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As we note throughout this report, there has always been a natural tension between communities where colleges and universities are located and the institutions themselves. Over the past year, these tensions have been exacerbated at times by a number of factors, including the COVID-19 pandemic and calls for police reform following the killing of George Floyd in Minneapolis and other high-profile incidents.

Local and campus police departments are on the frontlines of helping to manage relations between municipalities and institutions of higher education, so it is critical that these agencies know one another, share information, and collaborate in both day-to-day operations and special events. This report is intended to help these agencies work more strategically and effectively.

The idea for this project initially came from then-Tempe, AZ Police Chief Sylvia Moir, who was also PERF President at the time. Her agency and the Arizona State University Police Department, led by Chief Michael Thompson, have implemented some innovative approaches to working together, and Chief Moir was interested in sharing their story and learning from other agencies. We originally planned an in-person meeting of municipal and campus police chiefs in Tempe during the spring of 2020, but COVID-19 derailed those plans.

So we shifted gears and put together a virtual meeting, which was held on September 17, 2020. By that time, COVID-19 and police reform protests had dramatically upended policing everywhere, and also tested the relationships between municipal and campus police agencies. Our virtual meeting brought together six pairs of campus and municipal police leaders to discuss common issues and challenges, and how they are continuing to work together. Close to 600 people attended this online event.

In addition to Chiefs Moir and Thompson, I want to thank the other police professionals who participated in our virtual meeting: Atlanta Police Chief Rodney Bryant; Clark Atlanta University Police Chief Debra Williams; Austin Police Department Chief of Staff Troy Gay; University of Texas at Austin Police Chief David Carter; Boston Police Deputy Superintendent Kevin McGoldrick; Boston University Police Chief Kelly Nee; Detroit Assistant Police Chief Todd Bettison; Wayne State University Police Chief Anthony Holt; Madison, WI Acting Police Chief Victor Wahl; and University of Wisconsin-Madison Police Chief Kristen Roman. They represent different types of communities and institutions from different parts of the country. Their insights and experiences were invaluable to this project.

I also want to thank the International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators (IACLEA) for its leadership on these issues and its support of our project. Executive Director John Bernhards took part in the webinar, and he and Director of Training Josh Bronson provided valuable insights into the workings of campus police agencies. The professionalization of campus law enforcement has been an important story in American policing over the past few decades, and IACLEA has led the way.

This project is part of PERF’s Critical Issues in Policing series, which is supported by the Motorola Solutions Foundation. This is our 40th Critical Issues report—a testament to Motorola’s commitment not just to PERF but to the entire profession of policing. (Previous reports are listed on the back cover of this document and online at www.policeforum.org/critical-issues-series.)
PERF is grateful to my friend Greg Brown, Motorola Solutions Chairman and CEO; Jack Molloy, Executive Vice President of Products and Sales; Jim Mears, Senior Vice President; Jason Winkler, Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer; Tracy Kimbo, Chief of Staff, Global Enterprise and Channels; Monica Mueller, Vice President of Government Affairs; Shamik Mukherjee, Chief Marketing Officer; Karem Perez, Executive Director of the Motorola Solutions Foundation; and Wesley Anne Barden, Manager of Evaluation and Grantmaking at the Foundation.

Several PERF staff members contributed to this project. Kevin Morison, PERF’s Chief Program Officer, led the project team and deftly oversaw the shift in approach when the pandemic struck. Senior Research Assistant Amanda Barber did much of the heavy lifting, conducting background research, organizing the online meeting, and drafting this report. Senior Research Associate Sarah Mostyn provided valuable guidance and direction throughout the project. Communications Director Craig Fischer edited the report and oversaw its production. Dave Williams designed and laid out the publication.

My Executive Assistant Soline Simenauer was instrumental in organizing and executing our virtual meeting and keeping me on track. She was aided by Assistant Communications Director James McGinty, Membership Coordinator Balinda Cockrell, and Accounting and Resource Coordinator Kit Lau. Another great effort by the PERF team!

Long after the COVID-19 pandemic has passed, the challenges facing municipal and campus police agencies will continue to evolve. I hope this report will help today’s—and tomorrow’s—police leaders better understand those challenges and manage them even more effectively.

Chuck Wexler
Executive Director
COMMUNITIES WITH COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES are special places. Academic institutions contribute to the lifeblood of a city, and in turn the host city can offer students a rich array of cultural opportunities. Schools attract educated and skilled people, including professors, graduate and undergraduate students, professional support personnel, and others. Campuses also provide many job opportunities that help support economic development and the local tax base. Universities and colleges also attract people with a wide diversity of backgrounds and ideas, contributing to a more vibrant community.

However, the presence of a college or university can also result in tensions between the campus community and those who are not connected to the college. Because many students come from other places, they may not be familiar with the history and traditions of the city or town they have relocated to. And because most students typically move away after graduation, they may have little or no interest or commitment to the long-term well-being of the city or town. Longtime residents may feel annoyed if students have loud parties or otherwise disrupt their community, and there may be resentments about educational or socio-economic differences between students and residents of a city or town.

Complicating the situation further in some communities, especially those with major state universities, the student body can represent a large portion of the municipal population. Many students live off campus, in nearby neighborhoods, which can increase opportunities for conflicts with residents. Many colleges also attract major events such as sporting events and concerts, which can be both a blessing economically and a curse in terms of congestion and noise.

In 2020, two additional developments contributed to tensions in some college towns:

- The COVID-19 pandemic disrupted the economies of many cities and towns, as students shifted to online classes and many returned to their hometowns in the spring of 2020. As students returned to campus in the fall, there were often fresh conflicts. Because some students felt less threatened by the coronavirus than did many permanent residents, they engaged in risky behavior such as large parties that may have contributed to the spread of COVID-19 within the towns.¹

- In some cities and towns, students have participated in or led demonstrations over the killing of George Floyd in police custody in Minneapolis and other high-profile encounters between police and residents throughout the country. Permanent residents may be more concerned than students about disruptions to daily routines or property damage occurring during these demonstrations, some of which turned into riots.

---

The police are at the center of this dynamic and intricate relationship between campuses and communities. In most college towns, there are at least two separate police departments—a municipal department and a campus police department.

These two types of departments typically face different challenges and have different priorities. For example, college campuses often have less violent crime than the cities where they are located. But that does not mean there is less concern about crime and safety. Parents sending their 17- or 18-year-old children to live on their own for the first time tend to be very concerned about any crimes occurring on or near campus.

That is the backdrop against which this project was conceived and carried out. The interaction and collaboration between municipal and campus police agencies impact the safety of both campuses and communities.

And the relationship between these two types of agencies—and between agency leaders—is key, because what happens in one of their jurisdictions inevitably impacts the other. For example, a raucous off-campus party of students can upset neighbors and compel a significant response by local police. Or a high-profile crime in the community, far away from campus, can still cause students and their parents to worry about safety and can undermine the reputation of the college or university located in that community.

Because campus and municipal police agencies are so interconnected, it is critical that they regularly communicate and share information, and that they train and problem-solve together. This report focuses on how agencies can work together effectively, even during the turbulent times of the past year and a half.

About this Project

This project was the brainchild of Sylvia Moir, former President of PERF and then-Chief of Police in Tempe, AZ, and Michael Thompson, Chief of the Arizona State University (ASU) Police Department, which is located in Tempe.

Chief Moir explained that growing up in a town with a large university made her aware of these dynamics from a young age:

“I grew up in a college town—Davis, California—so I understood how college towns are different, how they often have complexities that must be addressed, including policing issues. At the same time, I understood how towns are enriched by the presence of colleges and universities, in ways that are unique and different.”

Michael Thompson, Chief of the Arizona State University Police Department, described some differences between campus police and municipal police agencies:

“In a municipal police department, your constituents generally are people who live and work in the community for a long time. But on a university campus, we have a constantly changing mix of people who are coming from all across the country and around the world, in many cases just for a few years. And in many cases, students bring the concerns and issues that they've had with police in their home communities to the university community.”

Understanding how complex and important these “town-gown” relationships are, Chief Moir and Chief Thompson approached PERF about organizing a meeting where these issues could be discussed by colleagues from municipal and campus police departments and other interested organizations. PERF began to plan for an in-person conference on the ASU campus. However, the COVID-19 pandemic altered these plans, requiring a shift to a virtual meeting.

The virtual meeting, “Municipal-Campus Police Collaboration During COVID-19 and Civil Unrest,” took place on September 17, 2020. The virtual format allowed more people to listen and participate, attracting close to 600 participants. A video recording of the meeting is available online.

---

Participants included a panel of municipal and campus police officials from six cities and campuses across the country, and the executive director of the International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators (IACLEA), a professional association of campus public safety officials.³

The discussions at the PERF conference touched on a range of topics, including:

- The unique and critically important relationship between campus and municipal police agencies and between agency leaders.
- The importance of municipal and campus police agencies working together to share information; develop inter-agency agreements; coordinate efforts both in everyday policing and when responding to critical incidents and major events; and working to reduce crime and enhance feelings of safety.
- How the COVID-19 pandemic and the widespread protests following the May 2020 killing of George Floyd in Minneapolis impacted municipal and campus police agencies and their working relationships.
- What community policing looks like on campuses and how that strategy can be effectively implemented among campus and municipal police agencies.
- The unique challenges that these agencies face—everything from major events such as football games to active shooter incidents on campus or in nearby communities—and how they can collaborate to address them.

