# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STATEMENT OF NEED</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGANIZATION OF THIS REPORT</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISCLAIMER AND DISCLOSURE</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECTION I – METHODOLOGY</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECTION II – GENERAL OBSERVATIONS AND ESSENTIAL CHALLENGES</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential Challenges</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECTION III – SPECIFIC OBSERVATIONS</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Orientation (Internal)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Strategy</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Prevention, Community Policing &amp; Community Engagement</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECTION IV – LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECTION V – REFERENCES</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment 1 – Firm Description and Qualifications</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment 2 – Origins and evolution of campus policing</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment 3 – Campus Police versus Other Police</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STATEMENT OF NEED

The State University of New York Buffalo State (Buffalo State, the college) can trace its roots to 1871, when the Buffalo Normal School admitted its first class, which consisted of 86 students (75 women, 11 men). The school’s sole purpose was to train teachers to serve the City of Buffalo’s fast-growing public school student population. By 1901, the student population had grown to 878. By 1928, the Buffalo Normal School had become the State Teachers College at Buffalo, and was accredited by the American Association of Teachers Colleges. The campus, which was intended to serve the institution until 1964, became overcrowded and plans were made for a new campus to be located on Elmwood Avenue, just north of the Buffalo State Hospital.

In 2013, Buffalo State conferred degrees on more than 2,000 undergraduate and 600 graduate students during its 141st commencement ceremony. Buffalo State is currently the largest comprehensive four-year college in the State University of New York system and offers more than 160 undergraduate academic programs and 60 graduate programs (36 master’s programs, two certificate of advanced study programs, four graduate certificate programs, and 18 post baccalaureate teacher certification programs). The college is known for its strong community connections and a continuing commitment to providing high-quality lifelong learning opportunities.

Under the leadership of Interim President Howard Cohen, and with direction from Vice President for Finance and Management Michael F. LeVine, the State University of New York Buffalo State College (Buffalo State) decided to conduct a Public Safety Management Study™ (PSMS™) to evaluate the University Police Department’s community policing approach, and determine whether the University Police Department (UPD) has adopted an appropriate campus public safety model based on the operational procedures and overall safety and security policies of the UPD.
ORGANIZATION OF THIS REPORT

This report is presented in a chapter format with six major sections. Section I describes the Methodology for the assessment and Section II outlines the General Observations and Essential Challenges, which are the major themes that evolved during the course of the review. Section III includes Specific Observations with the information presented by way of Contemporary Standards, Findings and Recommendations. The recommendations in this section address the areas in which we believe the campus should make improvements to meet current best, promising or acceptable practices. Section IV includes a Master List of Recommendations and Section V includes Reference Materials regarding the campus public safety landscape, the origin of campus policing, and information about Margolis Healy.
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DISCLAIMER AND DISCLOSURE

Margolis Healy & Associates conducted this assessment and prepared this report at the request of the State University of New York Buffalo State. The authors’ opinions, findings, conclusions, and recommendations are provided solely for the use and benefit of the State University of New York Buffalo State. Any warranties (expressed and/or implied) are specifically disclaimed. Any statements, allegations, and recommendations in this report should not be construed as a governing policy or decision, unless so designated by other documentation. The report is based on the most accurate data gathered and available to Margolis Healy at the time of the assessment and presentation. Our observations and recommendations are subject to change in light of new or different information.
In accordance with Buffalo State’s wishes, Margolis Healy conducted a Public Safety Management Study™ (PSMS™) by performing the necessary background research, document review, interviews, verification and analysis to become familiar with the organization’s orientation, operations and related safety and security functions. We assessed whether the Buffalo State College University Police Department (UPD) has adopted an appropriate campus public safety model based, in part, on the environment, culture and campus expectations. Our assessment provides a reasonable foundation from which to evaluate and make key decisions ranging from budgeting to resource allocation to reporting structure and human resources, and supports the operationalization, identification and further development of appropriate contemporary standards and goals for the UPD community policing model.

Margolis Healy assessed the University’s practices and programs against acceptable, promising and reasonable practices in campus safety and security. Margolis Healy conducted substantive research, document review, site visits, interviews, verification and analysis to become familiar with the various systems, procedures and protocols of the Department in accordance with the Margolis Healy methodology described herein.

The team, consisting of Paul V. Verrecchia, Team Leader & Margolis Healy Director of Organizational Assessment Services; Robert L. Evans, Margolis Healy Manager of Organizational Assessment and K12 Services; and Margolis Healy Senior Associate Aaron L. Graves visited the campus from Monday, April 14 through Friday, April 18, 2014. During our visit, we reviewed the areas under consideration and conducted interviews in a mix of one-on-one and forum sessions, and met with members of the University’s leadership team.

Our approach to this assessment included an in-depth examination of the following core areas:

• Written Directives - Margolis Healy turns to the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA) for internationally accepted practices in law enforcement operations and public safety management.

• Agency Orientation (internal) - We assessed and evaluated the strength and effectiveness of the connection between the Public Safety Department and student services, individual campus administrators, other campus departments and student government and groups.

• Communications & Dispatch Operations - We assessed the current staffing, technology, policies and procedures of the Department’s security dispatch operations.
• Use of Technology - We assessed and reviewed the Department’s current deployment of technology, including computer-aided dispatch and records management systems, mobile video records, mobile data terminals, etc.

• Operational Strategy - We assessed and reviewed the organization’s strategy against institutional needs and acceptable public safety practices and in light of staffing, call volume, policing philosophy, campus needs (including special events) and crime data.

• Crime Prevention, Community Policing, and Community Engagement - We assessed the Department’s crime prevention programming and strategies and community policing activities in light of contemporary practices. This focus area also examines the nature and perception of the public safety agency’s relationships with traditionally underrepresented groups such as the African-American, Latino, and GLBTQ communities.

