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GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

Introduction

Margolis Healy & Associates was engaged by the University of Michigan to conduct an organizational culture assessment and benchmarking study to better understand the working relationship of the three primary public safety organizations serving the University of Michigan community: The Department of Public Safety (DPS), The Hospitals & Health Centers Security Department (HHC-Security), and the Housing Security Department.

Research was conducted through interviews and site visits with university leadership, and staff members within the units and related campus offices. In addition, a review of the university and unit policies, operating procedures and other materials occurred, as did an analysis of the management, organization, planning, coordination and supervision of work within the three organizations. Finally, a benchmarking study of peer institutions provided useful comparisons.

The research and analysis produced the following findings:

- The three departments are well-run, professional and efficient organizations, committed to their areas of responsibility and recognized for their accomplishments amongst their peers.

- There is no formal and insufficient informal connection between the three resulting in significant lack of coordination, misunderstanding of roles and responsibilities, confusion on the part of the university community they serve and significant mistrust between DPS and HHC-Security, specifically.

- There is a commitment to create a safe and secure environment among the three groups, but a lack of a shared vision regarding what that means.

- The University of Michigan is the only institution in our benchmarking analysis to have a separate, professionally staffed housing security function reporting through a division of student affairs. While there was a broader range for health system security, there is consistency in having the hospital security function organizationally linked to the police/public safety function.

The institution’s leaders have committed to resolving issues and removing barriers that exist, enabling them to create a positive safety and security culture across campus. We believe the recommendations we put forth will help them achieve that cultural change.
HHC Security

The University of Michigan Hospitals and Health Centers Security & Entrance Services Department (HHC-Security), comprised of more than 200 employees, is a well-organized and professional security operation. HHC-Security employees are professional and highly trained with several having earned the distinction of advanced certification in the security field. The Department is responsible for educational services related to safety and security, and dispatching emergency and non-emergency calls for assistance within the Health System. Located in the Facilities Control Center (FCC), HHC-Security communicators receive and dispatch emergency (9-1-1) and routine calls for service and monitor security cameras and the card access control system.

We were impressed with their level of training, sophistication and professionalism. They are highly committed to, and significantly aligned with, the patient care ethos of the hospital and health care system.

Department of Public Safety

The Department of Public Safety is a full service law enforcement agency providing police services to the university community; a 9-1-1 Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) and Communications Center; and Campus Parking Enforcement & Management services. The Department is granted its authority to enforce the laws of the State of Michigan and the rules and ordinances of the University. The Department currently operates under the direction of an interim Chief of Public Safety, and has not had stable fulltime leadership in a number of years. The Department is internationally accredited and recognized by the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA; www.calea.org). As such, its written directives, and many of its policies and procedures meet international standards for law enforcement services.

Given the authority granted to the Department of Public Safety by the State of Michigan and the Board of Regents, we hold the organization to a different set of expectations. DPS is the only entity within the University of Michigan that deploys lethal force tools and which possesses the legal authority to seize human life and freedom - both Constitutional guarantees. While Housing Security's obligations end at the door of the residential facility, and HHC-Security's once one leaves the hospitals, DPS's responsibility is for the safety of all people visiting, attending or working at the University of Michigan. The Department is impressive, and in many
ways exemplifies the modern, professional campus police and public safety organization.

**Housing Security**

Housing Security was established 41 years ago and is one of the oldest and most established residentially based security programs in the country. They are a uniformed but unarmed security force whose primary responsibilities include, but are not limited to, mobile/foot patrol of nineteen residence halls and five apartment complexes; access control to all residential and apartment spaces; oversight of the residential security camera system; coordination of student move-in/out (traffic control); oversight of all residential fire safety functions (i.e. monitoring and inspections, etc.); ongoing proactive educational programming related to personal and community safety and security; and playing a role in the student conduct processes related to incidents in housing.

The size, scope and professional demeanor of the organization are impressive. They clearly resonate with the mission of Student Affairs in the development of the whole student beyond the classroom.