In addition to the discussion at the virtual meeting, this report is based on other sources of information, including recent PERF interviews with campus and municipal police leaders about the pandemic and reform issues.

³ For more information about IACLEA, visit www.iaclea.org.
Participants in PERF’s Conference on Municipal and Campus Policing

Police officials from the following jurisdictions participated in PERF’s virtual conference. Titles reflect the participants’ positions at the time of the meeting in September 2020.

**Tempe, Arizona** is a city of 192,000 residents approximately 10 miles east of Phoenix. Tempe is home to the main campus of **Arizona State University** (ASU), one of largest public universities in the United States. ASU has four campuses across the Phoenix metropolitan area and online programs. The ASU-Tempe campus is the largest, with 52,000 students in the 2020-2021 school year.

**Madison** is the capital of Wisconsin and the second largest city in the state, with a population of 260,000. The **University of Wisconsin-Madison** (UW-Madison), with a student enrollment of more than 45,000, is the state’s oldest and largest public university, as well as the City of Madison’s largest employer.

**Detroit** is Michigan’s largest city, with a population of 670,000. The city has 14 four-year colleges and universities, including **Wayne State University**, located in Midtown, a mixed-use area of businesses, cultural attractions, and historic residential neighborhoods. The university has a student body of 26,000.
**Boston** is the capital of Massachusetts and the state’s largest city, with a population of 692,600. Boston has more than 30 colleges and universities, including **Boston University**. With 41,000 students, Boston University is the largest university in Massachusetts.

**Atlanta** is Georgia’s largest city, with a population of nearly 500,000. Atlanta is home to 22 colleges and universities. Clark Atlanta University, with approximately 4,000 students, was created in 1988 with the consolidation of Atlanta University and Clark College, both historically Black institutions.

**Austin** is Texas’s capital city and has a population of approximately 965,000. Austin has several colleges and universities, the largest of which is the University of Texas at Austin, with more than 50,000 students on campus.

The **International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators** (IACLEA) is the largest professional association dedicated to campus security, with more than 4,200 members. Members are police chiefs, public safety directors, law enforcement officers, and security personnel at institutions of higher education around the world. IACLEA’s mission is to “advance public safety for educational institutions by providing training, research, advocacy, accreditation, education, and professional services.” (See page 18 for more information about IACLEA.)
Municipal Policing to Campus Policing: A Common Career Pathway

Many campus police chiefs start their careers in municipal policing. In fact, all but one of the campus police chiefs who participated in PERF’s virtual meeting had begun their careers in municipal departments and gained the majority of their experience in that setting.

These leaders said that as campus police chiefs, they must build relationships with their local city police agency. It helps to have an understanding of how the city department operates, both day-to-day and during major events or critical incidents.

University of Wisconsin-Madison Chief Kristen Roman noted that her years with the Madison Police Department gave her extensive experience with implementing community policing, which has been useful as she works to develop strong relationships with the campus community.

Chief David Carter spoke about his transition from the Austin Police Department (APD) to the department at the University of Texas at Austin. After a 28-year career with APD, he said the biggest adjustment was about the decision-making process in higher education, which tends to be more deliberate and sometimes more complicated. Chief Carter said he had to learn to be patient with presenting issues and ideas to various committees and then waiting for a response.

Boston University Chief Kelly Nee said that in campus policing, there is even greater scrutiny of uses of force than in a municipal department. “Our officers are expected to exercise a very high level of restraint,” Chief Nee said. “But if there’s a threat, they are Special State Police Officers and they’re very highly trained on use of force.”

Municipal policing is not the only career pathway to becoming a campus chief. Many campus police chiefs, like Chief Anthony Holt of Wayne State University, have come up through the ranks of their agencies.
PERF’s research into the relationships between municipal and campus police agencies in different institutional settings and different communities revealed a number of common issues and concerns. The following are some of the key strategies that PERF identified for building strong relationships between municipal and campus police departments (these strategies are covered in greater detail throughout the report).

These approaches are critically important now, as campuses and communities continue to address issues related to COVID-19, calls for police reform, tightening budgets, and regular protest activity in some areas.

Promote interagency cooperation through formal or informal agreements.

Because they operate in contiguous, and often overlapping jurisdictions, it is essential for municipal and campus police agencies to establish clear rules of engagement. In many cases, these collaborations are formalized with memorandums of understanding or agreement (see Appendix A for a sample MOU). In other cases, municipal and campus police agencies develop informal understandings or “handshake” agreements. Regardless of which approach is adopted, the goal is to know in advance how each agency will support the other in various situations or critical incidents.

Find ways to share information.

There are other ways to share information and improve collaboration. The Arizona State University Police Department, the Tempe Police Department, and ASU officials have a conference call every Monday to review events from the previous week and to develop strategies for handling emerging issues. The Wayne State University Police Department participates in the Detroit Police Department’s weekly COMPSTAT meetings. And University of Texas at Austin Chief David Carter said his department is able to share information with the Austin Police Department and nearly 20 other Texas police and sheriffs’ agencies through the Austin Regional Intelligence Center (ARIC), a fusion center that gathers intelligence related to crime, terrorist activity, critical infrastructure, and other matters.

Share resources to promote collaboration.

Wayne State University Chief Anthony Holt said the university regularly opens its doors to the Detroit Police Department, allowing them to hold training seminars, community policing programs, and youth programs on its campus at no cost. Chief David Carter said the University of Texas at Austin Police Department was building a satellite substation on the west campus boundary that will serve as a collaborative space for the Austin Police Department,

campus police, and the Texas Department of Public Safety.\(^5\)

---

**Conduct joint training.**

Joint training between campus and municipal police departments allows agencies to enhance everyday policing and prepare for large-scale events or critical incidents that involve students and the broader community. For example, Boston University police and city police officers train together regularly on de-escalation, active shooter scenarios, and other critical topics. Some BU police officers also attend the Boston Police Academy, which helps ensure the two agencies share a common vocabulary and approach to policing. As Boston University Chief Kelly Nee noted, “The first time that officers from the two departments meet should not be during a crisis.”

---

**Work together to prepare for large-scale planned events and critical incidents.**

Handling large-scale events requires collaboration between municipal and campus police. This includes planning for scheduled events, such as football games and other athletic events, concerts, holiday celebrations, and large demonstrations and protests. Joint planning also should be conducted for unplanned incidents, such as weather emergencies, natural disasters, transportation accidents, mass shootings, or terrorist attacks.

For example, Boston Police Deputy Superintendent Kevin McGoldrick said his agency’s plans for major planned events like the Boston Marathon include a joint team that incorporates personnel from many universities in Boston, especially schools located on the marathon’s route, such as Boston University and Boston College.

---

**If possible, embed campus police officers in your municipal police department.**

Embedding campus police officers in divisions of the city police department improves communication, information-sharing, and working relationships. When campus and municipal police work together on a daily basis, they are better prepared to jointly handle large-scale events or critical incidents.

In Tempe, for example, Arizona State University police bicycle officers ride with Tempe police bike officers. In Detroit, Wayne State University police participate in some of the investigations units within the Detroit Police Department.

---

**Controlling the spread of COVID-19 is a mutual responsibility of municipal and campus police.**

COVID-19 cases on campuses are a major concern and a potentially contentious issue between students and the residents of a community. That’s particularly true when students fail to adhere to public health regulations and guidelines, such as social distancing and mask wearing, or they hold large parties in off-campus housing.\(^6\) In some cases, it appears that the presence of a college or university resulted in higher rates of COVID infections and deaths in the college towns that contain the school.\(^7\)

Since the beginning of the pandemic, police chiefs across the nation, including those not in college towns, have struggled with managing their role in enforcing stay-at-home orders, mask mandates, limits on public gatherings, and other public health orders. Most police chiefs interviewed by PERF have agreed that a strict enforcement approach based on arrests is not viable, especially since most jurisdictions were trying to minimize community contacts.

---


\(6\). See, for example, the following:


and not bring more people than necessary into the criminal justice system. Some cities have used citations and fines for more egregious offenders.

**While campus police can issue citations and code violations, campus police chiefs agreed that disciplinary sanctions that affect academic status or housing often carry more weight with students than the threat of traditional law enforcement.**

In cities and towns with universities and colleges, municipal and campus police found it essential to coordinate with one another on their COVID response, to help ensure that they were not working at cross purposes. Agencies need to send a consistent message about their approach to COVID enforcement.

### Community policing continues to be a priority.

Community policing has been a guiding philosophy in many agencies for years, and was especially important in 2020 due to the close public scrutiny and distrust of the police following the killing of George Floyd in Minneapolis. The COVID-19 pandemic complicated in-person law enforcement outreach to communities because of the public health risks of holding public meetings or gatherings between officers and community members. As the pandemic recedes, police leaders hope to resume in-person community policing activities.

### Attend to the concerns of students, even as other issues demand attention.

Despite the disruptions to police work caused by the COVID-19 pandemic and the need in many cities for police to shift resources to managing demonstrations, municipal and campus police agencies have worked to keep their focus on the crime issues of greatest concern to their communities.

For example, to address the ongoing concern of sexual assaults on campus, Boston University Chief Nee hired a dedicated coordinator who was a former sexual assault investigator and supervisor with the Boston Police Department.