• External Orientation - We assessed and evaluated the strength and effectiveness of the connection between the public safety organization and local, state and federal law enforcement; prosecutor’s office; and advocacy organizations, as applicable; and,

Margolis Healy reviewed a compendium of documents including but not limited to the following:

• Written directives, operating procedures, manuals and related information from the public safety organization;

• The institution’s and Department’s organizational chart, including a staffing matrix (a list of authorized positions, who occupies them, vacancies); resumes of all command staff members; and attrition/retention data;

• General policies, protocols and procedures related to campus safety and security;

• Public safety job descriptions and staffing documents;

• The current and last year’s budget;

• Copies of applicable security contracts;

• The University’s last three Annual Security Reports (ASRs) and crime data for the campus and surrounding community;

• Memorandums of Understanding with surrounding police, public safety agencies and institutions of higher education;

• General policies, protocols and procedures related to operations, including organizational structure, hiring, training and staffing included in the assessment;

• Policies, procedures and documentation relating to existing crime prevention and community policing strategy and activities;
• The Campus Master Plan; and,
• Prior studies and related reports.

The information contained herein serves two general audiences and purposes. First, the research and findings are organized to provide University leaders with a concise set of actionable items. Second, the leadership can use the detailed information found in the observations to understand specific areas of structure, policy and practice they should address.
SECTION II – GENERAL OBSERVATIONS AND ESSENTIAL CHALLENGES

The State University of New York Buffalo State College enjoys a reputation and position in its community that is valued by the students, faculty, staff and administrators whom we interviewed. The college’s desire to maintain an open, welcoming campus is of central importance, and there is a recognition of the unique challenges posed by maintaining an open campus in an urban environment with reasonable security measures.

We found overall that members of the University Police Department are engaged in the important work of creating a safe and secure campus environment and care deeply about the Buffalo State campus community. We found these energetic officers to be dedicated and proud of their successes in keeping the campus safe. Members of the Department are proud of having achieved accreditation through the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services Accreditation Program. To be sure, accreditation is a laudable accomplishment achieved by a minority of campus police departments. We found a significant portion of members of the campus community expressed support for the University police while also expressing their belief that the Department should interact more with the community.

Below, we have identified what we believe are the Department’s most critical issues.

Essential Challenges

1. **Perceptions of Racial Profiling** – There is a perception among a number of campus community members whom we interviewed that the UPD engages in bias-based policing. Additionally, many faculty, staff and students of color reported they were either stopped personally by UPD officers for minor reasons (i.e., a burned tail light bulb) or they have a family member who was stopped by UPD officers. These faculty, staff and students said the experience left them with the perception that they or their family members were profiled. However, based on our interviews it does not appear that anyone has filed complaints with the UPD. Adding to this perception of bias-based policing is the UPD assertion that over 70 percent of traffic stops result in warnings. When we addressed these perceptions with UPD officers, a vast majority defended the validity of the stops, without acknowledging or expressing sensitivity to, or understanding of, the community’s concerns. Given that the State of New York does not require the collection of traffic stop or field interview data, there is no empirical data to support or refute the perceptions of biased policing. However, UPD arrest data for the period of 2011 to 2013 shows most arrestees are Caucasian. We note that UPD officers do not receive in-service cultural sensitivity education.
2. **Lack of Community Engagement and Community Oriented Policing (COP)** – Some students, faculty and staff reported a lack of trust in the University Police. Some students expressed feeling threatened by the officers and some staff said there is little communication from the UPD. Some staff and faculty said that officers appear overzealous in arresting students. On the one hand, several campus community members believe that students who commit minor offenses (i.e. underage possession of alcohol, possession of small amounts of marijuana, etc.) should be referred to the University’s student judicial process rather than arrested and charged for these minor offenses. On the other hand, officers expressed a lack of confidence in the University’s student conduct system and said they prefer to use their own discretion when making arrests.

Past cuts to funding and personnel have resulted in cutbacks to the UPD’s community policing program. The department currently shows little evidence of effective partnerships with students, academic departments, or stakeholders in general to identify what is important to the campus community regarding safety and security on campus. Community policing is a holistic approach to how a police department conducts its policing activities. Most importantly, a critical component of community policing is community engagement and community trust and, based on our interviews and forums, we found the UPD appears to be somewhat disconnected from the community. However, with the majority of the campus community (faculty, staff and students) being commuters, we also recognize that engaging a commuter community is a considerable challenge for the University Police Department.

3. **Lack of Supervision** – The UPD currently has three shift supervisors (lieutenants) who are responsible for supervising the three 24/7 patrol shifts. It is impossible for the three lieutenants to supervise the shifts seven days per week. There is no supervisor on a shift when the lieutenant is not on duty. This results in patrol officers being without supervision 40 percent of the time. The UPD is comprised of a significant percentage of junior officers who tend to require closer supervision.

4. **Demographic Composition of the Department** – The UPD’s demographic composition of sworn officers does not reflect the Buffalo State community. The UPD has four females, one of whom is African-American, and one African-American male. No other ethnic minority groups are represented in the 35 members of the Department. We realize it can be challenging to attain a department that reflects the community. However, we learned the UPD has made an effort through job fairs and local community organizations to encourage minorities and women to take the state civil service examination.

5. **Training** – Although it appears that UPD officers are well trained and participate in numerous training programs, we found little evidence that they are participating in training related to campus and community
policing issues. Additionally, the field training program for new officers
does not include an orientation to University functions such as student
affairs, residential life, judicial, etc.

In spite of these challenges, it is evident that the men and women of
the Buffalo State College Police Department are committed to effectively
delivering the best service possible in a thoughtful, humane, sensitive, and
efficient fashion. Based on our observations to date, we are confident that
the University is prepared to consider the recommendations in our report.
SECTION III – SPECIFIC OBSERVATIONS

Agency Orientation (Internal)

Contemporary Standards

Internal orientation is an important component of every campus law enforcement agency. The department’s relationship and coordination of services with various departments inside the institution, such as the dean of Student Services, and the directors of Administrative Services, is the backbone of daily campus life and operations.

Therefore, it is essential that well-defined policies, procedures, protocols and means of communication between these groups be established, nurtured and followed. These guiding principles, policies and procedures help define delivery of services, the role each partner will assume within a given process, and what the hierarchy of control and reporting will be. This clear definition and function is critical during a crisis.

