1. **Call to order/Roll/Declaration of Quorum**

   Chair Tom Imeson called the meeting to order at 3:03 pm, and David Reese called the roll.

   In person: Chair Tom Imeson; Vice-Chair Erica Bespitch; Gale Castillo; Margaret Kirkpatrick; Rick Miller; Christine Vernier. Via Zoom: Pete Nickerson, Pam Campos-Palma

   Absent: Sho Dozono

   A quorum was present and the meeting proceeded.

2. **Purpose of Committee and Authority of the Board of Trustees**

   **Chair Imeson** reviewed briefly the actions of the Board of Trustees on September 11, 2014 and request that the committee make a recommendation to the Board at its meeting on December 11, 2014.

   **David Reese** reviewed the charge to the committee as directed by the Board. He then discussed the two statutory provisions that give the Board the authority to establish a police department.

   **Chair Imeson** outlined the process that the committee would follow. He noted that the Committee would not take a position today, but would come back in November and possibly approve a recommendation at that time.

3. **Review of Material from September 11, 2014 Board of Trustees Meeting**

   **Kevin Reynolds**, Vice President Finance & Administration, and **Phil Zerzan**, Director of Campus Public Safety, reviewed the material that had been presented to the Board on September 11. They reviewed the process, timeline, and work of the President’s Task Force on Campus Public Safety, the recommendation of the Task Force, and information regarding public safety and CPSO.
Phil Zerzan reviewed the differences between sworn police and campus public safety officers, including the training and credentials required for both categories. He discussed CPSO’s current limitations, particularly regarding mental health checks, welfare checks, and handling issues that occur close to, but not on, university property but which involve PSU students. He also discussed the differences in approach between the Portland Police Bureau and Campus Public Safety when handling student-related calls.

Zerzan discussed progress made in sexual assault investigation protocols since his arrival in 2011. CPSO has hired a retired detective who specializes in sexual assault cases. Working together, CPSO, the Women’s Resource Center, the Dean of Student Life’s office and others have developed a much more survivor-centered and focused response to sexual assault issues on campus. He noted that Portland Police Bureau does not have the same training or sensitivities that universities expect. For instance, CPSO can work with the various departments in the University to address student needs, such as moving a student within University housing, or changing course schedules, to keep the parties involved apart, but without harming or stigmatizing the survivor.

4. Additional Material and Updates

Reynolds briefed the committee regarding activities, meetings and feedback since the last committee meeting.

Reynolds noted that the proposed budget for one scenario is $1.5 million in additional cost per year, and walked through the scenario and timeline for implementation. He noted that there would be a mix of both sworn officers and campus public safety officers. Using this hybrid model, Campus Public Safety would be able to provide the services that they currently provide, but would also be able to provide full police services.

Reynolds noted that since the last committee meeting, he had gone back to Portland Police, OHSU, and Oregon State Police to again confirm their positions regarding providing dedicated sworn police to the University. Their positions have not changed—they are not interested in contracting with PSU for dedicated service of this nature. Portland Police noted that they do not have the expertise required for effective university-specific policing. They also do not have the degree of physical knowledge of the campus that CPSO does. OHSU stated that they would be unable to provide support from officers, but would be interested in working with our staff on issues such as mental health, addiction, etc. OSP expressed concern about the number of their officers who would then be concentrated in the Portland metropolitan area, and how that would negatively impact their ability to serve the rest of the state. They noted that their primary mission is to serve the state, particularly with highway patrols and in rural areas.

Reynolds reviewed a table showing the amount of control that PSU and the Board of Trustees would have over a contracted police force as opposed to a PSU police force and noted that a PSU police force would give PSU the most oversight and control.
Reynolds noted common themes received through the online feedback form. 154 comments have been received and all of the comments have been provided to the committee. There is no consensus to be gleaned from the comments.

Zerzan explained his view that a sworn, but unarmed, police force would be problematic. He discussed the risks currently faced by CPSO officers and the need for sworn officers to have the ability to defend themselves.

Both Zerzan and Reynolds noted that most CPSO contacts are with individuals not associated with PSU, and that a high percentage of those individuals have criminal records, often involving violent crime, and are occasionally armed. Reynolds referred to a weekly report of calls, and highlighted a few where individuals either displayed or implied a weapon. He noted the difficulty that CPSO has in responding to those calls.

Reynolds also stated that the risk of an active shooter incident should not be downplayed. He noted that PSU has never had an active shooter on campus, but that we cannot assume that it will never happen. He noted that in recent cases, active shooter situations have been halted by people who were properly trained to respond, preventing results that could be much worse.

5. Comments from:

a. Campus Stakeholders

Rayleen McMillan, Eric Noll, ASPSU – McMillan noted that there was no consensus in the student body regarding this issue. According to ASPSU’s polling: 1/3 of students are in favor, 1/3 are opposed, and 1/3 are undecided. Written statement attached.

Michele Toppe, Dean of Student Life – Written statement attached.

Craig Leets, QRC – Written statement attached.

Mike Walsh, Director of Housing – Written statement attached.

Marcy Hunt – Written statement attached.

CeCe Rider, Executive Director, Diversity and Multicultural Student Services (DMSS) – Written statement attached.

Chas Lopez, Interim Director, Office of Diversity and Inclusion – Written statement attached.

Pam Miller, President AAUP – Professor Miller shared the results of an AAUP poll of members. There was a 42% response rate. 32% percent supported the
establishment of a sworn, armed police force and 62% opposed. Most respondents also felt that the issue should be decided by a campus vote.

**Kelly Cowan, President PSU Faculty Association** – Cowan noted that AFT members teach over 35% of classes on PSU at non-traditional times – evenings, weekends, etc. He noted that adjunct faculty is keenly aware of the need for increased safety. He shared the results of a PSUFA poll of its members. There was a 13% response rate, with 2:1 opposition to the establishment of a sworn, armed police force. Written statement attached.

**Marc Nisenfeld, President, SEIU** - Nisenfeld shared SEIU’s history of supporting the legislative changes that make it possible for the University to establish a police force. He noted that SEIU would recommend that any decision to move to a sworn force should also include a requirement that officers wear body cameras. There is not a consensus among SEIU members on campus regarding the issue of a university police department, which is left to the discretion of the Board.

### b. Law Enforcement Experts

**Chief McDermed, University of Oregon Police Department** – McDermed discussed her experience in local and university policing. She noted that a city policy bureau will always put the needs of the city before those of a university. The new UO police department provides a faster response and more complete investigations than had been the case. They can now transport suspects to jail, conduct follow-up investigations, do off-campus welfare checks, and are better prepared for the possibility of an active shooter. She strongly supports arming officers. Firearms are a basic tool of policing. UO police have direct oversight. An oversight committee is being formed that will have review authority and the ability to act when a complaint is filed. Effective oversight ensures that the police will be part of the institution.

