The Department of Public Safety (DPS) is comprised of the University Police Department (UMPD), the Department of Emergency Management (DEM) and the Department of Central Security (DCS). This new department was formed on July 1, 2002 in response to a heightened concern for security after the events of September 11, 2001, and to provide a less fragmented approach to the needs of the University community.

DPS provides the following services to the University of Minnesota community:

- Full service police response.
- Developing, implementing, and sustaining an emergency management program at the University.
- Emergency medical coverage at significant events.
- A complete range of security services including the design, installation, maintenance and monitoring of all access control, alarm, emergency communication and video surveillance systems on campus.
- For further information see: [www.uservices.umn.edu/ps.html](http://www.uservices.umn.edu/ps.html)

The mission of DPS is to develop and support an environment in which University community members can safely achieve their educational, research, and employment goals free of fear and concern for their personal safety and well-being.

The compact between the Senior Vice President for System Administration and the Vice President for University Services with the Assistant Vice President for the Department of Public Safety for 2004-05 includes the following:

**B. UPDATE: 03-04 Compact and Prior Goals**

**UMPD**

*(pre 03-04 Compact)*

1. **Community Investigator Division Expansion**

   CID is a community policing strategy which seeks to increase partnerships with UMPD across campus to reduce and prevent crime, increase clearance rates, and increase the perception of safety and security at the University. Currently one Sergeant and four Police Officers are assigned to CID with specific liaison to UM sites and communities.

   The further expansion of CID is linked to the UMPD strategic plan which seeks gradual growth of UMPD from the current 43 to 50 authorized officers.

   Measurement: Added CID officers, crime reduction, increased clearance rates, and improved perceptions as demonstrated by survey.

   STATUS: On hold pending funding for further growth.

   FINANCIAL PLAN: Police officers are almost exclusively an O&M expense. The 03-04 Compact called for establishment within existing budget, which did take place. Further expansion would require funding of approximately $75,000 per officer.
2. Neighborhood Watch

The goal of this strategy is to create a safety and security, conscious and competent, community at the University. This is being accomplished by CID officers establishing working relationships, developing, and delivering crime prevention programming.

A neighborhood watch program has been established on the St. Paul Campus. Extensive liaison is underway between CID and the Academic Health Center. CID, UMPD Administration, and Central Security staff participate in regular Safety and Security meetings. Credentialing in the AHC has generated more consciousness about security.

Measurement: Added programs from CID, decline in reported crime (N.B. there would be a lag time between the assignment of officers, program delivery, and results).

STATUS: Ongoing.

FINANCIAL: Accomplished within existing budget.

3. K-9 Program

A canine program was established. The program has been incorporated but will continue to mature. Providing public demonstrations is consistent with the UMPD Strategic Plan to increase interactivity with the entire campus community.

STATUS: Concluded for purposes of the Compact.

FINANCIAL: Accomplished within existing budget.

(03-04 Compact Additions)

4. Minimum patrol coverage increase

This goal intended to increase staffing by one officer in patrol each shift. Over three shifts this would require six officers. Currently, the average is three officers and one sergeant per shift. One officer is assigned to the west bank, east bank, and St. Paul. The additional officer per shift would have allowed additional foot patrol, provided support for multi unit responses, and have kept an assignment covered when the district officer is called away to court, makes an arrest, etc.

The University remains among the lowest officer to student ratios of the major universities (see Appendix A for current comparisons).

Measurement: Average number of officers on patrol.

STATUS: Though the UMPD reached its authorized complement of officers for the first time in several years, additional growth did not take place due to monetary constraints.

FINANCIAL: The cost to add six officers to patrol is estimated at $450,000.

5. Mounted patrol unit

The mounted patrol was proposed for use on the St. Paul Campus as well as an effective but non-confrontational method of crowd control. It is another way by which to reduce the anonymity of UMPD officers, as opposed to patrolling in squad cars.

STATUS: The idea is being explored by officers who have an interest in mounted patrol and a proposal is expected mid-2004. However, no further commitments have been made. With support for the development of an Equine Center on the St. Paul Campus
continuing, there may ultimately be economies restraining cost to the University of a Mounted Unit.

