

**Public Safety Program Review
University of the Pacific**

25 January, 2007

Contents:

- I. Overview of Procedures
W. R. Swagerty, Professor of History and Co-Chair of Committee
- II. Perceived Threats to Campus
John Phillips, Professor of Sociology and Co-Chair of Committee
- III. Comparison of Pacific with the Surrounding Community
Summary from “Self Study” by Chief Michael Belcher, comments by Delta College Police Chief Mark Bromme, and Lieutenant Ron Stansbury, Stockton Police Department. Interpretation by W. R. Swagerty.
- IV. Discoveries
 - a. Staffing and Budget Priority Issues
Debbie Kallman, Assistant Vice President/Controller, Business and Finance
 - b. Officer Training and Jurisdictional Issues On- and Off-Campus
Donald Floriddia, Professor and Associate Dean, Thomas J Long School of Pharmacy and Health Sciences
 - c. Risk-Management Issues
W. R. Swagerty, Professor of History
 - d. Athletic Department Issues
Derrick McGee, Director, Intercollegiate Athletics Finance
 - e. Faculty and Staff Issues
John Phillips, Professor of Sociology
 - f. Student Concerns
Meghan Hohenthanner, Assistant Director, Student Academic Support Services; and Tiffanee Hopf, Graduate Resident Director, Housing and Greek Life
- V. Recommendations
- VI. Acknowledgments
- VII. Attachments

I. Overview of Procedures, W. R. Swagerty, Co-Chair

The following committee (hereafter the Committee) was convened by Dr. Elizabeth Griego, Vice President for Student Life to undertake a formal program review of Public Safety at Pacific's Stockton campus:

W. R. Swagerty, Co-Chair of Public Safety Review; Professor of History and Director, John Muir Center for Environmental Studies, The College

John Phillips, Co-Chair of Public Safety Review; Professor of Sociology, The College

Debbie Kallman, Assistant Vice President/Controller, Business and Finance, University of the Pacific

Donald Floriddia, Professor and Associate Dean, Thomas J. Long School of Pharmacy and Health Sciences

Mark Bromme, Chief of Police, San Joaquin Delta College

Meghan Hohenthanner, Assistant Director, Student Academic Support Services, University of the Pacific

Tiffanee Hopf, Graduate Resident Director, Housing and Greek Life, University of the Pacific

Derrick McGee, Director Intercollegiate Athletics Finance, Athletics Department, University of the Pacific

The Committee first met on November 2 with Dr. Griego and Michael Belcher, Chief of Police. Belcher distributed copies of an extensive *Self Study* (which he authored in September, 2006 at the request of Dr. Griego), and transferred attachments referenced in the *Self Study* to the University Library for all to consult during the Review. The "Attachments" include forty-one items ranging from contractual agreements between the City of Stockton and the University of Pacific Police; Public Safety's Rules and Regulations; the Department's "Uniform Manual;" training manuals; statistical data on incidents on and off of campus; yearly reports; and, comparative data with other universities

Interviews with all Public Safety Department personnel were scheduled by Bernie Kramer, Executive Assistant to Dr. Griego. Each officer, dispatcher, and community service officer was scheduled to be interviewed by two of the committee in a single session. Except for officers James Aiello and Thomas Redfearn, all personnel officially in the Public Safety Department were

interviewed. The latter had misunderstandings or scheduling conflicts and were unable to make their formal interviews. Attempts to reschedule failed.

Additional interviews were conducted with the following officers and staff of the University between November 13 and December 15.

- *Dr. Patrick Cavanaugh, Vice President, Business and Finance
- *Marcus Perro, Director, Budget & Risk Management
- *Sue Sharp, Risk Manager, Budget & Risk Management
- *Joanna Royce-Davis, Dean of Students
- *Steve Jacobson, Assistant Vice President/Director, Housing & Greek Life
- *Faye Snowden, CSC Manager, OIT (on Staff Advisory Council)
- *Sheri Grimes, Administrative Assistant, Marketing/University Relations
(representing Staff Advisory Council)
- *Scott Heaton, Director, Support Services
- *R. Mike Lawrie, Supervisor, Support Services
- *Brian Klunk and Executive Committee, Academic Council
- *ASUOP: Adam C. Ellison and other officers and senators
- *S.T.R.I.P.E.S. (Student Escort and Area Security Program)
- *Lynn King, Director of Athletics
- *Coaches
- *Student Athletes
- *Graduate Resident Directors

The Committee reconvened on November 13, joined by Lieutenant Ron Stansbury, Stockton Police Department, and Chief Michael Belcher. Stansbury shared perspective on the relative safety of Pacific's campus.

Additional meetings of the Committee were held on December 11, 18, and January 8. A separate meeting with Chief Belcher was held on January 5 with Swagerty, Phillips, and Kallman. At that meeting, a document was circulated to Belcher with preliminary findings of the Committee. His responses were summarized by Swagerty and shared with the entire Committee on January 8, with Belcher present for part of the meeting.

Two survey instruments, one for students; the other for faculty and staff, were designed by Tiffanee Hopf and Swagerty/Phillips, respectively. Unfortunately, due to budgetary and personnel constraints, neither survey was conducted across campus.

On January 19, the Committee reassembled with Dr. Griego to share what it had learned in the process of the review.

From January 20 through January 25, the Committee revised the report and submitted its summation and recommendations to Dr. Griego on January 26, 2007.

II. Perceived Threats to Campus

John Phillips, Professor of Sociology

Committee members met with a variety of campus constituencies to obtain information about risks, or threats perceived by members of the campus community. This sort of inquiry can inform us all about concerns that are “out there.” Given the method we used, we are in no position to make claims regarding the distribution of hazards or ideas about hazards among the population. This can only be accomplished via carefully conducted sample surveys and crime pattern analyses.

A few concerns were repeatedly raised by our informants [Coming from a variety of individuals in a variety of positions, this consistency suggests that these issues are important, sample survey or no.] we will list the major issues (threats) and comment on them one by one.

Off-campus Individuals, variously referred to as transients, bums, “unauthorized visitors”, “people who don’t belong”, are a double threat. First, many auto break-ins and thefts of opportunity are attributed to these individuals. Occasional invasions of dorms and academic buildings and some “dumpster diving” are attributed to these sorts. Auto break-ins and thefts are widely considered problems at Pacific. For the record, only about 20% of these crimes are reported to police, according to nationwide studies. These incidents are more common than our local numbers would indicate, and they are a (perhaps *the*) major concern regarding crime on this campus.