**Cmdr. Bob Day, Portland Police Bureau** – Day is the Central Precinct Commander, responsible for about 41 square miles. PPB is dedicated to providing police services to PSU, but also recognizes that university policing is different than community policing. He stated that PPB’s response is always reactive in nature – not able do proactive protection and prevention. He said that PPB was very supportive of OHSU moving to a sworn and armed force, as they are supportive of PSU doing so also. It is not possible for PPB to know the layouts of the universities or where problem areas are. He noted that in those instances when PPB can respond quickly, they may not know where they are going, which slows down an effective response. He briefly talked about an active shooter situation, especially in light of recent events, and noted that such events have been interrupted and halted quickly and effectively by on-site law enforcement.

**Director Todd Anderson, Oregon Department of Public Safety Standards and Training (DPSST)** – Anderson is the director of the state agency responsible for the
certification and training of all sworn officers in the state. Anderson discussed the DPSST training that would be provided to PSU officers. The training is 16 weeks and provided at no cost to the institution. He reviewed the basic curriculum. He noted that there is a special emphasis on training regarding mental health issues. Anderson also discussed DPPST’s role holding officers accountable. He reminded the committee that DPSST is the licensing agency for all sworn officers throughout the state. He noted that they revoke or deny certification for approximately 100 officers throughout the state per year. Anderson also discussed DPPST’s training and work to prevent racial bias in policing and the agency’s work with Dr. Renauer, a professor in PSU’s Criminal Justice program. Anderson noted that an active shooter can happen anywhere and that preparation and training is the best defense.

Peter Ward – Ward is currently a PSU CPSO officer. He has also served as a police officer in the UK and US. He discussed the differences between patrolling as an unarmed officer in the UK and as an armed officer in the US. Ward noted that the main difference is the strict gun control in the UK compared to the US. He expressed his view that arming officers in the US, whether in a community police department or a university police department, helps keep both officers and citizens safer. Written statement attached.

Rick Miller asked the panel for their thoughts on body cameras. Director Anderson said that he was surprised at how many bureaus were using them. He said that there was quite a bit of pushback at first. They are now more accepted by agencies throughout state, because the agencies see that the cameras protect their officers as much as they protect citizens. Cmdr. Day said that PPB is currently testing body cameras. In addition, audio and video recording in patrol cars is proving to be helpful. He is convinced they will become commonplace. He reminded everyone that the cameras provide video evidence and need to be treated accordingly. Ward said that he would welcome body cameras. Chief McDermed said that UO is testing body cameras currently. She noted that some officers are wearing cameras and that cars have cameras that run during all stops.

Margaret Kirkpatrick asked how long UO has had a sworn police force on campus and if there is data showing the impact. McDermed noted that UO has had a sworn force for only a couple of years and are still transitioning.

6. Public Comment

Sean Kemper (student), Andrew McCandles (student), Sofia Fridman (student), Tom Hastings (faculty member, Conflict Resolution), Lisa Hawash (faculty member, Social Work), Beckie Child (student, adjunct faculty), Philip Alder (student), Richard Benner (student), Jack Stratton (faculty member, Physics), Leona Kindermann (student), Erinn Niemela (student), Tony Funchess (student), Jane Gerber (student), and TJ Love (student) spoke in opposition to the establishment of an armed sworn police department. Concerns include the effectiveness of a police department, the divisiveness of the firearms issue, training, the handling of mental health issues, the
impact on communities of color, the need for more study and process, and others. Statements that were submitted in writing are attached.

7. Board Discussion and Follow-up

Castillo expressed concerns about the potential profiling. She asked for information about the number and nature of complaints regarding CPSO. She stressed the importance of having different communities involved in any selection and oversight of police.

Kirkpatrick noted that there is not universal support for any of the options. She appreciated the requests that Castillo made and noted that the committee needs to dig a little deeper. She asked for more information regarding recruitment and training, particularly training regarding working with communities of color and mental health issues. She also asked for a better sense regarding oversight and the complaint process for a university police department.

Veriner requested more information regarding the $1.5 million budget figure, and the breakdown of that figure for salaries, equipment, start-up costs, etc.

Bestpitch asked for more information regarding primary prevention strategies. She feels that we need to see what we can do to make people feel safe.

Campos-Palma said that her biggest concern is the porous campus. She would like more information regarding the University’s approach to threat assessment and the jurisdictional lines between University police and PPB.

Nickerson had questions regarding UO’s decision making regarding an armed police department. He requested information from Chief McDermend.

Miller asked for information regarding the current demographic make-up of CPSO. Zerzan noted that there are currently 13 officers: 1 African-American, 3 female, 3 identify as LGBTQ.

Imeson noted that the committee would like to receive additional information at the next meeting in order to make an informed recommendation to the Board. The additional information should include more information about the specific commitments—oversight, training, etc.—that had been discussed.

Castillo asked that all information be put on the website.

8. Adjourn at 6:45 pm.
TO: Portland State University Board of Trustees

FROM: Eric Noll, ASPSU President

SUBJECT: RE: Presidential Task Force on Campus Safety Final Report

To the Special Committee on Campus Public Safety and to Members of the PSU Community,

We find common ground in the student community with regards to the need to improve safety for the students at Portland State University. Conversations with campus stakeholders, decision makers and most importantly, students, have yielded many diverse and legitimate viewpoints on the recommendation from the Task Force to transition PSU to sworn police officers. Transitioning PSU from a Campus Public Safety Office to a Portland State Police Department with sworn police officers and the components of the design and possible implementation of that transition are the specific topics we wish to address in this letter.

ASPSU does not yet have a policy position on the Task Force’s recommendation and taking a policy position in our official capacity would limit our capability to engage with students. This issue will at no point attain a consensus opinion within our campus community and a stance in support or opposition of the proposal from us would be heedless at this point in time. We ask, however, that the readers of this statement do not mistake in any way our nonalignment for apathy or indifference to the effects of the Task Force recommendation. Our persistent engagement with students and stakeholders as well as the recognition of the multi-faceted nature of this topic guides us to the following conclusions and subsequent requests to the Special Committee on Campus Public Safety:

- PSU students are apprehensive about the cost of the proposal and its effect on tuition. We recommend that in addition to balancing the quality and integrity of the possible development and implementation of a sworn police force, that price sensitivity greatly influence the recommendation from the Special Committee, if in fact the Board approves the recommended proposal.
- PSU students are concerned about the disproportionate effect a sworn police force will have on students of color and other marginalized communities historically affected by police profiling, harassment and violence. The plan to implement sworn police officers must address the legitimate safety needs of marginalized communities in an unprecedented way, just as it has sought to address the safety needs of others. This should include and not be limited to implementing meaningful cultural competency policies, initial and ongoing trainings and practices for sworn police officers, recruiting a diverse applicant pool to ensure that our sworn police force reflects the...
demographics and ethos of the PSU campus, and ensuring that campus safety and administration significantly improve efforts to intentionally engage marginalized student communities throughout the discussion and possible development, implementation, operation, and review of a Portland State Police Department.