**MEASUREMENT:** A progress report from UMPD on the stage of implementation.

**FINANCIAL:** Other than the personnel costs of the officers assigned to mounted, the costs are relatively small. (Minneapolis Police have been spending about $30,000 per year for the stabling, veterinary care, farrier service, and feeding of six horses). Additionally, mounted need not be a full time assignment. Horses should be ridden regularly but not necessarily in daily patrol service. There are start up, basic training, and replacement costs for equipment. O&M would be one source. Given permission, UMPD could look for a sponsor to fund raise and/or establish a non-profit.

6. **Bicycle patrol expansion**

This goal is intended to expand the shifts, hours, and geographic reach of bicycle patrol on Campus, serving to provide more opportunities for person-to-person interaction. It is consistent with the community policing goals of the UMPD Strategic Plan.

**STATUS:** Bike patrol coverage was expanded using existing staff. We consider bicycle patrol to be established as a regular policing assignment and can be dropped from Compact status.

**MEASUREMENT:** This year 1063 hours, or over .5 FTE was dedicated. There were 44 days where there was 24 hours coverage of bike patrol. Maintaining or increasing this benchmark will be the future measurement.

**FINANCIAL:** An increase in Department size would create more opportunities to assign officers to bike patrol. However, it is not absolutely critical. However, a decline from current numbers would make it very difficult to employ bike patrol, since speed to emergencies must also be factored. Minimal cost of maintaining the bike fleet can be covered internally. Replacements or increases would require a funding source.

7. **Emerging technologies implementation**

The emerging technologies referenced in the 03-04 Compact focused on improving emergency communications. This included an upgrade of the Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) system in the UMPD Dispatch Center, Pocket Blue handheld wireless information/communication devices for officers, and E911 police emergency telecommunications equipment.

**STATUS:** The CAD upgrade is complete, handhelds are deployed and under evaluation, and E911 upgrade is complete, but awaiting NTS database updating. By the end of the 03-04 Compact cycle, we expect to complete this goal.

**MEASUREMENT:** Reduced response time and enhanced officer safety.

**FINANCIAL:** Funding was handled internally. Cost was kept down by prior agreements, litigation, and leasing.

8. **FBI Joint Terrorism Task Force (JTTF) appointment**

With the University being a target of acts of domestic terrorism and the wealth of controversial topics addressed at the University, having a UMPD officer assigned to the JTTF would be beneficial both to the University and anti-terrorism efforts regionally.

**STATUS:** A UMPD sergeant was assigned to the JTTF on a part time basis. His focus and area of expertise are in the areas of ALF, ELF, and eco-terrorist groups that have targeted the University. A full-time assignment would increase his access to federal information and would keep the University better informed about
risks. This sergeant also currently serves as a criminal investigator on campus.

FINANCIAL: This has been managed within existing resources. An increase in the commitment would require backfill of his position. The FBI is not funded to pay the salaries of local officers assigned to the JTF. Cost planned at $75,000.

9. 800 MHz implementation

Public safety entities in the State of Minnesota and nationally are migrating to 800MHz radio systems to create interoperability among emergency responders. The UMPD interacts daily with the Minneapolis Police Department. MPD has converted to 800MHz. The St. Paul Police Department conversion is underway. A University 800MHz system could ultimately also support Facilities Management and other University operating units.

STATUS: A plan was drafted on behalf of UMPD in October of 2003 and presented to the Metropolitan Radio Board. The MRB must approve the plan and also control some funding to assist local units of government in the acquisition of 800 MHz technology.

Measurement: Progress toward funding, assignment of project responsibility, and implementation.

FINANCIAL: The cost estimate for the UMPD migration is approximately $600,000. That is down considerably from past years, where those joining the system participated in the cost of building the “backbone”. At its February 2004 meeting, the MRB agreed to provide $155,921. University Public Safety is seeking inclusion of our 800 MHz program in various federal grants administered by the Minnesota DPS, such as the Homeland Security Grant and Urban Areas Security Initiatives grant.

DEM

(pre 03-04 Compact)

1. Campus-wide evacuation/emergency response plan

DEM has begun developing detailed evacuation plans for some facilities. This project is designed to create and broadcast basic information to all facilities and departments at all campuses. After crafting and disseminating the plans, permanent on-going exercises, evaluation and education will be required.