Off-campus individuals pose a second hazard that is not visible to most of us—the low frequency, but high damage risk of an aggravated (deadly weapon) assault. Some day, someone is going to cause serious harm. Arrest records of our campus police indicate that this risk is far from imaginary.

This campus ought to be a welcoming place for members of the community and visitors. But there are people who are here to look for possible targets for crime.

Dangerous Places, especially at night, are a common concern of students and faculty. A lot of students who live in housing north of the Calaveras must cross the footbridge to get from home to class or library, or party venues. One reason this corridor seems hazardous is lack of good lighting along parts of the route. Good lines of sight and good lighting discourage would be offenders.

A related issue might be called levee security. Homeless people, intoxicated people, people-up-to-no-good use the levee for an approach to the campus and as a place to hang around. There is a potential for dangerous interaction with student joggers and walkers. Some members of this committee have observed this problem personally.

Building Security is seen as a problem. With multiple users in and out throughout day and night our buildings are at risk. Given an open environment building security must always be an issue, but the concerns for openness and security need to be addressed. It would seem that lots of training every year, coupled with excellent technology (locking systems) might reduce this problem.

Alcohol is not often mentioned as a hazard, but its effects are seen by many people here. Alcohol makes drinkers more likely to be victims and more likely to be offenders. Assaults, sexual misconduct, and traffic dangers are related to alcohol consumption for victims and offenders alike. [Sexual assault on college campuses is a national problem. Some very good research is available on the problem and ways to reduce it, and reducing levels of alcohol intake is prominent among those ways.] Alcohol abuse at universities is not a problem that can be “solved.” Rather we should aim to mitigate the problem via ongoing education, regulation, and enforcement.

A Comment: The campus community must deal with a “built in” tension between very real values that conflict with each other. First, universities need to be open to a variety of activities by a variety of people during a variety of times. This conflicts with an equal need for safety and security. The multiple uses of buildings by different people, day and night, come to mind as a security issue, but if access were strictly limited, buildings would lose their purpose for being. Second, Pacific is, and should be, a community resource. The community should feel welcome here. However, one of the key threats we face is criminals (at least potential criminals) coming on campus and posing a threat to the campus community.

The safety of the campus community will require ongoing efforts-- ongoing education of students, faculty and staff, ongoing improvement of facilities and equipment, and, especially, ongoing monitoring to identify problems as they emerge and even before they emerge. We all, not just the Public Safety Department, need to take a more vigorous and proactive approach to threats we all face together as a campus community.

III. Comparison of Pacific with the Surrounding Community

Summary based on “Self Study” by Chief Michael Belcher, discussions in Committee with Delta College Chief Bromme, and Lieutenant Ron Stansbury, Stockton Police Department, as well as other materials gathered; interpretation by W. R. Swagerty

The Department of Public Safety, a division of Student Life, operates under contract with the University as an organized association bargaining unit, whose members include all police officers and dispatchers. Other employees of the Department are not members of the association and are formally classified as staff of the University at large. All employees of the Department are subject to policies and procedures established in the *University of the Pacific Employee Handbook*.

An officer-corps of one chief (currently Michael Belcher who has been in that position since May 15, 2003 and is a former lieutenant with the City of Stockton Police), three sergeants, and seven officers provide twenty-four hour surveillance of campus and its environs. All officers receive the same police academy training as officers of the City of Stockton. Unlike many private security companies, since 1983, University of the Pacific's officers hold reserve powers on campus and off campus, including the power to arrest and cite within the municipal boundaries of the city of Stockton. All officers except the Chief dress in uniforms consistent with City of Stockton officers, carry weapons, and identify themselves on their persons and on their vehicles as "University of the Pacific Police."

The historic numbers of the officer-corps have been reconstructed by Chief Belcher, who writes:

I was recently asked by the administration to look at staffing numbers in the past and have we increased the number of officers. Here is what I found out:

In 1989 the department was staffed with the listed sworn positions

*1 Director
1 Assistant Director
4 Sergeants
6 Officers*

Around 1996 they were asked to reduce their personnel and listed the following sworn positions.

*1 Director
1 Assistant Director
3 Sergeants
6 Officers*

When I took over in 2003 the department was staffed with

*1 Director
1 Assistant Director
2 Sergeants
6 Officers*

The first thing I did was to dismiss the asst director and created a third sergeant position and I had enough money left over to create a seventh officer position. (Belcher to Swagerty, e-mail correspondence, 12 January, 2007).

Four dispatchers are currently employed by the Department. Each currently works an eight-hour shift, assisted on Fridays by one Community Service Officer during the day. Each dispatcher has attended a three-week academy. Responsibilities currently are restricted to the following tasks

while staffing the console in the Public Safety Department's headquarters: fielding of telephone calls; servicing of walk-in customers; indexing and filing reports; and documenting the police log with every call. At present, dispatchers do not do camera surveillance.

Both officers and dispatchers are required to participate in additional training, most of it occurring on Wednesdays, when all officers are working on campus. Two officers presently have status as "Field Training Officers" and have attended a forty-hour post-Field Training Officer Certification school. Officers currently do minimum additional training mandated by the State of California to maintain their status, and have little or no time to go for more extensive training off campus.

Currently officers operate mainly out of their vehicles, most of them four-door Ford Crown-Victorias. They do not have on-board computers, but have complete radio communication with the dispatcher and other Stockton-area police. Some officers also conduct foot patrols and bike patrols. Four bikes, two currently serviceable and equipped for policing, are available, but few of the officers have the proper clothing or training for this activity, which was limited to less than sixty hours in 2005.

The Department is also in charge of the golf-cart fleet used for special occasions, to escort dignitaries around campus, and to escort students across campus in the evenings. Since 2002, the S.T.R.I.P.E.S. (Student Escort and Area Security) program has been quite successful with student employees driving the "Tiger Buggies" that hold up to four people. Carrying only two-way radios and flashlights, drivers of S.T.R.I.P.E.S. vehicles operate out of the ground floor of Cowell Wellness Center. According to Chief Belcher, the program is cost effective because S.T.R.I.P.E.S.'s second purpose is Building Security. Drivers check buildings and lock all unlocked doors when not occupied with transporting students at night.

