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AGENDA

1. Call to Order/Roll/Declaration of Quorum

2. Approval of the October 27, 2014 Meeting Minutes

3. Review of Requested Information:
   a. Additional Online Feedback Received Since October 26, 2014
   b. Campus Safety Services and Support
   c. Complaints to Global Diversity and Inclusion Regarding Campus Public Safety Office (CPSO)
   d. Sworn and Armed Officers
   e. Budget Scenario for FY16 and Full Implementation
   f. Campus Police Department Management and Implementation Outline
   g. Implementation Advisory Committee Membership and Process

4. Public Comment

5. Resolution for December 11, 2014 Board of Trustees Meeting and Board Discussion

6. Adjourn
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.

**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.

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.
Statement to the Board of Trustees  
Regarding a PSU sworn police force  
University Housing and Residence Life  
Michael Walsh

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:

I support transitioning Campus Public Safety (CPSO) to a Law Enforcement Agency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Student</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention Mentors</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff member</td>
<td>10</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
location at the wrong time.

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 presences 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 not 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 an 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, etc.). 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
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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td>Not sure how many of you heard about a HS shooting near us up here in Washington. I don't believe officers would have stopped this tragedy. I don't think officers would stop a tragedy on campus here. What “sworn”/real officers would do is lessen the potential loss. Do we really have to wait until a shooter is on our campus before we do anything about it? A teacher put herself in harms way to save dozens of students. Is our answer to have professors put their lives on the line until sworn officers come from Portland? Good luck with that PSU. I want to know that we took REAL precautions if a tragedy does happen. I heard a lot about Michael Brown in the video. That was a tragedy and a loss. Can we talk about Nate Hatch, Zoe Galasso, Andrew Fryberg, and Gia Soriano now? These are all losses and guns are not going away. Can we make a campus a little less likely of a target or limit loss?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td>I believe that arming security guards at PSU is the worst idea ever. The only thing worse than having dedicated police on campus is having untrained men with guns on campus. There will still be issues with racial profiling, harassment, and abuses of power but with people who are less accountable and less trained. Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>10/28/14</td>
<td>Campus Population Density Ratios: 1 Student per 69sf of campus land area 1 Student every 109sf of net building area Police Weapon Facts (.38 Cal Std. Issue): Muzzle Velocity: 945ft/sec Muzzle Energy: 188ftlb = 17,000psi Unimpeded lethal target range: 180ft approx. 1/2 city block Lethal range through std. stud wall: approx. 50ft Lethal ricochet range varies up to about 75ft PSU is not your typical Oregon University campus. It has a much higher population density. If a PSU police officer discharges a firearm on campus, there is a much higher likelihood that an innocent by-stander will be lethally shoot by a PSU employee. Does the Board want the University to assume this burden?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>11/2/14</td>
<td>I have never used a blue-light phone, but I have seen them and appreciate they are there. It might be a good idea to have a smartphone app that people can download as part of orientation though, because those are more readily available than blue-light phones. I also am a fan of key cards; PSU's location is a wonderful part of our college experience, but there are some attendant risks. If PSU has had the same number of security staff since the 90s, I am also supportive of an increase in staff. I AM NOT IN FAVOR OF ARMING CAMPUS POLICE. NO GUNS, NO TASERS, NO LESS-LETHAL AMMUNITION. We are downtown. Portland Police have plenty of guns and they are close by. I am not okay with my money being spent on sidearms for private security. This is a completely outrageous and inappropriate suggestion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>11/3/14</td>
<td>Hello. I am an academic adviser at PSU, and I attended the Board of Trustees meeting on this issue last week, Oct. 27th. I have a few comments: 1. I was disappointed that public comment was delayed until past 5pm. The delay by over two hours undercut public comment almost completely. Please, in the future, ensure there is more democratic process and ability for the public and the PSU community to engage you in public comment. 2. I have worked at PSU for just over seven years. I am aware of the crime issues at PSU, and I also feel very safe here, considering we are an urban campus. I appreciate our CPS very much. They do a terrific job. Throughout the speeches for the creation of an armed CPS, I did not find the arguments convincing. The majority of student issues involve mental health issues, theft and occasional fights. The crime that is most concerning is from off-campus elements, and this is the job for the Portland Police. Instead of creating a new armed PSU campus police (and all the funding /training/supervisory issues that will ensue), we need a stronger connection to the City of Portland and Portland Police Dept. I would like to know if the president or the BOT has been in conversation with the Mayor and the Chief of Police? Instead of us taking on this new expense and burden, we need to have a better working relationship with the city and the police bureau. It should be relatively simple to work out having two officers assigned to this end of town that work more closely with our CPS. This would save us a tremendous amount of money, and would put the responsibility where it should lay, with our city police. We need to work with existing entities and make them work better for us. Thank you for reading my comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>11/3/14</td>
<td>There are major gaps in services as it stands now. It makes more sense to have a police dept that can provide all the services needed on a campus as large as PSU. I remember reading about two incidents that were very disturbing. One was a woman was raped and the case was handled by multiple agencies. Another was an active stabbing where PSU Officers had to wait outside for Portland police because they didn’t have the tools to stop the assault. Another incident was when one of there officers got a gun shoved in his face and he couldn’t do anything. Right now that dept. is not capable of serving warrants, or doing community holds. They have to depend on Portland, and a lot of times Portland is too busy. Some times PSU officers have to wait hours for ppd respond. In an active shooter incident it could take a long time for ppd to respond, and then they have to wait for PSU officers to let them inside the locked buildings. As far as the racial fear, the officers would have to go through the police academy where they will be trained a lot better then they are now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>11/9/14</td>
<td>I have not needed these services and feel that an armed campus security force would make the experience at Portland State much less conducive to maintaining the current positive attitude around campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>11/10/14</td>
<td>Stop fooling yourself that we would be safer without guns on campus - they already exist. Campus Police must be able to protect the PSU community as well as themselves. PSU is not an average campus that is physically separate from the city. This leaves the campus vulnerable to individuals with ill-intentions. It does not make sense that PSU police have to prolong a dangerous situation in order to wait for Portland Police to arrive with their guns to gain control of the situation. Many more lives could be lost in waiting. Train the PSU officers on carrying and use of a weapon, keep them trained, but allow them to protect us and themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>11/10/14</td>
<td>I was absolutely sickened to hear how poorly our faculty behaved at the last campus meeting. These our our educators and they quickly jumped to conclusions, made unfounded accusations, and completely made the argument personal towards individuals in CPSO. It was unprofessional and shameful. You are all educators and I would hope you would listen to all sides of the conversation and keep an open mind. You ask this of us students every day. It's your turn to grow up, look at the reality of the current situation, and offer real ideas that help, not accusations that hurt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>11/10/14</td>
<td>We need more training and personnel not guns! I am not in support of armed security on campus; I am in favor of having more than 3 individuals handling all the security...use human with more training and support and not guns...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>11/10/14</td>
<td>Hello, I am very concerned about expanding the security force on campus to include armed personnel. This kind of force is appropriate for the police force, but is inappropriate and detracts from an academic setting. With all of the budget issues facing PSU, it seems odd that we would try to duplicate armed forces that are already available from the City of Portland. A public university is not in a good position to develop or maintain a legal system or a law enforcement system, and those systems already exist sufficiently well in the city that envelopes PSU. It is better to for the university prioritize academic matters, while counting on city legal and law enforcement agencies to take care of legal and safety matters when necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>11/10/14</td>
<td>I approve of adding more security personnel to address the needs of PSU, however, I have not seen any credible evidence of the need for an armed police force nor how this would address any of the needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>11/11/14</td>
<td>I have felt mostly positive about the campus security. I am very much opposed to an expanded security force if that means armed police. I don't think bringing guns onto campus (security or police) is a positive development. If any additional investment is made I think it should be in having more preventative services and more student supports and trainings to continue to make security more responsive and available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>11/11/14</td>
<td>I have largely favorable experiences with campus security under its current configuration. I have read the task force report and believe that an expanded security force will not resolve the concerns raised in the report. Arming campus security will not prevent crime on campus, it will not resolve concerns regarding an active shooter incident (reviewing outcomes of recent active shooter scenarios across the country reveals that shooters are seldom stopped by armed security - much more often, the event ends with the shooter turning the gun on themselves), and it will certainly add more weapons to our local neighborhood downtown. The rhetoric that we need guns on campus to protect us from the porous nature of the University is simplistic and incomplete; introducing more weapons will require in some ways that our community/neighborhood has become less safe by virtue of us weaponizing our porous border.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>11/12/14</td>
<td>What are your plans to guarantee the safety of those PSU employees who do not work in PSU-owned buildings?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>11/13/14</td>
<td>I strongly disagree with the recommendation of adding sworn, armed officers to the campus public safety office force. As a graduate student and adjunct instructor, I have worked many hours, including late into the evening, in various parts of the campus (library, Market Center building, ASRC, Cramer hall and other classroom buildings). I have not needed safety escorts. I strongly support the inclusion of electronic ID cards for access to buildings after hours, additional blue-light phones, and with hiring more public safety officers. However, armed officers are unnecessary and unwanted by large numbers of faculty and students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>11/15/14</td>
<td>As a PSU student who has a CHL in Oregon but is not allowed to utilize it on campus, I would feel safer knowing the campus security had access to firearms to halt an active shooter in progress before further loss of life. I have children who attend Reynolds High School and understand the presence of the armed SRO's who were on campus, and their quick response, stopped that incident before more lives were lost. I understand the concerns of others on campus and believe that further education regarding firearms and their legal use would alleviate some concerns. So much is at stake during a shooting event; when seconds count we can't afford to wait for a police response that could take minutes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
October 27, 2014

As a member of the Portland State University community, the School of Social Work stands ready to actively contribute to and support efforts to promote campus-wide well-being in a climate of diverse and sometimes conflicting perspectives regarding campus safety. We do so as an expression of professional ethics and a commitment to and respect for our shared governance processes. We espouse a collective stance that campus safety must be carefully and rigorously balanced with social justice and inclusiveness through the following principles:

- Participating actively in all opportunities to provide input regarding the evolution of policies related to campus safety and security with particular attention to the inclusion of a diverse cross-section of student, faculty, staff, administrative and community perspectives in their many forms. Active and productive debate is celebrated as a sign of commitment to a safe, healthy and just campus.

- Use of best practices in promoting community justice, preventing violence, and encouraging peace is prioritized, including the knowledge that the most effective community safety approaches derive from active engagement and interconnectedness among community members.

- Practicing rigorous self-examination, evaluation and ongoing assessment/monitoring of public safety and community well-being in the past, present and future as part of any action plan.

- Acknowledging that the array of voices that comprise vulnerable and/or marginalized groups and populations merit special consideration in matters of public safety, campus security and well-being. This is in keeping with PSU's multiple and multi-sector efforts to promote success among a vibrant and diverse student, faculty and administrative community.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Burney Nissen, Dean and Professor
School of Social Work
We, the undersigned from the School of Gender Race and Nation Collaborative (SGRN), comprising Chicano Latino Studies, Indigenous Nations Studies, Black Studies, and Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies, and allies, oppose the PSU administration’s proposal to create a sworn police force on campus. We object that on such an important issue, our departments were not involved earlier in the decision making process, thus positioning us to only be reactive to it.

Our faculty and our students strongly oppose violence prevention methods on campus that involve guns, especially since many of us are of communities which have been targeted for racial profiling both on and off campus. Our students have voiced concern and fears that an armed sworn police force would decrease their safety on the PSU campus. They also express dismay with the QRC and WRC positions in support of this armed sworn police force. This has made some students withdraw from participating in those resource centers. Though the QRC and WRC on paper support the establishment of an armed sworn police force, it is deeply troubling that all of the proposals put forward by PSU last spring had an armed sworn police force as the only real option to consider, meaning there was no alternative to having an armed sworn police force at PSU. This was a false choice for those asked to support the proposal. It has created division in our community.

We recognize violence prevention and intervention at PSU is a priority among all levels of leadership at PSU. However, creating an armed sworn police force is contentious at best, and dangerous at worst. The AAUP survey of our members came out strongly against the proposal to create a sworn police force, with 68% of faculty respondents voting no to a sworn police force. It was deeply troubling at the October 27th, 2014 committee hearing on this issue that the PSU administration spent over two hours of the meeting making their case for armed sworn officers. Though there were a number of students and faculty who wanted to give testimony, there was little space in the agenda for it. This demonstrated a lack of respect for the voices of the PSU community. It also was a signal that public involvement around this issue is merely for window dressing, and not to be actively incorporated into our safety plan. The obvious lack of transparency around this issue is troubling.

We recognize that the Campus Safety Department is understaffed. We do support employing more Campus Safety Officers. We advocate increased funding for campus mental health services and regular early warning training of faculty and resource staff working with students, to better detect those who may be a potential danger to themselves and the PSU community. We call for the use of non-violent communication among campus safety officers. For instance the Portland Police Bureau refused the offer of training by Marshall Rosenberg, founder of renowned Non-Violent Communication, ten years ago. His work is an example of innovative violence prevention strategies that are being used around the world. We value listening to student recommendations for measures to improve safety at PSU. Some of those measures include increasing the number of blue emergency booths around campus, installing more lighting in poorly lit areas, increasing campus awareness around sexual assault, and improving security around dorms/campus apartments. Listen to students. Maybe even invite them to vote on the proposal.

We also advocate for mediation between the Portland Police and PSU Campus Safety. The inefficiencies within the Portland Police and PSU Campus Safety relationship are unacceptable. A functioning and sustainable collaboration between these two entities will have long-term effects that will be fiscally responsible as well. Developing this collaboration will release certain PSU funds to be
spent on some of the measures listed above. Improving this relationship would also address some of the concerns QRC and WRC staff have around improving campus response to instances of sexual assault.

At this moment we have the opportunity to put forward a comprehensive response to violence prevention and intervention at Portland State University. Letting this moment pass will be nothing short of failed leadership at PSU at the highest levels. As PSU has become a national leader in the sustainability movement, we can now become leaders in socially sustainable policing by moving away from the militarized model of armed enforcement to a more campus-centered model of safety and prevention. Just because other urban universities have armed sworn police forces does not mean we should follow in their footsteps. We should lead in new directions and demonstrate that there are other ways of doing public safety innovation instead of towing the line. It is clear throughout the nation, and we need no study to validate this, that more armed police does not actually improve society in quantitative ways. We encourage you now to move this university in a different direction, truly step up as leaders, and to show that the pulse of the campus community is indeed a guiding principle of your decision making.

We are in general agreement with the School of Social Work Community Members’ Position Statement on Armed Security on PSU Campus. The emphasis on safety in their statement is especially compelling to us. Of particular note is the safety of those most often targeted by armed police, namely people of color, people in mental health crisis, people who cannot correctly understand police commands, people who have little to no political clout.

The by-laws of the Board of Trustees state you are to provide oversight and guidance to the university’s strategic direction, and advising the President. With this mandate we ask you the question, what is the legacy that this board wants to leave? We call on you to exert the leadership of your position, and professional expertise, and say no to armed police officers on the Portland State University campus.

We look forward to your timely response. Feel free to contact us if you would like to talk about this in person.

Sincerely,

Cornel Pewewardy, Professor and Director of Indigenous Nations Studies
Sally E. McWilliams, Professor and Director of Women, Gender & Sexuality Studies
Veronica Dujon, Acting Chair of Black Studies
Roberto DeAnda, Acting Chair Chicano Latino Studies
Grace L. Dillon, PhD, Professor of Indigenous Nations Studies.
Sara Siestreem, Indigenous Nations Studies
Maria DePriest, English and Affiliate faculty in Indigenous Nations Studies and Black Studies
Brook Colley, Indigenous Nations Studies
Ethan Johnson, Black Studies
Sally Eck, Women Gender and Sexuality Studies
Pedro Ferbel-Azcarte, Black Studies
Derrais Carter, Black Studies
Joseph Smith-Buani, Black Studies
Jason Damron, Women Gender and Sexuality Studies
Jamie Ross, Women Gender and Sexuality Studies
Miriam Abelson, Women Gender and Sexuality Studies
Roberta Hunte, Black Studies and Women Gender and Sexuality Studies
Marlene Howell, Women Gender and Sexuality Studies
Maura Kelly, Sociology and Affiliate Faculty in WGSS
Kari Smit, Women Gender and Sexuality Studies
Vicki Reitenauer, Women Gender and Sexuality Studies
Elena Aviles, Chicano Latino Studies
Stephanie Lumsden, Women Gender and Sexuality Studies
Amanda Byron, Conflict Resolution Department
Tom Hastings, Conflict Resolution Department
Joyce O’Halloran, Professor of Mathematics
Date: November 20, 2014

To: Special Committee on Campus Public Safety

From: David Reese
General Counsel

Subject: Legal Requirement Regarding Sworn Peace Officers

Issues Presented

The following questions were recently asked of my office:

1. What are the legal authorities and responsibilities of sworn university police officers under Oregon law, and how do such authorities and responsibilities compare to those of current CPSO officers?
2. What are the legal requirements for the certification and training of university police officers?
3. Does Oregon law require university police officers to be armed while on-duty?
4. Assuming the answer to #3 is “no,” could unarmed university police officers safely and effectively exercise the new authorities provided to them as a result of being sworn peace officers?

Discussion

1. What are the legal authorities and responsibilities of sworn university police officers under Oregon law, and how do such authorities and responsibilities compare to those of current CPSO officers?

Oregon law permits public universities with governing boards, such as Portland State University, to employ two types of campus security officers: (1) police officers, with all of the privileges and immunities of municipal police officers, and/or (2) special campus security officers, with limited powers and scope. ORS 352.118. The first authority—to establish a police department and employ police officers—is relatively new. The Legislature provided this authority to the Oregon State Board of Higher Education in 2011 and extended this authority to institutional boards of trustees under SB 270 in 2013. The second authority—to employ special campus security officers—has been in place since 1987. Current CPSO officers fall within the second category, whereas sworn university police officers would fall within the first.
As “special campus security officers,” CPSO officers have very limited legal authority. ORS 352.118(1)(c) provides:

“Commission[ed] special campus security officers . . ., when acting in the scope of their employment, shall have stop and frisk authority as set forth in ORS 131.605 to 131.625 and probable cause arrest authority and the accompanying immunities as set forth in ORS 133.310 and 133.315. Special campus security officers may not be authorized to carry firearms as police officers and, except as provided in subsection (2) of this section, may not be considered police officers for purposes of ORS 181.610, 238.005, 243.005 or 243.736.” (Emphasis added.)

It is clear that campus security officers are not peace officers and possess only those authorities provided by the statute. Only two grants of authority are mentioned: (1) stop and frisk authority under ORS 131.605 et seq., 1 and (2) probable cause arrest authority under ORS 133.310 et seq. 2 In addition, the authority of CPSO officers is limited to university-owned or –controlled property, because that is “the scope of employment” of CPSO officers. CPSO officers have none of the other authorities or responsibilities of peace officers and lack the general jurisdictional authority of peace officers.