DEM is pursuing a Community Emergency Response Team (CERT) grant. This grant would provide organization and training for University teams system-wide to assist with emergency response and evacuations and help fund the creation of a Medical Response Team within the AHC.

STATUS: Campus evacuation plans have been received in DEM from some of the buildings at the Twin Cities campuses. The plans that have been received thus far are for the larger occupancy buildings (i.e. Williams Arena). DEM has some basic information on file for all of the buildings on the Twin Cities Campus. We are proposing the re-structure of our EMS Coordinator position in DEM to Program Coordinator, to provide oversight to several programs in need of more direction.

The installation of Tone Alert Radios has increased our ability to provide direction to occupants. This will continue to be an element of emergency planning. We will need to assist Facilities Management and Residential Life developing, exercising, and archiving evacuation plans in DEM. Evacuation plans must include responsible persons and an education and communication component. There is a guideline available on the DEM website.

Measurement: Evacuation plans completed and on file in DEM.
2. EOC Emergency Management Education

By reinstituting regular emergency exercises for the Emergency Operations Center (EOC) and emergency response staff, the DEM would better assure the ability of the University to cope with and respond to emergency situations.

STATUS: A training plan has been developed for table top exercises to enhance the University’s emergency response program. The acquisition of improved space for an EOC where training and regular meetings of the Emergency Management Policy Committee can take place is a good step in this direction. This will be a continuing process, but will remain at the Compact level for the indefinite future.

Measurement: Exercises conducted and training delivered.

Financial: Within existing DEM resources.

3. EM at coordinate campuses

Through implementation of this plan, the department could better assure the ability of the coordinate campuses to handle emergency situations and integrate these responses into the overall effort of the University. This new phase would include regular site visits and personal attention to details. Through this process protection of lives, property, research and mission would be accomplished along with the mitigation of hazards and their effects across the state.

STATUS: Departments of Public Safety, Emergency Management, and Central Security have been visiting coordinate campuses to offer assistance in emergency management. Most notable has been a visit to the Morris Campus. DEM is facilitating training and a table top exercise for campus and local officials in March 2004 and returning for a regional exercise in July 2004. A first visit to the Duluth campus took place in February 2004.

This will be an ongoing process to assure the entire University system maximizes emergency preparedness through collaboration, the sharing of expertise, and resources.

DEM’s budget includes funding for 1 FTE (50% UMD, 25% each to UMM and UMC), to physically reside at the coordinates. If filled, these positions would be a liaison to TC DEM and would expedite the improvement of coordinate campus emergency preparedness.


FINANCIAL: Within existing DEM resources and grants.

4. Community Outreach Programs

Through scheduled recurring public meetings, brown-bag sessions, and other communication strategies etc., DEM would present preparedness strategies for tornados, security awareness, winter storms, terrorism, etc. Previously occurring until a few years ago, the goal would be to provide University student, staff and faculty with information they can use to better protect themselves in the event of an emergency.

STATUS: Campus community outreach has been confined to the DEM website and some posters. In-person meetings and training for the public has not yet occurred. We still believe this plan has merit and will pilot the concept as priorities and workload allow.

We plan to make better use of University Services Communications professionals to help with our educational outreach.
Measurement: Training/sessions delivered, topics covered.

FINANCIAL: Within existing budget.

DEM

(update 03-04 Compact)

5. Emergency Plan Update and Reformat

We are working to update the EOP so that the Minnesota Office of Homeland Security accepts our plan in the format they require. Our goal is to be recognized as an individual planning entity and eligible for EM grants. We are creating three documents for that purpose:

1) Administration
2) Operations
3) Resources

STATUS: A Duty Officer Resource Manual has been developed and will be presented to the Emergency Management Policy Committee (EMPC). It will provide organizational assistance to the EOC staff. It provides contact information for key people on the TC and Coordinate Campuses, local officials, and Departments, as well as the Minnesota Duty Officer. DEM staff are meeting with the 16 primary annex holders to assist in the reformatting of plans.

Measurement: Acceptance of the plan by the Officer of the Day, Vice President for University Services and the MOHS.