Additional personnel in the Department include an administrative assistant to the Chief, and one full-time and two part-time Community Service Officers, and one security officer attached to the Health Sciences Building on North Campus.

The Department's "Mission Statement" reads:

Our mission is to promote the quality of life on the University of Pacific campus by working in partnership with students, faculty and staff to provide a safe and secure environment, recognizing the diversity and uniqueness of the University of Pacific, being sensitive and responsive to the campus community in an efficient and effective manner, and responding to the ever-changing needs of our community (Program Review, 2006, Self Study, p. 6)

The Department takes pride in not only providing police services, but also serves the University community in the management of special events,

parking enforcement (through its Community Service Officers), educational programs in crime prevention, and with its Student Victim Advocate Program. One Victim Advocate (Mary Ann Pearson) provides free and confidential support to students who are victims or survivors of crime, violence, or abuse. She also provides educational seminars on alcohol abuse, the criminal justice system, and accompanies students during court appearances. These activities comprise what Chief Belcher describes as “Community Policing,” which goes well beyond normal security and safety enforcement.

Throughout the deliberations of the Committee, it was learned that the University of the Pacific’s forty-acre campus is the “safest zone” in the entire Stockton metropolitan area. That stated, editorials in area newspapers, especially the *Stockton Record*, highlight Stockton’s growing reputation for an increase in violent crimes, auto burglaries and thefts. On October 5, 2006, an article in the *Record* reported that Stockton is now “No. 1 in Violent Crime Rate” for cities in the United States over 100,000 in population. “Radical intervention is required,” wrote Kevin L. Parrish in his Opinion-Page editorial on November 13, titled “Crime’s the No. 1 priority.”

Statistics do not support the conclusion that Pacific is an unsafe environment, despite several major recent incidents including the shooting of a Pacific student during an attempted robbery on Mendocino Avenue, directly across from South Campus, which has heightened public perception and has led to an increased sense of perceived threat to personal safety across campus. Chief Belcher has made a strong case in a recent memorandum to Vice President Griego (December 21, 2006; see Attachment A) that the campus environment remains stable and secure, despite an eleven percent increase in crime throughout the City of Stockton in the first six months of 2006. In 2005, for example, while aggravated assault for the City of Stockton was 9.6 incidents per thousand of people, it was .88 per thousand for campus and its immediate environs, as defined by the Clery Act. “Violent Crime” was 15 per 1,000 of population for the City; 1.5 per 1,000 for campus; “Auto Theft” 14 per 1,000 for the City of Stockton; 2.64 per 1,000 for Pacific (see Attachment B).

Comparison with other university communities for 2005 is also very favorable with “Alcohol Violations” (208) comprising by far the largest incident of citation, followed by “Narcotics” (39), “Burglary” (27); “Motor Vehicle Theft” (13); and four incidents in each of the categories of “Illegal Weapons,” “Forcible Sex Offenses,” and Aggravated Assault.” (see Attachment C). Even so, as a recent report by the U. S. Department of Justice noted, “Sexual assault is widely considered to be the most underreported violent crime in America.” Pacific is probably no exception. (“Sexual Assault on Campus: What Colleges and Universities are Doing About It,” *NIJ*, U. S. Department of Justice, December, 2005, ii; www.ojp.usdoj.gov/nij).

A comparison Pacific's number of officers and staff in Public Safety at University of California (U.C.) campuses shows that Pacific's ration of 1.7 staff per 1,000 population on campus is comparable to U.C. San Francisco (1.789) and very close to Berkeley (1.378), much higher than the other campuses, but lower than Merced with its very high Public Safety ration of 7.326 per 1,000 population. As Merced's student population grows, this number will undoubtedly decline. The average for all U.C. campuses is 1.036. Again, Pacific is above, when all students, faculty, and staff are factored in (see Attachment D).

On November 13, Lieutenant Ron Stansbury complimented the "air of professionalism" among Pacific's officers, describing the campus as a "closed sub-culture" where "visitors stand out." He noted that much of the transient population that used to live in downtown Stockton now roams between the two campuses of Pacific and Delta, making us vulnerable for an increase in uninvited visitor activity on campus. This was confirmed by Belcher, who noted that six arrests during the previous week involved transients on campus, some with felony warrants.

Clearly the porous nature of Pacific's campus will always pose a security and safety challenge, and the Committee is not as optimistic as statistics suggest that we do not have a safety issue for the average student, staff, or visitor to campus.

We are a relatively safe zone within Stockton, but the important descriptor is "relatively" safe. The range of perception of relative safety was recently highlighted in two articles read widely by the entire campus. Responding to the anonymous submission on December 7, 2006 by "Killgore Trout" in *The Pacifican*, Patrick Giblin, Media Relations Coordinator at Pacific provided a strong rebuttal to the assertion that the university has intentionally misrepresented or not disclosed the actual number of incidents of crime on campus. In "Pacific Is A Very Safe Place," Giblin used data provided by the Department of Public Safety as required under the Clery Act, assuring students, staff, and parents that the campus is not representative of Stockton-at-large, although there have been more incidents involving students that have been arrested or referred to Judicial Affairs than in previous years; and especially those involving alcohol and drunk driving , an increase of 9.3% in one year (see Patrick Giblin, "Pacific is a very safe place: A rebuttal to Killgore Trout, *The Pacifican* 98(13) December 14, 2006, p. 6).

As Stockton further modernizes and gentrifies its old downtown district, and as more and more homeless find their way to green spaces in public parks, grey areas such as shopping centers and malls, and buffer zones such as the Calaveras River levee, this campus will increasingly see more transient population passing through. A recent article in the Stockton Record reported 3,000 homeless are estimated to live in San Joaquin County, many of them in Stockton.

In the recommendations that follow our section on “Discoveries,” we address specific potential ways to discourage visitors without authorization on campus, short of building walls between Pacific and the outside community with the goal of making the campus a safer environment for all and one that parents of potential and enrolled students, students themselves, and all faculty and staff find a pleasant and desirable place to study, teach, and work.