To maintain a close relationship with students at Clark Atlanta University, Police Chief Debra Williams attends all student government town hall forums to gather information about the issues of concern to students, and regularly tells students that “this is your police department.” Atlanta Chief Rodney Bryant, who took office in June 2020, as the twin crises of the pandemic and George Floyd protests were taking hold, said he intended to have a presence on campus and more communication with students.

---

CITY AND CAMPUS POLICE EXECUTIVES AT THE PERF meeting stressed the importance of community policing as a foundational strategy to achieve safer campuses and communities. They also agreed that the COVID-19 pandemic and the demonstrations following George Floyd’s death only increased the need for more consistent community engagement.

For campus police agencies, community policing is often a natural fit. These agencies tend to have especially close relationships with students, because they often provide services on a daily basis that go beyond traditional law enforcement functions. These include such activities as escorting students walking across campus after dark and helping students who have locked themselves out of their dormitories.

Chief Thompson of the Arizona State University Police Department noted that law enforcement can be different in a campus environment. Depending on the nature and severity of the offense, a violation may involve the police; student counseling or social services such as drug treatment or mental health care; and/or the dean’s office and student disciplinary systems.

Campus police also are aware that they generally have an additional constituency to whom they are responsible: students’ parents or guardians. In most cases, going to college is the first time that students are living on their own, and one of parents’ top concerns is their children’s safety.

However, the basic principles of community policing are the same for municipal and campus agencies, the police leaders who participated in the PERF meeting said. People want to feel safe, and they want positive engagement with their police.

Municipal police agencies can participate in community policing efforts on campus, and campus police can support local initiatives. For example, Tempe Chief Sylvia Moir said her department has a tradition of conducting a “Welcome Walk” in August when students arrive on the ASU campus. City police officers visit with students on campus and in off-campus locations where students live. Officers also make sure to engage with students’ parents to provide information about how the police help protect students’ safety.

“I was with the City of Madison Police Department for the majority of my career before taking the chief’s position on campus. I can tell you that in a campus community, there are additional opportunities to engage in community policing. It manifests differently. Community policing defines and informs everything that we do.”

— Chief Kristen Roman, University of Wisconsin-Madison Police Department

>> continued on page 14
“We may have a situation where someone is shot on the east side of Detroit, miles from our campus, and parents become concerned, thinking, ‘This isn’t safe. I can’t send my kids to the city to go to school,’ even though we’re listed as one of the safest campuses in the Midwest. “So I have to be concerned with a lot of crimes that are not happening in my jurisdiction, because it affects the population of students that we’re trying to encourage to come to and stay at the university.”

— Chief Anthony Holt, Wayne State University Police Department

While she was still Durham, NC Police Chief, CJ Davis told PERF about a strategy she had found successful for reducing conflicts between Duke University students and members of the larger Durham community: create the position of fraternity house liaison officer. In June 2020, Chief Davis became head of the Memphis Police Department.

When I first got here in 2016, Duke University was basically a thorn in our side with off-campus parties. They’ve been a quality-of-life issue for people living in the community for a very long time. I was getting so many emails from community members about the noise, liquor bottles, and drug paraphernalia on the streets and in people’s yards, and people urinating in yards. I realized something needed to be done.

I met with community members in an area that has several fraternity houses, and we decided to assign an officer to be the college frat house liaison. This officer doesn’t take an enforcement or antagonistic approach. He’s young and could pass for a Duke student, and he has been very effective at having conversations with the students. He’s not seen as a Durham police officer coming to threaten them. He’s talking to them about college life.

We try to appeal to our college students’ empathetic side by helping them see how they’ve impacted the quality of life of some of their neighbors, particularly elderly folks. The neighbors had gotten so used to the parties over decades that they felt there wasn’t anything they could do about it.

But this liaison went from door to door and set up meetings with the individuals leasing the houses. He ended up taking some of the community members with him to talk about the effect the parties were having on them and their elderly relatives.

Since this started a couple of years ago, it has really changed the dynamic with party houses in the Duke area. We also get the university involved so there are sanctions and accountability. Before, the Durham Police Department just responded to the neighborhood and had to deal with the person renting the house. Now we have a process for running a student’s name through the university database, and there can be sanctions. If a person is cited a certain number of times, it threatens their ability to take part in some activities.
“Regardless of whether you’re working for a municipality or a university, people just want to feel safe. And they want to make sure that they have a good relationship with those who are protecting them. We all want to be treated with civility, respect and dignity.”
— Chief Debra Williams, Clark Atlanta University Police Department

In Austin, Police Chief of Staff Troy Gay said that officers with strong communication skills were important in engaging with demonstrators protesting the killing of George Floyd, which included large numbers of UT-Austin students:

“Each shift during a protest, we created community engagement teams. We had the best of the best out there, the officers who communicate well and love to talk to community members. By getting out there, we were able to hear their concerns, and all they wanted was to be heard.

“After a while, the protesters started to self-police. On many occasions, they would rein in individuals who were causing problems.”

In 2020, as demonstrations surged across the nation, Chief Roman said that the University of Wisconsin Police Department assisted Madison police during protests in the city. She added that she and Acting Madison Chief Wahl are in regular communication about how these roles might shift if protests move to campus locations.

The police executives consulted for this project said that as police agencies face greater public scrutiny and increased demands for transparency, establishing and maintaining strong relationships with their communities—whether it’s students or residents—will be more essential than ever. These leaders emphasized that agencies must remain anchored to the community policing approaches that have worked well in the past, even as they focus on an expanding set of issues and concerns.
A recurring theme expressed by all the police leaders involved in this project was that effective community policing requires collaboration between campus and municipal departments.

Campus police officers have the challenge of providing safety for both their students on campus and those who live off campus. That requires partnerships with municipal police departments and other law enforcement agencies. All meeting participants said that forming solid relationships with their city police or campus police counterparts is essential to their success.

Here are some of the ways that agencies are collaborating:

**Regularly Scheduled Meetings**

Tempe Police Chief Sylvia Moir emphasized the need for regular, standing meetings where all interested parties are briefed on current events and strategies. Every Monday morning, leaders from the Arizona State University Police Department, the University administration, the city of Tempe, and the Tempe Police Department come together on an online call to discuss incidents that occurred in the previous week and over the weekend, emerging trends and issues, and strategies for addressing them.

“I would urge cities and universities, if you don’t already have a situation report call like this, that you start one,” Chief Moir said.

**Joint COMPSTAT Meetings**

Wayne State University Police Chief Anthony Holt said that members of his department participate in the Detroit Police Department’s regular COMPSTAT meetings. This arrangement allows Wayne State University police officials to get accurate, up-to-date information about recent incidents or emerging issues in the city that may impact the campus. It also helps the two agencies work at developing collaborative strategies when issues impact both the city and the campus.

“We share information. We have formal data-sharing agreements, and one of the Wayne State professors participates and pulls data for our COMPSTAT,” said Detroit Assistant Police Chief Todd Bettison.

The situation in Detroit is unique for a few reasons. Wayne State’s open-style campus is located in the central part of Detroit called Midtown. In addition, all WSU officers are commissioned Detroit police officers, sworn in by the chief of the DPD. Chief Holt describes the departments as “enmeshed,” with officers from his agency embedded in DPD’s homicide, mounted, and commercial auto theft units.
Ongoing Communications

Beyond formal meetings and conference calls, municipal and campus leaders stressed the need for regular, ongoing communications between agency personnel. In many cases, participating in COMPSTAT or other meetings helps agencies build relationships and foster ongoing, everyday communication between them.

Most of the campus police chiefs participating in PERF’s project served in city police departments earlier in their careers. That experience has given them a good perspective on the importance of everyday communication and information-sharing between campus and municipal police departments. These chiefs stressed the necessity of environments with open lines of communication and a readiness to assist each other.

Sharing Facilities and Other Resources

Most municipal police departments run a variety of community-based programs directed at young people, senior citizens, advisory committees, and the community at large, but the agencies often lack the facilities needed to host these gatherings. On the other hand, colleges and universities typically have a range of facilities—classrooms, conference rooms, auditoriums, and gymnasiums—that are suitable for most community programs. Some campuses are making their facilities available to their municipal police partners for this purpose.

For example, Wayne State University makes its campus readily available to the Detroit Police Department for community policing and youth programs. The two police chiefs said that this helps bring the departments together while building familiarity and relationships between students and city police officers.

Memorandums of Understanding (MOU)

It is important for any police agencies that work together to create formal memorandums of understanding to guide their collaboration. MOUs help to minimize confusion and promote a consistent, organized response to a wide range of situations and jurisdictional issues.

For college and university police departments, it can be particularly important to have MOUs with their municipal agency partners. These agencies typically interact not just during major events or critical incidents, but also on an everyday basis in which student life intermingles with the surrounding communities.

Participants in this project shared different examples of how they formalize their collaboration through formal MOUs. Agencies can have a basic MOU to establish rules or guidance on a range of routine activities. For example, an MOU between the Austin Police Department and the University of Texas at Austin Police Department (see Appendix A) covers the following issues:

- Arrest authority for each agency;
- Mutual aid requests;
- Notification requirements regarding incidents in one agency’s jurisdiction that may affect the safety of residents in the other jurisdiction;

“We treat campus police as partners. We have various memorandums of agreement for specific situations, but if there’s just something that they need, we treat it like a mutual aid situation and help them out. And certainly they’ve repaid the favor numerous times and helped us out when we needed assistance. It’s actually pretty seamless. Even though it’s two different departments, we share much of the same geography.”