Police officers are granted various broad powers and responsibilities that are specifically denied to CPSO officers. Those powers and responsibilities include:

- the authority to issue criminal citations to persons believed to have committed a misdemeanor or certain felonies (ORS 133.055);
- the authority to issue citations for violations, such as certain traffic offenses (ORS 153.005 et seq.);
- the authority to arrest and detain, with or without a warrant (ORS 133.235 et seq.);
- the authority to seek, obtain and execute a search warrant (ORS 133.525 et seq.);
- the authority to respond to a stalking complaint by issuing a citation requiring a person to appear in court to show cause why the court should not enter a stalking protective order (ORS 163.735);
- the authority of a peace officer to use physical force to the extent necessary to make an arrest, to prevent an escape, for self-defense, or to defend a third person (ORS 161.235 et seq.);
- the authority to perform “community caretaking,” which is any lawful act inherent in the duty of a police officer to serve and protect the public, such as the right to enter and remain on the premises of another, or to stop and redirect traffic, if necessary to prevent

---

1 “Stop and frisk” authority is the authority to stop a person that an officer reasonably suspects has committed or is about to commit a crime in order to make a reasonable inquiry and to frisk the person being stopped for dangerous or deadly weapons if the officer reasonably suspects the person to be armed and dangerous. ORS 131.605-131.625.

2 “Probably cause arrest” authority is the authority of an officer to arrest a person without a warrant if the officer has probable cause to believe that the person has committed (a) a felony, (b) a misdemeanor, (c) an unclassified offense for which the maximum penalty allowed by law is equal to or greater than the maximum penalty allowed for a Class C misdemeanor, or (d) any other crime committed in the officer’s presence. ORS 133.310(1).
serious harm to persons or property, to render aid to injured or ill persons, or to locate missing persons (ORS 133.055);
• the authority to take into custody and deliver to a hospital a person believed to be dangerous to self or to any other person and in need of immediate care or treatment for mental illness (ORS 426.228);
• the authority to take or send home a person under the influence of controlled substances or, if the person is incapacitated or appears to be in immediate danger, to take such person to a treatment facility (ORS 430.399);
• an obligation, when responding to incidents of domestic violence, to arrest a person believed to have committed an assault between family or household members, or believed to be placing another family or household member in fear of imminent serious physical injury (ORS 133.055);
• the authority to recover a child pursuant to a custody order under the Family Abuse Prevention Act (ORS 107.732);
• the duty to arrest and prosecute violators of animal cruelty laws (ORS 133.379); and
• eligibility for benefits provided to police officers killed in the line of duty under federal and state law, which include financial assistance to surviving spouses and children, education assistance for surviving children, and burial expenses. Some of these benefits may not be currently applicable to CPSO officers because they are not police officers by definition.

In addition, although it is a crime to interfere with, obstruct, resist, impersonate, or give false information to a police officer, those offenses do not apply to, or protect, CPSO officers. ORS 162.225 to ORS 162.385. Although it is a traffic violation to fail to obey the direction or signal of a police officer, it is not a violation to fail to obey a CPSO officer. ORS 811.535. It is also not a crime to escape from or elude a CPSO officer. ORS 162.145; ORS 811.540. In addition, the crime of assaulting a public safety officer, a class C felony, does not apply to assaults of CPSO officers. ORS 163.208.

2. What are the legal requirements for the certification and training of university police officers?

The Oregon Board on Public Safety Standards and Training and the Department of Public Safety Standards and Training (DPSST) are charged with establishing and maintaining standards, certification, accreditation, and training for police officers in Oregon. ORS 181.640. This includes police officers commissioned by the Oregon State Police or by a city, port, school district, mass transit district, county, county service district, tribal government, public university, the Criminal Justice Division of the Department of Justice, the Oregon State Lottery Commission, or the Governor. ORS 181.610(15). All police officers in Oregon must be certified by DPSST. ORS 181.665. DPSST is also charged with suspending or revoking the certification of officers who fail to maintain compliance with the certification requirements. ORS 181.662.

DPSST provides various levels and types of training to law enforcement and fire personnel. Although required for police officers of all types, DPSST training is not available to CPSO officers. DPSST’s training and other requirements for certified officers are detailed in the
administrative rules of the agency. OAR 259-008-0010 establishes various minimum standards for police officers (e.g., categories such as citizenship, criminal background, moral fitness, education, academic proficiency, physical fitness, visual acuity, etc.). In addition, before an officer can be certified, the officer must satisfy the requirements of the “Basic Course.” OAR 259-008-0025. The Basic Course requires significant training in the use of firearms, cultural awareness and diversity, use-of-force law and application, less lethal options and concepts, tactical communication and defusing hostility, mental health and disabilities, veteran’s mental health issues, domestic violence, critical incident stress awareness, community policing and problem solving, criminal investigations, sexual assault investigations, vehicle stops, ethics and professionalism, civil liability and civil rights violations, defensive tactics, the simulation of confrontational situations, sexual harassment, patrol procedures, scenario training, and many other topics.

3. Does Oregon law require university police officers to be armed while on-duty?

Oregon law does not explicitly address this point. There is nothing in Oregon statutes mandating that police officers be armed; nor is there anything in Oregon statutes that seem to contemplate unarmed police officers. Rather, the law and the training requirements of DPSST appear to presume that police officers are armed. For instance, the single subject in DPSST’s Basic Course curriculum that receives the longest period of attention is firearms.

Oregon law does, however, explicitly require all peace officers to perform certain tasks that should generally and safely be performed only by armed police officers. For instance, ORS 133.055 requires a police officer, when responding to incidents of domestic violence, to arrest a person believed to have committed an assault between family or household members, or believed to be placing another family or household member in fear of imminent serious physical injury. One might assume that the Legislature would not have mandated that an officer effectuate an arrest in a highly volatile domestic violence situation if the officer were unarmed and unable to defend him or herself.

4. Assuming the answer to #3 is “no,” could unarmed university police officers safely and effectively exercise the new authorities provided to them as a result of being sworn peace officers?

Police officers encounter dangerous situations on a regular basis. According to the FBI, 27 law enforcement officers were feloniously killed in the line of duty in 2013, a marked decrease of more than 44 percent when compared to the 49 officers killed in 2012. By circumstance, in 2013, seven officers were killed as a result of ambushes (four during unprovoked attacks and three due to entrapment/premeditated situations). Five officers died from injuries inflicted as a result of answering disturbance calls (three of which were domestic disturbances), and five officers were engaged in tactical situations. Three officers sustained fatal injuries while they were investigating suspicious persons or circumstances, three were conducting traffic pursuits or stops, and three officers were responding to robberies in progress or pursuing robbery suspects. One officer was killed as a result of an investigative activity. FBI Releases 2013 Preliminary Statistics for Law Enforcement Officers Killed in the Line of Duty,
The authorities provided to police officers that are currently unavailable to CPSO officers—i.e., to conduct investigations, to respond in tactical situations (such as an active shooter situation), to handle domestic violence calls, to conduct traffic stops, etc.—are the very situations that put officer safety most at risk. Due to these risks, according to the Vice President for Finance and Administration and the Chief of Campus Public Safety, unarmed university police officers would not be permitted to perform these high-risk tasks. Unarmed officers would not conduct traffic stops, enter dwellings, engage criminal suspects believed to be armed, or perform other similar tasks, because doing so would create an unacceptable risk of harm to the officer, as well as an unacceptable risk of civil liability to the university. Rather, unarmed university police officers would call and rely on Portland Police to perform such tasks, as is currently the case. In certain domestic violence situations, where Oregon law requires a police officer to arrest a person, an unarmed officer would be in a particularly difficult situation.

Although it may be theoretically possible to establish and commission a police force without providing access to firearms, it is doubtful that unarmed police officers could—or would be permitted—to exercise many of the authorities afforded to them by their certified peace officer status. Because these enhanced authorities are significant motivators for the establishment of a sworn police force in the first place, the creation of an unarmed police force does not seem to meet the needs articulated in the Campus Public Safety Task Force report or by the proponents of a sworn and dedicated university police force.
Campus Safety Frequently Asked Questions

Q: Has PSU received complaints from students, faculty or staff about racial profiling or discrimination by Campus Public Safety officers? **Added Nov. 6**
A: Since 2011, PSU's Office of Global Diversity and Inclusion has received seven complaints alleging discrimination by the Campus Public Safety Office. Five of the complaints were investigated, and no violation of PSU's discrimination policy was determined. The remaining two complaints had insufficient information to conduct an investigation and were referred to the Director of Campus Public Safety for appropriate follow-up. Details of the complaints such as the name of the individual who filed the complaint are confidential.

Q: Why is the University reexamining campus safety?
A: The PSU campus has more than twice the buildings it had in 1976 and nearly twice the student body. Many more students are living on campus, adding more complexity to the job of keeping the campus safe. Campus safety needs to keep pace with these challenges.

Q: What has been the process?
A: Last year, President Wiewel put together a task force made up of PSU administrators, faculty and students. They were asked to provide recommendations on how to address safety concerns and improve the University's response to criminal activity on campus. The task force took a comprehensive look at the current state of campus safety and produced a report with a series of recommendations.

Q: Are students and faculty involved in this process?
A: Yes, faculty and students served on the task force along with PSU administrators.

Q: Did the campus community get a chance to see the report and comment on it?
A: Yes. The report was posted online in March along with a link that enables people to give feedback. Those links are still posted on the president’s web page. The campus community can make comments right up until the University’s Board of Trustees votes on the recommendations in December. Campus input will be taken into consideration along with other factors such as campus safety needs, law enforcement options and risks and national best practices.

Q: What do students think of safety on campus?
A: ASPSU conducted a survey in 2013. Of the 307 students who responded, a high percentage said they felt safe on campus, but most said they were not aware of the services the Campus Public Safety Office (CPSO) provides or how to get in touch with CPSO if they needed help. Forty-five percent of respondents said PSU should have more safety officers. A third of the
respondents said PSU should not have its own police force, although 65 percent were either favorable or neutral on the idea. These responses represent only about 1 percent of the student body and more feedback is needed.

Q: Does going through this process mean the campus is unsafe?
A: No. But the fact that Portland State is an urban campus that blends with the surrounding city gives us unique challenges. The campus community needs to know that, on occasion, dangerous offenders who are not affiliated with the University come on campus and commit crimes. That’s a big reason why the task force was created.

Q: Would PSU officers be armed. Why?
A: The report recommends having officers who are trained in using firearms because certain situations require them: serving search warrants and performing off-campus welfare checks, to name a few. If someone on campus is threatening armed violence, the University’s current security staff is not equipped to handle it.

Q: Were other options considered?
A: Yes. The task force explored partnering with the Portland Police Bureau and Oregon State Police instead of the University hiring its own officers. Neither agency said they had the resources to do that.

Q: OHSU recently formed a police force. Can’t we share theirs? **Added Oct. 21**
A: PSU approached OHSU with that question, and OHSU responded that it could not share their police force, citing numerous differences between the two institutions. For example, PSU has nearly six times the student body as OHSU; the OHSU campus is located in relatively contained locations on Marquam Hill and the South Waterfront, while PSU has the logistical challenge of blending with downtown; none of OHSU’s students live on campus, while a quarter of PSU’s 30,000 students do.

“OHSU has significant work ahead of it to ensure all of our officers are appropriately trained in the handling of firearms in our complex academic health sciences environment,” wrote Scott Page, OHSU’s vice president of facilities and logistics in a letter to Kevin Reynolds, vice president of PSU’s Office of Finance and Administration. “That work would be made substantially more difficult if we were to simultaneously take on the task of training those officers (or additional officers) to address the very different campus environment that Portland State represents.”

Q: Is the PSU campus dangerous enough to need arming? **Added Oct. 20**
A: CPSO officers make numerous arrests on campus of persons with violent criminal histories, and sometimes they are armed. However, the frequency of violent crimes in a community doesn’t determine whether its police are armed. All over the country there are police departments on campuses or in small communities that never have violent crimes, and yet those officers are armed as standard practice. Police officers are armed as a deterrent to those
who might choose to use violence against officers or community members. Officers are armed because there is no way to accurately predict what subjects or situations might threaten life.

Q: Why can't student patrols be created to alleviate the need for a campus police force? **Added Nov. 5**
A: Portland State cannot risk putting students in potentially dangerous situations, which is why this campus and universities in general have trained safety officers or a police force. The Campus Public Safety Office plans to work with student groups in establishing policies, procedures and accountability in the development and enforcement of whatever campus safety plan is adopted by the PSU Board of Trustees.

Q: Can a required class on conflict management be created for incoming freshmen to help them avoid situations that might involve police? **Added Nov. 5**
A: That’s an interesting idea and could happen in the future. The creation of new class requirements is handled by University Studies and the Faculty Senate.

Q: How would the presence of guns affect the campus culture? **Added Oct. 20**
A: A PSU campus police department would be part of the campus community and under the control and guidance of the university. Hundreds of campuses across the country have armed police. Compared to other universities nationally, PSU is unusual in that it does not. The other two large universities in Oregon have armed police officers on campus full-time, including the University of Oregon and Oregon State University which contracts with Oregon State Police instead of employing its own police force. Although the Portland Police Bureau currently provides an armed presence on campus, a PSU campus police force could help make the campus safer by executing police services at a higher level, and more quickly, than they are currently.

Q: What does it take to be a police officer? **Added Oct. 20**
A: Police officers at any agency must go through extensive background checks that look not only for any civil or criminal problems, but also look into the character of prospective officers. Investigators look at and talk to employers and acquaintances of applicants as well as full employment and education histories. Applicants must show exceptional honesty and integrity. Prospective officers also go through psychological evaluations aimed at confirming that they would use their authority wisely and appropriately and not abuse their status or training. Officers must then complete a four-month, full-time basic police academy. They must pass tests for knowledge, understanding and application of law; physical fitness; emergency vehicle operation; use of firearms and defensive tools and techniques; and simulations for policing situations. Then they have to successfully complete four months of field training in which they work with police mentors on real-world patrols. Once they've achieved certification, officers must pass more tests and take other trainings regularly to stay sharp and maintain their certification.

Q: How would police officers be trained for working on campus? **Added Oct. 20**
A: In addition to the state requirements for police officer certification, PSU police officers would
be given six months of field training in areas specific to Portland State University. That training would include first aid and CPR, multicultural competency, de-escalation techniques, and federal reporting mandates such as for the Clery Act and Title IX.

Q: How would having a campus police force make PSU safer?
A: Campus police would be able to immediately respond to emergencies. If there was ever a shooter on campus, campus police could respond in less than a minute and reduce that person’s ability to harm people. CPSO has no ability to do that now.

Q: How would a police force impact students?
A: The force would be designed to perform services that reflect PSU’s unique environment. For example, a campus police officer would be able to distinguish student conduct cases from other situations that can involve police. The Portland Police Bureau cannot refer anyone to student conduct authorities, and they will not come to campus unless there is a serious complaint. The University has limited ability to influence how city police conduct their duties on campus or whether their values fit with the University’s. A campus police force would work solely for the University, and would be required to have an advisory board.

Q: Can’t we just call the Portland police if we have a situation that requires guns?
A: The Portland Police Bureau has only one officer assigned to the part of downtown that includes Portland State. The bureau will send an officer in the event of a campus emergency, but its response time can be as long as 20 minutes.

Q: Under what conditions would a campus officer be authorized to use a weapon?
A: An officer would have to assess the severity of the crime and determine if the person they are dealing with is armed, is actively resisting and is an immediate threat to officers and others. These are standards set forth by federal law and are the same for police agencies throughout the country.

Q: Why guns? Why not Tasers or mace?
A: The level of force must be appropriate to the threat. Tasers or mace would be ineffective in a dire situation involving an active shooter. However, officers will have access to Tasers or pepper spray for situations that don’t require lethal force. Current campus public safety officers carry batons, pepper spray and restraints.

Q: When, how and why would officers use guns? **Added Oct. 20**
A: Without ever being drawn from a holster, firearms can deter aggressive or violent action by criminals. Some routine police duties are statistically very dangerous to officers, including dealing with armed and dangerous suspects, responding to domestic disputes, transporting suspects to jail, traffic stops and serving arrest or search warrants at residences. In dealing with dangerous confrontations or incidents, police officers may draw or fire a gun if the officer’s life or the lives of others are immediately threatened. Officers must have specific objective facts to justify the use of force, including firearms.
Q: What are UO, OSU and OHSU doing for campus security?
A: University of Oregon and OHSU have an armed campus police force as part of their security personnel. OSU has an unarmed public safety office and partners with Oregon State Police for situations where sworn officers are needed. Portland State remains the only public American university of more than 15,000 students without a dedicated police force.

Q: Would all of PSU’s safety officers be armed? **Updated Nov. 18**
A: No. The task force recommended having two groups of officers: non-sworn officers such as the current CPSO force as well as trained police. Only sworn, commissioned police officers would carry firearms, and they would do so at all times when on duty. Public safety officers, security officers and other department personnel would not. This combination is the most common campus security system used in the United States.

Q: Who will make the final decision?
A: The University’s Board of Trustees will make the final decision on the recommendations in December after reviewing public comments. Members of the campus community will be able to submit comments through the fall.

Q: If the board creates a campus police department, will it require that officers be armed? **Added Oct. 20**
A: All police departments in the State of Oregon are armed. That being said, it is possible the board may authorize a police force and create a policy that they not be armed. That would be highly unusual, and would be contrary to policing as it is done in the United States.

Q: Aside from being able to use guns, what would sworn police officers be able to that the current CPSO officers can’t do now?
A: They will be able to issue citations, investigate sexual assaults, apply for search warrants, impose mental health holds and involuntary detox, and will receive state public service training and certification. They will also be able to go off campus to follow up on crimes and check in on students who are suspected to be a risk to themselves or others.

Q: Why are concealed weapons permit holders forbidden from carrying guns on campus, but police officers might? **Added Oct. 20**
A: In 2012, the State Board of Higher Education enacted a policy prohibiting firearms from the buildings, sports and performance venues, and work places of Oregon’s public universities and prohibiting students, employees, contractors, vendors and others from possessing firearms on any university property. Under SB 270, this policy remains in effect at Portland State University. The policy, however, has always excluded on-duty law enforcement. Law enforcement officers must meet ongoing certification and training standards for having and using firearms, and firearms are considered standard equipment for law enforcement work. Law enforcement officers also have a duty to respond to crises or incidents (as opposed to regular citizens, who have no charge or obligation to be involved). Read the full text of the firearms policy here.
Q: How many sworn officers and how many safety officers would there be?
A: The plan would be to have 12 sworn officers, one police detective and 10 safety officers.

Q: How would the department be organized?
A: It would be headed by a Chief, under which would be three management positions: a Public Safety Lieutenant, a Clery Coordinator and a Police Lieutenant. The Public Safety Lieutenant would oversee a staff of 20, including 10 Public Safety officers. The Police Lieutenant would oversee a staff of 16, including 12 sworn officers and a Campus Police Detective. The department would continue to report to a director that would report to the vice president of Finance and Administration.

Q: If formation of a department is approved when would we first expect sworn officers on the PSU campus?
A: The complete transition would take about three years, depending on the availability of police academy openings.