IV. Discoveries

a. Staffing and Budget Priority Issues

Debbie Kallman, Assistant Vice President/Controller, Business and Finance

There seems to be a consistent theme amongst the individuals interviewed that there are staffing issues in Public Safety. While the vast majority of individuals interviewed generally feel safe on campus, many expressed concerns in the following areas:

- Poor lighting;
- Car burglaries (even in well lit lots);
- Increase in number of unauthorized visitors to campus;
- Increased arrests of individuals not associated with the University (i.e., unauthorized visitors);
- The desire that Public Safety officers be more visible on campus (i.e., more bike patrols, more consistency in “Walk, Stop, Talk” program);
- Potential danger associated with the openness of the campus (i.e., University’s proximity to the levee and bridges at Pershing and Pacific Avenues, lack of controlled entrances, fencing, etc.); and
- Security of buildings (i.e., Owen Hall, WPC, and the breezeway between the Spanos and Intercollegiate Athletics centers are often unlocked for lengthy periods of time in the evenings and on weekends).

Further, there was a perception by some that despite University growth Public Safety staffing hasn’t kept up.

Presently officers currently work a 10/4 plan (working ten hour shifts four days per week). According to Chief Belcher, “under the current schedule, officers work ten hour shifts and are assigned to one of two phases. On each phase, two officers are assigned the 7:00AM to 5:00PM shift. The evening officer starts at 5:00PM and works until 3:00AM. A sergeant starts at 7:00PM to 3:00AM. The graveyard officer starts at 9:00PM and works until 7:00AM. This arrangement is helpful as it allows the department to have three officers working from, 9:00PM to 3:00AM when the campus is busy with social events. The downside is the campus is staffed with one officer from 5:00 to 7:00PM and again at 5:00 to 7:00AM. If an officer is off campus while booking a prisoner, it leaves a security void.” (Memorandum to Dr. Griego, December 21, 2006; see Attachment A).

Further, some individuals interviewed expressed a concern that during the period from 3:00 AM to 7:00AM no sergeant was on duty; however, Chief Belcher indicated a Stockton Police Department Sergeant or he may be called in as needed during these hours.

It was noted that Public Safety officers are frequently called upon to respond to calls off-campus (for example at registered or unregistered parties held by

Pacific students). Further, it takes approximately three hours for a Public Safety officer to transport a suspect to the county jail or an individual (intoxicated or injured student) to the county hospital when the need arises. This leaves the campus vulnerable. It was also noted that Public Safety may be called upon to transport students to off-campus medical facilities for treatment; again, taking a sworn officer off campus for, potentially, several hours.

Several individuals interviewed questioned the use of sworn officers for such administrative tasks as locks and unlocks. These requests have increased over time as University events have increased and could be delegated to non-sworn personnel.

Several interviewees expressed a desire to see Public Safety officers spend more time on campus. This could involve more consistency in the “Walk, Stop, Talk” program, increasing bicycle patrols, and having sworn officers spending less time on administrative tasks, such as locks and unlocks mentioned above.

Several individuals mentioned that there appears to be a need for an additional dispatcher to provide coverage in event of illness, vacations or to provide additional coverage for special events or during the busy night and weekend periods when call volume increases. Presently the dispatchers handle all incoming calls including calls for locks/unlocks and calls for the S.T.R.I.P.E.S. program.

From a budget perspective, budgets seem to be adequate for basic operating needs. However, budget for major pieces of equipment or software is limited and must be funded through savings in operations or salaries – revenue from citations does not revert to Public Safety but rather to the University’s unrestricted fund. Presently individuals indicated the following equipment needs:

- Install laptop computers in each police vehicle;
- Upgrade the computerized record system;
- Improve lighting in parking lots;
- Install cameras in parking lots (which studies show may act as a deterrent to crime or at least capture vital information on film);
- Possibly install kiosks at entries to campus with cameras; and
- Replace parking dispensers (able to accept credit/debit or PacifiCards).

In addition some officers have suggested the acquisition of TASERS, insure portable radios are sufficient for the intended use (i.e., more robust than those that might be used during events), and a plan for swapping out patrol cars so that all are in good condition.

Several individuals mentioned that the Public Safety Department loans out its golf carts to other University departments at no charge while absorbing

all maintenance of these vehicles. Maintenance costs run approximately \$8,000 per year. Often times, these vehicles are returned damaged and must be repaired – frequently done by a community services officer. Other University departments that provide services to the University community generally recoup operating costs from the University departments utilizing the service.

While the Public Safety Department is able to take advantage of training offered by Stockton Police Department, training was mentioned as a concern by some of the dispatchers. Also, a common theme was increased outreach and training for students, faculty and staff by Public Safety.

b. Officer Training and Jurisdictional Issues On and Off-Campus

Donald Floriddia, Professor and Associate Dean, Thomas J Long School of Pharmacy and Health Sciences

Training:

Each officer must complete the Basic Police Academy which is a 26-week law enforcement academy. Once employed, officers must complete their Field Training Manual which is in compliance with Peace Officers Standards & Training (P.O.S.T.) guidelines under the supervision of a Field Training Officer. The Department has two officers assigned as Field Training Officers.

Officers receive 24 hours of Continuing Professional Training every two years to keep in compliance with P.O.S.T. Officers receive this training by attending classes hosted by the Stockton Police Department. Officer training records are maintained by the Stockton Police Department Personnel Division to ensure compliance. Officers must qualify quarterly with their firearm under the guidance of a range master. The department has two officers who were qualified range masters after attending a 40 hour P.O.S.T. school.

Dispatchers attend a three week dispatcher's academy. All members of the department attend in-house training sessions on a variety of subjects. Each month a different subject is taught and includes topics such as diversity, customer service, communication and firearms training.

Employees are evaluated yearly on a University of the Pacific evaluation form. Their performance is supported by documented incidents that occurred during the year. Supervisors document the incidents on their computerized performance log.

Jurisdiction:

The University of the Pacific Department of Public Safety has been granted peace officer status by the City Manager of the City of Stockton pursuant to

Section 830.6(a)(2) of the Penal Code. Persons so appointed will be known as City of Stockton Peace Officers at the University of the Pacific.

Conditions and qualifications required for City of Stockton Peace Officer status at the University of the Pacific are:

- Be employed full-time by the University of the Pacific Department of Public Safety;
- Meet minimum standards for employment as prescribed by the California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training;
- Meet minimum standards for training as prescribed by the California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training;
- Be recommended for such Peace Officer status by the Director of Public Safety at the University of the Pacific; and
- Undergo a review of the background investigation file by the Stockton Police Department prior to appointment.