- We recognize current legal limitations and jurisdiction barriers to responding to incidents of sexual violence as they occur at PSU. It is not sufficient for PSU to continue relying on the Portland Police Bureau when a scarcity of resources reduces priority given by the Bureau to PSU. However, it must be remembered that the Task Force recommendation does not prevent sexual violence at PSU. The epidemic of sexual violence on college campuses is being inadequately addressed nationally as well as here on our campus. We see a need to form a campus-wide committee charged with developing and implementing both a short and long-term strategic plan with the purposes of improving the effect of current policies at PSU and developing the necessary resources to adequately address prevention.

- Students and decision makers on campus are habitually disconnected from each other and, though the issue in not isolated to the topic of campus safety, it has played a significant role in the communication surrounding the Task Force recommendation. The communication between students and decision makers is improving, but moving forward, this process must ensure meaningful student involvement and influence in all aspects of the Task Force recommendation, development and possible implementation.

- If sworn police officers are approved by the Board, the oversight and accountability of the Department needs to be clear and distinct in the proposal prior to the implementation. We ask that this include and not be limited to an oversight board with at least three (3) students, including a student co-chair. The operational design should also include mandated officer-worn body cameras that store confidential video with a third party to be made accessible to the oversight board.

In conclusion, please accept these recommendations to be included with the proposal to the full Board of Trustees, should the Special Committee on Campus Public Safety recommend transitioning to a sworn police force at PSU.

In Thoughtfulness,

Eric Noll, President
Rayleen McMillan, Vice President
TO: Special Board Committee Meeting on Campus Safety

FROM: Michele Toppe, Dean of Student Life, Portland State University

DATE: October 27, 2014

Thank you members of the PSU Board of Trustees for allowing me to speak to you today. I am Michele Toppe, Dean of Student Life. I've worked at Portland State since 1995.

In my current role as Dean of Student Life, I convene PSU’s CARE Team. CARE stands for Coordination, Assessment, Response and Education and this team is co-facilitated by myself and Chenae Garcia (a proud graduate of PSU’s School of Social Work) using a case management model grounded in social work principles. We work with this team to coordinate support and response when a student is experiencing a crisis situation that threatens their life or well-being. In many cases, this includes working with staff from Campus Public Safety. To give you a sense of the number and types of issues we have handled since the start of fall term, just 4 weeks ago, we’ve discussed 80 individual CARE cases and adjudicated 90 separate Student Conduct cases. These CARE and Conduct cases have included students with suicidal ideation and attempts, drug use such as heroin and methamphetamines, assault and sexual assault. We have hospitalized 10 students.

I also oversee the work of our Women’s Resource Center. Jessica Amo, WRC Director, was unable to be here today, but I know that based on her expertise and experience handling cases involving sexual violence at PSU, she has included a letter of support for a sworn police force.

I recognize that there are multiple perspectives on this question of how best to create an optimally safe campus at PSU. I would note that the members of the CARE team, who have daily responsibility for the health, safety and well-being of our students stand in agreement. We need a sworn and armed campus police department.

The current status of our CPSO officers, coupled with the limited resources available to our partners at the Portland Police Bureau, inhibits PSU’s ability to provide adequate response and quality care for students. Let me give you just a few examples, because I believe these actual experiences best illuminate the issue.

Firstly, campus incidents are often a lower priority for PPB.

- A student was returning to his residence hall after work late in the evening this fall and was attacked by two individuals in the Park Blocks, one of them using a broken bottle and bat. As a result of the attack, the student went to the hospital and was treated for cuts on his hand and a significant injury to his ankle. Although PBB was present at the scene, they did not take a report and characterized the incident as “mutual combat” because they were called to another more serious incident.

Secondly, PPB’s response is often delayed or hampered because of their limited resources and their obligation to police an expansive metro area.

- In a recent situation, a student contacted PPB to report a sexual assault that occurred in University Pointe, a property that is maintained by American Campus Communities, and does not fall within our CPSOs current jurisdictional authority. This student waited for 4 days to be interviewed by an officer from PPB. Although PSU is required by Title IX to take immediate actions upon having notice of this
kind of allegation, such as separating the complainant and the respondent, we were unable to do so pending the interview being conducted by PPB, who asked that the respondent not be contacted until they had been able to conclude their investigation.

**Finally, PPB is not equipped to fully consider the unique nature of campus-based situations**

- In another incident, PPB was called to Broadway Housing by a student who reported he had intentionally severely cut himself and was bleeding profusely. PPB acted in a manner that would be appropriate in responding to this type of incident in a downtown apartment, but does not recognize the additional responsibilities and unique relationship between students in residence and the university. These issues would be immediately addressed by a Campus Police Department. For instance, they did not act on the fact that this person’s roommate was an international student who spoke little English and was gravely traumatized by this incident. They did not consider the impact the incident had on the other students living on the floor who witnessed the excessive blood and the extensive requisite cleanup of the room and floor.

Regarding the question of armament, I do not like guns and wish we did not have them so present in our society, but we already have guns on our campus. Under our current status, if PPB is called to respond to a campus incident, the PPB officer who arrives will have a gun. Similarly, the safety presence provided by OHSU at the Collaborative Life Sciences Building, where two of PSU’s largest classroom spaces now exist, is currently patrolled by OHSU officers with weapons. We will likely always have guns on campus and I do not believe that fact will change. However, we do have the ability to decide whether the officers responding to incidents on our campus are from PPB or are PSU employees.

Our CPSO officers are best positioned and best qualified to be equipped to respond to campus situations that require a law enforcement response.

- Unlike PPB, PSU’s CPSO has one focus, which is our PSU campus and the community who works, studies and lives here.
- University Police Officers are uniquely qualified to understand this community. They know that a student who loses a laptop didn’t only lose a piece of hardware amounting to a petty crime, but may have lost several years of research. They know that we are a campus that has become a destination for queer identified and transgender individuals, and they invest in training in order to be aware of the best practices for serving this population. They understand the intricacies required by federal laws such as FERPA and Title IX, that impose important obligations on college campuses.

Everyone here today is aware of the complexities and weight of this decision. As we were reminded last Friday with the school shooting at Marysville high school, the Pacific Northwest is not immune to this kind of tragedy. We cannot afford to ignore this risk and continue to operate with a less than adequate ability to respond and keep campus safe.