FINANCIAL: Within existing budget.

DCS

(update pre 03-04 Compact)

1. Security analysis for campus-based projects

A formal security planning/design process has been established. Incorporated with this process were the creation of design criteria levels and a formal security design review team. Additionally, University construction standards were updated to include security design requirements and security planning has been incorporated within Facility Management’s programming, development, and design processes.

STATUS: Completed and institutionalized, to be removed from Compact.

FINANCIAL: Completed within existing budget.

2. Integration of all security systems on campus

To achieve this goal, five mission critical units were merged from within four university departments. The merger included Facility Management’s card access and locksmith units, Classroom Management’s low voltage technical services unit, Parking and Transportation Service’s central station video monitoring unit, as well as a business office unit from the Police Department. This integration has been successfully completed, providing all service from one department.

STATUS: Development ongoing, completed for Compact purposes.

FINANCIAL: Completed within approved budget.
3. Optimize work flow and business processes

Following a recent reorganization, DCS plans on an analysis of the current operational processes, involving staff at all levels, to evaluate input and apply recommendations. This effort is expected to ensure that DCS provides prompt, quality service to its customers.

STATUS: Monthly meetings are conducted with all staff members to review business and service practices within this young organization. Participation with the University Services work team related to core values is part of this effort. Another component includes monthly project updates with clear communication of each team member’s role and responsibility. DCS was nominated for and received the University Services Star Performer Award. The efforts made to establish sound business practices in a start up department have been successful. This goal can be considered concluded for Compact purposes.

Measurement: Employee surveys on work environment, quality of supervisory direction, work load, and job satisfaction were conducted in early FY03-04 with positive results. We will also work with Measurement Services to develop and conduct customer satisfaction surveys. We closely track ISO solvency.

FINANCIAL: No cost associated with this effort to date. Nominal fees may be connected to customer satisfaction surveys.

4. University strategic security goals, standards, and funding

Subsequent to the terrorist attack of September 11, 2001, a cross-disciplinary campus work team audited vulnerabilities on the Twin Cities campus. A prioritized list of key sites and proposed remediation projects was developed. This also led to the development of generalized security standards for the different types of University programs. The DCS was itself created as an effort to focus security progress on campus by transferring budgets from the existing dispersed security programs. DCS also received funds from the investment pool to begin work on the security project priority list. These funds have been shared with the Coordinate Campuses.

The identified security needs of the University exceeded the available funds by approximately six times for the Twin Cities Campus alone. Additionally the dynamism of the University brings new sites and programs, with new security needs on line, and new technologies emerge.

There is a need to remediate identified or emerging security needs, which represent non-recurring costs. There is also a need to establish a funding source for recurring security costs.

STATUS: The needs identified in the original security audit are being addressed in a deliberate manner. A second review of the priority list was conducted in 2003, and a third update in February 2004.

Comprehensive individual security programs have been developed for major Twin Cities campus components. Programs have been developed for the Academic Health Center (AHC), the St. Paul Campus, and the West Bank, including steam tunnels.

AHC has progressed the farthest, with four of their top five projects being completed. On the St. Paul Campus, the top two security priorities have been addressed. Their next priority will be addressed in the 04-05 budget if funding is available. The West Bank plan is in the earliest stages of implementation.

DPS and DCS leadership are working with University Services financial officers to develop and propose a funding program.
Measurement: Maintenance and administration of a collaboratively developed security projects priorities list. Establishment of agreed upon security standards for University places and programs. Costing these programs and establishing a funding program for non-recurring and recurring security costs.

FINANCIAL: The initial cost of the post September 11th prioritized security projects was $7.1 million. The AHC and St. Paul programs come in at $2.5 million each. The current top system wide priority is to complete the conversion of our Twin Cities campus video surveillance program to digital technology, at an estimated cost of $750,000. About $1.1 of progress has been made, but new projects have been added. The current list is valued at $7.75 million. The Coordinate Campuses have specific projects of substantial cost as well.

As we improve our program there will be added recurring costs as well. There will also be some savings system-wide. For example, we currently have approximately 570 surveillance cameras. We are reaching the point where we will need to add monitoring staff as we expand. However, we are also exploring taking over monitoring duties for the Duluth Campus, at a lower cost than their current private monitoring agreement. More equipment will also require more maintenance.