While a campus public safety agency should work diligently to build and maintain relationships with a wide range of offices and departments at the institution, there are several partnerships that dictate a more concerted effort. These include relationships with student affairs, including residence life, student activities, etc.; health and counseling services; facilities management; risk management; conference services; athletics; communications; human resources; and general counsel. Much of a public safety agency’s day-to-day routine responsibilities rely on collaboration, coordination, and consistent communication with these departments. There are many ways to reach this goal, including regular meetings, assigning liaison officers to the various departments, forming a campus public safety advisory committee comprised of key constituents, and finally, developing and meeting relationship expectations.

Observations

Faculty, staff and students revealed two different perceptions of the University Police Department. Some of these internal stakeholders spoke highly of the relationship that exists between their individual departments and the UPD. However, a larger number spoke of the UPD’s lack of involvement with the community. These same people highlighted an “us against them” relationship between the police and the campus community. Many expressed the opinion that UPD officers spend too much time sitting in their police cruisers and/or making motor vehicle stops, and not enough time on foot patrol, conducting safety/educational programs, or being otherwise engaged with the campus community.

As previously noted, a number of faculty and staff interviewed described their personal interactions or those of family members with the University police as being “less than professional.” Some described the behaviors as
harassing and others expressed concerns that UPD officers may be profiling people of color. None of these community members reported filing any complaint (formal or informal) to the university police, the college’s Office of Equity and Campus Diversity or any other college office. Nevertheless, these perceived enforcement actions by the police have resulted in a sense of community mistrust of the UPD by a segment of the campus community.

Scott Johnson, the (then) Interim Senior Advisor to the President for Equity and Campus Diversity, conducted an investigation in response to a question posed by the College Senate concerning whether the Buffalo State University Police “engaged in a pattern of racial discrimination in recent years. We were provided Dr. Johnson’s May 7, 2012 report. The report, based solely on arrest data, concluded, “There is not sufficient evidence of a pattern of racial discrimination by University police officers.” The report also stated, “despite many concerns shared publicly about the behavior of University Police, data show that no member of the campus community lodged a complaint against a UPD officer.” The report also noted that the Office of Equity and Campus Diversity has also not received any complaints of racial discrimination involving the UPD. Dr. Johnson’s report was never released to the College Senate and/or the campus community. We were not able to determine why the report was not made public. As we previously noted, arrest data for the period of 2011 to 2013 does not indicate evidence of bias policing. However, arrest data alone is not always the best indicator of the presence or absence of bias-based policing practices.

The University Police Department no longer conducts annual cultural diversity awareness training for its staff. The reason cited to us is that the Campus Policing Advisory Committee challenged the effectiveness of the cultural diversity training and the result was to cease offering it. We respectfully disagree with any conclusion that cultural awareness education programs are ineffective.

The key to developing successful programs is to have a better understanding of the police. Research conducted by Stephen Hennessey, James Hendricks and Cindy Hendricks observed that programs that are designed for the general public or for private industry do not work well for the police. “One important area of the importance of effective training is content and design methodology based on the favored cognitive learning styles of police as well as class structure, appropriate selection of instructors, and to ensure the most effective programs possible in this ever challenging facet of community policing.”

The very success of many facets of community oriented policing programs depends on understanding that police face a unique challenge in developing cultural awareness compared to other professions because of the power the police hold. While it is critical that police officers understand both the changing community and the racial and ethnic challenges that follow, police leaders must also recognize that, like most people, many new officers’

\[^{1}\text{Hennessey, Hendricks and Hendricks, Cultural Awareness Training for Police in the United States,}\]

\[^{2}\text{Ibid.}\]
perceptions of police work are often influenced by the depiction of the police on television and in motion pictures. The depiction of strong enforcement tends to glorify action-oriented policing and an “us against them” mentality.  

When presented with the campus community’s perceptions of racial profiling, almost all the UPD officers we spoke to were not receptive to the allegations. The officers pointed to the legitimacy of traffic stops. They stated that an enforcement-heavy approach is a necessity because a portion of the college borders a high-crime area. They also cited Dr. Johnson’s conclusions as a defense against these perceptions despite the fact that the report was never released. The officers’ lack of understanding of community perceptions is not surprising. However, the reaction did provide even further evidence of the need for awareness education/training.

A vast majority of today’s police officers are members of the millennial generation. These millenial officers were hired well after the civil rights movement in the 1960s and may be less likely to carry overtly racist views. According to Bernard Melekian, former director of the U.S. Department of Justice Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, “The millennial officer does not have the same personal, contextual background that the older generation may have in understanding law enforcement’s historical role in enforcing and reinforcing laws resulting in racial inequity.” Thus, proper training and messaging is critical to these younger officers “who may be lacking both historical context and interpersonal racism and may not connect past wrongs and present-day unintentional bias.” Also critical to note is that enforcement-heavy, arrest-driven policing will continue to reinforce the community’s belief in the illegitimacy of the police, regardless of whether the young officer making those arrests considers himself or herself a racist.

Many UPD officers perceive that the residential judicial process is not taking student violations in the residence halls seriously. Officers spoke of responding to the same residence hall rooms several times for the same issue(s) and cited cases in which there was allegedly no campus judicial action against students with multiple drug infractions. A majority of the UPD officers perceive the entire student judicial process as too lenient in addressing violations of school policy. This perceived leniency has led to a high degree of frustration among some police officers. These officers feel their efforts to protect the campus and attempts to solve problems is being undermined by a lack of significant consequences for students who violate the Code of Conduct.

Judicial Affairs staff members disagree with the officers’ perceptions. They state that the primary goal of the University’s judicial system is to educate students and change behavior, not merely to punish the behavior. We believe the divide between Judicial Affairs and the UPD demonstrates a serious lack of communication. There needs to be a thoughtful and frank dialogue between the UPD and Judicial Affairs to clarify differences and seek a common understanding of the different orientations.