Q: How much would the transition cost?
A: It would cost an estimated $1.5 million over the three years.

Q: The task force recommended that there be a permanent committee to provide an ongoing review of campus safety needs and best practices. When would this committee be set up? Who would serve on it? And would the committee have oversight over the Police Department?
A: The oversight committee would be established by the President, and it would receive and respond to complaints involving the policies of the police department and the conduct of officers. This is required by state law. The committee would likely include students, faculty and staff. The President would determine when the committee will be formed, who will be on it and how often it will meet.

Q: What kind of review would the committee do and how would they gather information? How would people be able to provide criticism of the Police Department to the committee? To whom and how often would the committee report?
A: The University already has a process in place for people to register complaints about campus security and report use of force issues. The committee could have access to all those reports, and may create a process for people to report directly to the committee. These are details the University would work through in the early stages of the transition.

Q: How would the committee be structured to avoid conflicts of interest?
A: The committee’s job would be keeping the Campus Police Department responsive and accountable. Making sure that the structure avoids conflicts of interest would be another detail the President would work out in the early stages.

Q: How would sworn officers be recruited?
A: Positions would be broadly posted on law enforcement jobsites, the PSU campus and other
outlets. The selection process would include testing, psychological evaluation and extensive background checks. A final selection interview would be conducted with representatives from Student Life, the Women’s Resource Center, and other members of the PSU community. CPSO actively recruits from the PSU community, particularly the Criminal Justice Program.

**Q: How would PSU ensure diversity and cultural competencies in the Police Department?**  
**A:** Similar to how CPSO currently operates: It has a diverse workforce that interacts with the different campus resource centers and is trained in sensitivities surrounding race, ethnicity, sex, and LGBT issues. Police officers would receive cultural competency training provided in the Basic Police Academy, and would take part in a post-academy program tailored specifically to PSU. Officers would be evaluated daily on how they interact with the diverse PSU community.

**Q: What mechanism would there be for yearly review of individual officers?**  
**A:** Officers would receive yearly evaluations in accordance with PSU’s collective bargaining and human resource policies.

**Q: What is the timeline for implementing campus security changes?**

- Monday, Oct. 6: Q&A session at Faculty Senate, CH53, 3 p.m. to 5 p.m.
- Tuesday, Oct. 7: Campus Safety Forum, SMSU Ballroom  
- Friday, Oct. 10: Administrative briefing, presentation to staff and faculty, SMSU 327-9, 10 a.m. to noon  
- Monday, Oct. 20: Meeting with the PSU Student Union and the ASPSU Senate  
- Monday, Oct. 27: Board of Trustees Special Committee on Campus Safety, University Place, Wahkeena Falls Room, 3 p.m. to 6 p.m. Opportunity for public comment  
- Monday, Nov. 3: Faculty Senate discussion, CH53, 3 p.m. to 5 p.m.  
- Monday, Nov. 24: Board of Trustees Special Committee on Campus Safety, University Place, Wahkeena Falls Room, 3 p.m. to 6 p.m. Opportunity for public comment  
- Thursday, Dec. 11: Presentation to Board of Trustees. Opportunity for public comment, followed by a possible vote by the board, University Place

**Q: Were there other recommendation in the task force report, and have any of them been put in place?**  
**A:** Yes. The task force made a total of 10 recommendations, including regulating access to buildings, establishing a permanent committee to review campus safety and providing better outreach to the campus community. Since the report came out, CPSO has been switching campus buildings to electronic-only access. Electronic access control is now in place in Lincoln Hall, Cramer Hall and Shattuck Hall. Phase two is in progress, which will transition Smith Memorial Student Union and Neuberger Hall to electronic access. Lighting has been improved in key areas across campus. CPSO also is forming a campus security review committee, which will include faculty and students. CPSO has improved outreach by starting a twice monthly “Coffee with the Chief” where anyone is welcome to visit with CPSO chief Phil Zerzan. Improvements are ongoing. Some of them are driven by budget resources.
Q: How would PSU pay for a campus police force? Would my tuition increase?
A: Hiring a police force would increase the campus safety staff, and that increase would probably be phased in over three years. Tuition is not increased to cover the cost of a single additional expense. Rather, tuition setting is part of a complex yearly process which balances all changes in revenue and expenditures. The university consistently makes strategic investments and prioritizes spending within its budget, which for the current year is $522 million.

Q: How can I comment?
A: Attend one of the Board of Trustees Special Committee meetings on Oct. 27 or Nov. 24, or the regular Board of Trustees meeting in December. You can also submit comments online here.
# Campus Safety Services and Support Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Services/Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Campus Public Safety Office (CPSO) - PSU Alert and Timely Warning Notification System** | PSU Alert is an emergency communications system used to send emergency alert notifications to cell phones, landline phones and email accounts. PSU Alert is used for a variety of emergency situations, that may include (but are not limited to):  
* Unscheduled campus closures  
* Building emergencies  
* Potential life-threatening situations on campus  
* Inclement weather conditions  
* Activation of emergency response teams  

Timely Warnings are communications sent out on a case-by-case basis regarding threats and dangers to the campus community and nobody can opt-out of receiving these communications. Distribution methods can include:  
* Campus Wide E-Mail – Disseminated by University News and Communication at the direction of the Chief of Campus Public Safety and the Vice President of Finance and Administration  
* PSU Campus Announcement System – via myPSU Portal under the “Daily Messages” channel  
* Printed Notice – when appropriate, notices may be posted at campus locations affected by the emergency  
* Website Posting – public safety issues of on-going concern to the campus community are posted on the PSU Home Page and Campus Public Safety Office web site, under Timely Warnings  
* Local Media – media outlets may also be provided information when the risk of harm in a particular incident can reasonably be expected to extend to off-campus areas |
| **Campus Public Safety Office (CPSO) Services: Blue Light Phones, Dispatch, Safety Escorts** | The campus has a number Blue Light Phones which can be used whenever someone has an injury, feels they are in danger, or wants to notify CPSO of an emergency situation. In 2013, 22 calls were generated from the phone and none were for emergencies. In the past 2 years, emergency aid has only be summoned once.  
The CPSO Dispatch Center is a 24/7 operation staffed by specially trained personnel. Dispatchers can assist with emergency and non-emergency requests and have sophisticated telecommunication equipment. Dispatchers also work with the Portland Police Bureau (PPB) and Portland Fire Department (PFD) when responding to emergency situations. All dispatchers receive training through the Oregon Police Academy and complete the Basic Telecommunicators certification course as well as on the job training.  
CPSO provides 24/7 safety escorts for anyone on campus who would like to be escorted across the campus. |
| **Campus Facility Enhancements: Access Control and Standardized Building Hours and Lighting Upgrades** | Significant improvements have been made to access control on campus since 2012, and campus now has 24 full access controlled buildings. A long-term program is in place to transition all exterior building doors to access-control. A program is also in place to recognize the PSU ID card as the only official form of PSU identification and cards are available to all students, staff, and faculty free of charge.  
Classes and events are now consolidated into buildings out side of regular business hours (M-F 7:30am-8pm) to minimize the risk of safety issues.  
In 2013-14 the campus Facilities and Property Management department replaced over 1200 lights with LEDs in the park block and parking structures. |
<p>| <strong>Coordination Assessment Response and Education (CARE)</strong> | The CARE Team provides case management and wrap-around support for students who have been impacted by various types of incidents and crises, including but not limited to missing persons, interpersonal violence, individuals expressing intentions to harm themselves or others or acts of self-harm. The team is co-facilitated by Michelle Toppe, Dean of Student Life and Chenae Garcia, CARE Team Case Manager using a case management model grounded in social work principles. The CARE team works to coordinate support and response when a student is experiencing a crisis situation that threatens their life or well-being. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Services/Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Dean of Student Life Office (DOSL)            | DOSL, in reporting to the Office of Student Affairs responds to any concern a student, faculty, staff or community member might bring to their attention that involves a student. This often includes incidents when (a) student(s) has/have been the victim of property crimes, such as theft, identify theft, and vandalism and person crimes, such as assault, sexual harassment, and sexual assault.  

The Dean of Student Life and Student Health and Counseling Center provide programming for families during each of the Freshmen Orientation sessions that occur in the summer. The Dean of Student Life also sends a Newsletter to student's families 2-3 times per term. These presentations and newsletters highlight safety information and tips in hopes that families will help reinforce the messages that students hear from their Orientation Leaders during the Orientation sessions and from their Resident Assistants if they live on campus, and their Peer Mentors in their University Studies classes.  

The DOSL is involved in training various student leaders who are in positions to raise awareness and increase resilience, including Orientation Leaders, Resident Assistants, Student Organization Leaders and members of ASPSU, and Student Employees.  

Whenever DOSL is aware of an incident in which an individual is experiencing difficulty, they provide outreach, support, and referrals as appropriate. DOSL regularly refers students and faculty to other offices at the university, including but not limited to CPSO, Office of Diversity and Inclusion, Women’s Resource Center, Queer Resource Center, Veteran’s Resource Center, Resource Center for Students with Children, Disability Resource Center, University Housing and Residence Life, Diversity and Multicultural Student Services, Office of Academic Affairs, and individual faculty and academic departments, and other departments and offices across the University.  

Representatives from the Office of the Dean of Student Life meet every Monday morning with leadership from CPSO and University Housing and Residence Life in order to review the past week's CPSO log and determine next steps in order to support individuals who might be experiencing difficulty as a result of matters documented by the CPSO officers for the Diversity and Multicultural Student Services (DMSS)  

DMSS has three cultural centers and support services for students. The cultural centers are La Casa Latina, Multicultural Center and Native American Student and Community Center. DMSS also has the following student services: African American Student Services, Native American Student Services, Latino Student Services, TRiO Student Support Services. DMSS works with other campus and community partners to develop pathways to student success, enhance civic engagement through partnerships, improve/build community relationships, maintain a student centered and inclusive environment.  

Diversity and Multicultural Student Services (DMSS)  

New Student Orientation  

New Student Orientation is involved in working to make sure students have access to Title IX/Campus Sexual Violence Elimination (SaVE) Act information. The Creating a Culture of Respect module is included within online orientation.  

Representatives from Campus Public Safety and the Dean of Student Life are regular attendees at Parent Panels which take place during each Freshman Orientation session. New Student Orientation also promotes Viking Days, during which many of the campus’s student centers host information sessions and meet-and-greets with a focus on healthy relationships and consent.  

Office of Equity and Compliance  

Equity and Compliance investigates complaints of prohibited discrimination and harassment and ensures compliance with federal and state equal opportunity laws and regulations.  

Office of Equity and Compliance - Learning Module  

All PSU faculty, staff, and student employees must complete the "Creating a Culture of Respect: Preventing Prohibited Discrimination and Unlawful Harassment" learning module. This training offers strategies for preventing unlawful discrimination, harassment, and retaliation within the University. It teaches the PSU community how to respond appropriately when they become aware of potential discrimination or harassment, the risk of liability to Portland State University, its managers, and individual employees, and, in keeping with PSU’s core values it promotes a climate of mutual respect.  

Queer Resource Center(QRC)  

The QRC has a Graduate Assistant Transgender and Interpersonal Violence Coordinator that organizes events on transgender issues. They work closely with the Women’s Resource Center to conduct consent education events and interpersonal violence awareness events. The Transgender and Interpersonal Violence Coordinator provides support for students who have been victims of anti-queer and/or anti-trans hate crimes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Services/Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Health and Counseling (SHAC)</td>
<td>SHAC is a community-based health care organization that provides high quality, accessible mental health, physical health, dental, and testing services targeted to the needs of the PSU student population. They also promote health and wellness through proactive health promotion and awareness strategies. SHAC is always available to collaborate and consult with the PSU community of faculty, staff, and students on health, mental health and wellness needs. In particular, we have close collaborations with DOSL, CARE Team, CPSO, International Student Services, Academic Advising and Career Services, and Campus Rec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Legal Services (SLS)</td>
<td>SLS provides legal advice and advocacy on various issues such as: bankruptcy, consumer law, criminal law, employment law, family law, immigration consultations, landlord and tenant issues, personal injury, small claims, and traffic violations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans’ Resource Center (VRC)</td>
<td>The VRC serves veterans that are looking to transition from active military life to their vision of success at PSU. The VRC works directly with Veterans Affairs to ensure that student veterans are aware of the benefits that they are eligible for and helps them find resources on campus and throughout the Portland Metro area. The VRC has a licensed social worker on staff and works closely with campus partners such as SHAC and DOSL to provide support for student veterans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Resource Center</td>
<td>The WRC’s Interpersonal Violence Program (IPV) works with students experiencing sexual and relationship violence including assault, harassment, stalking and other gender-based crimes. The program consists of one full time IPV Advocate, backup advocacy provided by the WRC Director and two part time Masters of Social Work (MSW) interns. The IPV Program works one-on-one with students who have experienced sexual and relationship violence. Advocacy support includes &quot;Healthy Relationships&quot; peer support group offered in partnership with the Queer Resource Center, intervention, support, information, and referrals. The IPV program serves as a liaison between the student and campus departments such as Residence Life, Campus Public Safety, Student Health and Counseling, Student Legal Services, and the DOSL. The program assists in linking the student survivor to off-campus community services when needed. The IPV program assists the student survivor with accessing and understanding University policy, including the Student Code of Conduct. Advocacy is provided by Women’s Resource Center staff 9am-5pm Monday through Friday. After-hours advocacy is provided by 1) Housing &amp; Residence Life Professional Staff (for on-campus residents) and 2) a contract with the Portland Women’s Crisis line (for non-housing residents or to back up Residence Life staff as needed). The IPV Program works regularly with PSU Campus Public Safety (weekly at least - often more than once per week), Portland Police Bureau (approximately once per month), and Multnomah County District Attorney's Office (approximately once per month). CPSO is involved in all PPB cases and can provide more accurate data if requested. Due to the WRC's resources, prevention education efforts consist primarily of single-dose education and awareness presentations. This includes skills-based workshops on consent, classroom presentations on IPV and regular trainings for PSU students and staff on advocacy services and resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Campus Police Department Budget Scenario for FY16 and Full Implementation

### Table 1: Estimated Incremental Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>Total Salary Cost</th>
<th>Estimate of Equipment and Uniform</th>
<th>All other S&amp;S</th>
<th>Total S&amp;S (1)</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>Total Salary Cost</th>
<th>Estimate of Equipment and Uniform</th>
<th>All other S&amp;S</th>
<th>Total S&amp;S (1)</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campus Police</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Scenario 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un/Un Campus Police Lieutenant</td>
<td>1 $119,728</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$130,728</td>
<td>1 $119,728</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$130,728</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un/Un Campus Police Sergeant</td>
<td>3 $319,089</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>$33,000</td>
<td>$352,089</td>
<td>2 $212,726</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$234,726</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Campus Police Officer</td>
<td>12 $871,260</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$108,000</td>
<td>$132,000</td>
<td>$1,003,260</td>
<td>8 $580,840</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
<td>$88,000</td>
<td>$668,840</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Campus Police Detective</td>
<td>1 $80,877</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$91,877</td>
<td>1 $80,877</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$91,877</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total Campus Police</strong></td>
<td>17 $1,390,954</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
<td>$153,000</td>
<td>$167,000</td>
<td>$1,577,954</td>
<td>12 $994,171</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$108,000</td>
<td>$132,000</td>
<td>$1,126,171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: Estimated Transition Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year 2015-16</th>
<th>Salary and OPE</th>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Other S&amp;S</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convert Sergeant to Police</td>
<td>$13,659</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$15,659</td>
<td>Existing so no additional S&amp;S cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convert Detective Police</td>
<td>$1,784</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$3,784</td>
<td>Existing so no additional S&amp;S cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convert 2 Officers to Police</td>
<td>$11,049</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$15,049</td>
<td>Existing so no additional S&amp;S cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create 1 police Lieutenant</td>
<td>$119,728</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$130,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fiscal Year 2015-16 Estimated Incremental Cost</strong></td>
<td>$146,220</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$165,220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Campus Police Department Management and Implementation Outline

This document provides an outline of the strategies and approach that would be taken regarding the recruitment, training, policies and oversight of a Campus Police Department. This outline would serve as a starting point for a comprehensive management and implementation plan that would be developed in the first six months of 2015.

Recruitment and Selection Strategy
The process for recruiting Campus Police Officers would be based upon the current Campus Public Safety Office (CPSO) Hiring Process (Appendix A) and Recruitment and Selection Policy (Appendix B). Additional outreach efforts to obtain a diverse applicant pool will be made by Human Resources, the Office of Global Diversity & Inclusion and the search committee. Current affirmative action/reasonable recruitment availability data for the job grouping of “Police Officers” will also be evaluated based on local, regional and national recruitment areas. The recommendations made by a specially commissioned sub-committee regarding recruitment strategies will also be fully implemented.

During the process, candidates would go through the following screenings:

CPSO:
- Pre-employment Background Investigation Profile (Appendix C)
- Statement of Personal History (Appendix D)

Department of Public Safety Standards and Training (DPSST):
- Medical Examination Form (Appendix E)

An example of interview questions used by CPSO during the process can be found as Appendix F.

Training
In order to become a Campus Police Officer, successful candidates would undertake a 2-year training program after recruitment and selection. This would be followed by ongoing trainings and skill development.

External Training:
- Police Academy Basic Training: A 16 week live-in program, curriculum determined and provided by Department of Public Safety Standards and Training, requires demonstrated competency and certification standards (Appendix G).
- Field Training and Evaluation Program (FTEP): Required by DPSST, this program is adapted to the unique requirements of campus policing and is an 18-month program requiring
designated coaching/mentoring with demonstrated competency in knowledge and skills. (A selection of the training related to cultural competency is included as Appendix H).

- Ongoing certification training, including 84 hours of mandated training every three (3) years, which also includes eight hours of firearms/use of force annually.
- Lexipol Daily Training Bulletins. (Examples of bulletins related to cultural competency is included as Appendix I).
- Crisis Intervention Training (CIT): All officers are required to undertake CIT, a 40 hour specialized class provided by mental health professionals that relates to mental illness and how law enforcement officers can better interact with the mentally ill.

In addition to external trainings, Campus Police Officers would also undertake ongoing cultural competency and diversity trainings and complete the following modules developed by PSU’s Office of Global Diversity and Inclusion:

- Creating a Culture of Respect Learning Module: [http://www.pdx.edu/diversity/learning-module](http://www.pdx.edu/diversity/learning-module)
- Safe Campus Module: [http://www.pdx.edu/sexual-assault/safe-campus-module](http://www.pdx.edu/sexual-assault/safe-campus-module)

**Policies and Procedures**

As PSU employees, Campus Police Officers would be required to adhere to all university policies and procedures. A complete list is available on the Office of General Counsel Website: [http://www.pdx.edu/ogc/university-policy-library](http://www.pdx.edu/ogc/university-policy-library)

In addition, CPSO has its own Racial/Bias-Based Profiling policy (Appendix J).

