by the National Center for Campus Public Safety and can be viewed at their website: http://www.nccpsafety.org/resources/library/institutionalizing-the-clery-act-at-institutions-of-higher-education/

Similar committees could be established on sexual assault prevention and response as well as Title IX compliance. The LEMAP Team learned that such committees have been requested by stakeholders in these areas but they have yet to be formed.

**Recommendations:**

18.1 Organize a comprehensive Clery Act Compliance Committee with appropriate membership:

- Use the white paper noted above as a model
- Include the Title IX law as an expanded/complementary role to the committee
- Organize in a fashion that assignments are made and completed in a timely manner

18.2 Include in the annual letters to the local law enforcement agencies a paragraph that requests them to make direct contact with the PCCPD Communications Center anytime there is either an emergency of any nature occurring on campus or some event (criminal or otherwise) that might impact the PCCPD.
19. Emergency Operations Planning and Special Events

Statistics:

The Bureau of Justice Statistics, Law Enforcement Unit performed a study published in January 2015 – Campus Law Enforcement, 2011-2012. In a survey of more than 900 four-year institutions with 2,500 or more students, BJS found that more agencies serving public campuses, compared to private campuses, disseminated information to increase citizen preparedness (90% public compared to 81% private), had formal intelligence-sharing agreements with other law enforcement agencies (74% versus 62%), and designed or revised a preparedness plan for a school shooting (86% versus 81%). A slightly higher percentage of the agencies on private campuses (85%) than on public campuses (81%) designed or revised a preparedness plan for an emergency evacuation. Nearly all agencies on both public (99%) and private (98%) campuses participated in campus meetings regarding emergency preparedness plans.

Findings/Comments:

This review category seeks to determine the extent to which the campus police department is prepared to deal with catastrophic emergencies and special events. Catastrophic emergencies usually arise suddenly and pose an immediate major threat to people, assets, and property. They can include aircraft crashes, bombings, widespread utility failures, riots, mass casualty emergencies, bomb threats, accidents, severe weather, looters, mobs, fire, explosions, chemical spills, major violent crimes, terrorist acts, natural disasters, and other incidents that threaten the very existence of the organization. Special events are usually planned activities that cause major disruption of normal institutional operations and large commitments of resources and can include labor disputes, picketing, bomb threats, major sporting events, VIP visits, big name entertainment, and the like.

For many years, colleges and universities have dealt with critical incidents such as weather emergencies in the form of hurricanes and tornadoes, power outages, lab explosions, fires and medical emergencies. However, since the horrific incidents at Virginia Tech University and Northern Illinois University, colleges and universities across the nation are re-examining every facet of their emergency response plans including notification systems, business continuity plans, and National Incident Management System (NIMS)/Incident Command System (ICS) training. Numerous colleges and universities are also examining staffing levels within their campus law enforcement or security agencies and the issue of whether their officers should be armed and/or sworn. National attention has been focused on higher education like never before with respect to student safety and the response to critical incidents.

The PCC does have an Emergency Management Plan, dated December 2015, which references the National Incident Management System (NIMS) and the Incident Command System (ICS). The LEMAP Team, in speaking with faculty and staff, ascertained that while there is a broad based overall plan, there need to be addendums to the plan detailing emergency procedures for each individual campus noting their unique requirements (such as building evacuation, campus hazards, etc.).
Representatives of various Campus Action Teams expressed a critical need for these type of plans when meeting with the LEMAP Team. PCCPD Directive 710 provides departmental ICS guidance, but it was last revised in 2005, does not reference the campus-wide plan, and requires updating. The PCCPD maintains various MOUs including ones with the Tucson Police Department that cover law enforcement and a multi-agency radio system that will be critical in a major incident. Faculty and staff felt that there was no consistency among the various Campus Action Teams college-wide and that training is inconsistent or not available.

The LEMAP Team found one area that all campuses seem to struggle with is defining the role of senior leadership in a crisis and in providing training for these individuals who have demanding schedules and limited time. However, the LEMAP Team must emphasize the critical nature of this training and the need for senior leadership to make this a priority. This should become an annual training for the campus. This training should also be incorporated into special event planning. Periodic training with outside agencies that would be called on to assist the PCCPD should be scheduled on a consistent basis. A large campus this size would be well served to create a dedicated Emergency Management position. A site should be designated on each campus that could function as an Emergency Operations Center.

In every crisis that occurs, it is practically guaranteed there will be communication failures. Considering this, colleges must constantly review their emergency plans, including their emergency communications plan. The LEMAP Team recommends that the college should give the PCCPD Communications Center the authorization and training to send out initial messages in emergencies. While the emergency plan does discuss communications, it would be helpful if checklists were created for emergencies. Additionally, policy should provide additional clarification on upward communications, with a checklist for notifications. It needs well-defined procedures to describe the process for issuing Timely Warnings and Emergency Notifications. This must include responsibilities regarding those who are authorized to send notifications, as well as their back-ups, and the process to determine the content of the messaging. It should be mandated that follow-up messaging be provided to the community after emergency notifications have been made. After the initial emergency message the department should consult with External Relations and others on any follow-up messaging. This all needs to be clarified in policy.

Campus special events are deeply tied to emergency planning. Special event plans should include which position will be on call and available if the need for setting up an Emergency Operations Center occurs. Evacuation planning for special events, including athletic events, is critical. Command post locations should be designated in advance. Assembly areas should be posted in rooms. Policy and procedures should also should be developed for rallies and protests, which are often tied to special events.

The LEMAP Team feels there is a department and campus need for additional training in emergency management including ICS. The Federal Emergency Management Administration (FEMA) on-line ICS training should be mandated for all Campus Action Team members. Training and testing of emergency response and evacuation procedures must be articulated in policy and practiced. PCCPD policies and procedures need to revised and updated to reflect the campus emergency plans; future reviews should be annual. The plan must specify who is responsible for planning the departmental response to critical incidents. The plan should also identify responsibilities of all command and general staff positions in any critical incident as they relate to the command operations, other operations, planning, logistics, and finance/administrative functions. Testing emergency response and evacuation procedures must be done at least once a year. There are several standards that address this in the IACLEA Accreditation Standard Manual, and the above recommendations would be covered during the accreditation process.
**Recommendations:**

19.1 Conduct continual training and tabletop exercises for campus leadership, as well as specialized units and teams, including Campus Action Teams.

19.2 Provide training related to roles and responsibilities of senior leadership in a crisis.

19.3 Plan periodic training and/or exercises with outside agencies that would respond in a critical incident.

19.4 Provide for an annual review of the emergency plan.

19.5 Conduct a comprehensive review of emergency communications plans.

19.6 Develop an emergency notification checklist with clear guidelines for sending out communications and for upward notifications.

19.7 Develop a process for issuing emergency notifications and add to policy. Create prescribed messages and identify who has the authority to disseminate them. Identify alternate authorities designated to issue emergency notifications in the absence of the principals.

19.8 Provide authority for the PCCPD Communications Center to send out emergency messaging and ensure that all dispatchers receive ongoing training in properly discharging this responsibility.

19.9 Create the position of Emergency Planner/Manager.

19.10 Designate an Emergency Operation Center on each campus.