Jurisdiction – On Campus:

The function of UOP Peace Officers is to prevent and detect crime and generally enforce state laws, local laws and City ordinances in the interest of securing the safety of the residences of the University of the Pacific and the protection of their property. This function shall be accomplished by the patrol upon all those grounds, properties, and buildings owned, operated, controlled, or administered by the Stockton campus of the University of the Pacific.

Jurisdiction – Off Campus:

The function and jurisdiction of UOP Peace Officers in off campus interactions is defined in general terms in the “Memorandum of Understanding” between the University of the Pacific and the City of Stockton. Police action beyond the property of the Stockton campus must be specifically directed by the City of Stockton Chief of Police or his authorized designee. The territorial limitations imposed are subject to the provisions of Penal Code section 830.1. UOP Peace Officers shall have the authority of peace officers and shall act as peace officers only when they are on duty with the University of the Pacific Department of Public Safety. Minor crimes are normally investigated by UOP Peace Officers. Major crimes, which are clearly beyond the scope and resources available to UOP Peace Officers, will be investigated by the City of Stockton Police Department.

The committee has serious concerns regarding the extent of jurisdiction that UOP Public Safety has off campus. In the “Memorandum of

Understanding,” it appears that there is no defined perimeter in which the University public safety officers can be engaged in police related pursuits. In addition, University officials point out the statement in *Tiger Lore*, that students under the age of 21 are not permitted to possess, distribute or consume alcohol at any time on-campus or adjacent to the campus. Chief Belcher and Dr. Griego have clarified that the term "adjacent" would incorporate any location that our public safety officers responded to that involved our students.

Discussions in committee deliberations feel that this policy exceeds the acceptable jurisdiction of the University and UOP Public Safety. It is a potential violation of the civil rights of the students living in private apartments and homes as well as a violation of the civil rights of home owners that may rent to individuals that may be registered as University students. The committee feels that this opens the University to civil law suits that it would not be able to defend. Private home owners expect the services and attention of the Stockton Police that is guaranteed to tax payers of the city. Private home owners do not pay the University of the Pacific to police their properties and resent the fact that the City of Stockton police do not respond to calls as a result of their deferment to the University police to do their job. It is apparent that by responding to calls from private citizens for police protection on behalf of the City of Stockton, is a burden that is placed on the tuition paying students of the university. University police are responding to tax payer owned properties that should be protected by the City of Stockton police. The University of the Pacific is in effect subsidizing the City of Stockton by providing this protection by its police staff.

In addition to this perceived subsidy, while a UOP Public Safety Officer is responding to an off-campus call, the University of the Pacific Campus is left without adequate protection. The committee discussed the need for a clearly defined policy on off-campus jurisdiction. Other concerns expressed in committee were the actions on the part of certain UOP officers in responding to on- and off-campus calls. The committee has been informed of officers over stepping their authority by entering private homes under contrived or alleged “probable cause” reasons. Other issues include:

- The reporting of wide-spread under-age drinking in these private homes without verification of the actual age of the students involved. Forcing students to leave the private home and then “arresting” them for drunkenness in public.
- Alleged false or incorrect statements made in police reports identifying “non responsive” students that are passed out, calling for medical assistance and then in the next statement, “escorting” the students outside to be “arrested for drunkenness in public”. Statements of this type beg the question as to how a “non-responsive” student can be “escorted” outside. If medical attention is required, common sense

states that the non-responsive student should be left where he/she is until medical assistance arrives.

- The most serious complaint that has been expressed by students located on the south and north campuses is the policy of “arresting” students and then transporting them to the San Joaquin County Jail for being “drunk in public.” The reason supporting this policy is that the holding area located in the Cowell Wellness Center is not adequate and that there is no one to observe the students when placed in the holding area. However, if an officer(s) takes students to the San Joaquin County Jail and it is estimated that it takes approximately 3 hours to transport and “book” students into the facility, it is obvious that there is not adequate police presence on campus during this time. The question that comes to mind is “who is patrolling the campus during this period?”

In addition, the committee expressed concerns as to the safety of the students when they are left at the San Joaquin County Jail. UOP Public Safety Officers claim that the students are not really “arrested” and there is no record of the “arrest.” If a student is not arrested, then it is not necessary to transport them to the county jail. The committee urges the Public Safety department to come up with a more acceptable method of detaining allegedly drunk or disorderly students. Transporting students to San Joaquin County Jail is unacceptable to parents and the University community.

Command and Control:

Operational control and supervision of UOP Peace Officers shall be exercised by the Director of Public Safety or other appropriate University administrator. The Director of Public Safety at the University of the Pacific shall be a UOP Peace Officer with the designation(s) of Director of Public Safety and or University Chief of Police. In exercise of his authority as a UOP Peace Officer, the Director of Public Safety at the University of the Pacific is under the immediate command of the City of Stockton Chief of Police or his authorized designee.

The Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Stockton and the University of Pacific is reviewed on an annual basis.

c. Risk-Management Issues

W. R. Swagerty, Professor of History

On December 15, John Phillips and I interviewed Marcus Perro, Director of Budget & Risk-Management and Sue Sharp, Risk Manager. We learned that currently, \$76,900 is budgeted for Risk-Management upgrades concerning safety and security issues. These funds are used as necessary

upon special request for new locks, cameras, doors, and in remedial construction to conform to building codes and access for the handicapped.

Consistent with other officers and administrators, Risk-Management feels that Pacific's problem is not internal; it is external. Outsiders entering campus pose a perceived, and often, a real threat to all legitimate residents, employees, and visitors to campus. Beginning in the spring of 2006, Risk-Management began publishing a quarterly newsletter titled "Risk-Management Advisory" to disseminate safety tips and to respond to inquiries on liability, safety, and official University policy. Risk Management would like to see the following:

- more alarms, better locks, and cameras in student housing and classroom buildings
- universal use of a one-card entry system with recorded user-identification
- more involvement by Public Safety in workshops at new employee orientations
- more officers and especially more officer-visibility in the middle of campus on a regular basis
- Public Safety newsletter similar to Risk-Management "Advisory"
- a possible prohibition of alcohol on campus
- restoration of parking and moving vehicle violation revenues into Public Safety to help with the increase in the number of staff
- Risk-Management is impressed with improvements in lighting, ramps for accessibility into buildings, and other upgrades, but agrees that the middle of South Campus between the Atchley Clock Tower and classrooms and offices at the southern end of campus is still a poorly-lit main pathway through campus and would support a well-lit corridor.