**Personnel Complaint Procedure**

Complaints regarding Campus Police Officers would follow the current CPSO system using the CPSO Citizen Complaint Form (Appendix K) and the Personal Complaint Procedure Policy (Appendix L).

**Public Incident Reports**


**Oversight**

**Oversight Committee**

An Oversight Committee would be created and function as a civilian review board. Membership would be determined by the University President, and would include representation from faculty, staff, and students. The University community would be able to report issues and complaints directly to the committee, and the committee would have the ability to access adjudicated force reports and crime log data. PSU would use best practices from other campus oversight committees when creating and implementing such a committee (Appendix M). Post-Incident Review could be under the purview of the Oversight Committee.
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Appendix A

PSU Public Safety Office Hiring Process for Campus Public Safety Officer

Position is posted on the PSU-HR website for 2-3 weeks. Job is advertised through other law enforcement agencies: IACLEA (International Association Campus Law Enforcement Agency), WACLEA (Western Association Campus Law Enforcement Agency), LEDS (Law Enforcement Data System), and the Listserv for CCJ (Criminology/Criminal Justice) students.

Officer candidates are invited to take an 83 minute written test: Standard & Associates’ National Police Officer Selection Test. Candidates must obtain 80% or better to pass. The test is broken down into four sections: Arithmetic, Reading Comprehension, Grammar, and Incident Report Writing (test the candidate’s ability to take information from a scenario, and then transfer it correctly in a report).

Candidates who pass the test, will have an on-site interview with the Search Committee for 20-30 minutes. The Search Committee consists of community members on campus that Officers will have direct contact with and will require collaborative team work. Search Committee Members: Lieutenant of Operation of Public Safety as Chair; Director of Women’s Resource Center; Director of Conduct & Community Standards, Coordination Assessment Response and Education (CARE) Team Case Manager from Dean of Student Life; and Director of Housing & Residential Life. Candidates are scored during the interviews. The Search Committee comes to a census and ranks candidates.

Based on the Search Committee’s rankings, candidate(s) will be sent a background packet to fill out. Campus Public Safety hires a background investigator to provide an in-depth background check on candidate(s). This process takes an average of 40 hours a week per person. The background investigator gives a final evaluation of the candidate. Disqualifying behaviors are defined in the PSU Campus Public Safety Policy.

If the candidate passes the background evaluation, they will then require a Psychological Evaluation by a Licensed Psychologist. The Psychological Evaluation is an 8 hour process. The Psychologist screens for: Social Competence; Team Work; Adaptability-Flexibility; Conscientiousness-Dependability; Impulse Control-Attention to Safety; Integrity-Ethics; Emotional Regulation & Stress Tolerance; Decision-Making & Judgment; Assertiveness-Persuasiveness; and Avoiding Substance Abuse & Other Risk-Taking Behavior. The Psychologist will give a recommendation to hire or not.

Depending on the Psychological Evaluation, a Medical Exam Form (DPSST FORM F2) is given to the candidate to have completed by a Licensed Physician or Surgeon. If candidate completes all steps successfully, candidate is hired for position.
Portland State University Campus Public Safety Office

Recruitment and Selection

1000.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE
The employment policy of the Portland State University shall provide equal opportunities for applicants and its employees regardless of race, sexual orientation, age, pregnancy, religion, creed, color, national origin, ancestry, physical or mental handicap, marital status, veteran status, or sex, and shall not show partiality or grant any special favors to any applicant, employee or group of employees. The rules governing employment practices for this department are maintained by the Portland State University Department of Human Resources.

1000.2 APPLICANT QUALIFICATIONS AND SELECTION PROCESS
Candidates for job openings will be selected based on merit, ability, competence and experience.

1000.2.1 MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS
All persons hired by this department must meet the applicable minimum standards established by law, in addition to any standards established by this department. The Administration supervisor shall ensure that:

a) Persons hired as law enforcement officers by this department meet the minimum employment standards and requirements set by the Oregon Department of Public Safety Standards and Training (DPSST) (OAR 259-008-0010 and OAR 259-008-0070).

b) Persons hired as telecommunicators by this department meet the minimum employment standards and requirements set by the DPSST (OAR 259-008-0011 and OAR 259-008-0070).

c) Persons hired for any other position meet the requirements established by this department.

d) Personal history investigations for law enforcement officer and telecommunicator positions are conducted and retained appropriately and that all applicants are interviewed personally, prior to employment, by the Director of Public Safety or the authorized designee (OAR 259-008-0015).

1000.3 STANDARDS
Employment standards shall be established for each job classification and shall include minimally, the special training, abilities, knowledge and skills required to perform the duties of the job in a satisfactory manner. The Portland State University Department of Human Resources maintains standards for all positions.

The dilemma facing the Department is one of developing a job-valid and non-discriminatory set of policies which will allow it to lawfully exclude persons who do not meet the Portland State University or State of Oregon hiring standards. The disqualifiers listed below are examples and are not intended to be all inclusive. Other factors may also disqualify applicants. Final decisions will be at the discretion of the Director of Public Safety.

The following standards have been adopted for public safety applicants:
1000.3.1 OPERATION OF A MOTOR VEHICLE
a) The ability to possess a valid Oregon driver's license.
b) The ability to drive safely.
c) The ability to control a motor vehicle at high speeds.
d) The ability to operate a motor vehicle in all types of weather conditions.
e) The following shall be disqualifying:
   1. Receipt of three or more moving violations (or any single instance of a potential life
      threatening violation, such as reckless driving, speed contest, suspect of a pursuit, etc.)
      within three years prior to application. Moving violations for which there is a factual
      finding of innocence shall not be included.
   2. Involvement as a driver in two or more chargeable (at fault) collisions within three years
      prior to date of application.
   3. A conviction for driving under the influence of alcohol and/or drugs within three years
      prior to application or any two convictions for driving under the influence of alcohol and/or
      drugs.

1000.3.2 INTEGRITY
a) Refusing to yield to the temptation of bribes, gratuities, payoffs, etc.
b) Refusing to tolerate unethical or illegal conduct on the part of other law enforcement
   personnel.
c) Showing strong moral character and integrity in dealing with the public.
d) Being honest in dealing with the public.
e) The following may be disqualifying:
   1. Any material misstatement of fact or significant omission during the application or
      background process shall be disqualifying, including inconsistent statements made
      during the initial background interview (Personal History Statement or Supplemental
      Questionnaire) or discrepancies between this background investigation and other
      investigations conducted by other law enforcement agencies.
   2. Any forgery, alteration, or intentional omission of material facts on an official employment
      application document or sustained episodes of academic cheating.

1000.3.3 CREDIBILITY AS A WITNESS IN A COURT OF LAW
a) The ability to give testimony in a court of law without being subject to impeachment due to
   his/her honesty or veracity (or their opposites) or due to prior felony conviction.
b) The following may be disqualifying:
   1. Conviction of any criminal offense classified as a misdemeanor under Oregon law within
      three years prior to application.
   2. Conviction for two or more misdemeanor offenses under law as an adult.
   3. Conviction of any offense classified as a misdemeanor under Oregon law while
      employed as a peace officer (including military police officers).
   4. Admission(s) of having committed any act amounting to a felony (including felonies
      treated as misdemeanors at sentencing) under Oregon law, as an adult, within five
      years prior to application or while employed as a peace officer (including military police
      officers).
   5. Admission(s) of administrative conviction of any act while employed as a peace officer
      (including military police officers) involving lying, falsification of any official report or
      document, or theft.
   6. Admission(s) of any act of domestic violence as defined by law, committed as an adult.
7. Admission(s) of any criminal act, whether misdemeanor or felony, committed against children including but not limited to: molesting or annoying children, child abduction, child abuse, lewd and lascivious acts with a child, or indecent exposure. Acts of consensual unlawful intercourse accomplished between two minors shall not be included, unless more than three years difference in age existed at the time of the acts.

8. Any history of actions resulting in civil lawsuits against the applicant or his/her employer may be disqualifying.

1000.3.4 DEPENDABILITY

a) A record of submitting reports on time and not malingering on calls
b) A record of being motivated to perform well
c) A record of dependability and follow through on assignments
d) A history of taking the extra effort required for complete accuracy in all details of work
e) A willingness to work the hours needed to complete a job
f) The following may be disqualifying:
   1. Missing any scheduled appointment during the process without prior permission.
   2. Having been disciplined by any employer (including military) as an adult for abuse of leave, gross insubordination, dereliction of duty or persistent failure to follow established policies and regulations.
   3. Having been involuntarily dismissed (for any reason other than lay-off) from two or more employers as an adult.
   4. Having a work history that indicates an inability to maintain a long-term relationship with an employer or to establish and work toward achieving long-term goals.
   5. For officer applicants having undergone personal bankruptcy more than once; having current financial obligations for which legal judgments have not been satisfied; currently having wages garnished; or any other history of financial instability. The credit history of an applicant or employee shall not be used or obtained as part of an employment decision, including hiring, discharge, promotion or demotion, unless the position qualifies as a public safety officer as defined in OAR 839-005-0075.
   6. Resigning from any paid position without notice may be disqualifying, except where the presence of a hostile work environment is alleged.
   7. Having any outstanding warrant of arrest at the time of the application.

1000.3.5 LEARNING ABILITY

a) The ability to comprehend and retain information.
b) The ability to recall information pertaining to laws, statutes, codes, etc.
c) The ability to learn and to apply what is learned.
d) The ability to learn and apply the material, tactics and procedures that are required of a law enforcement officer.
e) The following may be disqualifying:
   1. Being under current academic dismissal from any college or university where such dismissal is still in effect and was initiated within the past two years prior to the date of application.
   2. Having been academically dismissed from any DPSST certified basic law enforcement academy wherein no demonstrated effort has been made to improve in the deficient areas, except: subsequent successful completion of another DPSST basic law enforcement academy shall rescind this requirement.
**1000.3.6 PERSONAL SENSITIVITY**

a) The ability to resolve problems in a way that shows sensitivity for the feelings of others.

b) Empathy

c) Discretion, not enforcing the law blindly.

d) Effectiveness in dealing with people without arousing antagonism.

e) The ability to understand the motives of people and how they will react and interact

f) The following may be disqualifying:
   1. Having been disciplined by any employer (including the military and/or any law enforcement training facility) for acts constituting racial, ethnic or sexual harassment or discrimination.
   2. Uttering any epithet derogatory of another person’s race, religion, gender, national origin or sexual orientation.
   3. Having been disciplined by any employer as an adult for fighting in the workplace.

**1000.3.7 JUDGMENT UNDER PRESSURE**

a) The ability to apply common sense during pressure situations.

b) The ability to make sound decisions on the spot.

c) The ability to use good judgment in dealing with potentially explosive situations.

d) The ability to make effective, logical decisions under pressure.

e) The following may be disqualifying:
   1. Admission(s) of administrative conviction or criminal convictions for any act amounting to assault under color of authority or any other violation of federal or state Civil Rights laws.
   2. Any admission(s) of administrative conviction or criminal conviction for failure to properly report witnessed criminal conduct committed by another law enforcement officer.

**1000.3.8 ILLEGAL USE OR POSSESSION OF DRUGS**

a) The following examples of illegal drug use or possession will be considered automatic disqualifiers for public safety applicants, with no exceptions:
   1. Any adult use or possession of a drug classified as a hallucinogenic within seven years prior to application for employment.
   2. Any adult use or possession of marijuana within one year prior to application for employment.
   3. Any other illegal adult use or possession of a drug not mentioned above i. (including cocaine) within three years prior to application for employment.
   4. Any illegal adult use or possession of a drug while employed in any law enforcement capacity, military police, or as a student enrolled in college-accredited courses related to the criminal justice field.
   5. Any adult manufacture or cultivation of a drug or illegal substance.
   6. Failure to divulge to the Department any information about personal illegal use or possession of drugs.
   7. Any drug test of the applicant, during the course of the hiring process, where illegal drugs are detected.

b) The following examples of illegal drug use or possession will be considered in relationship to the overall background of that individual and may result in disqualification:
   1. Any illegal use or possession of a drug as a juvenile.
   2. Any illegal adult use or possession of a drug that does not meet the criteria of the automatic disqualifiers specified above (e.g., marijuana use longer than one year ago or cocaine use longer than three years ago.).
   3. Any illegal or unauthorized use of prescription medications.
PRE-EMPLOYMENT BACKGROUND INVESTIGATION
PERSONAL PROFILE QUESTIONS

NAME ___________________________            DATE ______________________

The following questions are an addendum to the statement of personal history. Please answer each of the questions by circling either Yes (Y) or No (N).

GENERAL
1. Y/N Are you a citizen of the United States?
2. Y/N Have you ever applied for a permit to carry a concealed weapon?
3. Y/N Have you ever been suspended, expelled or put on probation from any junior high, high school or college?
4. Y/N Are you now or have you ever been a habitual gambler?
5. Y/N Have you ever been publicly intoxicated?
6. Y/N Are you now or have you ever participated with an organization that advocates or supports the use of force or other unlawful means to deny anyone their rights under the Constitution of the United States?

DRIVING/TRAFFIC
7. Y/N Do you have a valid driver’s license?
8. Y/N Have you ever been issued a non-Oregon driver’s license or identification card?
9. Y/N Have you ever been refused a non-Oregon driver’s license?
10. Y/N Have you ever had automobile insurance canceled or denied?
11. Y/N Have you ever been placed in a “High Risk” automobile insurance category?
12. Y/N Have you ever been notified by the motor vehicles division that your driver’s license was about to be suspended or revoked for any reason?
13. Y/N Do you have any outstanding traffic warrants?
14. Y/N Have you ever had a traffic or parking citation turn into a failure to pay, leading to a warrant for your arrest?
15. Y/N Have you ever driven while under the influence of intoxicants?
16. Y/N Have you ever received a traffic citation as a result of a traffic accident?
17. Y/N Have you ever left the scene of an accident in which you were involved?
18. Y/N Have you ever been the driver in an automobile accident where an injury or damages occurred, and you failed to report to the police or to the property owner?

EMPLOYMENT
19. Y/N Have you ever applied with PSU previously?
20. Y/N Are you willing and able to work all shifts, days and hours?
21. Y/N If employed by this agency, do you anticipate any income other than your salary?
22. Y/N Do you presently have any income other than your regular salary?
23. Y/N Have you ever applied for employment with any public safety agency?
24. Y/N Have you ever had another public safety agency begin or complete a background investigation on you?
25. Y/N Have you ever been denied employment by another public safety agency?
26. Y/N Have you ever failed, dropped out, or resigned from a public safety academy?
27. Y/N Have you ever completed a public safety academy?
28. Y/N Have you ever been discharged from any position?
29. Y/N Have you ever been asked to resign from a job?
30. Y/N Have you ever resigned to avoid discharge, negotiated a resignation, or resigned while under suspension or while dismissal proceedings were pending?
31. Y/N Have you ever had a probationary period extended for any reason?
32. Y/N Have you ever been the subject of a job related investigation?
33. Y/N Have you ever been the subject of a sexual or racial harassment complaint?
34. Y/N Have you ever had any complaint of unnecessary force or brutality filed against you?
35. Y/N Have you ever been demoted in a job?
36. Y/N Have you ever received penalty days off?
37. Y/N Have you ever had a pay raise delayed or withheld?
38. Y/N Have you ever taken money, merchandise or goods that you were not authorized to take, from a company where you worked?
39. Y/N Have you ever left a job without giving proper notice?
40. Y/N Have you ever been disciplined by an employer?
41. Y/N Will any of your past or present employers give you an unfavorable recommendation?
42. Y/N Have you ever been informed by a previous employer that you were ineligible for rehire?
43. Y/N Have you ever been counseled or disciplined for sick leave abuse or tardiness?
44. Y/N Have you ever had your integrity questioned in an employment setting?
45. Y/N Have you ever raised your voice in anger to a co-worker or supervisor?
46. Y/N Have you ever been late for work more than four times a year?
47. Y/N Have you ever called in sick to work when you were not really sick?

FINANCIAL

48. Y/N Have you ever received unemployment compensation?
49. Y/N Have you ever sued anyone or been sued by anyone?
50. Y/N Have you ever had a judgement rendered against you?
51. Y/N Have you ever filed for bankruptcy or been declared bankrupt?
52. Y/N Have you ever had any of your property repossessed?
53. Y/N Have you ever had a debt turned over to a collection agency?
54. Y/N Have you ever had your wages garnished?
55. Y/N Have you ever been delinquent in paying any of your taxes?
56. Y/N Have you ever failed to file a federal income tax return?
57. Y/N Have you ever avoided paying any lawful debt by moving?
58. Y/N Have you ever been given an eviction notice?
59. Y/N Have you ever failed to support any child of yours?
60. Y/N Have you ever failed to fully repay a student loan?
61. Y/N Are there any pending civil actions against you?
62. Y/N Have you ever filed a false insurance claim?
63. Y/N Are you generally able to pay all of your monthly bills on time?
64. Y/N Have you ever settled a lawsuit out of court in which you received a cash payment?
65. Y/N Have you ever settled any civil suit out of court in which you, your insurance company or anyone else was required to make a cash payment to another party?
CRIMINAL
66. Y/N Have you ever been arrested for any reason?
67. Y/N Have you ever been convicted of a crime or an offense?
68. Y/N Have you ever been given a trespass warning?
69. Y/N Have you ever been asked to take a polygraph examination?
70. Y/N Have you ever failed a polygraph examination?
71. Y/N Have you ever filed a false police report?
72. Y/N Have you ever pointed a firearm at another person outside of work in law enforcement or in the military?
73. Y/N Have you ever discharged a firearm at another person?
74. Y/N Have you ever been arrested or detained for shoplifting?
75. Y/N Have you ever struck or injured a person since you were 18 years old?
76. Y/N Have you ever disciplined a child that caused bruises or injury?
77. Y/N Have you ever furnished alcohol to a minor not in your custodial control?
78. Y/N Have you ever furnished illegal drugs to anyone?
79. Y/N Have you ever been the plaintiff or the defendant of a civil restraining order or stalking order?
80. Y/N Have you ever given or displayed pornographic material to anyone under 18?
81. Y/N Have you ever been the subject of any police investigation?
82. Y/N Have you ever been charged with a crime?
83. Y/N Have you ever had a warrant issued for your arrest?
84. Y/N Have you ever been detained, questioned, held on suspicion, fingerprinted or taken into custody by law enforcement officers for any reason other than minor traffic tickets?
85. Y/N Have you ever been placed into a diversion program as the result of an arrest?
86. Y/N Have you ever been under investigation by any law enforcement agency concerning any alleged violation of the law?
87. Y/N Have you ever stolen anything worth more than $50?
88. Y/N Have you ever stolen a motor vehicle?
89. Y/N Have you ever been the driver or passenger in a vehicle you were not authorized to use? (joyride)?
90. Y/N Have you ever been the subject of a federal or state civil rights violation investigation?
91. Y/N Have you ever committed any sexual crime?
92. Y/N Have you ever or are you now wanted for any reason by any law enforcement agency?
93. Y/N Have you ever sold, cultivated, manufactured or transported any illegal drug?
94. Y/N Have you used illegal drugs in the last six months?
95. Y/N Have you ever tried, used or experimented with marijuana?
96. Y/N Have you ever tried, used or experimented with other illegal drugs?
97. Y/N To your knowledge has your spouse, romantic partner, or roommate ever been involved in the use of any illegal or controlled drugs during the past five years?
98. Y/N Have you ever been in the presence of anyone using illegal drugs in the last five years?
99. Y/N Have you ever knowingly allowed anyone to possess or use illegal drugs in your home or vehicle within the last five years?