— Deputy Superintendent Kevin McGoldrick, Boston Police Department
• Handling of requests from one police department for particular types of assistance from the other, such as assistance provided by city police to campus police with crime scene evidence collection and processing, investigations, or special operations;

• Rules for executing warrants or investigations by city police on property owned or controlled by the university.

For various types of situations, the MOU specifies which agency will control the scene and will assume responsibility for managing the specified tasks.

An MOU can be quite detailed about complex situations. For example, the Austin-University of Texas MOU specifies that when it is necessary for city police to execute a warrant or conduct an investigation on campus property, the city police should request that a campus police officer accompany the city officer, unless that would “unreasonably interfere with the investigation.” And if notification would cause an unacceptable delay, it may be postponed. The MOU also states that city police should not interrupt a class to execute an arrest or search warrant, except in exigent circumstances.

Depending on the geography of the campus, agencies may need to formalize exactly who has jurisdiction where. For example, Clark Atlanta University has two different campus designations: interior campus area and open campus area. The interior campus is a gated area that is completely the jurisdiction of campus police. The open campus area is made up of educational buildings mixed among non-university buildings, outside of the gated area. Campus police have jurisdiction as far as 500 yards out from the farthest educational building. Atlanta police have jurisdiction and patrol the public streets that run through this part of campus. This arrangement helps the two agencies—and the community—understand who has jurisdictional responsibility on different parts of the campus.

Municipal and campus police leaders also said that mutual aid agreements and multi-agency coordination are important for major events and critical incidents, such as natural disasters, active shooter incidents, or large-scale planned events. They said that both the National Incident Management System (NIMS) and the Incident Command System (ICS) provide a framework for helping to manage these events, and it is important for all police leaders to become familiar with them.

### Joint Trainings

Several of the police leaders who participated in the PERF meeting reported that their officers train together, especially on the response to major events, demonstrations, and active shooter situations. Chief Kristen Roman said that Madison police participate in overlapping training sessions with the University of Wisconsin police so that they can become familiar with the geography of the campus and the resources that each agency brings to a response. The Austin police, University of Texas at Austin police, and regional partners have held joint trainings related to the increase in demonstrations during 2020.

The Boston University Police Department trains with the Boston Police Department on ICAT (Integrating Communications, Assessment, and Tactics), other de-escalation approaches, and active shooter scenarios. In addition, BU students sometimes serve as actors in scenario-based training sessions. During intercession periods between semesters, university police also host training activities in campus buildings.

Similarly, officers from the MIT, Harvard, and city of Cambridge police departments all went through ICAT training together. This helps to ensure a consistent response when any of the agencies is responding to a call involving someone in crisis who may be unarmed or armed with a weapon other than a firearm, whether the incident occurs on or off campus.


11. For more information about ICAT, visit www.policeforum.org/icat.
In recent decades, policing on America’s college and university campuses has become increasingly professional, with campus agencies adopting the industry standards and best practices of their local and state counterparts. A key driver behind this trend has been the International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators (IACLEA).

Founded in 1958 by 11 college and university security directors, IACLEA today has more than 4,200 members, the largest professional association dedicated to campus security. The association’s membership includes police chiefs, public safety directors, law enforcement officers, and security personnel at higher education institutions around the world. Its primary purpose is to share best practices, solve problems, and set standards for the profession.

IACLEA offers its members a range of services:

Training: IACLEA hosts an annual conference that features an educational program, networking opportunities, and products and services exposition. An Emerging Issues training series offers training on specific developing topics. IACLEA also offers a distance learning program which includes year-round webinars on a range of public safety concerns, and leadership development training to support future policing executives.

Accreditation: IACLEA operates an accreditation program which recognizes that a department conforms to the highest professional standards for campus law enforcement and protective services.

Government Relations: IACLEA members provide their expertise to federal, state, and local lawmakers, policymakers, and administration representatives.

Communications & Publications: IACLEA publishes the “Campus Law Enforcement Journal” for campus public safety officials. It also offers newsletters, a news clippings service, online communications, and social media to keep its members informed.

For more information about IACLEA, visit www.iaclea.org.

“We train with Boston, Brookline, and Cambridge. We do ICAT training and de-escalation training, and active shooter training. Some of my officers have actually attended the Boston Police Academy. So we do a lot of joint training.”

— Chief Kelly Nee, Boston University Police Department
Beginning in March 2020, the policing profession was upended by a series of major, often traumatic events. The COVID-19 pandemic forced businesses, schools, and other institutions to close and shift to remote operations. It also prompted police departments to rethink many of their basic operations, including how they respond to calls for service and interact with the community.

Two months later, footage of the killing of George Floyd while in the custody of Minneapolis police officers sparked nationwide protests over police use of force and led to widespread calls for police reform, including suggestions to “defund” the police by shifting resources to other agencies to deal with some of the situations that police traditionally respond to.

The economic impact of the pandemic, combined with defunding initiatives in some cities, led to budget reductions in many police departments. In a July 2020 survey of PERF member agencies, nearly half said that their budgets already had been cut or would likely be cut in the next fiscal year. Most of the remainder expected funding to be unchanged, and only 16% expected a budget increase. In general, COVID-related budget impacts turned out to be not as severe as originally expected, but many jurisdictions continue to face budget pressures.

On top of these three trends, many communities of all sizes experienced dramatic increases in homicides and shootings during 2020. Data collected by PERF and the Major Cities Chiefs Association found that 58% of 223 agencies surveyed had an increase in homicides during the first nine months of 2020, when compared to the same period of 2019. Approximately two-thirds of responding agencies reported an increase in aggravated assaults during this same period.

The combination of these factors affected police agencies of all types and in all parts of the country. They also had an impact on the relationship between campus police departments and their municipal counterparts. How those relationships will be affected long-term is unknown. This section explores what some of the short-term impacts have been.

Lessons Learned from the COVID-19 Pandemic

The COVID-19 pandemic has created special challenges for municipal and campus police agencies and elevated the importance of interagency collaboration. The lessons learned from this experience could be applied in the future to a wide range of challenges.

that colleges and universities and their community partners face.

COVID cases on campuses have been a major concern, and a potentially contentious issue between students and non-student residents of a community.\textsuperscript{15} Compared to the general populations of the cities and towns where their campuses are located, students tend to be young and at relatively low risk for life-threatening illness if they contract the coronavirus. That can lead to resentment among residents when students hold large parties or otherwise fail to adhere to public health regulations or guidelines.

It appears that the presence of a college or university can result in higher rates of COVID infections and deaths in the surrounding community. A New York Times study of 203 counties where students make up at least 10\% of the population found that COVID-related deaths increased faster in those college-rich counties than in the rest of the nation during the fall semester months of September–December 2020. “Few of the victims were college students, but rather older people and others living and working in the community,” the Times article stated.\textsuperscript{16}

Fortunately, that early trend seems to have abated. In 2021, COVID cases declined in both counties with and without a heavy campus presence.\textsuperscript{17} As of early June 2021, the New York Times counted more than 700,000 COVID cases at colleges and universities.

Since the beginning of the pandemic, police chiefs across the nation have struggled with managing their role in enforcing stay-at-home orders, mask mandates, limits on public gatherings, and other public health orders.

In campus communities, the challenges can be even greater, because many students do not understand the risks of not following public health regulations. In the fall of 2020, colleges and universities grappled with decisions about whether to bring students back to campus and whether to hold in-person classes. Some schools, such as the University of Notre Dame, chose to resume full in-person classes, which placed even more pressure on the university’s police department.

Most police executives PERF has interviewed throughout the pandemic agree that a strict enforcement approach to COVID-19 regulations is not a viable option. Most jurisdictions have tried to minimize unnecessary contacts between police and residents and not bring more people into the criminal justice system.

Instead, police executives have reported that the most effective and viable approach is to begin with education and guidance. Officers ask community members to comply and provide a brief statement of

\begin{quote}
“Students feel that they can go from one residence hall to another to visit each other, which is a natural, normal thing to do as a college student. But they don’t realize the potential risks that that causes.

“So it’s a challenge for the police and the university administration to try to keep people as separated as possible, and find ways for students to not feel isolated.”

— Chief Michael Thompson, Arizona State University Police Department
\end{quote}
How Events of the Past Year Impacted Municipal-Campus Police Relationships

As the fall 2020 semester was getting under way, the communities surrounding the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh were experiencing a surge in COVID-19 cases, with test positivity rates of 35% or higher. In an October 2020 interview with PERF, Police Chief Kurt Leibold described how the university mobilized to protect its students by adapting some of the trend analysis and operational techniques that police agencies often use to combat crime.

We realized we had to create our own testing site, because our Student Health Center couldn’t handle it, and we wanted to test as many students as we could. Every resident student is tested every week, so that’s 2,200 a week, or 440 a day. We do antigen and PCR testing. The antigen surveillance testing is the key.

We have contact tracers and disease investigators who were trained by our county public health agency. Our contact tracers are like detectives, and they work just with our college students, faculty, and staff who become infected.

We have an operations center where we analyze all this data. I base this on the way we do police work. When I was in the Milwaukee Police Department, we would identify trends and set up strategic plans to deal with issues.