**Organizational Structure**

There is no formal organizational connection between the three security functions. The Director of Security for HHC reports to the Associate Director of Operations within the Hospitals and Health Centers, eventually answering to the President of the University through the Executive Vice President for Medical Affairs, Dr. Ora Hirsch Pescovitz. The Chief of Police reports to an Associate Vice President for Facilities & Operations who reports through to the Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer Timothy P. Slottow. The Director of Housing Security reports to a Director of Housing who reports to an Associate Vice President for Student Affairs who reports to the Vice President for Student Affairs, Dr. E. Royster Harper. Many of those we interviewed believe the separate reporting lines contribute to inefficiency and current/historical organizational and cultural challenges. The three entities operate under the public safety umbrella for the University of Michigan yet their organizational structures create an independence and lack of coordination that has not been overcome by collaboration and partnerships, even among Department leadership. Our observations are consistent with past studies and findings in earlier reports we reviewed. Interviewees used the specific phrase “a
culture of fear and blame,” to describe the ongoing issues between the DPS, HHC-Security and, in small part, Housing Security.

The relationship issues center on a lack of trust and poor collaboration between HHC-Security and DPS, and are less problematic with Housing Security. These disconnects are around protocols for the reporting and investigations of crimes occurring within HHC; the leadership turnover in DPS; the chain of command’s ongoing struggle to correct matters; the hostility, in general, between DPS and HHC-Security; and concerns with the hospital’s FCC call center. The lack of a healthy working relationship between the three organizations contributes to confusion, misunderstanding, miscommunication, a lack of trust and respect, a lack of sharing of information, and a failure to recognize and appreciate the role, duties and responsibilities that each department must perform.

Staff we interviewed from the General Counsel’s Office, Risk Management, and other administrative functions expressed consistent surprise at the level of animosity between HHC-Security and the Department of Public Safety. One particular interviewee with a perspective into both organizations shared the belief that HHC-Security does not want to be accountable to DPS or have DPS involved in their “business.” At the same time, they articulated a belief that DPS is suspicious of HHC-Security, doesn’t respect its role and ignores health care laws. Many of those we interviewed believed that the cause for these challenges is a pervasive lack of leadership: “The fact is that leadership allows this to happen… what we permit we promote.”

The Department of Public Safety, HHC-Security, and Housing Security all use the moniker “Public Safety,” causing confusion for our team, and from what we were told, for students, faculty, staff, patients, visitors and guests. In the hospitals and health care system, people seeking help often believe that they are speaking with, or calling, the police (DPS) only to realize later that they are or were speaking to or calling a security officer (either HHC-Security or Housing Security). Their service expectations are therefore, according to HHC and DPS staff, sometimes unmet (e.g., their belief that they are filing a police report for crime or insurance purposes when they are actually filing a loss control report). “Public Safety” is on the vehicles driven by staff in each separate department and on the patch and badge of each department’s uniforms. The use of the emergency number 9-1-1 by both DPS and HHC-Security to contact their respective departments adds to the confusion.
Benchmarking Data

According to data gathered in the benchmarking analysis, it is common to have DPS report through the finance and administration function of the institution. Seven out of eight of the institutions surveyed have this reporting structure for their law enforcement organizations. The University of Michigan is the only institution in our benchmarking analysis to have a separate, professionally-staffed housing security function reporting through a division of student affairs. Most of the institutions surveyed rely on their campus police functions to address safety needs in the residential facilities. One of the institutions employs contracted security to perform this function, and another relies primarily on students.

The range is a bit broader for health system security. Several of the institutions have their hospital security function report through the equivalent of a department of public safety, which reports to a vice president and/or chief financial officer position. One institution assigns a sergeant to act as the hospital security liaison to the police department. While the institutions vary, there is consistency in having the hospital security function organizationally linked to the police/public safety function.