We believe the vast majority of security costs are most appropriately funded as an O&M cost. At least $2 million per year but not more than $4 million would permit acceptable progress on the University security program.

C. NEW LONG-TERM GOALS/PRIORITIES

DPS ADMINISTRATION

1. Increase participation of UM/DPS with regional colleagues

Public Safety and departmental leadership will increase participation with regional colleagues in professional organizations, oversight boards, and ad hoc work committees. The purpose is to raise the profile of UM Public Safety as a partner in regional public safety, gain recognition and standing, and position ourselves for grant, funding, equipment, training, or other opportunities that become available.

Measurement: Citation of participation and documentation of any tangible benefits that accrue to the University as a result of such participation.

FINANCIAL: Limited impact, cost of appropriate professional memberships for DPS leadership and their work time.

2. Strategic Plan Development for DPS

UMPD is the only department of DPS that is currently operating under a strategic plan. A preliminary strategic plan will be developed as required for submission with budget FY 05. During the early part of FY 05, DPS will undertake and complete a comprehensive and representative strategic planning process.

Measurement: Completion of the strategic plan as early in FY 05 as possible.

FINANCIAL: Nothing major anticipated, possibly some cost associated with facilitation.
UMPD

No new goals have been added or proposed.

DEM

1. **Improve delivery of the Automated External Defibrillator (AED) program**

   The AED program was implemented with a host of unanswered questions regarding training, delivery, maintenance, and other issues. This became source of considerable exasperation to staff, faculty, and students. DEM/EMS will correct the shortcomings of communication, assure the planned delivery of additional units, and assure adequate training is delivered.

   **Measurement:** AED units and training delivered. Reduction or absence of complaints, documentation of incidents of usage.

   **FINANCIAL:** Initial units are paid for. Our plan is to turn responsibility for the AED program over to the person hired for the unfilled Program Coordinator position. An evaluation of the coverage will be undertaken to identify how optimal the deployment has been. Should there be a need for additional AED placement, grants will be sought or the need will return as a budget request in the following budget year.

2. **Achieve the restoration of the University of Minnesota as a recognized planning entity by the State of Minnesota.**

   The University has lost its recognition as an independent planning entity with the Minnesota Department of Homeland Security. As a result the University cannot directly receive grants or other assistance for emergency management, but are dependent upon the counties within which the campuses reside. The nature of the coordinate campus system makes it impossible for the University to have a reliable stream of support for our EM efforts.

   **Measurement:** Restoration of the University’s status as an independent planning entity.

   **FINANCIAL:** No additional impacts for the effort, success will improve our access to emergency management funding.

DCS

1. **Testing and evaluation of emerging security technologies**

   Testing and evaluation of emerging technologies is a critical component of our long-range efforts. Biometrics, wireless card access, and advanced video recognition solutions will be examined for the value of their inclusion in our security program. Such technology is an essential part of increasing safety and security at our higher risk facilities.

   **Measurement:** Technologies evaluated, incorporated, or rejected.

   **FINANCIAL:** New technologies considered for use in our security program will compete for investment pool dollars. Value will be key.

2. **Credentialing Program on Campus**

   A program for the production, wearing, and control of credentials in certain areas and with certain employees, will contribute to safety, security, and the confidence of the University community. The pilot program in AHC has been well received and effective.

   Though the program itself must be administered within the departments, DCS will create a set of recommendations for a broader credentialing program based on the work and experience of the AHC program.
Measurement: Drafting recommendations for a credentialing program for consideration of the Administration.

FINANCIAL: Staff time associated with the study and report.

D. DIVERSITY ASSESSMENT AND PLANNING

Creating a workforce that is reflective of both the University and the larger community is a matter of both social justice and effectiveness in our multi-cultural society. Tension and lack of trust between public safety and protected class communities must be overcome. One method is to encourage members of underrepresented communities to consider a career in public safety.

DCS and DPS, in addition to their other recruiting strategies, now include the Office of Multicultural and Academic Affairs in their postings of employment opportunities. DCS has used this mechanism and found that it does indeed generate protected class candidates.