That’s what we do in our operations center every day. We dive into the data and look at how many COVID tests we did, how many tests were positive, and which residence halls and floors were most affected. The idea is to come up with actionable intelligence that we can act on immediately. If we see a 10% positivity rate on any floor, that entire floor is ordered in for testing, or put on notice that they’re a hotspot.

We actively pursue the virus. We did tabletop exercises in the summer anticipating a surge. We had a norovirus outbreak a couple years ago, so we learned from how we handled that. We knew we were going to have a surge at the beginning because college kids came here to socialize as well as receive an education. We brought students back September 2, and by September 17 we were at our high, with 90 students infected per day. The residence halls that we had converted into quarantine and isolation centers were filling up to capacity.

We knew we had to control fear, because that’s what was going to shut us down. Once the faculty members lose confidence, you have to go online again. We were able to avoid that by explaining that we anticipated this and we would get through it. And we did.

Our latest issue is off campus, with neighborhood parties. We monitor social media and proactively go out to prevent parties from happening. If we have to break up a party of 200, that’s a spreader event. So we try to get to them before it becomes an event.

How One University Used Hot-Spot Analysis to Combat COVID-19
Chief Roman agreed with other chiefs that education should be the first response to violations of COVID rules. But if infractions persist, her department turns to Student Affairs to help address the situation.

**Chief Roman said that while campus police can issue citations and code violations, campus sanctions that could affect academics or housing often carry more weight with students.**

As part of its COVID response strategy, Madison formed small teams of municipal and campus officers and included a representative from the university’s Student Affairs Office to drive home the message that students could face penalties from the school for not complying with the rules.

Other schools are following a similar approach, and in some cases the penalties for failing to abide by COVID-19 restrictions have been severe. At Boston University, for example, sanctions can include a suspension from school with no refunds.

Tempe Chief Sylvia Moir pointed out that while university sanctions are the first action for students who violate regulations, legal penalties within the Tempe municipal code are available if students continue failing to comply.

“A citation or a warning from the Madison Police Department may not be a big concern for a student who wants to have a party and live the college experience. But when they recognize that there are potential sanctions through the university that can affect their status as a student, that’s much more impactful.”

**— Acting Chief Victor Wahl, Madison Police Department**
The Impact of Budget Cuts

In addition to the issues created by the COVID-19 pandemic, municipal and campus police agencies have had to deal with other challenges over the past year, including budget cuts, large-scale protests over police use of force, and calls to reform policing.

The economic recession resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic had a significant effect on municipal tax bases. Because police departments typically account for the largest share of a city government's budget, it is often difficult to spare the police when budget cuts must be made.

At the same time, the demonstrations, and in some cases rioting, that followed the death of George Floyd in Minneapolis spurred calls to “defund” police agencies. In many cases, this term was used to mean cutting police budgets by shifting funds from police departments to other agencies that provide services for people in crisis.

In Austin, for example, the police department’s share of the city's general fund dropped from 40% to 26% as some responsibilities such as forensics and victim services were shifted away from the police department and the funds were reallocated to a wide range of services, including mental health first responders, substance abuse programs, workforce development, and housing for homeless persons.

At PERF’s meeting, Chief of Staff Troy Gay said the cuts, along with a significant decrease in overtime funds, would eventually affect agency operations. He said the Austin Police Department was working to ensure that patrol staffing would remain adequate. Gay said the department has been working with local social justice groups for several years on alternative public safety responses, “so this is not new to us.”

“This is requiring us to pivot and to make the necessary changes to make sure our community is safe,” Gay said.

In Tempe, the Police Department was slated for a 5% cut in funding for 2021, but city council members said the cuts were due to the COVID recession, not to calls for defunding. Council members reportedly said that hundreds of community members told them they did not want to see major cuts in policing.

At the PERF meeting, Tempe Chief Sylvia Moir said that even the relatively small 5% cut was concerning, in light of increasing calls for service. She expressed concern about reductions in officers’ ability to provide proactive services to the community, and said that cuts could have damaging effects on employee morale.

Municipal police leaders at the PERF meeting said that while reductions in their budgets would not immediately affect their relationships with campus police agencies, they warned that continued cuts could have a negative impact over time. Departments could be forced to concentrate their resources on core services such as responding to calls for service and investigating crimes, and cut back on initiatives such as community policing and collaborative programs with other agencies, including campus police departments.

For the most part, it appears that campus police departments have not been directly impacted by pandemic-related budget reductions. However, campus agencies have not escaped the calls for reform or defunding. In general, it appears that college and university administrators have resisted these calls, primarily from student leaders, to dramatically cut funding for their campus police agencies.

At Arizona State University, Chief Michael Thompson said that several student groups had called for either defunding or even disbanding the campus police department, but university administrators value the department and have turned back those ideas. “University officials recognize that there

have probably been some shortfalls in their response to addressing some of the concerns that people have about social services issues, so they're working to rectify those issues,” he said. Chief Thompson said his department has worked to establish relationships with the student groups that are concerned about policing, so that the police can understand the students’ concerns and work to address them when they can.

Clark Atlanta University Chief Debra Wil-
liams said there haven’t been any discussions about defunding her agency, and that university leaders have supported her officers and their presence on campus. Similarly, Atlanta Chief Bryant said that the citizens of Atlanta do not want to see the dismantling or reduction of police.22

Both the Detroit and Wayne State University police departments reported budget cuts, but they were related to the COVID-19 pandemic.23 For the university police, this was unusual. Chief Anthony Holt explained that because police are first responders, they have not been included in past funding reductions. Chief Holt said he expected a budget cut of approximately 10%, which could result in layoffs, changes to retirement packages, and/or forced furloughs.

While the WSU administration does not support defunding the police, University President M. Roy Wilson formed a Social Justice Action Commit-
tee to examine the department’s policies and procedures, saying that “the brutal injustice of George Floyd’s death at the hands of police has continued to galvanize people across the nation to demand real change to combat systemic racism.” The committee was charged with addressing issues of bias across the university, including its police department.24

Chief Holt said that part of his challenge will be to educate members of the WSU community about what the police actually do and how they operate. For example, he said, many people do not know that the WSU Police Department already operates a program in which a mental health professional rides along with an officer.

"Parents will tell you over and over that their biggest concern is the safety of their children, the students. That’s the dominant theme. And it’s getting harder and harder to do that with fewer resources. We need to make certain that we’re providing support to the schools. We need to make certain that our agencies are fully equipped and that they’re able to do their jobs.”

— Executive Director John Bernhards, International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators

Calls for Police Reform
Have Tested Relationships
Between Municipal and Campus Police

While none of the campus police chiefs at the PERF meeting said their schools were contemplating changing their relationships with their municipal police agencies, events of the past year have strained relationships between some campus and municipal police departments in different parts of the country.

The most extreme example comes from the University of Minnesota. Two days after George Floyd was killed while in custody of Minneapolis police officers, University President Joan Gabel announced that the school was scaling back its relationship with the Minneapolis Police Department. The university no longer contracts with MPD for law enforcement support during football games and other athletic events, concerts, and ceremonies. In addition, the university is no longer using the MPD when specialized services, such as K-9 explosive detection units, are needed for university events.

“We will limit our collaboration with the MPD to joint patrols and investigations that directly enhance the safety of our community or that allow us to investigate and apprehend those who put our students, faculty, and staff at risk,” President Gabel wrote in a May 27, 2020 message to students, faculty, and staff.25

In June 2020, Clark University announced changes in its relationship with the Worcester, Massachusetts Police Department. While it didn't completely sever ties, the university said it would stop hiring off-duty Worcester police officers for campus details and eliminate a policy requiring a police officer at large student events.26 This came after university officials expressed concern over the Worcester Police Department's response to a George Floyd-related protest in which pepper spray was deployed and four students were arrested.

Student groups at several other colleges and universities have called for their campus police agencies to be scaled back or even eliminated, and for their schools to rethink their relationships with municipal police agencies.

At The Ohio State University, for example, student government leaders called on the OSU Police Division to end all contractual arrangements with the Columbus Division of Police (CDP) for services, event management and investigations on campus, as well as re-evaluate joint patrols, in the aftermath of local protests over the George Floyd killing.27 In April 2021, students renewed their calls for the university to sever ties with the CDP after a Columbus police officer fatally shot 16-year-old Ma'Khia Bryant as she was attempting to stab another individual.28

At the University of Arizona, students advocated cutting ties not only with the Tucson Police Department, but also with Customs and Border Protection and other federal and state agencies.29 Similar calls for downsizing university police departments and restricting cooperation with municipal police agencies have been made at New York University, Columbia University, University of Louisville, Georgetown University, Temple University, University of Iowa, and Northwestern University, among others.30

At Northwestern, a student-led organization called “NU Community Not Cops” organized in the wake of the George Floyd killing. The group has called for the abolition of the University Police within the Department of Safety and Security. Following clashes with both university and municipal police during protests, the group has also called for Northwestern to end its mutual aid agreements and other collaborative efforts with the Evanston and Chicago police departments, as well as other law enforcement agencies.

In response, Northwestern University administrators authorized two studies of the Department of Safety and Security—one internal,\(^{31}\) the other an external review conducted by a team of lawyers and security experts.\(^{32}\) The latter study included a number of recommendations, including assessing whether some safety and security activities could be assigned to other university functions, enhancing community engagement and accountability, and improving unconscious bias training.