MILITARY
100. Y/N Do you currently hold a secret clearance issued by a federal agency?
101. Y/N Have you ever had any type of secret clearance denied or revoked?
102. Y/N Have you ever performed duties which required certification under a “Human Reliability” or “Personnel Reliability” (PRP) program?
102. Y/N Are you registered with the selective service?
103. Y/N Have you ever served in any branch of the armed services?

If the answer to question #103 is yes, answer the following questions.
1. Y/N Were you stationed overseas?
2. Y/N Were you ever personally involved in combat?
3. Y/N Did you fail to complete any term of enlistment for any reason?
4. Y/N While in the service were you ever court-martialed?
5. Y/N While in the service were you ever placed under military arrest?
6. Y/N While in the service did you ever receive any type of disciplinary action?
7. Y/N While in the service were you ever reduced in rank or grade?
8. Y/N While in the service were you ever incarcerated?
9. Y/N While in the service were you ever A.W.O.L. or on unauthorized leave?
10. Y/N When you left the service, could you have re-enlisted if you wanted to?

COMPUTER USE
1. Y/N Have you ever viewed confidential computer information without authority?
2. Y/N Have you ever shared confidential employer information outside of the agency/company or with others not authorized to such information?
3. Y/N Have you ever installed software that would capture information such as passwords or other protected information?
4. Y/N Have you ever looked at someone’s computer without their permission via a remote access?
5. Y/N Have you ever removed equipment, components, or software from an employer for personal use?
6. Y/N Are you LEDS certified?
7. Y/N Have you ever been disciplined or fired from a position because of your computer use or habits?
8. Y/N Do you now use or have you ever used any proxy software or proxy website or other relaying software to conceal ANY online activity?
9. Y/N Have you ever used a company/department computer contrary to any company/department policy?
10. Y/N Have you ever engaged in any online sexual conversations or activity with anyone under the age of 18?
INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETION OF STATEMENT OF PERSONAL HISTORY

- Please make a copy of this packet after you have completely filled it out. We will not be able to provide you a copy later.

- Statement of Personal History must be turned in at the time of testing.

- Statement of Personal History must be filled out completely according to the instructions.

- Statement of Personal History must be notarized.

- Statement of Personal History must be signed in 4 places.
Position applying for: ________________

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

CAMPUS PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICE

STATEMENT OF PERSONAL HISTORY

NAME: ____________________________________________

LAST  FIRST  MIDDLE

POSITION APPLIED FOR: __________________________________________________________

SUBMISSION DEADLINE: _________________________________________________________

RETURN TO: PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY
             CAMPUS PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICE - CPSO
             1914 SW PARK, SUITE 148
             PORTLAND, OREGON  97201
CAMPUS PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICE

Applicant Letter of Understanding

The information furnished in your Statement of Personal History Packet and all the information supplied by you for the application process will be treated as confidential to the extent permitted by Oregon Law and is to be utilized for the purpose of enabling the Campus Public Safety Office to determine your qualifications and to assist in the hiring decision. The Statement of Personal History is the property of the Campus Public Safety Office and will not be returned to you. In addition, any reports, information or feedback that we receive because of the background investigation or your psychological evaluation is the property of the Campus Public Safety Office. We will maintain the information in a confidential background or medical file, and will only be released at the authority of the Sheriff.

Information voluntarily submitted by background sources in response to a request for information will be treated as confidential if so requested by the provider, pursuant to ORS 192.502(4). The Campus Public Safety Office obliges itself not to disclose background information submitted in confidence if the provider requests confidentiality, as there is a strong public interest in obtaining complete and accurate background information. Disclosure of confidential background information harms the public interest in making providers of background information reluctant to share this information, and thus encourages the hiring of deputies who may have significant background issues that would have precluded employment had the information been known to The Campus Public Safety Office. The files pertaining to your background investigation will be kept by us according to the Oregon Archive laws.

All questions must be answered completely and accurately. All statements in your Statement of Personal History Packet and statements made during interviews are subject to verification. When in doubt as to the necessity of listing information, it is recommended that the information be listed to preclude future questions regarding omissions from this form. The fact that you have been fired, have a criminal record, have a military discharge other than honorable, or have other potentially negative background information may not automatically result in you being denied employment, if you truthfully disclose the information. Be aware that if any such information is discovered during the course of your background investigation that appears to have been withheld, and it should have been divulged up front, the background investigator will consider that this information was concealed by you with the expectation that the investigator would not find it. Any such omissions or any willful misrepresentations or falsifications of information may result in your application being rejected and you may be disqualified from this process; or if after your acceptance for employment, subsequent investigation should disclose misrepresentation, omission or falsification, it may be just cause for immediate dismissal.

In the event that your background investigation for this position should uncover information that you have, or are suspected of having been engaged in illegal activities while employed as a peace officer, this information will likely bar you from further consideration for this position.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT:

I have read and understand the above information.

____________________________________________________________________
Print name  Date

___________________________________________________
Signature
Permission to Use Your Social Security Number

As you know, the Campus Public Safety Office is committed to completing an accurate background investigation on all of our applicants. We are also committed to safeguarding your personal identification information.

The Campus Public Safety Office uses your Social Security number and other personal identification information in your background investigation. We also use information from the United States Internal Revenue Service to confirm some of the information you have given us. The form we use, Form 4506-T requires you to list your Social Security number. We in turn, mail this to the IRS for processing.

We need your permission to use your Social Security number in our background investigation, as outlined above.

I have read and understand the above disclosure. I hereby knowingly and voluntarily give my permission for the Campus Public Safety Office to use my Social Security number and other personal identification information for the limited purpose of my pre-employment background investigation.

Dated this ______ day of ___________________________ 20__.

____________________________________________
APPLICANT’S SIGNATURE

____________________________________________
Printed Name
INSTRUCTIONS

READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS CAREFULLY
BEFORE PROCEEDING

These instructions are provided as a guide to assist you in properly completing your Personal History Statement. It is essential that the information be accurate in all respects. It will be used as the basis for a background investigation that will determine your eligibility for employment.

- Your Personal History Statement should be typed or printed legibly in black ink, by you (the applicant). Answer ALL questions to the best of your ability. Sign and date the “Agreement,” “Authorization for Release of Information Agreement,” and “Permission to Obtain Consumer Report” forms. Your signature on the “Authorization for Release of Information Agreement” must be notarized.

- If a question is not applicable to you, enter N/A in the space provided.

- Avoid errors by reading the directions carefully before making any entries on the form. Be sure your information is correct and in proper sequence before you begin.

- You are responsible for obtaining correct addresses, including zip codes and e-mail addresses (where requested). If you are not sure of an address, check it by personal verification. Your local library may have a directory service or copies of local phone directories. If you do not provide complete names and addresses, the SOPH may be returned to you or you could be disqualified.

- If there is insufficient space on the form for you to include all information required, attach extra sheets to the Statement of Personal History. Be sure to reference the relevant section and question number before continuing your answer.

- An accurate and complete form will help expedite your background process. Deliberate omissions or falsifications may result in disqualification. No matter how qualified you are in other respects, you cannot become a Campus Public Safety Office employee if your truthfulness is in doubt.

- You must provide the following:
  ✓ A copy of your high school diploma or transcripts, or GED, even if you are a college graduate.
  ✓ An uncensored copy of your DD214 military release form, if you served in the military.
  If you do not have these documents, indicate that you are obtaining them as soon as possible.

- Submit sealed certified college transcripts of any college level work you have completed. Mail your transcripts to the Background Unit or request that they be mailed directly to the Background Unit. Indicate “transcripts requested” if they are not available to submit with the completed document.

- Questions may be directed to the Background Investigation Unit at 503 846-2772.

The Americans with Disabilities Act prohibits employers from making medically-related inquiries prior to a Conditional Offer of Employment. Therefore, if you are completing this personal history statement before you have received a Conditional Offer of Employment, do not divulge information concerning physical or medical conditions, either past or current.
PERSONAL HISTORY STATEMENT

A. APPLICANT IDENTIFICATION – Information provided in this section is used for identification purposes only.

Name: ____________________________

Home Address: ____________________________

Mailing Address: ____________________________

Home Phone: ____________________________ Work Phone: ____________________________ Ext. __________

E-mail address: ____________________________ Cell or Pager #: ____________________________

Date of Birth: ____________________________ Social security number: ____________________________

Nickname(s), maiden name, or other names by which you have been known: ____________________________

Driver’s license #: ____________________________ Expiration date: ____________________________ State: ____________________________

List other States in which you’ve had a driver’s license/number: ____________________________

Height: __________ Weight: __________ Color of eyes: __________ Color of hair: __________

Scars, tattoos, or other distinguishing marks: ____________________________

Place of birth: ____________________________

If you were born outside of the United States, are you a U.S. citizen??   ☐ Yes   ☐ No

If yes, please provide documents as proof of citizenship.

If No, are you a resident alien who is eligible and has applied for U.S. citizenship?

☐ Yes   ☐ No   Expected date of naturalization ____________________________

The Campus Public Safety Office does not discriminate on the basis of a person’s citizenship. Oregon law does require that all certified police officers and corrections officers obtain citizenship within a prescribed time.

E-mail is the primary method we will use to communicate with you. Please make sure that you enter your e-mail address legibly. We will also provide you a subscription to the Sheriff's Office News, an on-line publication. If you want to unsubscribe, you can easily do so on the last page of the publication. We will not share your e-mail address with any other agency or entity.

E-mail is the primary method we will use to communicate with your references. You must provide an e-mail address for each of your references, unless they do not have one. We will not use your reference’s e-mail for any other purpose other than conducting this background investigation.
B. LIST OF RESIDENCES

List all residences during the last ten years. Provide complete addresses (include markers such as Street, Drive, Road, East, West, etc., and unit or apartment number). Do not use P.O. Boxes.

- If the residence is a military base, identify name of base in address, nearest city, state and zip code. DO NOT LIST military barracks mates or assigned college roommates unless you shared individual quarters.
- If more space is needed continue on a supplemental page.

Address Where You Now Live (STREET/CITY/STATE/ZIP CODE)

From ______________ to Present Renting/Leasing or purchasing? __________________________
If Renting/Leasing: Property Manager, Rent Collector, or Owner ______________________________
Complex name and Address of Property Manager, etc ______________________________
Names and date of birth of those with whom you live ______________________________

Former Address (STREET/CITY/STATE/ZIP CODE)

From ______________ to ____________ Renting/Leasing or purchasing? __________________________
If Renting/Leasing: Property Manager, Rent Collector, or Owner ______________________________
Complex name and Address of Property Manager, etc ______________________________
Names of those with whom you lived ______________________________

Former Address (STREET/CITY/STATE/ZIP CODE)

From ______________ to ____________ Renting/Leasing or purchasing? __________________________
If Renting/Leasing: Property Manager, Rent Collector, or Owner ______________________________
Complex name and Address of Property Manager, etc ______________________________
Names of those with whom you lived ______________________________

Former Address (STREET/CITY/STATE/ZIP CODE)

From ______________ to ____________ Renting/Leasing or purchasing? __________________________
If Renting/Leasing: Property Manager, Rent Collector, or Owner ______________________________
Complex name and Address of Property Manager, etc ______________________________
Names of those with whom you lived ______________________________

Former Address (STREET/CITY/STATE/ZIP CODE)

From ______________ to ____________ Renting/Leasing or purchasing? __________________________
If Renting/Leasing: Property Manager, Rent Collector, or Owner ______________________________
Complex name and Address of Property Manager, etc ______________________________
Names of those with whom you lived ______________________________
C. EXPERIENCE AND EMPLOYMENT – Beginning with your present or most recent job, list all employment held for the past 10 years, including part-time, temporary, seasonal, or self employment. Include all periods of unemployment. Attach extra pages if necessary. Please indicate if you are fearful that your present job would be in jeopardy if inquiries were made. Please indicate month and year.

**Current Employer:** ___________________________ From __________

Address: ____________________________________________

STREET           CITY           STATE           ZIP/CODE

Job Title: ___________________________ Name of coworker: ___________________________

Duties: ____________________________________________

Supervisor: ________________________________ Phone Number: ________________________

Reason for leaving: ________________________________

May we contact your current employer? ☐ Yes ☐ No

**Employer:** ___________________________ From _____ To ________

Address: ____________________________________________

STREET           CITY           STATE           ZIP/CODE

Job Title: ___________________________ Name of coworker: ___________________________

Duties: ____________________________________________

Supervisor: ________________________________ Phone Number: ________________________

Reason for leaving: ________________________________

**Employer:** ___________________________ From _____ To ________

Address: ____________________________________________

STREET           CITY           STATE           ZIP/CODE

Job Title: ___________________________ Name of coworker: ___________________________

Duties: ____________________________________________

Supervisor: ________________________________ Phone Number: ________________________

Reason for leaving: ________________________________

**Employer:** ___________________________ From _____ To ________

Address: ____________________________________________

STREET           CITY           STATE           ZIP/CODE

Job Title: ___________________________ Name of coworker: ___________________________

Duties: ____________________________________________

Supervisor: ________________________________ Phone Number: ________________________

Reason for leaving: ________________________________
Employer: ________________________________ From ______ To ________
Address: ________________________________
          STREET          CITY          STATE          ZIP CODE
Job Title: ________________________________ Name of coworker: ________________________________
Duties: ___________________________________________________________________________________

Supervisor: ________________________________ Phone Number: ________________________________
Reason for leaving: __________________________________________________________________________

Have you ever been discharged from a job for failing to pass a probationary period? ☐ No ☐ Yes
Have you ever been discharged from any position? ☐ No ☐ Yes
Have you ever resigned to avoid discharge or resigned while under suspension or while dismissal proceedings were pending?
☐ No ☐ Yes

Have you applied for employment with any other criminal justice system agencies? ☐ No ☐ Yes
If yes, where and when? ______________________________________________________________________

Have you ever worked for a criminal justice agency? ☐ No ☐ Yes
Position(s): ________________________________ State: ________________________________
DPSST/POST certification number: ________________________________ Certification: ________________________________
Is your certification still current? ☐ No ☐ Yes
Has your certification ever been suspended or revoked? ☐ No ☐ Yes

D. MILITARY HISTORY

Have you registered with Selective Service? ☐ No ☐ Yes
Have you served in the U.S. Armed Forces? ☐ No ☐ Yes
Date of service: From: __________ to: __________ Branch of service: ________________________________
Unit designation: ________________________________ Military service number: ________________________________
Highest rank held: ________________________________ Type of discharge: ________________________________

NOTE: A discharge that is other than honorable is not an absolute bar to employment.

Were you ever disciplined while in the military service (include court-martial, captain’s masts, company punishment, etc.)?
☐ No ☐ Yes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARGE</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>AGE AT</th>
<th>DISPOSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Were you ever denied a security clearance, or had a clearance revoked, suspended or downgraded?
☐ No ☐ Yes
If yes, explain? ________________________________________________________________
### E. EDUCATIONAL HISTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIGH SCHOOL ATTENDED</th>
<th>CITY/STATE</th>
<th>DATES ATTENDED FROM/TO</th>
<th>GRADUATED YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

College or university attended: ________________________________

City & State: ________________________________ Dates attended: ________________________________

Units completed: ___________ Major/Minor: ________________________________

Degree received, if any, & date: ________________________________

College or University attended: ________________________________

City & State: ________________________________ Dates attended: ________________________________

Units completed: ___________ Major/Minor: ________________________________

Degree received, if any, & date: ________________________________

College or University attended: ________________________________

City & State: ________________________________ Dates attended: ________________________________

Units completed: ___________ Major/Minor: ________________________________

Degree received, if any, & date: ________________________________

List other schools attended (trade, vocational, business, etc.) Give name and address of school, dates attended, course of study, certificate, and any other pertinent information:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Have you ever been placed on academic or disciplinary suspension or expelled from any high school, college university, business or trade school?  No  Yes

If yes, describe in detail below. Starting with high school, list any and all disciplinary actions received in any school or educational institution. Include when the disciplinary action(s) occurred, name of school(s), and explanation of circumstances:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

### SPECIAL QUALIFICATIONS & SKILLS

List any special skills, qualifications, or licenses you hold (such as pilot, radio operator, scuba, etc.).  Show licensing authority, original date of issue, and date of expiration:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

If you are fluent in a foreign language, indicate in each area your degree of fluency (excellent, good, or fair):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LANGUAGE</th>
<th>READING</th>
<th>SPEAKING</th>
<th>UNDERSTANDING</th>
<th>WRITING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F. LEGAL

IN ANSWERING THESE QUESTIONS, DO NOT INCLUDE MINOR TRAFFIC INFRACTIONS. DO NOT INCLUDE ANY INFORMATION ON MATTERS WHICH WERE EXPUNGED OR SEALED BY THE COURT. IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS ON WHETHER OR NOT YOUR RECORDS ARE EXPUNGED OR SEALED, CONTACT THE APPROPRIATE JURISDICTION FOR CONFIRMATION.

Have you ever been convicted of a crime or violation?  
☐ No  ☐ Yes

Were you ever referred to juvenile court?  
☐ No  ☐ Yes

Have you ever been arrested or given a citation for a crime or violation, even though you were not convicted?  
☐ No  ☐ Yes Include any diversions.