The UMPD presents a particular challenge in that the specific licensing requirements of the Minnesota POST Board create an extremely small pool of protected class candidates. For this reason, targeted recruitment efforts are essential. Whether through minority police officer associations, personal contacts, or strategizing with the Office of Multicultural and Academic Affairs, it is clear very intentional strategies are required. UMPD will further pursue “grow your own” police officers through the Student Monitor Program and outreach to the minority student associations, to encourage consideration of a police service career with UMPD. (See appendix B for current workforce demographics).

E. OUTREACH AND CIVIC ENGAGEMENT

DPS

In keeping with the Compact goal of raising the profile and thereby the effectiveness of DPS and the University, we are being very intentional in working with colleagues across the Twin Cities and coordinate campuses. We are increasing participation with other public safety professionals in the region. We are connecting with students and citizens in the larger campus community. Examples include:

1. Participation in neighborhood meetings and events in the community surrounding campus as requested or invited by the community or University Community Relations. UMPD and DCS along with MPD colleagues have participated multiple meetings and events in Marcy Holmes.

2. UMPD is active in the Greek Council meetings.

3. DCS provides consultative resources to neighboring educational and research institutions, local public schools, neighborhood organizations, and community groups.

4. DEM is assisting UM Morris with training and exercises that include campus, local public safety, and local policy makers. A trip to UM Duluth took place in February 2004 to begin similar collaboration and one to UM Crookston will be planned.

5. DCS is active in emergency management organizations including the Association of Minnesota Emergency Managers (AMNEM), the Metropolitan Emergency Managers Association (MEMA), the International Association of Emergency Managers (IAEM), the Minnesota Office of Homeland Security (MOHS), and
local colleague emergency management government entities.

6. UMPD and the AVP for Public Safety are active in the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP), the Minnesota Chiefs of Police Association, the Hennepin and Ramsey County Chief’s Associations, the Police Executive Research Forum, the International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators (IACLEA), and the FBI National Academy Associates.

7. As part of the development of University Security and Funding standards, DCS will more regularly convene a standing review team to re-evaluate security project priorities.

8. UMPD has participated in “unified command” actions with MPD, HCSO, SPPD, RCSO, and MSP for large on campus events. We are pleased to reciprocate. We have been asked by SPPD to assist in July when the Taste of Minnesota occurs during significant dignitary visits.

9. UMPD officers have done personal safety and K-9 demonstrations at the Minnesota State Fair.

F. ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT N/A

G. FACILITIES ISSUES

UMPD

A classroom and shelter (30’ x 60’) must be incorporated within the Rosemount firing range to permit required firearms training and Police Officer Standards and Training (POST) Board qualification during inclement weather. Inclusion of a classroom at the range would ensure a significant increase in range rentals, ultimately improving UMPD revenue. Grounds and roadway improvements will be essential to maintain our customers and anticipated revenue. Completion of these facility issues would secure the Rosemount range as a full service training facility. Estimated improvement costs are $360,000.

The UMPD police facility appears to be at maximum occupancy. If planned growth to 50 officers does take place, it would be prudent to request a space programming study.

DCS

Temporarily housed within the U Press Building, a permanent location must be identified for the department. DCS is currently occupying space that will not adequately support its functions. U Press code shortcomings have exacerbated the need to find new space.

Space restrictions within the existing Transportation and Safety Building monitoring center limit expansion. Relocation of the monitoring center will be necessary within the coming fiscal year. A conversion to digital technology is required for the move. Estimated conversion costs are approximately $750,000.

Our proposed move to available space at 2221 University Avenue SE appears to be moving ahead, but funding and implementation details still need to be finalized.

H. OTHER FINANCIAL ISSUES

UMPD

The Police Department is seeking funds to implement the five-year plan. The plan calls for 50 officers. At the present time, the Police Department is funded for 43 officers. Increasing the number of officers in difficult times will be a challenge due to its reliance on O&M funding. Failure to grow will have two impacts. Elements of the Strategic Plan and Compact, designed to enhance
community policing will be on hold. Secondly, there appears to be little likelihood of turnover in UMPD. Absent the opportunity to hire, increasing diversity within UMPD, a most visible representation of Public Safety and the University will be nearly impossible.