3Hennessey, (1998), Thinking Cop – Feeling Cop; A Study in Police Personalities.
In 1984, the State University of New York (SUNY) System’s chancellor and board of trustees mandated that all SUNY campus presidents establish advisory groups to review campus safety issues. As a result, the Buffalo State College Campus Safety Forum was created to review public safety issues on campus. According to the Dean of Students website, the Campus Safety Forum is “committed to strengthening relationships between the campus and the Buffalo community; regularly assessing student, faculty, and staff perceptions of safety issues on campus; supporting programming that promotes personal safety awareness; and increasing knowledge of relevant events and issues on campus.”

The Campus Safety Forum is also charged with reviewing sexual assault policies and reviewing campus response procedures to reported sexual violence. While other campus stakeholders participate, we learned the college’s chief of police no longer attends Forum meetings, electing to send a lieutenant in his place. We view the Campus Safety Forum as an opportunity for dialogue and interaction where decision makers can provide unique insights and foster improved relationships. There are some who question the effectiveness of the Forum. Nonetheless, like any other University group charged with discussing campus safety, the Forum would benefit from the expertise of the University’s chief law enforcement officer.

**Recommendations**

1. Create a University Police Advisory Committee to students, faculty and staff comprised of a cross section of the campus, charged with the responsibility of advising the University Police Department on campus climate issues; improving the existing lines of communication with those having a vested interest in campus safety and security; and helping to develop future security priorities. We recommend the committee meet up to three times per semester, but no less than twice per semester.

2. Conduct regular cultural diversity education for UPD personnel. Consider establishing a partnership with the Office of Equity and Campus Diversity and appropriate student and academic departments to conduct these education sessions. Consider resources such as the U.S. Department of Justice’s Community Relations Service to assist with these sessions.

3. Conduct a survey of faculty, staff and student perceptions, attitudes and opinions on campus safety and security. The survey should evaluate overall Department performance; community concerns over campus safety and security; and community recommendations and suggestions for improvement. This survey could be conducted annually, but should be conducted at least every three years.
4. Conduct a thoughtful and frank facilitated dialogue between the UPD and judicial affairs to clarify the differences in orientations and seek common understandings. Require regular meetings between the UPD and judicial affairs to share information.

5. The chief should reconsider his decision not to attend the Campus Safety Forum meetings.

**Operational Strategy**

*Contemporary Standards*

Campus public safety agencies must be flexible in adopting strategies that simultaneously create and maintain a reasonably safe campus environment, meet the expectations of the campus community and are in sync with the institution’s senior leadership in order to meet the various safety and security needs of their campuses. They must be capable of preparing for and responding to a wide range of known, probable, and reasonably foreseeable security risks. Fortunately, most college and university campuses are reasonably safe places and there is a limited range of routine security and crime problems that campus public safety agencies must address. The strategy that a campus public safety agency adopts should meet a full range of duties and responsibilities germane to creating and maintaining a safe campus environment. A comprehensive strategy should include the following community policing objectives: (1) High visibility patrols, especially in crime prone areas or those where there is a high-density population; (2) Problem solving and prevention; (3) Community engagement; (4) Partnerships; (5) Organizational development and change; and (6) Analysis, measurement, and evaluation.5

Regardless of the strategy an agency adopts, there must be an acknowledgment and recognition at the core that the central outputs of campus public safety include patrolling the campus, responding to calls for service, investigating crimes and other incidents, arresting suspected offenders, regulating traffic, responding to citizen requests for assistance, handling crowds and demonstrations, providing security services, and performing a variety of emergency medical and community caretaking functions.6 Obviously, public safety officers need the appropriate training and tools to carry out these diverse responsibilities.

Patrol will forever remain the central function of police officers, whether they are in a city or county, on a campus, or in some other special environment such as a railroad, airport, seaport, etc. As such, the duties and responsibilities related to patrol should be clearly articulated and ingrained in an agency’s DNA.

The word “patrol” is used here in its broadest sense. It embraces much more than the act of patrolling. It is a generalized function in which officers may be engaged in a variety of activities, ranging from traditional response to requests

---

5Department of Justice Community Policy Committee, *Award Winning Community Policing Strategies: A Report for the International Association of Chiefs of Police, Community Policing Committee, USDOJ, COPS OFFICE, 9.*

for service to alternate strategies for the delivery of public safety services. Patrol can occur in vehicles, on foot, or on alternative forms of transportation such as bicycles or personal mobility devices, such as the T3 Electric Standup Vehicle or Segway. In the campus setting, patrol often includes building security checks and other non-police related duties.

In a campus environment, the patrol function must be highly flexible to meet community expectations. Colleges and universities often expand the boundaries of their police/public safety jurisdiction through relationships/agreements with local and state governments. This expansion is usually brought about to provide resources to the local communities to deal with student behavior or housing safety issues. Patrol functions within expanded jurisdictions are generally coordinated with and supported by local law enforcement agencies.

Over the past several years, police and campus public safety departments have increasingly adopted additional strategies such as hot spot policing, disorder policing, information-led policing, and predictive policing to address crime and the general fear of crime, especially in urban areas. Many of these newer strategies derive from the COMPSTAT model developed in New York and other major cities during the 1990s. Many of these are based on the systematic collection and analysis of crime, call for service data, and workload data to drive the allocation of resources.

**Observations**

The Buffalo State College University Police Department is a sworn law enforcement agency that provides 24-hour law enforcement services to the Buffalo State community. The UPD is comprised of a chief, a deputy chief, three shift lieutenants, one training lieutenant, two investigators, 25 officers, two dispatchers and a variety of support staff. As previously noted, the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services Accreditation Program recently awarded accredited status to the department.

The UPD has three patrol shifts, each supervised by a lieutenant. There are two established patrol zones to which officers are assigned for coverage of the campus. With only three lieutenants assigned to supervise the three shifts, patrol officers are without adequate supervision 40 percent of their working time during each pay period. We learned that the New York Civil Service System prohibits assigning supervisory responsibilities to any shift personnel when the lieutenant is not working. The lack of supervision potentially exposes the College to the risk of civil liability and results in inconsistent supervision. As we previously observed, the lack of supervision also compromises the consistency of policing efforts.