Most administrators at these and other schools have said that ending their relationships with the local police departments would not necessarily solve the problems that students have identified or make campuses safer. They have agreed that it is necessary to look at current policing practices and identify specific improvements that could be made. But because many colleges and universities are not equipped to handle large-scale events or major crimes on their own, schools will always require some support from outside police agencies.

Both campus and municipal police executives at PERF’s meeting said that the policing profession is facing greater public scrutiny than ever before. Leaders said that in this environment, they will need to step up their efforts to listen to the community, understand their concerns, and work more collaboratively to implement meaningful changes.

---

FOR BOTH CAMPUS AND MUNICIPAL POLICE agencies, the primary mission is to prevent crime and promote public safety. Although their size, geography and community makeup may differ, both types of agencies are evaluated largely by the amount of crime taking place in their jurisdiction. And campus police departments are accountable not just to the student population, but to students’ parents and guardians as well.

Since the passage of the Clery Act in 1990, colleges and universities have been required to collect and report a wide range of crime data. And while the vast majority of crimes on campus are property offenses, campus police chiefs at the PERF meeting expressed concern over two more serious crime types: sexual assaults and active shooter incidents.

This section provides an overview of crime on campuses, as well as recent crime trends in municipalities that could impact campuses as well.

**Historical Trends on Campus Crime**

According to the most recent national data on crimes on campuses, gathered by the National Center for Education Statistics, the total reported number of criminal offenses on campuses declined from 41,596 in 2001 to 28,873 in 2017—a 31% decrease that mirrored an overall reduction in crime in the United States as a whole.33

The rate of crime per 10,000 full-time equivalent students declined even more steeply, from 35.6 per 10,000 in 2001 to 19.6 per 10,000 in 2017—a 45% reduction.34

As is the case in non-campus communities, property crimes on campus, especially burglaries and motor vehicle thefts, far outnumber violent crimes, such as assaults and robberies.

>> continued on page 31

---

34. Ibid. Table 21.2, page 205.
Number of on-campus crimes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Burglary</th>
<th>Motor vehicle theft</th>
<th>Forcible sex offense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### On-campus crimes at degree-granting postsecondary institutions: Selected years, 2001 through 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control and level of institution and type of incident</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>In residence halls</th>
<th>At other locations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, in residence halls and at other locations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Selected crimes against persons and property</strong></td>
<td>41,596</td>
<td>42,710</td>
<td>44,492</td>
<td>41,829</td>
<td>40,296</td>
<td>34,054</td>
<td>32,097</td>
<td>29,766</td>
<td>27,236</td>
<td>26,818</td>
<td>27,532</td>
<td>28,376</td>
<td>28,873</td>
<td>14,671</td>
<td>14,202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder(^a)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negligent manslaughter(^b)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex offenses—forcible(^c)</td>
<td>2,201</td>
<td>2,674</td>
<td>2,670</td>
<td>2,694</td>
<td>2,544</td>
<td>2,927</td>
<td>3,375</td>
<td>4,015</td>
<td>4,977</td>
<td>6,751</td>
<td>8,022</td>
<td>8,931</td>
<td>10,398</td>
<td>7,517</td>
<td>2,881</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fondling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex offenses—nonforcible(^d)</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery(^e)</td>
<td>1,663</td>
<td>1,551</td>
<td>1,547</td>
<td>1,561</td>
<td>1,576</td>
<td>1,409</td>
<td>1,392</td>
<td>1,285</td>
<td>1,368</td>
<td>1,317</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>1,044</td>
<td>1,097</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated assault(^f)</td>
<td>2,947</td>
<td>2,656</td>
<td>2,817</td>
<td>2,604</td>
<td>2,495</td>
<td>2,327</td>
<td>2,221</td>
<td>2,239</td>
<td>2,423</td>
<td>2,044</td>
<td>2,048</td>
<td>2,258</td>
<td>2,181</td>
<td>2,216</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>1,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary(^g)</td>
<td>26,904</td>
<td>29,256</td>
<td>31,260</td>
<td>29,488</td>
<td>28,737</td>
<td>23,083</td>
<td>21,335</td>
<td>19,472</td>
<td>18,183</td>
<td>15,232</td>
<td>13,419</td>
<td>12,320</td>
<td>11,965</td>
<td>11,053</td>
<td>5,810</td>
<td>5,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle theft(^h)</td>
<td>6,221</td>
<td>5,531</td>
<td>5,231</td>
<td>4,619</td>
<td>4,104</td>
<td>3,977</td>
<td>3,441</td>
<td>3,334</td>
<td>3,013</td>
<td>2,971</td>
<td>2,890</td>
<td>3,218</td>
<td>3,528</td>
<td>3,450</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson(^i)</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


---

\(^a\) Excludes suicides, fetal deaths, traffic fatalities, accidental deaths, and justifiable homicide (such as the killing of a felon by a law enforcement officer in the line of duty).

\(^b\) Killing of another person through gross negligence (excludes traffic fatalities).

\(^c\) Any sexual act directed against another person forcibly and/or against that person’s will.

\(^d\) Includes only statutory rape or incest.

\(^e\) Taking or attempting to take anything of value using actual or threatened force or violence.

\(^f\) Attack upon a person for the purpose of inflicting severe or aggravated bodily injury.

\(^g\) Unlawful entry of a structure to commit a felony or theft.

\(^h\) Theft or attempted theft of a motor vehicle.

\(^i\) Willful or malicious burning or attempt to burn a dwelling house, public building, motor vehicle, or personal property of another.
Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act

The Clery Act, enacted in 1990, was named for first-year student Jeanne Ann Clery, who was raped and murdered in her residence hall room at Lehigh University in 1986. Her parents later learned that students had not been told about 38 violent crimes on campus in the previous three years. The law is designed to promote greater transparency by requiring Campus Security Authorities (CSA) at public and private colleges and universities to disclose information to the public about certain crimes that occur on or near campus, including crimes of sexual violence.

The Act applies to all colleges and universities that receive any federal funding, including student financial aid. It requires institutions of higher education to publish an Annual Security Report (ASR) on October 1 every year, detailing crime statistics for the three preceding calendar years. These statistics must cover major crime categories as well as hate crimes, domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, and arrests and referrals of students for disciplinary action regarding weapons violations and liquor and drug abuse violations.  

The ASRs must also include policy statements regarding campus security and access, the incidence of alcohol and drug use, and the prevention of and response to sexual assault, stalking, and domestic or dating violence.

The Act requires reporting of crimes and other events anywhere on campus (including on-campus student housing), on public property within campus or immediately adjacent to campus, in off-campus buildings or property frequently used for educational purposes by students, and in buildings owned or controlled by student organizations officially recognized by the college or university.

The Act also provides for timely warnings and emergency notifications about threats to the campus community. And it has provisions requiring prevention and awareness campaigns regarding sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking.

Colleges and universities must provide victims of these crimes with a written explanation of their rights, including a relocation or change of housing, counseling services, legal services, and other rights.

Finally, the Clery Act requires that college or university disciplinary proceedings be conducted by trained personnel, that they be prompt, fair, and impartial, and that they provide procedural rights to both accusers and accused persons.

Most Cities Saw an Uptick in Homicides and Shootings in 2020

Crime trends in municipalities can impact both the perceptions and reality of safety on college and university campuses. Police leaders at PERF’s September 2020 meeting noted that while the pandemic and George Floyd demonstrations were dominating the headlines, homicides and nonfatal shootings were increasing in many cities.

In mid-November, PERF (with the assistance of the Major Cities Chiefs Association) conducted a national survey of police chiefs and sheriffs about crime trends. 58% of responding agencies reported an increase in homicides during the first nine months of 2020, compared to the same time in 2019. Only 20% reported decreases, and 22% reported no change.36

Total homicides in the responding cities rose from 5,583 in 2019 to 7,158 in 2020. Aggravated assaults also increased. But rapes and robberies declined.

In interviews, police chiefs cited the following causes of the increases in homicides and shootings:

• Near-total cutbacks in court operations due to COVID, and release of jail inmates in order to reduce the spread of COVID, resulted in arrestees and offenders being returned to the community.

• Large-scale demonstrations, and rioting in some cities, required police to move officers from specialized units in high-crime areas to patrol.

• There was a reduction in proactive police activities due to COVID-19.

• There was a sense among offenders that they could act with impunity because of the reduction in police activity and cutbacks in court operations.

It is not completely clear how these recent crime trends impacted college and university campuses. The spread of COVID-19 prompted many schools to shift to online learning, rather than in-person classes, and many campus social activities were cancelled or restricted. As a result, many students returned home, and for those who remained, activities were dramatically curtailed.

With fewer students on campus, opportunities for crime declined. Campus police chiefs at PERF’s meeting reported that COVID social distancing requirements reduced their ability to engage in crime prevention and community policing efforts on campus. As a result, some campus chiefs said they turned their focus more toward off-campus crime and disorder.

At Wayne State University, Chief Anthony Holt reported a decline in low-level crimes on campus in 2020, but noted an overall increase in homicides in Detroit, mirroring PERF’s survey. Similarly, in Madison, Acting Chief Victor Wahl reported a spike in gun violence that had not been seen in years in that city.

While these trends may not have directly impacted crime on college and university campuses, police leaders said they can affect perceptions of safety in and around their schools.

https://www.policeforum.org/criticalissuesnov19
https://www.policeforum.org/criticalissuesnov23
https://www.policeforum.org/criticalissuesnov24
Sexual Assault and Active Shooters: Two Issues of Particular Concern

College and university campuses have generally low crime rates, especially when it comes to crimes of violence. As noted above, overall crime on campuses has decreased substantially over the past two decades.