The major "threats" that concern Risk-Management officers as high potential liability issues include the following:

- transients
- perimeter security
- students advertising parties and thus encouraging outsiders to enter campus or attend parties off-campus where University students are renters, lessees, or owners.
- use of alcohol at events on campus
- poorly lit areas used by pedestrians across campus

On the issue of potential staffed kiosk entries at Larry Heller Drive and off of Pacific, Risk Management does not feel that the kiosks would make campus "safer," but they do see the campus being viewed as "friendlier" by all entering, especially visitors looking for directions, parking permits, and seeing campus for the first time.

d. Athletic Department Issues

Derrick McGee, Director, Intercollegiate Athletics Finance

Athletics plays a role in public safety from the stand point of game management and supervision, student-athlete safety, transportation and safety of athletic equipment. I had the opportunity to not only speak with student-athletes, but also Vice President Cavanaugh, Steve Jacobsen of Student Life, S.T.R.I.P.E.S., members of the Public Safety Department, and athletic administrators.

PSAC (Pacific Student Athletic Club)/Student Athletes:

The greatest issues to student-athletes and athletic administrators are these:

- Concerns over car theft in Mendocino lot and swimming pool lot and lack of police concern or response.
- Need for cameras for parking lots and more patrols for sorority and fraternity parking lots.
- Student concern that Public Safety does not follow through on their claims of helping students.
- Lack of concern or response on issues that are relevant to students, but may cause them to get out of their cars.
- Issuance of unexplained tickets. Students feel that Public Safety officers often just give tickets without even issuing a warning (ticket happy)
- The student athletes would rather have Stockton Police Department (SPD) respond to their needs rather than Public Safety, because SPD normally handles the situations better.
- Students also complained of several instances where Public Safety officers have interrupted off campus parties miles from campus, hand-cuffing, pushing around, and verbally abusing students, ultimately transporting them to County Jail, but not charging them with a crime.
- One officer of PSAC stated that the University needs more of a presence on campus (more officers), but that the new officers need to be more student-oriented. Public Safety does not treat students with respect which makes it hard to give respect to them. Officers should be aware that they are on a college campus and not working the streets of Stockton.

Athletic Department Administration, staff, coaches, and managers of athletic facilities had these concerns:

- Request of new doors and locking systems for Athletics, because access is too easy. They support the “one card system” university-wide
- Multiple thefts in the Athletics Department by non-Pacific employees force the conclusion that Public Safety needs to expand patrols to help with the influx of transients moving to Pacific’s campus.
- With our 24/7/365 operation, Athletics needs more of a presence around our area along with more lights and cameras
- There is a general feeling that calls are handled sporadically by Public Safety with issues regarding management of athletic facilities and fields.
- Risk-management issues for the fields. Often fields are being used at the wrong times (during rainy days) which can cause injury to student athletes.
- Request for sweeps of the levee for student safety.
- Event management needs improvement with more presence of officers to enforce parking and crowd control. Staffing is low, and no officer is usually present, even though Athletics pays for additional security.
- Need for additional officers for crowds over a specific size limit.
- Need for special parking permits for student athletes who have practice at the pool, main gym, Spanos Center, etc. They are getting tickets when practice begins at 5:00AM in the morning and ends at 8:00AM. This is not acceptable
- When an individual sport handles parking to raise money for their sport, no safety official is out there helping them; often they are holding large sums of cash.
- Athletics firmly believes that Public Safety should take the lead on event security, parking management, etc.
- Complaints of “heavy hands” by Public Safety on campus.
- Public safety should educate and not intimidate students.
- Athletic administrators suggest speed bumps for speeders in the intersection near Knowles Field.

I also spoke with several police officers and dispatchers, but this summary was primarily for what was recognized for Athletics and related organizations that shared the same common threads for their concerns and complaints with Public Safety. I must admit that not all of the interviews were of a negative nature. The overall outlook on Public Safety is that they provide a much needed service and are well received, but just like any

organization, an individual member or two can tarnish the image of the entire group. From interviews with student-athletes, Athletics administrators, and staff, as well as student officers of A.S.U.O.P., I believe there are some loose cannons in the Department that are sending the wrong message or signals about the Public Safety Department at large.

e. Staff and Faculty Issues

John Phillips, Professor of Sociology

As several faculty and staff personnel were interviewed by committee members during the work of the committee, there are few “faculty and staff issues” that have not been reflected throughout this report. Faculty park in the same areas, work in the same buildings, and occasionally work at late hours. Indeed some work during academic recesses in empty buildings on a relatively empty campus.

The committee met with the leadership of the Academic Council as part of the process of interviewing the several constituencies of Public Safety. That interview revealed no “surprises.” The faculty leadership is concerned about issues relating to the safety of students, staff, and faculty. They recognize their share of responsibility for safety. Aside from concerns about parking—auto break-ins, the chief concern is building security.

“Thefts of opportunity” were seen as endemic. This constant threat affects academic programs. The key problem is lack of building security. It is easy to get into buildings where academic programs take place. Lighting on the South Campus was also seen as something that requires attention. [John Phillips’ own nighttime walkthrough found the same problems.]

Faculty appreciate, and would like to see more, “Walk, Stop, and Talk” activity by campus police officers. One suspects we all feel more secure when we know some campus police officers, and we are more ready to use campus safety services when we know the providers.

f. Student Concerns

Meghan Hohenthauer, Assistant Director, Student Academic Support Services; and Tiffanee Hopf, Graduate Resident Director, Housing and Greek Life

Judicial Affairs Perspective - Meghan Hohenthauer:

Student Judicial Board Members have mentioned the following challenges with Public Safety. These are all centered on the police reports that are written and submitted to Judicial Affairs.