Citing the City of Buffalo’s crime rate and particularly the criminal activity of the Grant Street area, many of the UPD officers expressed a need to concentrate patrol strategies in the area of the campus that borders Grant Street. However, none of the officers could point to any specific crime statistics
to support this patrol strategy. Buffalo State is located in Buffalo Police District D. Chief Anthony Barba is the officer in charge of District D police operations. He described the Grant Street neighborhood as a very diverse community that has seen some recent revitalization efforts. Chief Barba further described the neighborhood as the major drug area in District D and “statistically” the most violent area in the district. However, the majority of crimes occurring in the Grant Street area are petty thefts and burglaries.

UPD investigators attend what Chief Barba described as “intelligence meetings.” The University of Buffalo and other law enforcement agencies also attend these meetings. Crime, crime trends and offender information is shared with all agencies during the intelligence meetings.

The UPD conducts a combination of motor vehicle, foot and bike patrols to support its day-to-day policing operations. While the campus is broken down into two separate patrol zones, we could not determine what criteria is used to determine the patrols zones other than historic reasons. The UPD, along with other area law enforcement agencies, utilizes the Erie County Crime Analysis Center and the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services for crime mapping, crime analysis and/or predictive modeling to identify patrol priorities or campus areas in need of directed patrol operations. However, based on our interviews with students, faculty and staff, we could not determine if internal and external partners have input into how UPD determines its patrol operations strategy.

Many campus stakeholders spoke of a strong desire to have the UPD be more visible during both the day and night. Many of those interviewed spoke of seeing UPD officers engaging in traffic or parking enforcement rather than having a significant foot patrol presence on campus. These same campus partners said they would feel safer if the UPD officers conducted more foot patrols, especially in heavy pedestrian traffic areas when evening classes are ending. The UPD officers expressed the same desire to be visible when classes are ending. However, the officers also told us they are required to lock campus buildings during this same time period, making visibility a challenge for them.

The first step in achieving a highly visible officer presence is developing a patrol zone scheme that divides the campus into manageable zones or “beats” configured either geographically or by area type. It is possible for the zone configuration to be a combination of the two. Whatever scheme is adopted, it should be developed with input from line-level officers and supervisors and then be consistently staffed to ensure uniformity. This does not negate flexibility in the patrol zone deployment; to the contrary, a zone configuration gives the Department a high degree of flexibility and surge capacity to address ever-changing situations.

The second step in shifting toward a comprehensive patrol operations strategy is to adopt proactive practices based on problem solving and prevention initiatives. There are volumes written about adopting community
policing and problem solving models, so we do not intend to repeat that literature here. The most important dimension of this approach is to ensure that officers acknowledge their performance in this role, including building this responsibility into the performance management system. For example, if an officer is assigned to a specific patrol area and there are problems identified in that area, the officer would assume responsibility for addressing the problem until it is solved. This method of operating may represent a fundamental shift in the way officers are accustomed to performing and may take time to evolve. It may impact training and evaluations.

The next step, and one of the most important, is to ensure that the Department is guided by ongoing data analysis, community feedback, and rigorous measurements of the outcomes arising from changes in the operational strategy. The Department must develop the capacity to measure crime, the fear of crime and general disorder, along with less-used measurements such as contacts with campus community members, programming activities, problem-solving projects initiated and completed, and campus community satisfaction with UPD services.

Recommendations

6. Work with internal and external partners to develop a strategic patrol operations plan that is aligned with the goals and objectives defined for the UPD by the senior leadership of the college.

7. Consider alternative options to UPD officers being required to lock college buildings.

8. Develop benchmarks for success to determine the effectiveness of existing patrol operations.

9. Conduct crime prevention, community policing and problem solving training for all department personnel.

10. Assign UPD patrol officers “ownership” of various areas of the campus where they would become the liaisons (community police officers) between the UPD and that area (e.g., Residential Life, Student Affairs, Judicial Affairs, Student Government, multi-purpose athletic complex, etc.).

11. Continue the partnership with the Erie County Crime Analysis Center and the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services for crime analysis.

12. Consider creating additional supervisory positions within the UPD or in the alternative formalize a chain of command structure that identifies supervisory responsibilities in the absence of shift commanders.
Crime Prevention, Community Policing & Community Engagement

Contemporary Standards

The Department’s community involvement initiatives and crime prevention activities should be developed based on data that reflect community needs and input. Programs should be evaluated to determine how effectively they meet goals aimed at preventing crime and reducing the fear of crime. Proactive community involvement in a campus environment is a key element in a successful crime prevention program. Working with various community groups to establish formal relationships enables the agency to learn of issues and respond before the issues become bigger problems.

Crime prevention opportunities could include speaking to various campus groups on crime prevention topics, distributing literature, staffing information booths, developing materials for the media, and maintaining a relationship with local law enforcement and neighborhood groups.

It is essential for campus public safety agencies to form meaningful relationships with the campus community so they are not viewed as an occupying force that is merely in the community to enforce rules and laws. There are plenty of examples of promising practices for successful police-community interactions and even more for partnerships with traditionally under-represented groups. Research shows this generation of students is more willing to be engaged than previous generations so the key is to enhance the department’s readiness to engage with students and then increase the actual engagement in order to support a vibrant and intellectual educational environment.

Observations

Both the University Police Department’s webpage and its annual report state that it conducts a variety of community policing and crime prevention activities, including: rape aggression defense, fire safety, bias crime, alcohol awareness, drug abuse awareness, Internet safety, responding to school violence and what to do when stopped by the police. The annual report for July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2013 notes an 18 percent increase in community policing efforts; a 25 percent increase in educational programs provided to the campus; and a 60 percent increase of bike patrol miles compared to the previous year. These accomplishments are commendable; however, based on the information gleaned from our interviews and forums with members of the campus community, they appear insufficient to overcome the perception of a lack of positive engagement by the UPD and an “us against them” mentality perceived by some in the Buffalo State community.

In 2001, Buffalo State’s Ad Hoc Committee on Community Policing identified four areas needing improvement: 1) a greater need to educate the campus community on community policing programs offered by the UPD; 2) improving police conduct; 3) broader diversity training; and 4) improving the
recruitment and retention within the department. The need to educate the campus community continues and will be addressed further in this section of the report. Recruitment and retention also remains an area of concern.