Even with these favorable trends, there are two crime issues that campus police chiefs pay particularly close attention to: sexual assaults and active-shooter incidents. These crimes can have a major impact on the safety (and perceptions of safety) of students, faculty and staff. They are also crimes that require greater collaboration among campus and municipal police agencies.

Sexual Assault

Unlike overall campus crime, which has declined, the number of reported forcible sex offenses on campus has risen dramatically in recent years, from 2,201 in 2001 to 10,398 in 2017—a 372% increase. Part of this increase is likely the result of more victims being willing to come forward and report the crimes, as colleges and universities have increased programs and resources to support sexual assault victims.

At Boston University, Chief Kelly Nee hired a dedicated sexual assault coordinator who was a former sexual assault investigator and supervisor in the Boston Police Department. The coordinator leads the team of BU detectives who handle the investigations of on-campus assaults.

BU works to consider the needs and wants of the victims as investigations progress. Chief Nee reported that some cases go through the university’s disciplinary process because victims prefer this approach. However, if a student reports that they have been a victim of an assault off campus, campus police refer the case to the department that has jurisdiction to investigate.

Shootings and Active Shooters

While still rare, shooting incidents on college and university campuses may be more common than many people realize. The Citizens Crime Commission of New York City examined 190 shooting incidents at 142 institutions of higher education from the 2001-2002 school year through the 2015-2016 school year in which at least one person was intentionally shot.

In the 190 shooting incidents, 167 people were killed, and another 270 were wounded, for a total of 437 victims. The victims included 290 students, 77 persons not associated with the school, 40 employees, and 5 former students.

Among the 145 incidents where the shooter’s relationship to the college was identified, 59% of the shooters were not associated with the college, 28% were students, 9% were former students, and 4% were employees.

As illustrated in the chart on the next page, the number of shooting incidents per year has generally increased over time.

“What keeps me up at night is the ongoing threat of an active shooter. I have to always be prepared for that. When my phone rings in the middle of the night, that’s one of my major concerns.”

— Chief Anthony Holt, Wayne State University Police Department

The first mass shooting in modern history at a college or university took place in 1966, when Charles Whitman, a former Marine, took rifles to an observation deck overlooking the campus of the University of Texas at Austin, and began shooting at persons on the ground. He killed 17 people over the course of more than 90 minutes before police were able to fatally shoot him.

At PERF’s meeting, University of Texas at Austin Police Chief David Carter noted that it was the mass shooting at UT-Austin and other sniper incidents that led to the creation of SWAT teams in police departments across the nation. The UT-Austin shooting also raised awareness on college campuses of the threat of active shooters.

Since 1966, there have been at least nine mass shootings at U.S. colleges and universities, listed below.\(^{39}\) (This list uses the definition of “mass shooting” that was cited by the Congressional Research Service in a 2015 report: “a multiple homicide incident in which four or more victims are murdered with firearms, within one event, and in one or more locations in close proximity.”)\(^{40}\) Although still rare, mass shootings on campuses have increased in frequency in recent years: 6 of the 9 known incidents dating back to 1966 have occurred within the past 15 years.

An analysis of these incidents by the Voice of America, based on data assembled by Jillian Peterson, Ph.D., and James Densley, Ph.D., for the


How Active Shooter Incidents on Campuses Changed Training and Response

While the mass shooting at the University of Texas at Austin in 1966 was among the first such incidents at a school campus, active shooter incidents at public high schools over the years have altered how police, including campus police, respond to these incidents.

Prior to the 1999 killing of 12 students and one teacher at Columbine High School in Colorado, most police training on active shooter threats called for officers to wait for SWAT officers to arrive before engaging the shooter(s). At Columbine, this delay may have cost lives. Following Columbine, police training shifted toward training all officers how to respond, and to prepare for the possibility that any officer might happen to be the first to arrive at an active shooter scene.

There was another major shift in thinking on active shooter response following the 2018 mass shooting at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida. In that case, a sheriff’s deputy was criminally charged for failing to enter the school as students were being shot. After Parkland, a consensus emerged that a lone police officer does have a duty to engage an active shooter, despite the risk of being shot and even losing his or her own life.

And that risk is substantial. In a 2014 PERF report on active shooter response,41 Professor Pete Blair of Texas State University, a leading expert, evaluated the impact of the post-Columbine practices in terms of officer safety. Professor Blair studied 84 incidents over an 11-year period, and found that when a lone first-responding officer ran to the sound of gunfire, they ended up being shot in one-third of the cases.

The April 2007 mass shooting at Virginia Tech in Blacksburg, VA prompted significant changes in how many colleges and universities respond to mass violence events and work to prevent them. At Virginia Tech, a 23-year-old student first shot and killed two women in a dormitory, then entered an academic building, chained several entrances shut, and proceeded to kill 30 more people.

Following Virginia Tech, campuses took measures to increase security and harden their buildings, including placing locks on the inside of classroom doors and retrofitting building entrances so doors could not be chained from the inside. Schools also developed or expanded emergency reporting and notification systems, building in redundancy through text messages, emails, social media, even sirens and message boards.

Campuses also invested resources in early detection and intervention with students who may be in crisis. In Virginia, colleges and universities now have dedicated Threat Assessment Teams that receive and evaluate reports of students having possible mental health concerns. At the University of Texas at Austin, a Behavior Concern Advice Line (BCAL) provides options and resources for students who may need help. Recently, the BCAL was expanded to provide assistance with issues specifically related to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Violence Project Database of Mass Shootings in the United States, 1966-2019, concluded the following:

While there is no single profile of a mass shooter, there are several similar characteristics of shooters who commit crimes at a college or university. According to The Violence Project database, a college shooter tends to be a non-white male who is a current student of the college and who has a history of violence and childhood trauma. He is suicidal, uses handguns that he legally obtained, and often leaves behind a manifesto or video about his crime.\(^\text{42}\)

Whether a mass shooting occurs on a college or university campus or in a community that contains a school, it is almost certain that officers from multiple departments will respond. When a gunman opened fire inside a supermarket in Boulder, Colorado on March 22, 2021—killing 10 people, including Boulder Police Officer Eric Talley—it was both Boulder Police and University of Colorado-Boulder Police officers who were first on the scene.\(^\text{43}\)

Campus and municipal police leaders emphasized that it is critical that all responding agencies work together and follow the same protocols for responding to a mass shooting. Mutual-aid agreements, joint training, and other collaborative preparations are essential in these types of incidents.

---

\textbf{Mass Shootings on College and University Campuses Since 1966}

- August 1, 1966 – University of Texas–Austin: 17 fatalities
- July 12, 1976 – California State University, Fullerton, CA: 7 fatalities
- November 1, 1991 – University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA: 5 fatalities
- April 16, 2007 – Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, VA: 32 fatalities
- February 14, 2008 – Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, IL: 5 fatalities
- April 2, 2012 – Oikos University, Oakland, CA: 7 fatalities
- June 7, 2013 – Santa Monica College, Santa Monica, CA: 5 fatalities
- May 23, 2014 – University of California–Santa Barbara: 6 fatalities
- October 1, 2015 – Umpqua Community College, Roseburg, OR: 9 fatalities

Conclusion: Moving Forward After a Challenging Time

Since early 2020, municipal police and campus police agencies have been confronted with several unusual, even unprecedented challenges.

- **COVID-19**: The COVID-19 pandemic turned many aspects of policing upside-down. Officers suddenly had to avoid unnecessary encounters with the public to prevent the spread of the virus. And overnight, police agencies changed officers’ schedules and made other staffing changes to reduce officers’ interactions with each other. Many courts essentially shut down, preventing prosecutions from moving forward. Jails rushed to release inmates to reduce COVID threats. And crime patterns changed, because many businesses closed, and people were home rather than at work.

  These operational changes, coupled with the closure of businesses and restrictions on public gatherings, interrupted many of the community policing initiatives that have become key strategies for both campus and municipal police agencies.

- **Demonstrations**: The killing of George Floyd in police custody on May 25, 2020 triggered demonstrations in cities across the nation, and even internationally. Demonstrations took place on many college and university campuses, and students took part in protests in the community as well. Concerns over how municipal and campus police agencies in many areas responded to protests prompted calls for colleges and universities to rethink their relationships with municipal police counterparts. In a few instances, schools restricted their collaboration with local police departments, and many other schools began studying the issue.

- **Budget issues, “defunding,” and police reforms**: The pandemic quickly caused a recession that reduced many cities’ tax bases. This inevitably impacted police agencies, which usually are the largest line item in a city’s budget. Simultaneously, protests following the death of George Floyd brought calls for reform and, in some cases, for “defunding” the police—that is, shifting funding away from the police and toward social services.

  While campus police agencies did not necessarily experience the pandemic-related budgetary pressures that municipal police did, on many campuses, students pressed for cutting—or in some cases, abolishing—police departments. University administrators generally resisted those calls, but budget issues are not likely to go away.

- **Uptick in homicides and shootings**: Cities across the country have experienced sharp increases in homicides and serious aggravated assaults, with many of these offenses committed with firearms. In the first few months of 2021, the number of mass shootings increased as well. While these trends have not necessarily impacted campuses directly, they have affected the perceptions of safety at some colleges and universities.