Have you ever been detained (stopped, contacted, or questioned) by the police or the subject of an investigation?  
☐ No  ☐ Yes

If yes to any of the above, provide the details and circumstances, (juvenile as well as adult occurrences) including the POLICE AGENCY, CITY & STATE, CRIME CHARGED, DATE OF CASE, AND DISPOSITION: ____________________________  
__________________________________________
__________________________________________
__________________________________________

Have you ever been involved as a party in civil litigation?  ☐ No  ☐ Yes If yes, give details: ________________
__________________________________________
__________________________________________
__________________________________________

Have you ever applied for a permit to carry a concealed weapon?  ☐ No  ☐ Yes
If yes, please provide the following:
Permit granted:  ☐ Yes  ☐ No Date: ________________
Name of law enforcement agency: ____________________________

Purpose: ____________________________

Have you ever been refused a permit to carry a concealed weapon?  ☐ No  ☐ Yes

Are you now, or have you ever been, a member or associate of a criminal enterprise, street gang, or any other group that advocates violence against individuals because of their race, religion, political affiliation, ethnic origin, nationality, gender, sexual preference, or disability?  ☐ No  ☐ Yes

Do you have, or have you ever had, a tattoo signifying membership in, or affiliation with, a criminal enterprise, street gang, or any other group that advocates violence against individuals because of their race, religion, political affiliation, ethnic origin, nationality, gender, sexual preference, or disability?  ☐ No  ☐ Yes

Since the age of 16, have you ever been involved in an anger-provoked physical fight, confrontation or other violent act?  ☐ No  ☐ Yes

Have you ever hit or physically overpowered a spouse, domestic partner or romantic partner?  ☐ No  ☐ Yes

If yes to any of the above, please provide the details and circumstances: ____________________________
G. DRUG USE

These questions ask about your current and past recreational drug use. This covers the use of any drug, including the unauthorized use of prescription drugs or over-the-counter drugs. Your answers should include, but not be limited to, your use of any of the following drugs:

- Amphetamines / Methamphetamine (Uppers, Speed, Crank, etc)
- Barbiturates (Downers)
- Cocaine / Crack Cocaine
- Designer Drugs (Ecstasy, Synthetic Heroin, etc.)
- GHB (Date Rape Drug)
- Glue/Huffing
- Hallucinogens (Peyote, LSD, Mushrooms)
- Hashish / Hashish Oil
- Heroin / Opium
- Marijuana
- Mescaline
- Morphine
- PCP / Angel Dust
- Quaaludes
- Steroids
- Tetrahydrocannabinol (THC)
- Study drugs (Adderall or other ADHD drugs)

Within the past twelve months, have you used any drug(s) as indicated above or other drugs?  
No ☐  Yes ☐

If yes, give details, including drug(s) used and circumstances: ____________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

Prior to the past twelve months (check all that apply):

☐ A. I have never used any drug recreationally.

☐ B. I have tried or used one or more drugs, but only under limited circumstances (for example, experimentation, at parties, concerts, special events, etc.).

If you checked B, give details including drug(s) used, most recent date used, and circumstances: ____________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

Have you ever engaged in any of the activities listed below for drugs, narcotics or illegal substances, including marijuana?

No ☐  Yes ☐ If yes, please check the boxes that apply:

☐ Sold  ☐ Furnished or shared  ☐ Used someone else's prescribed medication?

☐ Manufactured  ☐ Cultivated  ☐ Given someone your own prescribed medication?

☐ Purchased  ☐ Carried or held for another  ☐ Misused a prescription drug

If you checked any items above, give details including drug(s) involved, over what time period(s), and circumstances: ____________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________
H. MOTOR VEHICLE OPERATION

Has your driver’s license ever been suspended or revoked? □ No □ Yes

Have you ever driven a vehicle without auto insurance, as required by law? □ No □ Yes

Has a traffic citation ever resulted in a warrant or caused your driver’s license to be withheld due to the following? (Check all that apply): □ Failed to appear □ Failed to complete traffic school □ Failed to pay the required fine

Have you ever been arrested or cited for driving under the influence of an intoxicant? □ No □ Yes
If yes to any of the above, give date, location and details: ________________________________________________________________

List all driving citations you have received in the last five years, excluding parking tickets (even if not convicted):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH &amp; YEAR</th>
<th>CHARGE</th>
<th>CITY &amp; STATE</th>
<th>DISPOSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe in a brief narrative any traffic accidents you have been in within the last five years, in which you were the driver, giving approximate dates and locations:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

I. RELATIVES, REFERENCES, ACQUAINTANCES*

Are you? □ single □ married □ separated □ divorced □ widowed □ domestic partner
If married: Date of marriage: __________________________ City & State: __________________________
Spouse/Partner’s name and Date of Birth (include maiden name): ________________________________________________

IF EVER SEPARATED, DIVORCED OR WIDOWED OR FORMER DOMESTIC PARTNER:

Previous spouse/partner’s full name: ________________________________ Date of birth: ______
Current address: ________________________________________________
Date of marriage: __________________________ Date of divorce decree: _________________
Where is the divorce record located (city, state): ________________________________

Previous spouse/partner’s full name: ________________________________ Date of birth: ______
Current address: ________________________________________________
Date of marriage: __________________________ Date of divorce decree: _________________
Where is the divorce record located (city, state): ________________________________

*Attach additional pages if necessary
List all children related to you or your spouse/partner (natural, stepchildren, adopted & foster children).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>RELATION OF BIRTH</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>SUPPORTED BY WHOM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List other relatives in the following order: parents, stepparents, brothers & sisters, stepsiblings. Include maiden names. If deceased, so indicate.

Name: ___________________________ DOB: ______________
Address: __________________________
Phone: ___________________ Relationship: __________________________

Name: ___________________________ DOB: ______________
Address: __________________________
Phone: ___________________ Relationship: __________________________

Name: ___________________________ DOB: ______________
Address: __________________________
Phone: ___________________ Relationship: __________________________

Name: ___________________________ DOB: ______________
Address: __________________________
Phone: ___________________ Relationship: __________________________

To your knowledge, has any member of your immediate family (spouse/partner, children, parents, siblings, step-relatives) or your spouse/partner’s immediate family ever been arrested for anything other than a minor traffic violation?
☐ No  ☐ Yes

If yes, list other person’s name, date of birth, relationship, and the charge(s). Please use attachment sheet if space provided is not adequate.

J. REFERENCE OR ACQUAINTANCES – List seven persons who know you well enough to provide current information about you; at least three co-workers. Do not list relatives or former employers.

Name: ___________________________ Years known: __
Address: __________________________
Residence phone: ___________________ Cell phone: ___________________
Business address: ___________________
E-mail address: ___________________ How do you know this person? ___________________

Name: ___________________________ Years known: __
Address: __________________________
Residence phone: ___________________ Cell phone: ___________________
Business address: ___________________
E-mail address: ___________________ How do you know this person? ___________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years known:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you know this person?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years known:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you know this person?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years known:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you know this person?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years known:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you know this person?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years known:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you know this person?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**K. FINANCIAL HISTORY**

What is your present salary or wage?  

Do you have income from any source other than your principal occupation? [ ] No [ ] Yes  
If yes, how much? How often?  
The source?  

Do you have a bank account? [ ] Yes [ ] No  
Savings account average balance: $  
Name & address of bank  

Have you had any financial problems in the last twelve months? [ ] No [ ] Yes  
If yes, explain:  

In the last five years, have you ever had any debt turned over to a collection agency? [ ] No [ ] Yes
If yes, explain: ____________________________________________________________

In the last five years, have you ever had anything repossessed? □ No □ Yes If yes, explain: ____________

In the last five years, have your wages ever been garnisheed? □ No □ Yes If yes, explain: ____________

Have you ever been evicted or asked to leave a residence? □ No □ Yes If yes, explain: ____________

Have you ever left a residence owing rent? □ No □ Yes If yes, explain: ____________________________________________

FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS

Give names and addresses of the individuals, companies, or others to whom you are indebted, and the extent of your debt. Include rent, mortgages, vehicle payments, charge accounts, credit cards, loans, child support payments, and any other debts and payments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>NAME, ADDRESS, &amp; PHONE NUMBER OF CREDITORS</th>
<th>REASON FOR DEBT</th>
<th>TOTAL BALANCE</th>
<th>MONTHLY PAYMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) Are there any events in your life that may reflect on your suitability to perform duties of the position for which you are applying, or is there anything in your background that requires further explanation? □ No □ Yes  If you answered “yes”, please explain.

2) In your own handwriting, please write in a short paragraph explaining why you want this position.
AGREEMENT

I hereby certify that there are no willful misrepresentations, omissions, or falsifications in the foregoing statements and answers to the questions. I am fully aware that any such misrepresentations, omissions, or falsifications will be grounds for immediate rejection or termination of employment.

[Signature]

DATE COMPLETED
AUTHORIZATION FOR RELEASE OF INFORMATION AGREEMENT

APPLICANT’S NAME ________________________________________________

CURRENT ADDRESS ________________________________________________

TELEPHONE NUMBER ______________________________________________

DATE ______________ SIGNATURE ___________________________________

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN: I am an applicant for a position with Portland State University, Campus Public Safety Office. PSU needs to thoroughly investigate my employment background and personal history to evaluate my qualifications for this position. It is in the public interest that all relevant information concerning my personal and employment history be disclosed to the Campus Public Safety Office.

I hereby authorize any representative of the Campus Public Safety Office bearing this release to obtain any information in your files pertaining to my employment records, or any part thereof, regardless of whether those records are considered public, private or confidential. The intent of this authorization is to provide full and free access to my background and history, for the specific purpose of conducting a background investigation that may provide relevant information for PSU Campus Public Safety Office to consider in determining my suitability for employment with the Campus Public Safety Office. It is my specific intent to provide access to personnel information, however personal or confidential it may appear to be. This release does not authorize the release of any medical records.

I consent to your release of any and all public and private information that you may have concerning me, my work record, my background and reputation, my military service records, educational records, my financial status, my criminal history including any arrest records, any information in investigatory files, efficiency ratings, complaints or grievances against me, the records or recollections of attorneys at law, or other counsel, whether representing me or another in any case in which I was involved, attendance records, polygraph examinations, any internal affairs investigations and discipline, including any files which are deemed to be confidential or sealed. I specifically authorize the release of law enforcement or criminal records and information from law enforcement agencies.

I hereby release you, your organization, and all others from liability or damages that may result from furnishing the requested information, regardless of any prior agreement I have made with you or your organization to the contrary.

For and in consideration of the Campus Public Safety Office’s acceptance and processing of my application for employment and background check, I agree to hold harmless and indemnify The Campus Public Safety Office, its officers, agents, and employees from any claim or liability associated to my background check and any decision to employ, not employ, or cease employing me with The Campus Public Safety Office. I understand that if information of a serious criminal nature is discovered in this investigation, that information will be turned over to the proper authorities.

I understand that the Privacy Act, 5 USC § 552a, prohibits disclosure of certain federal records without my signed authorization or other statutory exemption. My signature above indicates my express permission to release these records pursuant to 5 USC § 552a (b), to the Campus Public Safety Office for their use in conducting this background check.

A photocopy or telephonic facsimile (fax) of this release shall be valid as an original, even though such photocopy or fax does not contain my original signature. This release is valid for six months from the date of my signature above.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this _____ day of _________________. 20___.

__________________________
Notary Public for the State of ____________________________

In the County of _____________________________

My commission expires the _____ day of ________________, 20___.
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This medical examination form is derived from a Job Task Analysis of the entry level Police, Corrections and Parole & Probation officer. It meets the Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA) criteria to identify the Essential Functions/Tasks of the position. A panel of physicians developed the medical standards based upon the essential tasks.
### Combined Physical Activities
- Drive patrol car in a wide range of routine and emergency conditions
- Rapidly exit patrol car (standing up from a seated position inside the car) and move away from the car
- Pursue subject on foot, negotiating barriers and hazards (running, jumping, climbing etc.)
- Struggle with and subdue subject after pursuit/evasion; place subject in transport
- Multi-task while operating patrol car (radio communications, computer, weapons and tools, etc.)
- Subdue and physically/mechanically restrain; lift/carry/drag person from one area to another
- Understand speech through electronic devices (telephone, radio, cell phone, etc.) in a wide range of environmental conditions
- Maintain visual contact in pursuit (car and foot) in unpredictable terrain and conditions
- Routine use of color computer monitor (CRT)
- Draw, aim and fire service pistol

### General Physical Activities
- Transport person (resisting, not resisting) between locations, maintaining physical control, negotiating stairs, doorways, obstacles and other features
- Being struck by, and/or striking person (physical altercation)
- Physically struggling with multiple persons
- Falling/being knocked down in struggle or pursuit, recovering to feet, resuming struggle/pursuit
- Participate in Defensive Tactics Training (DT’s)
- Conduct physical person searches of individuals
- Conduct area searches (walking, standing, kneeling, crawling, lifting, bending, etc.) looking for item or person

### Psychological Elements with Physical Effects
- Continuing to function in a physical confrontation after being struck/injured
- Cope with physical effects of acute emotional stress (fear, anger, etc.)
- Cope with the physical effects of chronic (cumulative) emotional stress
- Cope with the emotional and physical results of being struck by/exposed to bodily fluids
- Maintaining a state of high hyper vigilance (highly concentrated mental and sensory attention) over protracted period of time
- Cope with the emotional and physical impact of being subjected to verbal threats of violence
- Being exposed to hazardous substances (drugs, chemicals, infectious diseases, etc.)
- Cope with the emotional and physical impact of witnessing the abuse, injury or death of a child
- Cope with the emotional and physical impact of constant scrutiny and criticism (management, attorneys, judges, the public, etc.)
- Cope with the long-term emotional and physical impact of constant exposure to deviance (distorted world view)
- Cope with the emotional and physical impact of being shot at

### Sensory Acuity, Discrimination
- Accurately visually detect and resolve images, facial and body features, and movement of persons and objects in varying light conditions, at distances up to 100 feet
- Accurately determine full-range colors (clothing, substances, skin tones, etc.) in varying light conditions
- Resolve and understand faint auditory signals (whispers, transients [clicks, pops, impacts], air movement, etc.)
- Resolve and understand speech in presence of wide range of environmental sounds, including high levels of ambient background noise
- Accurately resolve visual images in low-light conditions
- Three-dimensional vision, sufficient for clear depth perception, image placement and location sufficient for complex visual tasks (driving in a vehicle in emergency conditions, pursuit of persons over complex surfaces in unpredictable conditions, stairs, steps, obstacles, weapons use, etc.)
- Accurately visually detect and resolve transitory and subtle changes in body language (pupil constriction/dilation, skin color and respiration changes, etc.)
**Sitting, Standing, Walking, Running**
- Run on flat surface
- Walk continuously
- Stand continuously
- Walk up/down stairs
- Sit continuously (car, desk, etc.)
- Run up/down stairs
- Walk/run – irregular, potentially hazardous surfaces

**Crawling, Climbing, Over/Under Obstacles**
- Climb steps, railings, external features, obstacles

**Lifting, Carrying, Pushing**
- Lift objects off the ground
- Assisted carry of unresisting inmates
- Carry and place objects
- Lift objects down from elevated surface and place on ground or floor
- Pull/Push unresisting/resisting person through vehicle or structure window to remove person from vehicle or structure
- Physically force open locked, or blocked door/gate

**Struggle, Fight, Defend**
- Grip and hold inmate to maintain physical control
- Extract/place struggling inmate from/in cell
- Hold/restrain struggling inmate
- Physically defend against and control attacking inmate
- Take down and subdue resisting inmate
- Handcuff – mechanically restrain inmate
- Use chemical weapon (OC) to subdue inmate
- Continue to function effectively after exposure to OC
- Physically intervene to break up inmate fights/physical confrontations
- Dodge/evade blows, thrown objects
- Exposure to hazardous materials

**Combined Physical Activities**
- Subdue and mechanically restrain, life/carry inmate to/from holding area/cell
- Transport inmate (resisting, not resisting) within facility; negotiate physical barriers
- Being struck by and/or striking inmates

- Falling/being knocked down in a struggle, recover to feet, resume struggle/pursuit
- Loading, unloading, driving transport vehicles – maintain control of inmates
- Participate in Defensive Tactics training
- Continue to function in a physical altercation after being struck
- Maintain a state of hyper vigilance

**Psychological Elements with Physical Effects**
- Cope with physical effects of acute emotional stress (self)
- Cope with physical effects of acute emotional stress (others)
- Cope with the physical effects of chronic emotional stress (self)
- Cope with the physical effects of chronic emotional stress (others)
- Cope with chronic physical effects of shift work
- Cope with the emotional and physical results of bodily fluid contact/exposure
- Cope with the emotional and physical impact of verbal threats of violence by inmates
- Cope with emotional impact of working with seriously mentally ill inmates
- Cope with the emotional reactions to verbal abuse by inmates

**General Physical Activities**
- Kneel, squat and recover to feet
- Repetitive hand movements (typing, mouse, bar code scanning, etc.)
- Bending over from waist, at or below waist level
- Cardio-vascular endurance (over three minutes – high intensity)

**Sensory Acuity, Discrimination**
- Accurately resolve visual images in various conditions – to 100 feet
- Accurately determine full-range of colors
- Resolve and understand faint auditory signals
- Resolve and understand speech in noisy environment
- Detect and resolve odd odors
- Accurately resolve visual images in low light conditions
- Three-dimensional vision sufficient for accurate depth perception in high risk situations
- Accurately visually detect and resolve transitory and subtle changes in “body language”
PAROLE & PROBATION OFFICER ESSENTIAL TASKS

➢ **Sitting, Standing, Walking, Running**
  - Run to pursue/escape fleeing/attacking person (pursuit-evasion)
  - Walk continuously
  - Stand continuously
  - Walk up/down stairs
  - Sit continuously (car, desk, etc.)
  - Walk/run – irregular, potentially hazardous surfaces
  - Walk backwards (retreat)

➢ **Lifting, Carrying, Pushing**
  - Lift objects off the ground
  - Push/pull objects
  - Carry and place objects
  - Lift objects down from elevated surface (waist high or above) and place on ground or floor

➢ **Struggle, Fight, Defend**
  - Grip and hold a person to maintain physical control
  - Hold/restrain struggling person
  - Physically defend against and control attacking person
  - Take down and subdue resisting person
  - Handcuff – mechanically restrain person
  - Tackle a fleeing person to stop flight
  - Use hand weapon(s) (other than firearm) to subdue person in physical confrontation
  - Use chemical weapon to subdue a person in a physical confrontation
  - Use firearms in physical confrontation
  - Dodge/Evade blows, thrown objects

➢ **Combined Physical Activities**
  - Pursue fleeing person on foot, negotiating barriers and hazards (running, jumping, climbing, etc.), struggle with and subdue after pursuit/evasion
  - Physically/mechanically restrain, lift/carry/drag resisting person
  - Draw, aim and fire service pistol
  - Transport person (resisting, not resisting) between locations, maintaining physical control, negotiating stairs, doorways, obstacles and other features
  - Being struck by, and/or striking person (physical alterations)
  - Physically struggling with multiple persons
  - Falling/being knocked down in struggle or pursuit – recovering to feet – resuming struggle/pursuit
  - Participate in Defensive Tactics Training (DT’s)
  - Conduct routine physical person searches of individuals
  - Conduct high-risk searches of individuals (weapon drawn)
  - Conduct area searches (walking, standing, kneeling, crawling, lifting, bending, etc.)