Our review failed to identify UPD’s Community Oriented Policing and Problem Solving (COPPS) strategy. Community policing is a department-wide philosophy that promotes and supports strategies to reduce the fear of crime and social disorder through problem-solving tactics, and community-police partnerships. Several members of the UPD told us they make conscious efforts to be visible and engage the campus community. However, these attempts are challenging because of minimum staffing levels, as well as the need to respond to calls for service and decreases in staffing from levels over the past several years. In the past, the UPD was able to dedicate grant-funded police officers’ positions to specific community policing initiatives. With the grant funding no longer available, the Department has lost these positions. The result is that the current community oriented policing program has been reduced to officers walking through residence halls and academic and administrative buildings. When an officer conducts COPPS activities s/he is required to request the police dispatcher create a “community policing card,” which merely amounts to a computer-aided dispatch (CAD) system entry. When the walk-through or other activity is completed, the officer informs the dispatcher how many people s/he had contact with and the information is entered into the CAD. There is no other documentation required and no follow-up with the officer(s). Several officers interviewed were unable to articulate the department’s community policing strategy. Further, some officers told us that, other than any instruction that may have been offered in the basic police training course, they had not received any formal COPPs training since being employed by Buffalo State College.

Stakeholders observed that police-community relations were better several years ago. Students, staff and faculty said they would like to see more of officers both on campus and inside campus buildings. Of all the interviews/forums conducted, only a few stakeholders indicated they had interactions with UPD in a manner that appeared to be community oriented and geared to solve their particular problem. The majority expressed concerns that the Department’s focus appears to have drifted away from community engagement and towards traffic enforcement.

There is little evidence of effective partnerships with stakeholders to identify campus safety and security priorities. Community policing is a fundamental shift from traditional, reactive policing to focusing on the prevention of crime through proactive means and building relationships. It is an integral part of improving the quality of life in our communities. Core components of community policing include partnering with the community; problem solving; and transforming policing agencies to support and empower front-line officers, decentralize command and encourage innovative problem solving. Most importantly, community policing is not just a UPD responsibility.
It is a community responsibility, with the police working as members of the community. As Chief Carey stated to us, “Community policing without community involvement is just policing.” We strongly agree with the Chief’s observation. The campus community must recognize their responsibility in the partnership.

The role and expectations of the UPD and the Buffalo State community are unclear. The 2012-2013 Annual Report states as a goal, “The University Police Department will develop and plan measures to increase safety at Buffalo State in accordance with the Buffalo State Strategic plan for 2009-2013.” (This goal is ongoing for 2013-2014.) Although the Department reported decreases in crimes against persons and property, there is no evidence of directly engaging the community in the development and implementation of a crime prevention strategy. We also found no evidence that the community is aware of what problems the UPD identified and no evidence that the community is aware that the UPD attempted to or actually resolved these problems.

The COPPS training UPD officers receive has been limited to what was provided during the basic police academy training course. We found no evidence of continued community oriented policing in-service training requirements. The Field Training Program (FTO) does not address the agency’s policing philosophy. It provides little opportunity for the newly assigned officers to become acquainted with the campus offices with which partnerships are invaluable to assist in accomplishing their duties as university police officers. The officers’ perception of the student conduct disciplinary process is the result of a lack of understanding and communication of expectations. Partnering with the Division of Student Affairs to design and conduct joint training opportunities would not only serve to educate both entities, but build and foster a stronger working relationship.

Crime prevention and awareness programs are intended to inform the public how to play a greater role in their personal safety. UPD tracks crime prevention and awareness programs by the number of attendees and the number of courses offered. Approximately 35 programs were provided last year, representing the 25 percent increase referenced above. However, we found no evidence that the Department conducts any outcomes-based evaluations of its crime prevention programs.

Officers at every level should be prepared to conduct crime prevention awareness presentations to the campus community. With the exception of new student orientation for undergraduates and some graduate students, crime prevention programs are seldom offered on a scheduled basis. Programs are scheduled on an as-needed basis. We fully understand the challenges of reaching a student population comprised of a large percentage of commuter students. Nevertheless, developing relationships with all segments of the campus community is vital in building positive relationships with UPD and reducing criminal activity. As an example, UPD has not developed a strategy to reach out to the nearly 100 registered student organizations on campus.
and offer its services. We view this situation as a lost opportunity for positive engagement with students while enhancing safety and security awareness.

Recommendations

13. Conduct an evidence-based review of all UPD crime prevention programs to determine the effectiveness of each. Consider replacing those programs lacking successful outcomes.

14. Develop community involvement initiatives and crime prevention programs based on community needs and input.

15. Engage all available crime prevention expertise within the department to develop strategies, information and presentation tools for the community, based on the results of the preceding.

16. Consider establishing a single point of contact within the UPD responsible for all crime prevention programming on campus.

17. Develop template presentations (easily adapted for special topics) that can be quickly learned and delivered by any officer with the requisite training and certification to educate and inform stakeholders about all hazard response best practices.
SECTION IV – MASTER LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Create a University Police Advisory Committee to students, faculty and staff comprised of a cross section of the campus, charged with the responsibility of advising the University Police Department on campus climate issues; improving the existing lines of communication with those having a vested interest in campus safety and security; and helping to develop future security priorities. We recommend the committee meet up to three times per semester, but no less than twice per semester.

2. Conduct regular cultural diversity education for UPD personnel. Consider establishing a partnership with the Office of Equity and Campus Diversity and appropriate student and academic departments to conduct these education sessions. Consider resources such as the U.S. Department of Justice’s Community Relations Service to assist with these sessions.

3. Conduct a survey of faculty, staff and student perceptions, attitudes and opinions on campus safety and security. The survey should evaluate overall Department performance; perceptions of officers’ attitudes and behaviors; community concerns over campus safety and security; and community recommendations and suggestions for improvement. This survey could be conducted annually, but should be conducted at least every three years.