Since our campus visit, the University of Michigan Safety & Security Steering Committee has issued a Draft Report on the Status of Management Response to the Audit (September 2012). This report outlines several areas where the University has taken substantive steps to address areas of concern brought to light by Audit Services and by our work to date. Where applicable, their efforts are highlighted in this report. The University is to be commended for its commitment to rigorously addressing all concerns raised in a timely, efficient and effective manner, and in advance of finalizing our work.
RECOMMENDATIONS

The goal of our recommendations is to improve coordination and collaboration among the units; clarify roles and responsibilities for each organization; and create a shared vision of a safe and secure environment that serves the university community most effectively.

The recommendations cover five areas:

- Consider organizational reporting structure options to ensure a shared vision
- Develop a unified standard practice guide (interagency agreement)
- Develop a brand management strategy
- Recruit and select an executive director for public safety and security and/or chief of police
- Formal and Informal Engagement

I. ORGANIZATIONAL REPORTING STRUCTURE

We recommend that you create a shared vision through your reporting structure and suggest the following three options for your consideration:

A. OPTION A: EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR FOR PUBLIC SAFETY & SECURITY

- Responsibility for a single, merged Division of Public Safety & Security that includes Public Safety & Security; HHC-Security; Housing Security; Emergency Preparedness; and related security functions at the University;

- Reports to either the President or the Executive Vice President for Finance & Administration. We recommend this reporting line given either the President’s or Division of Finance & Administration’s broad set of responsibilities across the institution (Division of Finance & Administration is consistent with benchmark data);

- Institutional responsibility for Clery Act compliance;

- Find economies of scale between departments, and consolidate and combine resources, where feasible;

- Responsible for the Unified Public Safety Standard Practice
Guide(s);

- Implement an advisory board that includes representatives from each of core constituents that are served;

- A qualified candidate has extensive organizational leadership and transformation skills, and/or broad experience in campus safety and security, and a background in law enforcement, corporate security or medical center security, and is able to obtain clearance classification (Secret/Top Secret) through the US Department of Justice/Homeland Security.
Option A – Create a new office that reports directly to the Office of the President.

- President’s Office
  - Executive Director for Public Safety and Security
    - Division of Public Safety & Security
      - Public Safety
      - Hospitals and Health Centers Security
      - Housing Security
  - Advisory Board of 5-6 Members from Relevant Units & Campus Constituents
    - Other Security Functions
B. OPTION B: EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR FOR PUBLIC SAFETY & SECURITY AND CHIEF OF POLICE

- This position is the Chief of Police, and as Executive Director is also responsible for a single, merged Division of Public Safety & Security that includes Public Safety & Security; Housing Security; HHC-Security; Emergency Preparedness; and related security functions at the University;

- Reports to either the President or the Executive Vice President for Finance & Administration. We recommend this reporting line given either the President’s or Division of Finance & Administration’s broad set of responsibilities across the institution (Division of Finance & Administration is consistent with benchmark data);

- A challenge with this model may be the amount of attention the Chief of Police is able to give to their role as the Executive Director of Public Safety & Security;

- Institutional responsibility for Clery Act compliance;

- Responsible for the Unified Public Safety Standard Practice Guide(s);

- Timing is such that the University will begin the search for a new Chief of Police, so the timing may be ideal to explore a consolidation of this position. The right person is critical to the success of this option;

- Find economies of scale between departments, and consolidate and combine resources, where feasible;

- Implement an advisory board that includes representatives from each of core constituents that are served.
Option B – Elevate Chief of Police position to “Executive Director for Public Safety and Security/Chief of Police.” Change reporting line directly to the Office of the President.
C. OPTION C: MAINTAIN CURRENT ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

- Maintain the current organizational structure. Develop a shared vision and philosophy for public safety at the University of Michigan;
- Engender buy-in at all levels. There is significant pride and ownership within each of the three (3) public safety organizations;
- Allows the chain of command the opportunity to participate in, and own, the success of these efforts;
- Supports the professional status of each organization and its leadership;
- AVPs, directors and the organizations are incentivized to conduct the process and for meeting measurable outcomes and goals.

II. DEVELOP A UNIFIED STANDARD PRACTICE GUIDE (INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT)

Regardless of the organizational reporting structure, the “Division of Public Safety & Security” will need to develop a Unified Public Safety Standard Practice Guide as it addresses the issues contained in this report, and previous reports. Develop a shared vision and philosophy for public safety and security at the University of Michigan.