➢ **Psychological Elements with Physical Effects**
  - Continuing to function in a physical confrontation after being struck/injured
  - Cope with physical effects of acute emotional stress (fear, anger, etc.) (self and others)
  - Cope with the physical effects of chronic (cumulative) emotional stress (self and others)
  - Cope with the emotional and physical results of being struck by – exposed to bodily fluid
  - Maintaining hyper vigilance over protracted period of time
  - Cope with the emotional and physical impact of being subjected to verbal threats of violence
  - Cope with emotional and physical impact of being on-call
  - Cope with the emotional and physical impact of dealing with repeat offenders

➢ **General Physical Activities**
  - Bending over from waist, at or below waist level
  - Twisting from the waist
  - Typing on keyboard
  - Routine driving of automobile
  - Use computer mouse
  - Talking on phone, radio, while using computer
  - Cardio-vascular endurance (sustained high-demand physical exertion for longer than three minutes)
  - Transition between sitting and standing

➢ **Sensory Acuity, Discrimination**
  - Accurately visually detect and resolve images, facial and body features, and movement of persons and objects in varying light conditions, at distances up to 100 feet
  - Accurately determine full-range colors (clothing substances, skin tones, etc.) in varying light conditions
  - Resolve and understand faint auditory signals (whispers, transients [clicks, pops, impacts] air movement, etc.) in varying light conditions
  - Resolve and understand speech in the presence of a wide range of environmental surrounds (wind, vehicle noise, equipment sounds, etc.) including high levels of ambient background noise
  - Detect and resolve faint and/or odd odors
  - Accurately resolve visual images in low-light conditions
  - Understand speech through electronic devices (telephone, radio, cell phone, etc.) in a wide range of environmental conditions
  - Three-dimensional vision sufficient for accurate depth perception, image placement and location sufficient for complex visual tasks (driving a vehicle in emergency conditions, pursuit of persons over complex surfaces in unpredictable conditions, stairs, steps, obstacles, weapons use, etc.) in high risk situations
  - Accurately visually detect and resolve transitory and subtle changes in “body language” (pupil constriction/dilation, skin color and respiration changes, etc.)
  - Accurately use vision and hearing for threat assessment in use of force situations
  - Maintain visual contact in pursuit (car and foot) in unpredictable terrain and conditions
  - Routine use of color computer monitor
9. **Eyes and Vision**  

**A1  Visual Acuity**  
- Corrected vision shall be at least 20/30 (Snellen) in each eye.  
- Applicants whose uncorrected vision is worse than 20/100 shall wear soft contact lenses (SCLs) to meet the corrected vision requirement.  
- Applicants with uncorrected vision of 20/100 or better may wear glasses with frames to meet the corrected vision requirement.  
- Replacement glasses or lenses (as appropriate) shall be on the person or readily available at all times during each workshift. The employing agency must monitor this compliance.

Applicant’s Corrected Visual Acuity: L20/___________ R20/___________  
Applicant’s Uncorrected Visual Acuity: L20/___________ R20/___________  

Comments:__________________________________________________________________________________________________  
____________________________________________________________________________________________________________

**A2  Peripheral Vision**  
- The Field of Vision shall be at least 140 degrees in the horizontal meridian combined.

Applicant’s Form Field of Vision (Temporal): L_________ R_________ Combined_________  

Comments:__________________________________________________________________________________________________  
____________________________________________________________________________________________________________

**A3  Depth Perception**  
- Depth Perception shall be sufficient to demonstrate stereopsis adequate to perform the essential tasks of the job. Recommended test is the Random Stereo Test with 60 seconds of arc.

Comments:__________________________________________________________________________________________________

**A4  Night Blindness**  
- The applicants history of night blindness should be evaluated to determine applicant's capacity to perform essential tasks at night or in dark or low light settings.

Comments:__________________________________________________________________________________________________
A5  COLOR VISION

- Red or green deficiencies are not necessarily excludable but should be noted for further examination.
- Correct reading of at least nine (9) of the first thirteen (13) plates of Ishihara Test (24 Plate Edition).
- Applicants who fail the Ishihara test can meet the color vision standard by demonstrating that they can correctly discriminate colors via a field test conducted by the employer and approved by DPSST.

Comments:___________________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________________________

10. B - EARS AND HEARING

B1  HEARING ACUITY

- Applicant must have hearing sufficient to perform essential hearing tasks without posing a direct threat to themselves or others.
- Police & Corrections applicants must not have an average loss greater than 25-db at 500, 1000, 2000 and 3000 Hertz (Hz) levels in each ear with no single loss in excess of 40 db or achieve a Speech Discrimination test score of no less than 90% utilizing a standard 50 word presentation at 60 db Hearing Threshold Level (HTL).
- Parole & Probation applicants must not have an average loss greater than 35-db at 500, 1000, 2000 and 3000 Hertz (Hz) levels in each ear with no single loss in excess of 45 db or achieve a Speech Discrimination test score of no less than 90% utilizing a standard 50 word presentation at 60 db Hearing Threshold Level (HTL).
- Amplification device(s) may be used to meet the above hearing requirement.
- If amplification devices are used, they must be of the type that screens out loud sounds, i.e., gun shots, to prevent further hearing loss.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Left (Decibels)</th>
<th>Right (Decibels)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hertz: 500______</td>
<td>500______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000_____</td>
<td>1000______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000_____</td>
<td>2000______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000_____</td>
<td>3000______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg._______</td>
<td>Avg._______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Speech Reception Threshold

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aided</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Speech Discrimination (@ 60 dB)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aided</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unaided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Police/Corrections an average >25 db or a single>40db requires Unaided % %
Parole & Probation an average >35 db or a single >45 db requires Unaided % %

Audiologist Signature:___________________________________________   Date:______________ _____

Comments:___________________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________________________

11. C - NOSE, THROAT AND MOUTH

C1  NON - ASSISTED APHONIA, LOSS OF SPEECH DEFECTS

- Applicant must be able to use vocal chords and have significant speaking ability to perform speaking related essential tasks.
C2  ABNORMALITIES OF THE NOSE, THROAT OR MOUTH

- For police and corrections applicants, an abnormality must not interfere with the applicant's breathing, or proper fitting of gas mask or similar device.

Comments:___________________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________________________

12. HEAD (note any defect, disease, or injury involving eyes, ears, mouth, throat)

Comments:___________________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________________________

13. DENTISTRY RECOMMENDED □ Yes □ No

Comments:___________________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________________________

14. LUNGS

Comments:___________________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________________________

15. D - CARDIOVASCULAR SYSTEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF ACTION AT REST</th>
<th>PULSE RATE</th>
<th>SOUNDS</th>
<th>RHYTHM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PULSES</td>
<td>R L</td>
<td>Note any abnormality</td>
<td>R L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Femoral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>popliteal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dorsal pedes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:___________________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________________________

D1  CARDIOVASCULAR DISEASES

- Any finding in the personal history or physical examination, which suggests the presence of an organic cardiovascular disease, shall necessitate further medical evaluation.

- Resting blood pressure should be less than, or equal to, 140 mmHg systolic and 90 mmHg diastolic on three successive readings.  
  1st Resting blood pressure __________/_________ mmHg __________________ Time __________________ Date
  2nd Resting blood pressure __________/_________ mmHg __________________ Time __________________ Date
  3rd Resting blood pressure __________/_________ mmHg __________________ Time __________________ Date

- Failure to meet the blood pressure guideline shall cause referral for further medical evaluation. (If the applicant has controlled hypertension not exceeding the above standards and is on medication with side effect profiles, which do not interfere with performance of duty, the condition may not be excludable.)

- Applicant shall not have a functional and therapeutic cardiac classification greater than the Heart Association Class A.
- Functional Capacity I Patients with cardiac disease may not be excludable if they have no limitations of physical activity; ordinary physical activity does not cause discomfort; they do not have symptoms of cardiac insufficiency, and they do not experience angina pain.
- Therapeutic Classification A Patients with cardiac disease whose physical activity is restricted should be evaluated thoroughly.

Comments:___________________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________________________

16. ABDOMEN

17. RECTAL (Men age 40 or over)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MASSES</th>
<th>FISSURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TENDERNESS</td>
<td>FISTULA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HERNIA</td>
<td>HEMORRHOIDS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:___________________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________________________

18. GENITAL-URINARY SYSTEM (note any abnormalities)

Comments:___________________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________________________

19. MUSCULAR - SKELETAL (Test flexibility by bending, stooping, squatting; also by head, arm and finger motions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPINE</th>
<th>TOE TOUCH (distance from floor)</th>
<th>SYMMETRY</th>
<th>POSTURE</th>
<th>X-RAY RECOMMENDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UPPER EXTREMITIES</td>
<td>LIMITED FUNCTION</td>
<td></td>
<td>MISSING PARTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOWER EXTREMITIES</td>
<td>LIMITED FUNCTION</td>
<td></td>
<td>MISSING PARTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. SKIN (Scars, varicosities, disease, abnormalities - nature and severity)

Comments:___________________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________________________
## MEDICAL EXAMINATION FINDINGS

21. [ ] APPLICANT **DOES NOT** MEET VISION ACUITY VISION STANDARD A1  
Comments: ____________________________________________________________  
________________________________________________________________________

22. [ ] APPLICANT **DOES NOT** MEET PERIPHERAL VISION STANDARD A2  
Comments: ____________________________________________________________  
________________________________________________________________________

23. [ ] APPLICANT **DOES NOT** MEET DEPTH PERCEPTION VISION STANDARD A3  
Comments: ____________________________________________________________  
________________________________________________________________________

24. [ ] APPLICANT **DOES NOT** MEET NIGHT VISION STANDARD A4  
Comments: ____________________________________________________________  
________________________________________________________________________

25. [ ] APPLICANT **DOES NOT** MEET COLOR VISION STANDARD A5  
Comments: ____________________________________________________________  
________________________________________________________________________

26. [ ] APPLICANT **DOES NOT** MEET HEARING ABILITY STANDARD B1  
Comments: ____________________________________________________________  
________________________________________________________________________

27. [ ] APPLICANT **DOES NOT** MEET SPEAKING ABILITY STANDARD C1  
Comments: ____________________________________________________________  
________________________________________________________________________

28. [ ] APPLICANT **DOES NOT** MEET BREATHING AND PROPER FITTING STANDARD C2  
Comments: ____________________________________________________________  
________________________________________________________________________

29. [ ] APPLICANT **DOES NOT** MEET CARDIOVASCULAR STANDARD D1  
Comments: ____________________________________________________________  
________________________________________________________________________

30. Are there any conditions; *physical, mental or emotional* - which, in your medical opinion, suggest further examination?  
  [ ] Yes (explain below)  [ ] No  
31. Does this Applicant have any *physical* condition that prevents performing the essential functions/tasks of the job?  
  [ ] Yes (explain below)  [ ] No  

32. **Summary/comments/special instructions**  
________________________________________________________________________  
________________________________________________________________________  
________________________________________________________________________  
________________________________________________________________________

33. **PHYSICIAN'S SIGNATURE**  
34. **NAME AND ADDRESS OF PHYSICIAN** (print or type)  

35. **DATE**
Public Safety Officer Interview Questions

*Rank answers 1-5 (5 being the highest, 1 being the lowest). Add up points and put the total on the top right corner (Total Points).*

1. Tell us what you know about PSU, the role of Public Safety and give us a few examples of what makes your background a good fit with PSU.

   Points: _______  
   Notes:  

2. Within your understanding of the role of a campus public safety officer at PSU, who would you identify as your most important community partners?

   Points: _______  
   Notes:  

3. In one sentence, describe how your last/current supervisor would describe you.

   Points: _______  
   Notes:  

4. What would you identify as significant challenges for today's university students?

   Points: _______  
   Notes:  

5. (Follow-up) How would you view the role of a campus public safety officer in addressing these challenges?

   Points: _______  
   Notes:  

6. Please describe what diversity means to you and what value it has in the workplace.

   Points: _______  
   Notes:  

7. What would you hope to get out of a position here at Portland State University’s Public Safety?

   Points: _______  
   Notes:  

8. Give an example of a problem you solved, the process you used and what would you do differently?

   Points: _______  
   Notes:  

9. Give an example of your experience in Community Oriented Policing.

   Points: _______  
   Notes:  
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LEARNING GOALS and OBJECTIVES

**A Resilience Plan for Law Enforcement – 10 hrs**
To provide the students with exposure to the concept of emotionally surviving the career of law enforcement by way of resiliency.

- 204.001 Identify how officers are affected by hyper-vigilance and the emotional demands of the law enforcement profession.
- 204.002 Identify appropriate responses to the emotional demands of the law enforcement profession.
- 204.006 Define resilience and understand its’ relevance post-incident.

**Alcohol, Controlled Substances Offenses – 2 hrs**
To develop the ability to recognize alcohol and controlled substances offenses as defined by the Oregon Criminal Code.

- 101.001 Identify and distinguish alcohol offenses using the Oregon Criminal Code Book.

**Bombs and Explosives – 4 hrs**
To develop officer awareness and understanding of the techniques used to correctly identify and respond appropriately to various types of explosive devices. Develop officer understanding of the proper procedures for responding to bombings and bomb threat incidents.

- 301.001 Identify the officer’s priorities in responding to the scene of an explosion or possible threat of explosion.
- 301.002 Identify the officer’s role in investigating a bomb threat.
- 301.003 Identify and distinguish the common types of Improvised Explosive Devices (IEDs).
Building Searches – 8 hrs
To develop the ability of an officer to safely and intelligently perform in a variety of high-risk situations through the use of tactical movements and concepts applied after proper analysis of the problem areas and threats and the effective utilization of available resources.

- **501.001** Demonstrate proper technique for assessing interior and exterior problems.
- **501.002** Demonstrate search strategy concepts.
- **501.003** Demonstrate proper techniques for entering and clearing an area.
- **501.004** Demonstrate proper techniques for apprehension and control of suspects in the building search process.
- **501.005** Demonstrate understanding of building search concepts during participation in scenario-based exercises.

Civil Liability and Civil Rights Violations – 4 hrs
To develop students’ knowledge of police actions that could expose them to civil liability and that may constitute civil rights violations. To suggest things officers can do to reduce the civil liability risks associated with their jobs.

- **102.001** Identify the legal authorities for civil liability and civil rights claims against law enforcement officers and differences in potential penalties.
- **102.002** Identify steps that law enforcement officers/agencies can take to reduce exposure to civil liability.
- **102.003** Identify the two-part test for qualified immunity as determined by the courts.

Communicable Diseases/Bloodborne Pathogens – 2 hrs
To know which communicable diseases officers are most likely to face in the line of duty, how they spread from one person to another, and how to prevent exposure to them. To know how to protect oneself from contracting diseases. To know the officer’s legal responsibilities related to diseases.

- **302.001** Identify the various risk factors from blood borne pathogens.
- **302.002** Identify specific strategies for mitigating exposure to blood borne pathogens.
- **302.003** Identify the basic principles of legal protections for individuals with HIV.
- **302.004** Identify the similarities and transmission of blood borne pathogens.

Community Policing and Problem Solving – 6 hrs
To develop an understanding of the principles and practice of modern community policing, and to encourage the adoption of community policing as professional and personal philosophy.

- **201.001** Identify policing strategies with the community.
- **201.002** Identify the process of structured problem solving.
Confrontational Simulation – 16 hrs
To develop the officer’s knowledge and understanding of the critical role of personal communication, confrontation and conflict management skills. To develop critical verbal and physical skills for managing confrontations, including the appropriate use of physical force options.

901.001 Demonstrate the effective use of authority, command presence, verbalization and physical confrontation tactics in order to control conflict situations safely and professionally.

Controlled Substances Investigations – 4hrs
To develop a broad understanding of the history of drug abuse in America and develop the knowledge to identify drugs, narcotics and signs of their abuse.

401.001 Identify proper technique for identifying dangerous drugs and their abuse.
401.002 Identify principles of effective drug investigations.
401.003 Identify elements of field drug tests.

Crash Investigations – 16 hrs
To develop an understanding of the uniform officer’s role in traffic investigations, and the knowledge and skills necessary to process the crash scene, protect life and property and write a report of the investigation.

402.001 Identify principles of motor vehicle crash prevention/investigation.
402.002 Demonstrate the ability to perform the basic skills required at a crash scene investigation.

Criminal Investigations – 8 hrs
To develop an understanding of the uniformed officer’s role in a major crime scene investigation, and the knowledge and skills necessary to process the scene, and report the investigation. To develop an understanding of the fundamentals of police report writing and to develop the knowledge and skills necessary to write an acceptable police report. To develop the knowledge and skills necessary to properly process latent fingerprints photographs, and evidence recognition.

403.001 Identify assistance and coordination functions at the crime scene.
403.002 Identify crime scene search techniques.
403.003 Identify principles and methods of managing crime scene evidence.
403.004 Identify processes to effectively manage a fatality-involved crime scene.

Critical Incident Stress Awareness – 2.5 hrs
To develop an understanding and awareness for dealing with critical incident induced stress both individually and with other officers experiencing it. To understand the community’s role in critical incident dynamics and to implement problem solving strategies.

202.001 Identify basic principles of critical incident stress.
202.002 Identify how to appropriately manage and respond to critical incident stress.
Cultural Awareness and Diversity – 8 hrs
To develop an awareness of cultural/interpersonal issues, which dictate the predominant values, attitudes, beliefs, and outlooks among multi-cultural environments.

203.001 Identify critical aspects of cultural diversity awareness.

Defensive Tactics – 40 hrs
To develop the knowledge and skills necessary to use the reasonable amount of force necessary to make an arrest, overcome a person resisting arrest and to defend oneself from an armed or unarmed attacker. To safely control suspects and maximize protection of the public and officers. Physical fitness and continuing practice are emphasized.

502.001 Demonstrate the ability to effectively defend from a physical attack and/or immediate physical threat.
502.002 Demonstrate the ability to effectively control and restrain a resisting threat.
502.003 Demonstrate the ability to effectively utilize defensive equipment/tools.
502.004 Demonstrate the ability to effectively utilize tactics/concepts to minimize risk to self, fellow officers, threats and the public.
502.005 Demonstrate ability to implement and articulate appropriate use of force based on the totality of situational circumstances.
502.006 Identify appropriate use of defensive equipment/tools.

Definitions, Introduction to Crimes Against Persons – 3 hrs
To develop the ability to recognize assault, homicide and related offenses as defined by the Oregon Criminal Code, including necessary definitions.

103.001 Identify and distinguish assault, homicide and related offenses using the Oregon Criminal Code Book.
103.002 Identify and distinguish the definitions for assault, homicide and those related offenses according to Oregon Criminal Code.

DMV Hearings – 2 hrs
To understand the role of a peace officer in an implied consent hearing. To develop an understanding of statutory law and case law which applies to these hearings.

118-001 Identify the statutory authority for peace officers in implied consent hearings to present evidence, examine witness and make arguments.

Domestic Violence – 12 hrs
To expose participants to varying perspectives and dynamics of domestic violence within a community philosophy and to provide options to resolve the immediate violence, assure officer safety and develop strategies to resolve conflict.

404.001 Identify basic principles of investigating domestic violence.
404.002 Identify laws, regulations, and rules regarding domestic violence.
404.003 Identify requirements for mandatory arrest in domestic violence situations.
Elder Abuse Investigations – 4 hrs
To gain the knowledge necessary to effectively conduct elder abuse investigations. To understand the specific guidelines for properly investigation allegations of elder abuse.

405.001 Identify the principles of elder abuse investigation.

Emergency Vehicle Operations – 36 hrs
To develop the officer’s knowledge and understanding relating to the safe, effective and responsible operation of a patrol vehicle during routine and emergency conditions. To develop the officer’s knowledge of the concepts of vehicle control in all conditions and decision making during routine and emergency driving. To develop the officer’s practical skills, techniques and abilities necessary to operate a patrol vehicle under routine and emergency situations.