➤It is unclear in some reports what exactly the student(s) has done wrong.*

- Reports are often not thorough enough which turns a hearing into a “he said, she said” forum.
- Information in report needs to be more concrete when referencing evidence that would support charges.
- Some reports are overly detailed about irrelevant information.
- A lack of consistency from report to report and officer to officer.*
Not having statements from all involved, witnesses, etc.
- Phrases in reports such as “...smelled alcohol on his/her person or individual had red watery eyes...” as determinants for the level of intoxication are too vague and easily debatable by the student.

* There are efforts underway to develop a citation that can be filled out immediately with a copy signed by and given to the student(s). Mike Belcher has taken the lead on developing this with input from Housing and Judicial Affairs.

Student Perspective - Tiffanee Hopf:

The Department of Public Safety at University of the Pacific strives to make collaborative efforts with other departments. These efforts are made on campus to heighten awareness of potential dangers on and off campus, to inform the community of incidents that have occurred, and to serve as a resource for students in regards to safety issues. With that being said the following are observations from the student’s perspective on the areas of the Department of Public Safety that have been beneficial and areas of improvement:

S.T.R.I.P.E.S:

Students respond to the availability of STRIPES throughout the evenings when they do feel safe to walk on campus at night. However, encouraging students to use S.T.R.I.P.E.S. as a safety force and not an easy ride across campus would be beneficial. If this could be accomplished through programming or more information on the website on the best reasons to use strips could help utilize the maximum escort time provided by the STRIPES unit on a nightly basis.

Vehicle Patrol:

Vehicle patrol of campus by the officers is the best visible tool. Officers are seen patrolling but are not felt to be consistent. If Officers could be more visible throughout the areas on campus that are not designed for heavy traffic, then students would recognize the danger of that area and would feel that Public Safety has made an effort to keep that area surveillanced. (i.e.

parking lot behind fraternity and sorority circle and Monogan/Brookside, the dark walkways surrounding the library, students leaving late night classes, etc)

Programming:

The Department of Public Safety has created several programs that would be beneficial to all students on campus. These programs include Walk, Stop, and Talk, Adopt-a-Hall, Safety Walk, and Crime Warnings. However, these programs have not been implemented to their full potential.

Walk, Stop, and Talk: The networking between students, faculty, and staff with the Public Safety Officers would be beneficial in creating a more cohesive campus community where everyone feels comfortable talking with the Officers on a candid basis or during an emergency. However, to implement this program more officers would have to be present on campus to also patrol during this time.

Adopt-a-Hall: Students who work with the Housing & Greek Life Office have responded to the idea of this program. They have enjoyed the “Meet & Greet” sessions that have occurred during training at the beginning of each semester. However, they are left with the feeling that having an Officer available to them for more programming or safety informational sessions would be beneficial to their areas on campus. The Adopt-a-Hall program would give these students a centralized person to speak with about any issues within their area and would give them a sense of connectedness to the Department of Public Safety which would ultimately serve as a tool for collaborative efforts between departments.

Safety Walk: The Safety Walk brings awareness of issues that have occurred on campus and what items around campus need to be fixed to help prevent the incident from occurring the second time. However, the walk should spark interest in students to work with Public Safety on keeping the campus safe and secure. This should not be an event that turns everything back onto the Department of Public Safety to fix and work alone on.

Crime Warnings: More often than not students feel in the dark on serious issues surrounding campus safety and incidents that have occurred. Safety bulletins can be an effective tool to help students understand the severity of the incidents occurring on campus and can also serve to help the Department of Public Safety with identifying when perpetrators are present on campus or when gathering more information campus events. However, the effectiveness of Crime Warnings hinges upon the visibility of the warnings. It might be beneficial for the Department of Public Safety to work with the Housing & Greek Life Department in raising awareness through RA’s and GRD’s hand delivering Crime Warnings to each room and explaining the safety issues that have occurred. This way Public Safety is

aware that each room on campus has been issued the warning in writing and that students should be more cautious around campus.

Parking & Parking Passes:

Parking on campus is an everyday experience for most students. However, there are many unknown facts to the rules and regulations to parking areas on campus.

It may be beneficial for the Department of Public Safety to issue a letter or a rules guide to parking on campus with every parking pass that is issued. This guarantees that everyone with a pass has had the chance to read over the specific rules and regulations and should not have an excuse when a citation is issued to them.

V. Recommendations

As a Committee, we feel that Public Safety will continue to best serve Pacific as a division of Student Life. In the recommendations which follow, we have attempted to provide Vice President Griego and University Administration with realistic and achievable goals.

Highest Priorities:

1. Addition of Staff.

The committee recommends employment of two additional sworn officers in order to better protect campus. One officer on duty for a campus of this size is unacceptable and places the University community in jeopardy. Although several interviewees within Public Safety recommended additional dispatchers, we do not see this as a high priority at this time. Should kiosks be considered for entry into campus, we support the additional hiring of Community Service officers to staff these entry and exit kiosks.

2. Surveillance

Surveillance is inadequate at Pacific. Parking lots are especially vulnerable, as documented statistically. We recommend pilot surveillance cameras in the following areas: Lot 7; the swimming pool lot; and the lot behind Spanos Center with access on Mendocino Avenue. Should these be successful in warding off car burglaries and thefts, additional cameras should be added in other parking areas, such as Stagg Stadium Lot, where students currently are reluctant to leave cars overnight.

Public Safety is divided among dispatchers on the capability of watching cameras while on duty at the main console. We suggest experimenting with this in Public Safety, purchasing cameras that are motion-sensitive at night for the targeted pilot parking lots. If staffing among dispatchers is an issue, we recommend employment of more S.T.R.I.P.E.S. personnel or the addition of non-sworn personnel to help with surveillance. Should kiosks be constructed at the Pershing Avenue entrance on Larry Heller Drive and the main entrance on Pacific Avenue, we suggest utilizing kiosk staff at night to monitor the cameras in specific lots.

3. Lighting

Pacific is generally well lit, but there are gaps. The most serious is along the levee, along the footbridge, under Pacific Avenue, and under Pershing Avenue. Although jurisdiction under the two main bridges over the Calaveras rests with the City of Stockton, unless Pacific takes the initiative, the Committee fears this will continue to be neglected. Joggers, pedestrians and bicycle riders are in harm's way given the transient population trends and the dark corridors presently on- and off of University property along the levee.

Additional areas needing reassessment include the center of South Campus between the College of Education and the new Biology Building, as well as along all natural corridors running between student residential areas and classroom buildings, and the University Library.