I urge the members of the Board to take this important step toward enhancing PSU’s ability to keep our campus community safe and to approve the creation of a sworn campus police force.
Craig Leets, Coordinator
Queer Resource Center

Good afternoon. My name is Craig Leets, I use he/him/his pronouns, and I am the Coordinator of the Queer Resource Center. I would like to thank the Campus Safety Board of Trustees Special Committee for the opportunity to speak today. I started at Portland State University 364 days ago (I started on October 28th), so I am relatively new to campus and still learning about our great university. I hope to speak with you about three topic areas in the next several minutes related to the current conversation on campus safety. These topics are: 1. the context within which I wrote the letter in support of transitioning Campus Public Safety Officers to a sworn police force, 2. my current support for our officers on campus, and 3. some perspective of the impact that this conversation is having on our campus. As I begin, it is important for me to mention that I do not speak for all queer and trans students on campus – I speak for the experiences that I have had as the Coordinator of the QRC and the experiences I have heard from specific students.

Onto the first topic. The letter that I wrote in support of transitioning CPSO to a sworn police force is dated April 8, 2014. Around that time, my attention was drawn to the Presidential Task Force on Public Safety’s Final Report, which had been released in my first days on campus. In that report, I read the letter of support written by the Director of the Women’s Resource Center. Shortly after reading this report, I was asked by a colleague to write a similar letter of support for our CPSO officers. At that time, and through today, my interactions with CPSO have been positive, so I felt agreeable in crafting a letter. I wrote the letter, which I hope has been made available to you, and reviewed it with my supervisor to ensure it was appropriate and to receive her approval.

The important context to understand within which I wrote this letter of support is this: I was operating under the assumption that there would be movement on campus regarding public safety and that the only options to be considered were the four recommendations presented in the Task Force report. As such, I wrote a letter in support of the officers with whom I had worked for the past 6 months and in support of the department with which I had developed a strong working relationship. At that time, I was writing the letter in support of one of the four options that all included bringing sworn officers to our campus – my letter says “In my role as the Coordinator of the Queer Resource Center, I have interacted with and heard anecdotes from students who have worked with CPSO officers that lead me to believe that keeping our current officers on campus will have the most positive impact on the queer community at Portland State University of the multiple recommendations that were offered in the Presidential Task Force on Campus Safety Final Report.” In my letter, I specifically state that I am commenting on my preference among the four options presented in that report. If additional options are now being considered, I question the extent to which my letter still carries weight in the conversation of sworn officers on campus given I did not know at that time that additional options would be considered and what those options might include.

However, this brings me to my second point. Although there might be some question regarding my support of sworn officers on campus, I would echo today much of what was written in my letter regarding the strong relationship that I have with CPSO and its officers. Another line from my letter: “Queer and trans people have a long, complicated history with law enforcement, and the proactive
approach that CPSO takes in providing a safe, welcoming, and inclusive climate for the queer community on campus is essential to PSU continuing to be a university that is known for its inclusion of queer students, faculty, and staff.” CPSO and the QRC work together in various ways to support queer and trans people on campus. We have a liaison officer to our center who frequents our space, sits on the Commission for Sexual and Gender Equity, and attends QRC events to ensure students see CPSO officers in contexts other than enforcement. Also, when appropriate, QRC staff are consulted to see if we have a pre-existing relationship that might assist CPSO in their work with a student, and if we do not have a relationship already established, an officer will offer QRC staff as a resource to a student who might benefit from the services we offer. Additionally, new officers are provided with training on ways they can be more trans-inclusive in their work with students on campus. It is important for me to state that I am advocating for keeping our officers on campus who know PSU and are intentional about ensuring that they are operating in ways that support the success of our students. Currently, there is a level of accountability that allows me to work directly with CPSO if there is a concern between an officer and a queer or trans student.

The final topic that I wish to cover is the impact that this conversation is having on campus and, more specifically, on our centers. As you have heard, both today and previously, many members of the PSU community have very strong opinions on this decision, and I hope that you understand the real emotion that is wrapped up in this. I also hope you know that this complex conversation has been simplified to guns or no guns which then puts those of us who have voiced support in a very tricky position. At the forum several weeks ago a faculty member stood and stated to the room that they would not send their students of color to the Queer Resource Center or the Women’s Resource Center. I was deeply impacted by that statement. I am saddened to hear that a student who could receive support from a resource center to aid in their success at PSU might not be referred to us or might not access our services because the letter of support that I wrote has been simplified to this message: the QRC supports guns. This issue is so complex, yet it is resulting in an “us versus them” climate on our campus with a real impact on the functioning of our university.

I am driven in my work by the belief that services specifically for the promotion of queer and trans students can have a real, significant impact for the success of these students in higher education. I hope that this decision, whatever it may be, will not have a lasting impact on the ways that the QRC is able to support student success on campus. Thank you, once again, for the opportunity to speak today. I acknowledge the very challenging decision that the Board of Trustees has ahead, and I hope that my thoughts today are somehow helpful in making the decision that is best for Portland State University.
Good afternoon. My name is Mike Walsh. I am the Director of University Housing and Residence Life. I’m hoping to shed some light on the perspective of students who have often been left out of this discussion – our on campus students.

We house 2,100 students and staff in ten distinct residence halls all across the PSU campus. Our Residence halls take up about 1 million square feet representing over 25 percent of the entire campus. Our residents include:

- Brand new first year students who have left home for the first time
- International students who not only may be leaving home for the first time, but are learning a brand new culture and language. 21 percent of our residential students are from abroad
- Students with families, including small children who need protection
- Students with physical and other disabilities

In essence, our residential student community is like a little city.

And this little city is their home. Our residents are the only people at PSU who are here 24 hours a day/7 days a week. Many of them do not leave campus for the breaks. This really is their home.

Since this is their home, each person who seeks to debate the ethics of limiting our public safety presence must first ask: How comfortable or safe would you feel in your own homes if you knew your safety personnel were limited in their abilities to fully protect you and your family? Would we stand for that? I think not. I think we would make a big fuss about it.

Most likely we would all want our safety officials to be unfettered in their roles – ready to respond rapidly to our safety needs – needs that must absolutely be met first before any of us can pursue the higher goals we have for ourselves.

We should want nothing less for the students who call PSU home like you and I call where we live home.

Dean Toppe has already mentioned several recent and serious situations just this academic year – in the last four weeks – that would have been less complicated and ended with less traumatic result if our CPSO already had police powers, including being equipped to manage that role and expectations in a complicated, densely packed, urban environment. Among other things, this means police fire arms. We welcome our CPSO becoming properly armed police just like I welcome the properly armed Portland police into my neighborhood when I need them.
As I’ve said before, this is their home, and it is our responsibility in housing is to do everything we can to make sure our residents’ safety is not limited.