- **Campus policing issues**: Campus police agencies have faced their own challenges. COVID-19 brought a shift to online education, and many campus social activities were curtailed, resulting in many students returning home. Students who remained on campus were often subject to public safety rules banning large gatherings, requiring students to use masks, etc. But because students
tend to be young, many did not feel threatened by COVID and were less inclined to obey rules both on campus and in the community. The spread of COVID-19 tied to large parties and other student-related activities increased “town-gown” tensions in some communities.

In short, 2020 was a difficult year for both municipal and campus police departments. And while some of those challenges may be abating as COVID-19 cases decline and a sense of normalcy returns to both campuses and communities, it is unlikely that these issues will disappear completely anytime soon.

So how will municipal and campus police agencies address these ongoing challenges? At the PERF meeting, police leaders told us they will use the same techniques and strategies that they have relied on in the past and which have proven successful:

• **Information-sharing:** Regularly scheduled meetings, joint COMPSTAT sessions, and other ongoing communications help to ensure that issues of mutual concern are identified and addressed promptly.

• **Collaborative training and operations:** Campus and municipal police should continue to train together on critical incident response, de-escalation strategies, protest management, active shooter scenarios, and other matters. And memorandums of understanding or other formal or informal agreements ensure that personnel in each department can react effectively as a team during a critical incident.

• **Community policing:** While the community policing philosophy dates to the 1980s, attendees at the PERF meeting emphasized that in today’s environment, community policing has never been more important. The challenges confronting both campus and municipal police agencies can best be addressed when police have the support and direct involvement of the community.

The unprecedented challenges of 2020-21 have tested the relationships between municipal and campus police agencies like never before, but they have also reinforced the need for those agencies to cooperate and collaborate even more closely. While there may never again be a time period as disruptive and contentious as this one, campus and municipal police leaders can take the lessons they have learned and apply them to whatever challenges lie ahead.

“There is no time like the present for us to resist the toxicity and tension that we sometimes see in the current environment. We heard from chiefs at universities and municipalities about what we should hold paramount: strong relationships, communication, and delivery of police services and accountability to the rule of law in a way that honors people and respects the sanctity of human life.”

— Chief Sylvia Moir, Tempe Police Department
THE POLICE EXECUTIVE RESEARCH FORUM (PERF) is an independent research organization that focuses on critical issues in policing. Since its founding in 1976, PERF has identified best practices on fundamental issues such as reducing police use of force; developing community policing and problem-oriented policing; using technologies to deliver police services to the community; and developing and assessing crime reduction strategies.

PERF strives to advance professionalism in policing and to improve the delivery of police services through the exercise of strong national leadership; public debate of police and criminal justice issues; and research and policy development.

The nature of PERF’s work can be seen in the reports PERF has published over the years. Most of these reports are available without charge online at http://www.policeforum.org/free-online-documents. All of the titles in the Critical Issues in Policing series can be found on the back cover of this report and on the PERF website at https://www.policeforum.org/critical-issues-series. When COVID-19 struck in March 2020, PERF began producing daily reports on how the pandemic was affecting police agencies and how agencies were responding. Over the next year, PERF produced close to 250 reports on COVID-19, as well as issues related to police reform, violent crime, and other key concerns.

In addition to conducting research and publishing reports on our findings, PERF conducts management studies of individual law enforcement agencies; educates hundreds of police officials each year in the Senior Management Institute for Police, a three-week executive development program; and provides executive search services to governments that wish to conduct national searches for their next police chief.

All of PERF’s work benefits from PERF’s status as a membership organization of police officials, who share information and open their agencies to research and study. PERF members also include academics, federal government leaders, and others with an interest in policing and criminal justice.

All PERF members must have a four-year college degree and must subscribe to a set of founding principles, emphasizing the importance of research and public debate in policing, adherence to the Constitution and the highest standards of ethics and integrity, and accountability to the communities that police agencies serve.

PERF is governed by a member-elected President and Board of Directors and a Board-appointed Executive Director.

To learn more about PERF, visit www.policeforum.org.
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Following is a sample memorandum of understanding between the Austin Police Department and the University of Texas at Austin Police Department. Like other MOUs, it spells out jurisdictional responsibilities, reporting requirements, resource sharing, investigative procedures, and other key elements of how the two agencies work together.
STATE OF TEXAS  )  MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
COUNTY OF TRAVIS   )

This Memorandum of Understanding is entered into by and between the City of Austin Police Department (APD) and the University of Texas at Austin Police Department (UTPD).

WHEREAS, Section 51.203 of the Texas Education Code provides for the governing boards of each state institution of higher education to employ and commission peace officers for the purpose of providing police services to all property owned, leased, rented or otherwise under the control of the institution of higher education that employs the peace officer; and

WHEREAS, the University of Texas at Austin (UTA) has employed and commissioned said peace officers; and

WHEREAS, the UTA has facilities and other properties acquired, owned, leased, or under the control of the UTA within the City of Austin and has commissioned law enforcement personnel of UTPD stationed to respond to calls at these locations.

WHEREAS, UTPD and APD acknowledge that APD law enforcement officers have concurrent jurisdiction over UTA property located within the jurisdiction of Travis County and that no mutual aid request is necessary for APD officers to make an arrest in that jurisdiction.

WHEREAS, UTPD and APD acknowledge that pursuant to Section 51.203 of the Texas Education Code, all University of Texas System commissioned law enforcement officers, including UTPD, have concurrent county wide jurisdiction in all counties where The University of Texas owns, leases, rents or otherwise controls property, including Travis County, and that no mutual aid request is necessary for UTPD officers to make an arrest in that jurisdiction.

WHEREAS, UTPD and APD desire to set out the respective duties and obligations with regard to the coordination of law enforcement efforts between the University of Texas at Austin Police Department (UTPD) and the City of Austin Police Department (APD) on UTA owned and controlled property within the City of Austin; NOW THEREFORE:

The Parties To This Memorandum of Understanding Hereby Agree As Follows:

1. The UTPD has primary law enforcement jurisdiction on all property owned, leased, or under the control of the UTA and shall provide police services on said property, except as otherwise specified in this Memorandum of Understanding.

2. The UTPD shall notify the APD of any incident or situation on any property owned, leased, or under the control of the UTA that may affect the safety of the residents of the City of Austin not present or residing on said property.
3. The APD shall notify the UTPD of any incident or situation on any property within the city limits of the City of Austin that may affect the safety of the persons on any property owned, leased, or under the control of the UTA.

4. Should the UTPD request the assistance of the APD Evidence Unit for the purpose of collecting and preserving evidence, the APD shall be granted control of the crime scene. The UTPD will support and assist the APD Evidence Unit as directed by the ranking APD officer at the scene. The APD shall involve and coordinate the processing of the crime scene with the UTPD. The UTPD shall be responsible for the storage, preservation, and processing of all physical evidence, unless the UTPD requests the APD to assume the responsibility for the investigation and case management of the incident.

5. Should the UTPD request the assistance of the APD Special Operations Units in incidents involving the discovery of suspected explosive ordnance devices, a barricaded person or a hostage situation, or building or area searches, the APD shall be granted control of the scene. The UTPD will support and assist the APD Special Operations Units as directed by the ranking APD officer at the scene. The APD shall involve and coordinate the resolution of the incident with the UTPD. Upon resolution of the incident, the area shall be returned to the control of the ranking UTPD officer at the scene. The UTPD shall be responsible for the investigation and case management of the incident, unless the UTPD requests the APD to assume this responsibility.

6. Should the UTPD request the assistance of the APD in the investigation of an offense which occurred on UTA property, the APD will support and assist UTPD as appropriate and the UTPD will involve and coordinate the investigation with APD. Should UTPD also request that APD assume responsibility for the investigation and case management of the incident, UTPD will support and assist APD as appropriate and APD will involve and coordinate the investigation with UTPD. Said investigative assistance may not necessarily include the assistance outlined in paragraphs 4 and 5 above.

7. When it is necessary for the APD to execute a warrant or conduct an investigation on any property owned, leased, or under the control of the UTA, the APD shall contact the UTPD and request a UTPD officer accompany the APD officer. However, if notification of UTPD would unreasonably interfere with the investigation, APD may proceed without notifying UTPD. If the presence of a UTPD officer would cause an unacceptable delay, APD may proceed without a UTPD officer, but will notify UTPD as soon as possible. The APD shall refrain from interrupting a class to execute an arrest or search warrant, except in exigent circumstances. In the event of “fresh” or “hot” pursuit, the APD communications unit shall notify the UTPD as soon as possible and the APD officer will proceed as necessary.

8. The UTPD shall be the primary agency responsible for responding to all requests for police services originating from any property owned, leased, or under the control of the UTA. The APD shall transfer voice and data communication for all requests for
9. While providing mutual aid under this Agreement, all law enforcement officers remain employees of the agencies with which they are regularly employed. Each agency shall be solely responsible for compensation, insurance, benefits and liability of its officers.

10. The Chief of the UTPD and the Chief of the APD may enter into more specific and detailed operational procedures and guidelines as necessary.

11. Either party may terminate this agreement by notification in writing to the other party.

IN WITNESS OF WHICH THIS MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING has been executed on this 20 day of April, 2009.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN
POLICE DEPARTMENT

Name

Signature

Title

CITY OF AUSTIN
POLICE DEPARTMENT

Name

Signature

Title
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