4. Conduct a thoughtful and frank facilitated dialogue between the UPD and judicial affairs to clarify the differences in orientations and seek common understandings. Require regular meetings between the UPD and judicial affairs to share information.

5. The chief should reconsider his decision not to attend the Campus Safety Forum meetings.

6. Work with internal and external partners to develop a strategic patrol operations plan that is aligned with the goals and objectives defined for the UPD by the senior leadership of the college.

7. Consider alternative options to UPD officers being required to lock college buildings.

8. Develop benchmarks for success to determine the effectiveness of existing patrol operations.

9. Conduct crime prevention, community policing and problem solving training for all department personnel.

10. Assign UPD patrol officers “ownership” of various areas of the campus where they would become the liaisons (community police officers) between the UPD and that area (e.g., Residential Life, Student Affairs, Judicial Affairs, Student Government, multi-purpose athletic complex, etc.).
11. Continue the partnership with the Erie County Crime Analysis Center and the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services for crime analysis.

12. Consider creating additional supervisory positions within the UPD or in the alternative formalize a chain of command structure that identifies supervisory responsibilities in the absence of shift commanders.

13. Conduct an evidence-based review of all UPD crime prevention programs to determine the effectiveness of each. Consider replacing those programs lacking successful outcomes.

14. Develop community involvement initiatives and crime prevention programs based on community needs and input.

15. Engage all available crime prevention expertise within the department to develop strategies, information and presentation tools for the community, based on the results of the preceding.

16. Consider establishing a single point of contact within the UPD responsible for all crime prevention programming on campus.

17. Develop template presentations (easily adapted for special topics) that can be quickly learned and delivered by any officer with the requisite training and certification to educate and inform stakeholders about all hazard response best practices.
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Attachment 1 – Firm Description and Qualifications

Margolis Healy is a professional services firm specializing in campus safety, security, and regulatory compliance for higher education and K-12. We provide our clients with a variety of specialized services that include, but are not limited to, campus safety and security assessments, Title IX and Clery Act assessments; emergency management risk and hazard assessments; emergency preparedness and crisis response systems and exercises; implementation of lethal and less-than-lethal force options; litigation consultation; and special investigations/independent reviews. Our team of professionals brings a diverse set of skills and expertise to client institutions ranging from large public universities to private institutions, community colleges and K-12 private and public school districts.

Dr. Gary J. Margolis and Mr. Steven J. Healy founded Margolis Healy in January 2008 when they merged their practices, Margolis & Associates, LLC and Strategic Security Consulting, LLC, into Margolis Healy & Associates, LLC. With more than fifteen years each of providing consulting services to clients in the education, public and private sectors, their combined experience quickly earned Margolis Healy recognition as one of the leading professional services firms for safety and security needs in North America. In August 2013, U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance awarded Margolis Healy the responsibility of developing and operating The National Center for Campus Public Safety, established by Congress in early 2013.

The Margolis Healy team has personally managed or been intimately involved with numerous high profile higher education cases. These cases include Clery Act and Title IX compliance issues at institutions such as Penn State, Swarthmore and Emerson, or critical incidents on college campuses ranging from violent crimes at universities such as Virginia Tech to natural disasters (including the 9/11 tragedy and its impact on the schools in NYC). We have first-hand experience in strategic security planning, crisis response and recovery planning and campus public safety management at institutions of higher education. Dr. Margolis was contracted to review the Federal Emergency Management Department’s Incident Action Guides to assure their relevancy to the higher education environment. Shortly after the tragic mass-shooting incident at Virginia Tech in 2007, the U.S. Department of Education Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools asked Mr. Healy to participate in the development of the first ever emergency management guide for higher education. That document, Action Guide for Emergency Management at Institutions of Higher Education, is considered an essential playbook for campuses developing or refining their emergency management programs. In addition, Mr. Healy and Dr. Margolis are the lead authors of the International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrator’s Blueprint for Safer Campuses: An Overview of the Virginia Tech Tragedy and Implications for Campus Safety. This document, unveiled at a press conference sponsored by the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University, is a roadmap for
campus safety and security. Margolis Healy also manages competitive grants from the U.S. Department of Justice (Community Oriented Policing Services Office and Bureau of Justice Assistance) on topics ranging from behavioral threat assessment to crime prevention and study abroad safety.

Mr. Healy and Dr. Margolis have worked tirelessly to assemble the best and brightest in the campus safety and security, and regulatory compliance fields in order to provide Margolis Healy clients with outstanding service. The high-level of professionalism and breadth of experience each member of the Margolis Healy team has is second to none and allows us to provide each of our clients, no matter how difficult or challenging their case may be, with personalized attention and, most importantly, high-quality work.

The MHA Methodology

Margolis Healy & Associates serves our clients through the development of a Risk Tolerance Profile that assists the institution with identifying the range of realistic threats and vulnerabilities it faces, and then implementing a decision making process to determine which require prevention, mitigation and/or response plans. Without such a process, universities and colleges face the daunting task of giving equal attention to all perceived and real threats. Our process recognizes the range between high impact/low probability and low impact/high probability events. The active shooter tragedy (high impact/low probability) and the iPod theft from the library (low impact/high probability) each require different strategies. Impact is defined through the institution and the individual.

MHA has developed a unique, proprietary methodology for evaluating safety and security needs at institutions of higher education based on years of educational campus safety and security experience, research, reflection and evaluation. We assess safety and security at educational institutions through our proprietary 3 Circles of Prevention System. We have extensive proprietary checklists that support our methodology.

The First Circle asks to what extent relationships and services exist for early interception and intervention for problems and issues germane to faculty, staff and students. Such services may include drug and alcohol education and counseling, behavioral threat assessment teams, grievance policies, workplace violence policies and prevention systems, sexual assault, stalking and domestic violence victim advocacy; mediation services and grievance policies and procedures for faculty and staff; and other similar policies and services that address problems before they become a crisis.