In housing we always want to hope for the best and prepare for the worst. We are not prepared for the worst because we have not taken the necessary and logical steps yet to upgrade our public safety to a sworn police force. I say this knowing that even though Public Safety is limited, they do a miraculous job in keeping us all safe. But we shouldn’t have to rely on miracles. We have it in our power to be rational and remove the final impediments to keeping a thriving, residential urban campus as safe as we can.

On behalf of the 2,100 Portland State students and staff who call the campus their home, I urge you to grant our Public Safety full sworn police powers. Thank you.
Hello, my name is Marcy Hunt and I am the Director of Counseling Services at the Center for Student Health and Counseling (SHAC). I am also a member of the PSU CARE Team. Dr. Dana Tasson, SHAC’s Executive Director, sends his regrets that he was unable to attend today’s forum, but asked if I would make a statement in his absence. I appreciate the opportunity. I have been listening closely to both sides of this issue and want to acknowledge that the worries and fears that many have expressed about guns and/or the ramifications of having guns on campus are worries and fears that I too hold both personally and as a mental health professional. Despite my concerns, I am aware that we, the campus community, cannot ignore that campus violence is happening and happening with alarming regularity. PSU is not immune. We must do everything we can to keep PSU safe and secure so that the academic success and well-being of all PSU students can be realized.

At SHAC our primary mission is to promote the health and well-being of our students. As Dr. Tasson noted at the forum earlier this month, “there is no health without safety.” CPSO has been a wonderful partner to SHAC....Officers have walked countless numbers of students in need of mental health support to SHAC with great care and dignity...officers work closely with the WRC to connect sexual assault survivors to SHAC’s Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner program...I shares these as a couple of examples of the collaborative care that currently exists and with a sworn force would continue to exist, but with more efficiency and expediency than we currently experience working with Portland Police.

I also want to share that over the summer the PSU CARE Team participated in a training with national experts on threat assessment, management and violence prevention (SIGMA Threat Management Associates). One of the “take aways” from the day was their assertion that campus police departments that are “organically” connected to the culture and mission (e.g., first responders who know our campus climate and value are campus ethos around care) are invaluable resources to mitigating risk. A sworn police force would contribute significantly to the capacity and effective operation of a multidisciplinary threat assessment process.

I have the utmost respect for Chief Zerzan, his officers and staff. They promote our campus’s ethos of care 24/7 and I would only expect more positive and collaborative outcomes with a sworn force.
CeCe Ridder, Executive Director  
Diversity and Multicultural Student Services

My name is CeCe Ridder and I am the Executive Director of Diversity and Multicultural Student Services, or DMSS. Our population includes: first generation, low income, indigenous, people of color, undocumented and communities with historical trauma as well as communities that have been historically marginalized. There is so much history with people of color and the police, we ask that you acknowledge this history and act accordingly. No matter how educated we are and no matter what we do, we still show up in the room differently than most of the people in Portland and differently than those around us on this campus - and that matters.

We had two open conversations with Phil Zerzan at which we invited him into our space to discuss this issue, along with other administrators who came to the second session, and included many allies. However, what typically happens at these types of forums with many voices, is that the intent to discuss as a DMSS community, got lost with the many allies who showed up as well - many White allies. We were also not one of the focus groups on the Task Force Report. As a result, we haven’t really had a voice yet.

As you have invited us to make a statement today and to be a part of your process, we invite you into our community to ask us, just us, what we think. 3-5 minutes of a statement and a town hall really isn’t enough. In communities of color in particular, we sit down and build a relationship, therefore building trust. Sometimes it takes a little time, and we are asking you to invest that time. We invite you to participate with us in this fashion. We do not want a town hall, we want to be in small groups or one on one (not with every single member of our community) but where you might truly hear what our people have to say. If we are to do any implementation, you want our community on your side.

We did conduct a survey of our students and staff which asked how they felt about transitioning CPSO to a law enforcement agency. We had 86 responses. 41% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed; and 51% disagreed or strongly disagreed. 11% didn’t know enough to respond. We did collect a number of comments which we think will assist you in your research. We hope that you will read them and really consider what our folks are saying.

Some of our recommendations include:

- Consider a consultant or benchmarking against other campuses
- The creation of more prevention programs. For example, Working with Global Diversity and Inclusion on the campus modules for sexual assault and discrimination; promoting safety on campus including campaigns to educate our community about being an urban campus; education on how to reach campus safety; working with the Dean of Students on the Bias Response Team so we can create a safer campus.
- Hiring a diverse set of officers including gender and people of color
- Ongoing training for officers to include bias and racial profile training and building knowledge of marginalized communities such as that held by the Antidefamation League specifically for law enforcement officers.
- Addressing response time to sexual assaults and emergency situations
• Building relationships with departments and students on campus through liaisons like Trinity University in San Antonio did with their Campus Awareness and Resource Team (or CART).

• Creating an advisory group with a diverse set of members such as that at the University of Nevada, Reno.

• Thinking through how to make people feel safe on campus if there are to be changes to the current CPSO, what is the marketing and PR plan?

• Consider creating a student safety brigade that could assist and advise, like the Student Safety Patrol at Marquette University.

• Thorough consideration of alternatives to weapons and if each officer needs to have a weapon or is there a model of some officers with weapons and some without? There are many articles and models of campus policing, such as those found in the Campus Law Enforcement Journal.

• And finally, before implementation of any changes, a thorough roll out of the proposed plan such as what University of California did with their Response to Protest documents which were shared with the campus community, complete with charts and deadlines.

Thank you for your time and the opportunity to speak to you today.

Diversity and Multicultural Student Services

CeCe Ridder, Executive Director: October 2014

Survey results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I support transitioning Campus Public Safety (CPSO) to a Law Enforcement Agency.</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>86</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Breakdown of respondents

<p>| General Student | 2 |
| Graduate Student | 2 |
| Retention Mentors | 10 |
| Staff member | 10 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student in retention</th>
<th>51</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Support Svcs</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Centers leadership</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC Advisory</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>86</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Arming CPSO does not increase my feeling of security on campus. In fact, it lowers my personal feeling of safety tremendously. I believe that some situations may require a police force, but we are located within the city of Portland and our alliance with PPD is all that we need. Across the country incidents involving police violence are on the rise in frequency and severity. I do not believe we need to increase our risk to such events by arming our public safety. Thank you.

As a student of color, and speaking from prior experience with CPSO (as well as an armed law enforcement presence in another institution I have attended), I very strongly oppose the idea of the presence of a police force on campus. I have been profiled and discriminated against in the past - while I was simply minding my own business and waiting for a street car. I shudder to think that would happen to me and other students of color at PSU - on a campus and community that has had a recent and prior record of racial profiling and discrimination. I also fear the unsolicited presence and potential use of arms on campus. There are alternative ways of preparing for and dealing with any potential security risks on campus - and having a LEA on campus is not one of them.