**Unified Public Safety Standard Practice Guide**

- Clarify inter-organizational roles and responsibilities;
- Develop a shared mission, vision and set of common values;
- Improve communication and coordinate resources;
- Build and enhance trust and respect;
- Create an environment of problem solving and conflict resolution;
- Provides clear set of goals and metrics for which to include in performance expectations, evaluations and incentives;
- The process becomes a tool in and of itself to facilitate understanding, communication, collaboration and goodwill;
- Endorsed by senior leadership.
The process will require collaboration and communication at every level within DPS, HHC-Security, Housing Security, and Emergency Preparedness. Significant effort is already underway in these areas.

**Steering Committee:** Three (3) Directors; representative from the Office of the General Counsel; Office of Emergency Preparedness. (Operationalization and core work of the development of the USPG to include representatives at all levels of the various organizations).

**Oversight and project management:** assigned/appointed staff (internal/external) representing the Office of the Executive Director of Public Safety & Security.

**TOPICAL AREAS**

A. Policies & Procedures *(in process)*

1. Crime/incident reporting and investigations
2. Service of court documents
3. Weapons
4. Recruitment, selection and hiring
5. Application of local, state and federal laws
6. Shared resources
7. Emergency management

B. Technology

1. Assessment, integration and funding of shared security technology (e.g., video cameras, alarms)
2. Integrated 9-1-1 Call Center (PSAP/2nd PSAP) and related protocols and processes (potential for backup locations at each site) *(in process)*

C. Training

1. Regular and on-going joint training opportunities on topics of mutual importance;
2. Field training;
3. Laws;
4. Accreditation standards;
5. Telecommunications/dispatching;

III. BRAND MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

Develop a brand management strategy that unifies the three (3) public safety functions (all security functions) under a single Division of Public Safety & Security while celebrating their individuality in service to their specific and shared communities. A brand management strategy will reflect and communicate the overarching mission to safeguard people and property.

A brand management strategy will help correct misinformation, miscommunication and misalignment of community expectations in seeking public safety services throughout the institution, at the Hospital & Health System, and in the residential facilities. Develop uniform design standards for uniforms, marks, logos, patches, badges, publications, signage, etc.

Engage The Ross School of Business to collaborate with faculty and students working in strategic brand management & equity, and marketing management to address this need. Involving faculty and students enhances their academic experience and development while leveraging one of our most valuable institutional resources for the betterment of the campus.

IV. RECRUITMENT & SELECTION (EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR FOR PUBLIC SAFETY & SECURITY; CHIEF OF POLICE)

The University of Michigan’s Executive Director for Public Safety & Security and/or Chief of Police is a critical component to the success of the cultural and organizational change. The executive search process should ensure that the successful applicant(s) (depending on the model) fully understands the unique challenges in policing a complex campus environment while balancing the specific needs of students, faculty, staff, patients, and visitors. S/he must have a proven track record engaging the community and, specifically the other public safety functions on campus, in collaborative partnerships that promote proactive, solution-oriented, community-based policing philosophies.

We cannot underscore how important this recruitment and selection process is, and the need for it to be transparent, open and engaging of the multitude of stakeholders at the University of Michigan.
V. FORMAL & INFORMAL ENGAGEMENT

The leadership of the three (3) public safety organizations on the Ann Arbor campus (DPS, HHS, and Housing) along with Museum Security and the North Campus Research Complex must meet formally and informally to discuss policy issues, concerns, successes and procedural challenges relevant to their individual and shared operations and services for the University of Michigan community. Likewise is true for their command staffs and line operations.

Informally, this may take the form of weekly/bi-weekly coffee/lunch meetings between the leadership. Formally, this may be bi-weekly operation’s staff meetings (e.g., supervisors, investigators and communications) to share information, concerns, common problems. Consideration may be given to an annual, shared awards event where members of each of the organization are recognized for their contributions (collectively and individually), along with members of the community who contributed significantly to the safety and security of the institution.