Interoperability of emergency communication agencies is without exception a critical consideration of emergency response. With many of our colleagues on or moving toward 800 MHz radio systems, finding the funding for UMPD (and later other U Services groups) is critical. We believe some or all of the funding can be obtained through grants, however, it will take persistence and participation. The price tag is just under $600,000.

Funding the previously cited Training Building at the Rosemount range is a financial challenge. Once the training building is in place, the range will be more marketable. Many of the range trainings are a combination of classroom learning and range instruction. The Police Department will promote the renting of the range, concentrating on the southern suburbs.

DCS

The ability to continue to fund the identified security priority projects and the occasional security emergencies that arise is the primary financial issue for DCS. Whether the funding comes from the investment pool, HEAPR, or other sources, we must continue to make deliberate progress on our plan.

DEM

The primary financial challenge for DEM is to restore the University to recognized status as a planning entity. This would position us to directly apply for and receive emergency planning grants. Failing this, we require consideration from the various county emergency managers in those counties where the University campuses are located.

I. COMPACT DEVELOPMENT

Update of this Department of Public Safety Compact was a collaborative process led by Assistant Vice President for Public Safety, Greg Hestness. Participants included:

- Mr. George Aylward, UMPD Chief of Police
- Mr. Bob Janoski, Director of the DCS
- Mr. Dick Turner, Interim Director of the DEM
- Mr. Greg Hayes, Assistant Director of the DEM
- Mr. Mark Cox, Finance Director for the DPS
- Ms. Julie Gfrerer, Administrative Professional - Finance, UMPD
- Ms. Lynn Gerhard, Administrative Assistant, DPS

DPS Department heads were asked in regular staff meetings to begin planning for the revision of the 03-04 Compact. Discussions were held about where the Compact process fits into University workflow. The 03-04 Compact was the first time the newly-formed DPS had participated in this process. There was significant transition in DPS leadership in the six months since the drafting of the compact. A permanent AVP of Public Safety and Director of DCS were named. A Director of DEM was hired in October and resigned in December. An Assistant Director for DEM was hired in December and became the responsible person for their part of the Compact update.

DPS leadership spent time really getting to understand what the Compact process is. The instructional sessions hosted by VP Al Sullivan were extremely helpful to us all and provided some real context for this process.

Subsequently, we were able to work on updating Compact commitments and identifying new priorities. We believe this will be an excellent process to identify work plans for the year. Given greater stability in leadership, DPS will be able to make this a useful process of goal setting, progress and accountability.
DATA PROFILE

- UMPD Five-year plan
- Department of Education crime on campus report
- Customer service survey, the 2003 customer service survey was completed by the Office of Measurement Services.

REPORT SUMMARY AND ALLOCATION SUMMARY

NOTE: It is not necessary to complete this section until the document is almost finalized. The Report Summary will contain lists of any reports mentioned in the document. The Allocation Summary will detail fiscal year 2004-2005 compact funding.

Appendix A

Campus Police Staffing Ratios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Student Population</th>
<th>Officers</th>
<th>Officers/1,000 Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Florida State U</td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana U</td>
<td>38,903</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Madison U</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas State U</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State U</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Minnesota</td>
<td>48,677</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi St. U</td>
<td>16,610</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern</td>
<td>17,528</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>48,477</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State</td>
<td>41,445</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue</td>
<td>40,117</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Iowa-Iowa City</td>
<td>29,687</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC/Berkeley</td>
<td>33,145</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Arizona</td>
<td>36,847</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Illinois</td>
<td>37,743</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Michigan</td>
<td>38,972</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Pittsburgh</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Texas-Austin</td>
<td>52,261</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Wash-Seattle</td>
<td>39,216</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Wisc-Madison</td>
<td>41,552</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix B

#### Diversity Charts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department of Public Safety</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Minority Asian</th>
<th>Amer Ind</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Total Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C S/Union</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department of Central Security</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Minority Asian</th>
<th>Amer Ind</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Total Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C S/Union</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department of Emergency Management</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Minority Asian</th>
<th>Amer Ind</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Total Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C S/Union</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UMPD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Minority Asian</th>
<th>Amer Ind</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Total Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P/A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C S/Union</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>