Besides being a mentor in the Diversity Scholar retention program, I am also a Resident Assistant for Housing. This is my second year being an RA and through this position I would feel more safe on the job as well as a student at PSU to have officers who are allowed to have more power to interfere in all situation that require more attention such as threats that are either verbal, physically or suggestive. I think that by having CPSO transition to a Law Enforcement Agency there will be less threats on campus because both the PSU and PDX community will be more aware of the fact that our officers will take things into their hands when situation arises. Having a Law enforcement Agency is the wrong way to go!

I am in support of more enforcement but not about the usage of guns. Maybe using alternate solution instead of guns (tasers).

I am so worried about having armed police at school. I am a tall African American Male. I have had to swallow my pride too many times to get away from "Jumpy Officers" alive. I hate to think of paying so much money to be at PSU and have the potential to have negative experiences with someone I help to pay.

I believe if the PSU community members who are opposed of arming trained officers are aware of some of the incidents on campus or near campus they would be more supportive and would likely demand more officers on campus.

I do not agree with the University creating an armed campus police force because I do believe
that guns make people feel more safe. I believe that guns create more harm than good because so many misshapes can happen with guns. Especially being on a campus this size, I feel that if they were brought onto campus more "accidents" would happen than them creating a safe environment.

I do not feel safe being surrounded by law enforcement. CPSO has proven satisfactory. I want an environment of freedom, not restriction and fear around my campus. Keep guns and violence off PSU campus!

I do not understand how arming our campus security will make us safer or emergency response times around campus any faster. Armed officers are false of sense of security that only increases the chances of someone being unnecessarily shot and injured on our campus.

Lately we have seen increasing reports of distrust and fear from communities of color in relation to armed officers based on their conduct and patterns of discriminating against people of color (particularly black men). Why, when we're facing these issues which are based on factual incidents, would we introduce armed officers to our diverse PSU community (and again, especially when guns will not ensure increased campus safety)? Are we interested in all PSU community members feeling safe or just certain groups who coincidentally share a history and social privilege that do not reflect racial profiling, harassment, or being unfairly and disproportionately shot and killed by armed officers? There has to be culturally responsive alternatives that address the concerns of ALL PSU communities.

I don't feel comfortable with an armed guard surrounding our campus. We are a diverse campus, but so far police officers in a number of other instances make mistakes and choices that have killed or injured that diversity. I don't think arming them is going to help, but the presence of them being around, ready to help and protect in a moments notice is beneficial. Arming them with guns in not the answer, but giving them tasers IF they need to use them is alright, other ways of conflict resolution should be used before the taser is even thought about.

I don't feel that the majority of the situations that CPSO officers encounter could be better handled with firearms. I think firearms on campus will lead to more violence on both ends. It is also unfair that officers would be able to have guns but students who live on campus are not allowed it. Although I am not a gun owner, I do believe in being fair. I think nothing positive would come from guns on campus.

I have concerns that even as the University feels that our community can create a more socially just police force, it won't be possible if we select people who have developed beliefs, attitudes and dispositions that are culturally bias.

I have heard many students say they are very against this initiative. However I have not done enough research to have a strong opinion.

I am concerned about safety on campus but I am not sure if an armed force is the right decision.

I strongly believe if we allow those who are affiliated with public safety to be armed with a deadly weapon, this choice may not be beneficial for people of color, or for those individual who find themselves being target based on clothing, skin color or just being at the wrong
I strongly feel that because PSU is such a very big school. We need to protect ourselves in all ways possible, by having the safety team on site it's a very good idea.

I think that an Enforcement Agency on campus would not help. I have been following this issue and I think prevention is a more progressive way to handle these issues. I also think that by having a police precinct on campus it will hinder students freedom as far as assembling and as a female student of color I do not feel safe with the increase in security of this kind.

I'd rather have Portland State create a Security group or section to work with those already working on Campus Public Safety and making PSU a safer environment.

I'm not sure how this would affect the campus if the Portland Police force took charge? However, I am concerned that our safety on campus is compromised because campus officers cannot carry arms.

If adding armed security had any real impact on safety I would be in total agreement; however that is not the case and adding Law enforcement add a level of discrimination to people of color especially males. The Portland Police department is noted for their racist practices and their presence on campus will cause more problems than it would solve, If you have extra monies for campus security perhaps you should increase the number of officers so that their presence would be an effect deterrent to criminal activity.

It is great if we move to a Law Enforcement Agency guideline but my main concern is harassment or excessive force towards minorities on campus. What are you going to do to insure that this does not happen to any student in particular students of color? If a student has made a mistake that was minor but not a serious crime where no body is in danger can the officer in a case like this have more discretion to give students a warning instead of having it on their record? How is diversity going to be represented in this agency and to make sure that the officers can connect with the students around them? Is this going to be a community centered Law Enforcement approach or a more reactive and aggressive means of measure? I would just like to say that I feel great about having a law enforcement agency but if it does not apply the community, diversity, and basic rights principles that provide fairness to all than I would rather keep the CPSO and give the power of decisions back to students.

My position is this: college campuses, in my opinion, can be a unpredictable environment. On one hand, (though a weak argument) there is obvious drug usage that leads to students behaving badly, and on the other, there are students who suffer from mental illnesses (sometimes untreated) which can cause them to act out. Is it justifiable to meet those behaviors with force? How large is the margin for human error? In other words, how likely is it that innocent student will get hurt. What kind of training will armed police officers receive to recognize the difference between a real threat and a imagined threat induced by stress (manic attacks, mental breakdowns, ect.). The reality is - students sometimes make bad decisions, and those decisions should not be met with great force. (I hope this makes sense)

Phil Z indicates that it takes 5.2 fte to complete one 24hr shift - hire 65 new CPSO officers to meet the need to have 24 hour CPSO presence in each of the housing (or split them between CLOSE housing facilities).
Phil Z indicates current officers unable to conduct "official" paperwork must be completed by SWORN officers - Hire or create 5 new deputy positions - These five (plus one current) can provide 24 hour coverage (unnecessary for filing paperwork, but whatever). These five can be armed officers

Create a more easily accessible security office with a secure gun cabinet. Provide SWORN officer TRAINING to all officers and develop "emergency use" protocols

There is no need for armed police on campus. This has the potential for resulting in unnecessary altercations between students, staff, and the police. PSU is in the heart of Portland and we already have a police headquarters in the downtown area. The need for armed more people walking around can not be justified at this time. As a black male student who live very close to campus, I am very concerned for my safety if police officers on campus were armed.