4. Computers in Public Safety Vehicles

Currently Public Safety has a plan to add laptops to all University-owned police cars. We feel this is essential and should be expedited in order for officers to have as much information as possible on suspects, situations, and to better judge and communicate with other police units.

5. Expansion of S.T.R.I.P.E.S. (Student Escort and Area Security Program)

S.T.R.I.P.E.S. has been successful and needs to be expanded with addition of more vehicles (golf carts), one of which needs to carry at least six persons. Patrolling, as well as escorting, needs to be expanded as a regular part of S.T.R.I.P.E.S.' duties.

6. Bike Patrols

Many campuses rely heavily on bicycle patrols, which are cost effective, efficient, and highly visible. Presently bike patrols are almost non-existent at Pacific even though four bicycles are owned by the Department, two police-ready. Between 1 September, 2004 and 31 May, 2005, the Department spent only 50.33 hours on bicycles. We recommend an active program to expand bike patrols, recognizing this requires supplemental

uniform allowance and training for officers. Our collective belief is that students and staff will be more comfortable interacting with Pacific police officers on bicycles than those in vehicles, especially in the middle of campus. Bike patrols have the potential to create a better sense of “community policing,” one of Chief Belcher’s primary goals.

Other Priorities and Issues:

7. One-Card System

The University is already implementing this program of a one-card entry system on buildings. As this moves forward, we recommend transferring some of the lock up and openings to non-sworn personnel within Public Safety. A large percentage of time is presently spent performing this activity, which has benefits of police being “on the spot,” but it takes them away from active patrolling by vehicle much of the time.

8. Detoxification Facility on North Campus

The present system of arresting individuals suspected of intoxication and transporting them to County Jail for detoxification is inefficient and puts the campus at risk when officers are away from campus. We recommend two solutions: First, breathalyzers should be explored and used by officers who suspect individuals of intoxication. If legally intoxicated, the University should insist that the City of Stockton intervene, process, and transport those arrested to County Jail. This seems feasible given the new Stockton P.D. sub-station on North Campus.

For individuals suspected of being under the influence of alcohol, but not legally intoxicated, a new Detoxification Facility should be considered for North Campus. This would require medical supervision, but would improve public relations with students, their parents, and others presently being arrested but not charged at County Jail.

9. Policy Clarifications

The University needs to develop a policy on Public Safety jurisdiction off-campus. Clery Act boundaries are vague and need some definition. Many campuses, such as the University of Southern California, have precise agreements with their local municipal police force as to how far off-campus university police will answer calls (four blocks in the case of U.S.C. and L.A.P.D.). Pacific has clarity in its policy. Officers on watch currently answer any call where University students are involved.

For reasons of risk-management, public safety, and potential law suits for violation of civil rights, the University needs to determine where University

police should intervene on private property off-campus and where this should be the responsibility of the City of Stockton.

10. Use of Public Safety in Transportation of Students for Medical Issues

The present policy of police officers personally driving students to and from medical facilities or appointments needs evaluation. Chief Belcher recently summarized the unwritten policy as follows:

The current policy is that if a student is not well, an officer responds and evaluates. If it is a back or limb problem or breathing problem, Cowell Wellness will not look at them so we would call an ambulance to transport. If they have a stomach ache or something else that Cowell handles, we would consult with their staff and if acceptable, transport in our vehicle. (Belcher to Swagerty, e mail communication, December 19, 2006)

In the process of the review, we learned that out of sincere interest in students' well being, Chief Belcher has taken students to medical appointments beyond Cowell, transporting them personally to a hospital or doctor's office.

Beyond the risk-management issue of a potential liability against the University should the student be injured in an accident, the Committee is concerned with the time spent away from campus by officers-on-duty. A Community Service Officer or Student Victim Advocate with proper licensing and insurance might be an alternative to the present system.

11. Grievance Process

Presently, there is no internal grievance process for students or staff who feel their rights have been abused by Public Safety short of direct complaints to the Chief or routing through Stockton Police Department's Internal Affairs. Student Life needs to consider a system that functions parallel with Judicial Affairs in giving individuals an alternative to filing a formal complaint with the City of Stockton when they feel an officer has treated them unfairly. We have no solution here, but it is a policy area deserving more study.

12. Public Relations Function of the Public Safety Department

Throughout the process of this review, the Committee has been impressed with the level of dedication of Chief Belcher to serving the University community as educator and mentor, as well as primary safety officer. His devotion is an unusual commitment and vision. Nevertheless, there are problems in perception among students and some staff as to the purposes and goals of Public Safety.

The University needs to enhance opportunities for officers to meet students on a casual basis such as in dining halls. We also recommend appointment by the Chief of specific staff within his Department as liaison-officers with specific groups or spatial areas on campus. The Department would like to give more seminars and have a larger voice in education on campus. We agree and suggest formal involvement in introducing safety issues during Freshman Orientation, with a follow-up reorientation during students' third year, or as they approach legal drinking age.

As a matter of courtesy and to provide incentive for officers to interact more frequently and meaningfully with students and staff, we suggest granting privileges of access to use of the Baun Fitness Center (without charge) and a schedule of University-supported meals in student dining areas.

VI. Acknowledgments

Throughout the Public Safety Review, Chief Michael Belcher of Public Safety made himself available, provided insight, documentation, and perspective on the important subjects of campus safety and security. On behalf of the Committee, we thank the Chief for his cooperation and salute his devotion to his job at Pacific and his personal concern for the welfare of his staff and Pacific's students, employees and visitors. Clearly he is a model of "community policing." We also thank the staff of Student Life, especially Bernie Kramer, who scheduled interviews, reserved conference rooms, and made the entire process run smoothly.

(W. R. Swagerty, Co-Chair)

(John Phillips, Co-Chair)

VII. Attachments

- A) Memorandum, Edward Michael Belcher to Elizabeth Griego, 21 December, 2006 regarding "Public Safety Response to Safety Issue Near the Campus"
- B) "2005 Incidents Per Thousand of People: City of Stockton compared with University of the Pacific"
- C) Clery Act Statistics as reported by select California universities, 2002-2005, as provided by Public Safety in *Self Study*.
- D) Ratio of Police Officers per 1,000 of Population, University of California Campuses