The Second Circle explores the extent to which institutions of higher education have employed physical obstacles, delaying tactics and security technology to control, secure or regulate access to the physical plant. This may include systems that direct vehicular traffic; security cameras; networked or standalone door locking systems and hardware; campus lighting (interior and exterior); E911 capacity and PBX phone systems; mass notification systems
(high and low technology); fire and life safety systems; visitor management policies and practices; inclusion of crime prevention through environmental design considerations; and access control and other security technology tools.

The Third Circle explores measures that enable the institution to respond to events and security and safety related needs in an organized, timely, and efficient manner. This may include a public safety function with organized involvement of students, faculty and staff in the security of the campus; memoranda of understanding with area police, fire and emergency medical services; emergency response and recovery systems, policies and procedures that have been trained to; and adoption and implementation of the National Incident Management System (NIMS) and the Incident Command System (ICS). Combined, this third circle of prevention builds capacity for the human response to safety and security requirements.

Taken together, the various strategies depict the interconnected nature of campus safety and security. Changes or decisions made to one area impact the others. The deployment of security technology (cameras, door prop alarms, controlled access points) may or may not have an effect on the number of public safety officers, which may or may not impact other security needs. MHA works with our clients to develop a reasonable campus safety and security program based on their current state and the desired future state.

The measures taken to address safety and security are as much data and metrics driven as they are based on perception. We believe that our expertise, knowledge and experiences uniquely qualify us to assist our client institutions with recommendations tuned to their culture and needs.

Margolis Healy & Associates, LLC is a minority and veteran-owned small business. For a complete listing of available services, please visit www.margolishealy.com.
Attachment 2 – Origins and evolution of campus policing

The first campus police in the United States were retired New Haven, CT police officers hired by Yale University in 1894 to patrol and keep order on campus. For the first fifty years of campus policing, retired men were hired in a custodial capacity to protect university property from fire, water, and other damage. This “watchman” system prevailed for decades, and while these guards had no police authority, colleges and universities effectively established pseudo-police forces in an attempt to monitor and control campus activity (Sloan, 1992). The 1950s saw unprecedented growth in student enrollment and the size of physical plants at higher education institutions. Universities hired faculty and staff to meet student needs, and additional buildings were constructed for housing and teaching. Campuses became small cities with congestion, crowding and crime. Administrators realized there was an increased need to police the campus and stepped up the hiring of retired municipal officers, usually men, who became known as “security officers.” Logically enough, these men worked in what became known as campus “security departments.” Their duties continued to be custodial and they still had no law enforcement authority. During this time, the security function, which had been commonly housed in the physical plant, was realigned to report to the upper administration. (Sloan, 1992; Bromley & Reaves, 1998). According to Bordner & Petersen (1983), campus policing was “limited to detection, apprehension, and reporting, rather than making an arrest.” This pseudo-police system prevailed through the middle-1960s and created a double standard on campuses in conjunction with the in loco parentis doctrine. Campus security detained outsiders, as well as faculty and staff, for referral to local police, but sent students to the internal judicial process.

The 1960s were witness to an increase in unrest on college campuses. The Korean War, Vietnam Conflict, and civil rights movement were at the heart of social change and universities were a place for open discussion and rancorous debate. Unfortunately, that debate often turned violent, leading to injury and property damage. Unless college administrators kept order on their campuses, many realized that someone else would do it for them. Their solution was to develop a campus police organization more closely modeled after municipal policing. Legislative action recognized universities as municipalities for the purpose of granting arrest powers, and mandated law enforcement certification requirements. The goal of the campus police movement during this time was professionalization and recognition for having a legitimate role as law enforcement. No longer were colleges and universities “sedate ivory towers, sanctuaries apart from the larger society and places where crime and criminal justice do not interlude” (Smith, 1988). Sweeping economic, social, and political factors reflective of the climate of the times forever changed the educational environment (Nichols, 1995).

To understand the public safety challenges facing higher education at the turn of the millennium, it is important to have an accurate perspective
on the current generation. As we know, the campus population consists primarily of young adults between the ages of 18 and 22. Nowhere else but at higher education institutions is there such a concentration in this age range. This population possesses an educational background, and presumably an intellect, greater than that of the society at large, and the majority of this group is single and experiencing unbridled freedom for the first time. Fraternity and sorority functions, parties, athletic events, and other activities create opportunities for alcohol abuse, misconduct, and criminal activity (Nichols, 1995). Furthermore, the desire to create academic environments that support an “open campus” atmosphere fosters criminal activity. Most campus boundaries are indistinguishable from the surrounding community. While objectively the safest place for young adults to be, college campuses across the United States have seen an increase in homicidal behavior, workplace violence, sexual assaults, substance abuse, drug dealing, and property crimes in the last 20 years. This escalation of crime has precipitated a swift response by government and higher education officials, most notably in the Campus Security Act of 1990, which mandates postsecondary institutions receiving federal aid to report specific crimes statistics on a regular basis. In addition, a significant increase in lawsuits against colleges and universities alleging negligence in security has forced administrators to enhance safety measures and increase police presence. The modern college campus can no longer do without the modern police presence.
Attachment 3 -- Campus Police versus Other Police

Studies comparing campus police organizations with their municipal and state counterparts have generated interesting findings on the role and efficacy of the campus police organization. Campus constituencies have come to demand the same level of service from their campus police as they do from their municipal law enforcement agencies (Atwell, 1988). In spite of these increased demands for similar service, the culture and climate of the campus police agency continues to be subtly different. Studies have shown that campus police see themselves more in the service-providing role than do their non-campus counterparts, who focus primarily on law enforcement. Campus police tend to concentrate first on crime prevention, and second on law enforcement due to the educational mission of their institutions (Etheridge, 1958; Sloan, 1992). Interestingly enough, this orientation to full service policing is exactly what the law enforcement profession as a whole is attempting to accomplish these last 30 years in its shift to “community policing.” Municipal police agencies by design are reactive, while campus police agencies have had a prevention orientation for the better part of the last century. Furthermore, when compared with their municipal brethren, campus police employ more female and minority staff members, have higher educational standards, provide more training/education per officer/employee, and make better use of community members in policing. One area where municipal policing excels is that of compensation: municipal police officers on average tend to make more money than do their campus counterparts (Bromley & Reeves, 1998).
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