We are in the heart of downtown Portland and there are already police who patrol the area. Campus safety does a great job in serving the students it is here to protect. From my experience, campus safety can handle most things thrown their way and if they can't, they know to call the police.

with the police station less than a mile away there is no need for a outside law enforcement agency to be on the campus. the lack of diversity within the campus security that already exist is an issue and with the addition of law enforcement with guns on campus is not a good idea and there is too much room for error and tragedy to happen.

Working as a Resident Assistant in University Housing I have noticed that the only officer I work with, officer M. Anderson, has been very good at treating students with dignity and respect. Looking at the larger community on campus I have noticed that I only see officers that reflect the majority European-American or 'white' student demographic. We need officers and people that reflect the communities that are represented on campus and that are aware of different customs from different cultures. I believe it could be beneficial to have a troupe of officers that do not impose the majority culture beliefs and attitudes towards historically marginalized groups of people.
Chas Lopez, Executive Director  
Office of Diversity and Inclusion

I wanted to brief the Board Committee on three main areas that may assist you as you make your decision:

1. Highlight some concerns that have been raised by some students, staff and community members.
2. Recommendations
3. Over-sight

1. Concerns surrounding profiling/officer shootings/overall treatment of historically marginalized individuals or groups, including, but not limited to racial minorities and individuals with mental health disabilities.
2. Suggestions have been made by CDO to VP Reynolds and Chief Zerzan (which they have already agreed to and incorporated) of potential ways of attempting to mitigate some of these concerns which includes:
   a. Working to ensure that we have a diverse applicant pool of potential candidates to choose from and this means diversity in its broadest sense.
   b. Training - before during and after the academy and the after means training on an ongoing basis to includes subject matter such as how to identify unconscious bias.
   c. Need to develop procedures for a post-incident review and a determination of who would be a part of that review committee.

3. Oversight - the Office of Equity & Compliance has oversight in conducting prompt, thorough and neutral investigations regarding any allegations of prohibited discrimination and harassment made against any faculty or staff member. If CPSO were to become a fully-sworn police department then the officers would be employees of PSU and the Office of Equity & Compliance would have the same oversight.
4. In my role as Title IX Coordinator have heard some concerns regarding response time for the survivors who choose to file a police report. The hope would be to have a rapid response to any survivor who wants to report an incident of sexual assault to the police. I also want to make sure to clarify that response time is distinguishable from education and prevention which the university also needs to provide.
   a. The recommendations made in the above section would also apply to this
Mr. Chairman, Board Members:

Thank you for this opportunity to speak with you today. My name is Kelly Cowan and I am the President of the PSU Faculty Association, the union representing approximately 800 part-time faculty members who teach each term at PSU. My members teach over 35% of the credit hours at PSU and as part-timers, we are often on campus teaching late at night, on the weekends, and during many times outside the normal business hours of the rest of the campus. We know what it is like to walk across campus in the middle of the night or into dark parking structures. Therefore, my members are keenly aware of the need for safety on campus. We have often interacted with Campus Public Safety Officers, and in talking to my members, I have heard many positive comments about the courtesy and professionalism displayed by these officers. I have also heard that there seems to be a very strong sense that we have a pretty safe campus at PSU and we are grateful to everyone who works so hard to keep it that way.

However, I am concerned about proposals I have heard to potentially create an armed police force. After a number of forums on this issue, and having worked with a variety of groups on campus to investigate the issue, there seem to be significant questions about how much such a plan will actually increase safety on campus, whether the additional cost of such a plan are justified, and whether these changes could open the door to new problems, such as excessive use of force, racial profiling, or abuse and intimidation of students and faculty of color.

I want to share with you the results of a recent survey of my members. We collected responses from nearly 100 members and found that they opposed the plan to create an armed PSU police force by more than a two-to-one margin. Concerning the question of safety, almost 3/4ths of respondents questioned whether such a plan would increase campus safety, and over 2/3rds questioned whether the additional cost was justified. We asked a final question regarding how members felt about possibly taking a mixed approach, such as retraining CPSO as a sworn police force, but not have them armed with lethal weapons. Members were more supportive of this idea, with 1/3rd supporting, 1/3rd neutral or unsure, and 1/3rd opposing.

Several of our members also mentioned that they have had considerable background in criminology and law enforcement experience and they asked me to clarify the following issues: (1) Please clarify the ongoing costs of maintaining an armed police force vs. the start-up costs?; (2) What are the cost differences between an armed and retrained police force vs. retraining but not arming a new police force?; and (3) Has a Job Task Analysis been performed to determine what new functions these armed police officers will do to increase campus safety that current CPSO or PPB officers are not.
already performing? We would appreciate answers to these questions, and hope that the entire campus will have access to a great deal of additional information and analysis on this subject before a final decision is made regarding the creation of an armed police force at PSU. Also, is it possible to share the slidea and materials presented at the campus public safety meetings.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Kelly Cowan
President
Portland State University Faculty Association
AFT Local 3571 - PSUFA
Peter Ward, CPSO

I appear before the board to give a professional and personal viewpoint, in their deliberations, over the findings of the President’s Task Force.

That viewpoint is based on my professional experience as a Police Officer, both in the US, and the United Kingdom.

I joined the Liverpool and Bootle Constabulary in January of 1974 and remained with it, and its successor, the Merseyside Police, until August 2006, a service of 32 years.

Merseyside is a county, which has within its borders the city/ port of Liverpool, whose population of 466,415 makes it the fifth most populous conurbation in England.

The total population of the County of Merseyside is 1.5 million.

The Merseyside Police are responsible for policing the County with 3954 police officers, 316 community support officers and 1714 police support staff. (UK Home Office Statistics – March 2014)

My policing experience, in the US, has been with the Portland Police Bureau, the Tigard Police Department and, for the last two years, the Campus Public Safety Office.

The purpose of my testimony is to comment on the issue of policing, in these two similar but also, pointedly, different environments.

The UK environment, where I patrolled, for the majority of my service, unarmed and the US environment where patrolling unarmed, as a Police Officer, is unthinkable.

In the US the purpose of a firearm is not for the general ‘day to day’ incidents that populate the majority of an officer’s career. But, those occasions where a person, or persons, are armed, with the intention, to avoid arrest by the use of deadly physical force or, more current, to inflict the maximum injury to others, until they are killed or kill themselves, because they are confronted with the probability of their own injury or death.

Whilst it is still true that the general patrol officer in the United Kingdom (with the exception of Northern Ireland) does not carry a firearm, what they do carry has changed drastically since 1974.

In 1974 my only protection was a wooden truncheon, which was kept in an interior leg pocket. I was not even issued handcuffs which, if you wanted a set, you had to buy out of your own pocket, and body armor was not even on the horizon.
The need for firearms was so rare that when they were issued, from a secured cabinet in the main station, it was the topic of conversation in the Division (Precinct), if not the Force.

However, by the end of my career I was equipped with overt body armor, a PR24 side handed baton and CS spray, with serious consideration being given to the issue of Tasers.

I had also been issued with a handgun and shotgun, for specific incidents, an example being the arrest of a male who had shot at police officers and had told his compatriots that he would not be taken alive.

However, once we had tracked him down, and he knew we were armed, he surrendered.

The force had also introduced 24/7 cover from specially customized Volvo Estate vehicles, with the two person crew armed with semi-automatic pistols and rifles, designated as Armed Response Vehicles (ARVs).

I would highlight that such was in a country where the possession of firearms was and is a minority sport (possession for self-defense being completely prohibited) and where there was no public outcry, when handguns were completely banned, after the Dunblane Massacre, in 1996.

I would contrast that with the US where is a Constitutional Amendment / Right to own firearms, and where 35-50 million Americans own firearms (the population of the UK is 64 million).

A culture where, after every incident of active shooters, the question of firearm regulation is raised, but is vehemently opposed by a significant portion of the population.

Where the primary question asked, when a call is made about a violent, or possibly violent incident, is, “DO THEY HAVE ACCESS TO FIREARMS?”.

Something I had to bear in mind, on any contact I made as a US police officer, and which saw me draw my firearm, on a number occasions, when involved in arrests; ranging from murder to armed robbery to interpersonal violence, with an armed abuser.

And for the last two years, as an unarmed Campus Public Safety Officer, where I have contacted two persons with licensed handguns, in the University District.

Such a possibility that rarely entered my consideration, when I attended violence calls, as a UK police officer, even at the end of my career, as handguns are prohibited.
During these same two years I have frequently dealt with persons not affiliated with the university, armed with knives and daggers, whilst on the campus in furtherance of their criminal lifestyle.

Currently, the scenario that occupies my mind is my response to an active shooter, or a violent intruder, on the Campus.

At present the procedure in place is for CPSO to attempt to clear buildings and then establish a perimeter around the location of the shooter, whilst awaiting armed officers.

This, even though experience of such incidents indicates that confronting the shooter or violent intruder can truncate the incident and reduce the loss of life.

Speaking for myself, I would not be able to remain inactive, after 35 years as a Police Officer, and especially as I have given a personal commitment to parents, and students, that I will do all that I can to keep the University community safe.

Accordingly, I would endeavor to remove the threat, and I strongly believe that my CPSO colleagues, that share a former experience as police officers, would do the same. That is, confront an armed offender without the ability to defend the community, or myself.

In conclusion, I would consider that it would be unconscionable to create a Portland State University Police Department, and then expect the officers to be unarmed, when the President's Task Force has, as its basic finding, stated that the PSU needs access to armed police officers, and where the other options, by default, would see armed officers.

I thank you for this invitation to address you and I will assist you in any other way I can.

I later responded to the question of officers wearing body cameras and paraphrase what I believe I said, namely that I had no objection, especially as members of the University Community already recorded any incidents I might be involved in and, that from personal experience, I know that a recording from one position can give a misleading perspective, which I would like to be able to challenge with my own recording.
The Portland State University Student Union stands in opposition to the current proposal to create a deputized university police force. We believe that we need to continue to develop strategies that ensure a safe campus. Developing alternative solutions to each individual service gap would more effectively address campus safety while eliminating the negative collateral effects that a standing police force would have on the PSU community.

We are proud that PSU remains the only of the twenty-one urban universities that does not employ a private police force. Currently we are in the middle of a national conversation on the militarization of American policing, and we are regularly seeing the fallout of a discriminatory and heavy-handed use of the authority that we as citizens have entrusted to the police. As students and creators of our future community, we believe that because our community safety is at stake, we must continue this national conversation in a way that begins offering solutions in our university that differ from the answer we have seen play out time and again over the last sixty years.

Police discrimination against people of color is well documented. Black males are stopped at a rate four times higher than the rest of the population and are twenty-one times more likely to be killed by a police officer than a white male. This pattern is no different with the history of the Portland Police Bureau, who would be involved in training the new force. When all the officers involved with the killing of Keaton Otis remain on active duty for the PPB, and without a specific method for how this culture would be prevented from forming within the PSUPD, we can’t accept that forming a new department is the solution to these ills plaguing police culture. When there is already evidence that CPSO interacts with people on campus in a discriminatory manner, it would be naive to think that a new body with expanded authority would be different.

In addition to discrimination, sexual assault is an important issue that must also be addressed, and it must be done in a way that does not trade the perceived safety of one group for the safety of another. Rape and Sexual Assault are fundamentally difficult situations to address, whether or not police are involved. When less than 5% of rapes and attempted rapes are
reported to campus authorities and only 3.6% of rapes occur outdoors, police presence has a
negligible effect on the rate at which these crimes occur. Furthermore, police are guilty of
sexual assault at a rate 230% that of the general public\(^1\), so it is hard to understand why they
are seen as the solution to this problem.

We find it negligent on the part of the task force that PSU’s nationally recognized Conflict
Resolution department was never contacted over the course of the current proposal’s
development. This department has authored a body of research that could be drawn upon to
create potential alternative solutions - we would be remiss to not utilize this unique resource.
We believe restorative justice should be valued more than punitive justice in our development
of a safe community, and that the Conflict Resolution department should be directly involved in
the creation of new solutions. In addition to the Conflict Resolution department, other
departments on campus have valuable perspectives on this incredibly important issue.
Departments such as the Women’s Resource Center, the Queer Resource Center, the Disability
Resource Center, Black Studies, Chicana(o) Studies, Indigenous Nation Studies, Urban Studies,
Public Policy, et al. would have relevant input in finding a strategy that accounts for the
complexity of our community in a way that uses the collective expertise of our academic
institution in order to find new solutions.

We believe that solutions derived from empowering individuals and strategies which affirm our
responsibility as members of our community will more effectively create an environment that is
both safe in its perception and safe in its actuality, while preventing the alienation that is
invariably associated with police presence.

PSUSU Alternative Safety Demands

1) Vote "no" on the current proposal

2) Develop a new safety report with non-violent alternatives to deputization including, but not limited to: an increase in the number of campus safety officers on campus; an increase in lighting on campus; mandatory de-escalation trainings for officers and the broader PSU community; and the implementation of a Student Patrol and Safe Walk Program. All solutions presented in the report should be shaped through a series of forums, conversations, and measurable opportunities for input from the PSU community, including, but not limited to: people of color, veterans, student parents, the queer community, and students with disabilities.

3) Student body, faculty, and staff must vote on and ratify the new proposal before implementation.

4) Consult with the criminology, conflict resolution, public health, social work, and psychology departments, among others, to find and implement nonviolent, student-centered safety measures as soon as practicable.