503.001 Identify basic police vehicle operational considerations.
503.002 Identify principles of vehicle dynamics and control.
503.003 Demonstrate driving skills.
503.004 Demonstrate emergency driving skills.

Ethics and Professionalism – 10 hrs
This training is designed to help officers understand the importance of acting professional and to understand the correlation between acting professionally and making their jobs and lives easier.

205.001 Identify the basic principles of ethical police work.

Federal Weapons Possession – 1 hr
To familiarize basic police students with federal firearm laws and processes.

105.001 Identify federal criminal statutes pertaining to federal weapons possession investigations and prosecutions.

Firearms – 44 hrs
To understand the use, limitations and techniques of the service handgun and shotgun, and to develop knowledge and skills in firearms safety, proper gun handling, marksmanship and tactics.

504.001 Identify the basic issues governing the use of firearms
504.002 Identify administrative issues governing the use of firearms
504.003 Demonstrate appropriate use of firearms

Forensics – 4 hrs
To develop an understanding of the uniformed officer’s role in a crime scene investigation and the knowledge and skills necessary to process the scene and report the investigation. To develop an understanding of the fundamentals of police report writing and to develop the knowledge and skills necessary to write an acceptable police report. To develop the knowledge and skills necessary to properly process latent fingerprints, photographs and evidence recognition.

406.001 Identify proper techniques for identifying, collecting, and securing physical evidence.
406.002 Demonstrate proper techniques for identifying, collecting, and securing physical evidence.
Gang Awareness – 8 hrs
To develop the officer’s basic understanding and awareness of gangs as a law enforcement issue, recognition of overt indicators of gang activities and membership and the specific responsibilities and accountabilities for police officers.

- 304.001 Identify the dynamics of a gang.
- 304.002 Identify standard procedures for investigating and managing gangs.
- 304.003 Identify common gangs and their impact on law enforcement.

Harassment – 2 hrs
To understand the attitudes, conditions and/or actions that creates a hostile work environment and sexual harassment in the workplace. To develop the necessary knowledge to prevent sexual harassment in the workplace and/or a hostile work environment.

- 106.001 Demonstrate understanding of the requirements of all employees under anti-harassment laws, rules and policies.

Health and Fitness / ORPAT – 34.5 hrs
To develop a positive attitude toward fitness and to understand the relationship between physical fitness, productivity, health, and safety.

- 505.001 Identify basic health and physical fitness issues.
- 505.002 Demonstrate ability to complete the ORPAT (Oregon Physical Abilities Test).

History of Law Policing-Professionalism – 2 hrs.
To develop an understanding of the evolution of American policing and what Professional Policing means in today’s environment.

- 209.001 Upon completion of instruction, students will be able to explain how policing evolved in America into the current model.
- 209.002 Upon completion of instruction, students will be able to describe what it means to be a professional police officer

Homicide – 3 hrs
To develop the ability to recognize criminal homicide offenses as defined by the Oregon Criminal Code

- 107.001 Identify and distinguish criminal homicide offenses using the Oregon Criminal Code.

Interview and Interrogation – 7.5 hrs
To develop an understanding of the components of an interview and an interrogation. To develop an awareness of the physical, psychological and environmental factors which affect an interview or an interrogation and how a proper interview or interrogation plays a critical role in a criminal investigation.

- 407.001 Identify basic interrogation and interviewing techniques.

Intoxilyzer 8000 – 8 hrs
To develop an understanding and the operation of the instrument used to measure the breath alcohol levels of individuals who may be impaired in DUII investigations.

Canned Program – tested separately
Introduction to the Criminal Justice System – 4 hrs
To develop a basic understanding of the criminal justice system, the relationships among its components, and of general criminal code concepts and definitions.

108.001 Identify the criminal justice system process including jurisdictional issues.
108.002 Identify general criminal code definitions, including inchoate crimes, criminal liability and classes of offenses.
108.003 Identify sources of law.

Investigative Report Writing and Note Taking – 14 hrs
To develop the necessary report writing skills to effectively document the information discovered and received during a criminal investigation. To understand the proper procedures for preparing a police report for criminal prosecution.

306.001 Identify the principles of report writing and note taking.
306.002 Demonstrate the ability to correctly construct sample reports, notes, documents, given the necessary information.

Juvenile Law – 4 hrs
To develop an understanding of Oregon's juvenile court laws, which affect the way the police deal with the juvenile offender.

109.001 Identify legal definitions and distinctions in juvenile cases.
109.002 Identify proper policy and procedure in juvenile cases.

Less Lethal Options and Concepts – 8 hrs
To give students a general understanding of less-lethal options and what needs to be done when a less-lethal option is on scene. To give students a general understanding of post-incident requirements.

506.001 Identify incidents that may require the use of a less-lethal force option.
506.002 Identify limitations of less-lethal force options.
506.003 Identify proper procedures for the delivery of OC.
506.004 Identify post-incident requirements following the deploying of a less-lethal force option.
506.005 Demonstrate tactical delivery of a handheld OC restraint

MDT Child Abuse Investigations – 8 hrs
To gain the knowledge to effectively investigate allegations of child abuse. To gain the knowledge to effectively interface with the Department of Human Services – Child Protective Services and the District Attorney’s Office during a child abuse investigation.

408.001 Identify principles of child abuse investigation.
408.002 Identify how to assess child abuse situations and respond appropriately.

Mental Health and Disabilities – 15 hrs
To develop the ability to recognize and resolve situations involving clients who are mentally ill and other citizens with disabilities.

206.001 Identify common mental illnesses and other disabilities in a law enforcement context.
206.002 Identify basic information regarding suicide and appropriate law enforcement responses.
Mental Health/Veteran’s – 2 hrs
Unit Goals
The purpose of this class is to:
   1) Provide new officers the necessary resources to be successful when
      contacting a veteran in crisis.
   2) Expose new officers to the challenges faced by veteran’s when re-integrating
      into civilian life.
Learning Outcomes
Upon completion of this course, new officers will be able to:
   210.001 Identify resources that will aid them when in contact with a veteran in
      crisis.
   210.002 Recognize significant stressors faced by soldiers and veterans.
   210.003 Articulate strategies to minimize conflict when dealing with a veteran in
      crisis.

Mental Health/Veteran’s Awareness – 1 hr
Unit Goals
The purpose of this class is to:
   1) Introduce new officers to signs that may indicate that the officer is in contact
      with a veteran in crisis.
   2) Provide techniques and resources to prevent a situation involving a veteran in
      crisis from escalating.
Learning Outcomes
Upon completion of this course, new officers will be able to:
   211.001 – Identify signs that may indicate that an officer may be dealing with a
      veteran in crisis.
   211.002 – Identify techniques and resources that may aid in dealing with a
      veteran in crisis.

Missing and Abducted Children – 2 hrs
To provide an introduction to investigating missing and abducted children. To
understand the specialized investigative techniques and services available to aid in
successful child recovery.
   409.001 Identify laws and regulations applicable to missing and abducted
      children.
   409.002 Identify procedures and resources for investigating missing and
      abducted children.

Mock Trials – 12 hrs
To understand the role of a peace officer in violation trials, jury trials and other criminal
and civil proceedings. To develop an understanding of the purpose of cross-
examination and how to deal with courtroom tactics.
   902.001 Demonstrate ability to prepare for and/or participate in mock-trial
      simulation.
MVC and Traffic Law Enforcement – 7.5 hrs
To develop the necessary working knowledge and understanding of the Oregon Traffic Code. To recognize traffic violations and/or crimes police enforce, their elements and classifications.

- 307.001 Identify officer authority in traffic law enforcement.
- 307.002 Identify the responsibilities and requirements of motor vehicle drivers.
- 307.003 Identify motor vehicle violations and crimes.
- 307.004 Identify legal requirements in the enforcement of traffic law.

Offenses against Property – 4 hrs
To develop the ability to recognize offenses against property as defined by the Oregon Criminal Code.

- 110.001 Identify and distinguish arson and related offenses using the Oregon Criminal Code Book.
- 110.002 Identify and distinguish criminal mischief offenses using the Oregon Criminal Code Book.
- 110.003 Identify and distinguish criminal trespass and burglary offenses using the Oregon Criminal Code Book.
- 110.004 Identify and distinguish robbery offenses using the Oregon Criminal Code Book.

Offenses Against State, Public Health and Animals – 4 hrs
To develop the ability to recognize state, public health and animal offenses as defined by the Oregon Criminal Code.

- 111.001 Identify and distinguish escape offenses using the Oregon Criminal Code.
- 111.002 Identify and distinguish obstructing governmental administration and related offenses using the Oregon Criminal Code.
- 111.003 Identify and distinguish offenses against animals using the Oregon Criminal Code.

Officer in Court – 3 hrs
To understand the role of the witness in court and the importance of preparation. To develop confidence and professional demeanor necessary to testify during a court proceeding.

- 112.001 Identify specific skills in preparing for and testifying in a court of law.

Oregon Liquor Control Commission Investigations – 2 hrs
To develop a basic understanding of the role the Oregon Liquor Control Commission (OLCC) has in assisting law enforcement officers in enforcement of Liquor Law and Administrative Rules.

- 410.001 Identify functions and roles of the OLCC and their relationship to law enforcement.
- 410.002 Identify various OLCC law enforcement issues
Patrol Procedures – 12 hrs
To develop the knowledge and understanding of the procedures, methods, and purposes of patrol. To develop an awareness of how the patrol function fits into the overall mission of a law enforcement agency and how to safely respond to crimes in progress or suspicious and potentially dangerous situations.

308.001 Identify common patrol processes and techniques.
308.002 Identify usage of commonly employed patrol equipment and tools.
308.003 Identify conceptual tactics that serve to improve officer and public safety.
308.004 Identify physiological responses to critical incidents and ways to lessen the effect on officer performance.
308.005 Identify commonly used manipulative behaviors and techniques for mitigating situational impact.

Patrol Shift – 32 hrs
To develop the officer’s ability to multi-task in a complex, real-world patrol environment while utilizing problem-solving and decision-making skills. To provide exposure to numerous calls for service that range from routine to high intensity, low frequency critical incidents.

Procedural Law – 11.5 hrs
To develop an understanding of the rules, restrictions and guidelines established by Oregon Revised Statutes, and/or appellate courts which control a police officer’s authority to arrest, search and seize property, obtain statements and confessions, and to present evidence in a court of law.

113.001 Identify the scope and application of the Miranda decision (state and federal application – case law).
113.002 Identify applicable search and seizure rules and procedures.
113.003 Identify general procedural requirements for citations, arrests, probable cause statements and other procedural activities.

Procedural Law Review-2 hrs
To review, in a scenario-based format, the rules, restrictions and guidelines established by the Oregon Revised Statutes, and/or appellate courts, which control a police officer’s authority to contact, detain and arrest persons, seize and search property, obtain statements, and engage in other procedural law-related activities.

Range 3000 – 8 hrs
To develop the officer’s knowledge and understanding of the critical role of personal communication and confrontation and conflict management skills. To develop critical verbal and physical force for managing confrontations, including the appropriate use of physical force options.

507.001 Demonstrate the ability to specifically articulate the concept of totality of circumstances and how this idea affects officer judgment and decision-making in use of force situations.
507.002 Demonstrate effective use of authority and command presence to control conflict situations.
507.003 Demonstrate effective physical confrontation skills and tactics.
507.004 Demonstrate appropriate verbal and non-verbal conflict management / reduction skills.

Scenarios – 40 hours

To provide a “building-block” approach to learning where officers are allowed to concentrate on specific training area in “field” settings and to develop the officer’s practical field application of academic knowledge and skills through the response to a variety of scenarios.

Sex Crimes, Family Offenses and Related Crimes – 4 hrs

To develop the ability to recognize sex offenses, family offenses and related crimes, as defined by the Oregon Criminal Code.

114.001 Identify and distinguish sexual offenses using the Oregon Criminal Code.
114.002 Identify and distinguish offenses against the family using the Oregon Criminal Code.
114.003 Identify and distinguish kidnapping and related offenses using the Oregon Criminal Code.

Sexual Assault Investigations – 8 hrs

To gain the knowledge necessary to effectively investigate allegations of sexual assault. To understand the specialized investigative techniques necessary to perform a sexual assault investigation.

411.001 Identify various types of sexual assaults and the laws and regulations governing their investigation.
411.002 Identify investigation and evidence collection and protection techniques required for sexual assault cases.
411.003 Identify sexual assault victim issues including the role of various department and community resources.

SFST and DID - 20 hrs

To increase deterrence of DWI violations, and thereby reduce the number of crashes, deaths and injuries caused by impaired drivers.

Canned Program – tested separately

Solo Officer Response - 8 hours

To develop an officer’s ability to respond to a variety of calls that initially require individual assessment of the scene and action to contain or control the problem prior to the arrival of back-up. These scenarios are grounded in the fact that many calls start with a single officer (regardless of agency size) and back-up is dependent upon the agency and/or region.

Tactical Communication and Defusing Hostility – 8 hrs

To develop the interpersonal communication skills necessary to communicate effectively with emotional, angry and/or hostile citizens, and to develop the communication techniques necessary to defuse and de-escalate crisis situations.

208.001 Identify methods to reduce or eliminate defensive and hostile responses in public interactions.
Tactical Safety Briefing-1 hrs
To develop awareness to safety concerns related to scenario based training.

Theft, Offenses involving Fraud and Deception – 4 hrs
To develop the ability to recognize theft and offenses involving fraud or deception, as defined by the Oregon Criminal Code.

- 115.001 Identify and distinguish theft and related offenses using the Oregon Criminal Code Book.
- 115.002 Identify and distinguish offenses involving fraud or deception using the Oregon Criminal Code Book.
- 115.003 Identify procedures for investigating identity theft.

Unattended Death Investigations – 8 hrs
To develop an understanding of the uniformed officer’s role in a death investigation as controlled by ORS 146 and the Oregon State Medical Examiner’s Office. To develop knowledge necessary to identify the types of deaths which fall under the jurisdiction of the Medical Examiner.

- 412.001 Identify the categorization and investigation of different types of deaths.
- 412.002 Identify the roles and responsibilities of various professionals in death investigations.

Use of Force Law and Application – 12 hrs
To develop student recognition of the interrelatedness between statutory law, case law and defensive tactics skills as these pertain to lawful public safety use of force.

- 116.001 Identify the application of relevant use of force statutes.
- 116.002 Identify federal and state case law relevant to the use of force, applicable to ORS.
- 116.003 Identify the principles of the use of force by police officers.

Vehicle Stops – 24 hrs
To develop the officer’s understanding, knowledge and skills relating to unknown-risk and high-risk vehicle stops. To develop the officer’s ability to assess conditions and respond appropriately to maintain personal and public safety. To minimize potential liability and public concern by using accepted vehicle stops practices.

- 508.001 Identify principle aspects of vehicle stops.
- 508.002 Demonstrate critical tactical concepts associated with vehicle stops.
- 508.003 Demonstrate fundamental skills of conducting vehicle stops.

Weapons, Public Order Offenses – 2 hrs
To develop the ability to recognize weapons and public order offenses as defined by the Oregon Criminal Code.

- 117.001 Identify and distinguish disorderly conduct, harassment and related offenses using the Oregon Criminal Code Book.
- 117.002 Identify and distinguish firearms and weapons offenses using the Oregon Criminal Code Book.
- 117.003 Identify and distinguish intimidation offenses using the Oregon Criminal Code Book.
- 117.004 Identify legal requirements for law enforcement agencies to report bias-related crimes to the state.
Weapons of Mass Destruction – 6 hrs
This module provides students with an opportunity to demonstrate current awareness of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD).

Canned Program – tested separately
Appendix H

I will never act officiously or permit personal feelings, prejudices, animosities or friendships to influence my decisions. Without compromise and with relentlessness, I will uphold the laws affecting the duties of my profession courteously and appropriately without fear or favor, malice or ill will, never employing unnecessary force or violence, and never accepting gratuities.

I recognize my position as a symbol of public faith, and I accept it, as a public trust to be held so long as I am true to the ethics of The Criminal Justice System. I will constantly strive to achieve these objectives and ideals, dedication myself before God to my chosen profession.

COMMUNITY POLICING

Community policing recognizes a shared responsibility and connection between the police and community in making PSU a safer, more livable community. Community policing encourages a problem solving partnership between citizens and police. This partnership jointly identifies community safety issues, determines resources, and applies innovative strategies designed to create and sustain healthy, vital communities.

Recruit officers will need to understand the community policing approach to law enforcement. Officers are responsible to identify problems in the PSU community, to establish a plan of action to attempt to resolve the problem, to facilitate, when needed, the use of other support groups within or outside the PSUPD, and to take action according to the plan. The plan can be as simple as confirming that a campus crime problem exists and referring it to a unit or division of the Portland Police Bureau, such as a Neighbor Response Team. Recruit officers are always accountable for keeping community members informed of the progress or outcome of investigations or action plans affecting them or their neighborhoods.

You, the recruit officer, will adopt a positive approach to enforcement, accept the responsibilities of law enforcement and take positive and aggressive action when the need arises. You will be reasonable in every interaction with the community. You will demonstrate an equal emphasis on being service and enforcement oriented. You will provide supportive, professional service to the community and to other PSUPD members by promoting human rights, mutual respect and courtesy. You will work in partnership with the community, City of Portland Bureaus, service agencies and the criminal justice system. You will promote community member responsibility and involvement and use problem solving methods to reduce the incidence and fear of crime in the community.

You will understand and support the PSUPD mission:

The Portland State University Police Department, in partnership with the campus community, and within the framework of the University's mission, is dedicated to creating and promoting a safe, secure and peaceful environment by effectively applying policies and laws, delivering emergency services, performing requests for assistance, and providing ongoing public safety education.

You will recognize the Portland State University Police Department is committed to supporting a campus community with a commitment to diversity and inclusion, where cultural differences are appreciated and embraced. That part of our mission is ensuring a safe environment that promotes partnership with all PSU community members, fostering an inclusive and culturally respectful exchange, in every personal and professional encounter.
• Courteous and professional conversations during contact
• Correct and safe disengagement

Date / FTO          Date / RO

1.1.34a Recruit Officer is able to explain Multnomah County procedures for handling traffic citations and has developed strategies to deal with some common emotions demonstrated by violators, to include:

• Embarrassment
• Fear
• Anger
• Rationalization

Date / FTO          Date / RO

1.1.35 Recruit Officer demonstrates safe approach to the following vehicle types:

• Trucks and buses
• Bicycles and motorcycles
• Motorhomes and vans

Date / FTO          Date / RO

1.1.35 Recruit Officer is comfortable in locating the VIN on most vehicles encountered at PSU.

Date / FTO          Date / RO

1.1.35 Recruit Officer understands the importance of hearing and understanding all police radio traffic, to include when the recruit is engaged in activities.

Date / FTO          Date / RO

1.1.36 Recruit Officer understands the importance of adhering to Policy 402 Racial/Bias Based Profiling.

Date / FTO          Date / RO

1.1.37 Recruit Officer has worked one (1) ride-a-long with dispatch.

Date / FTO          Date / RO
• 161.267 Use of physical force by a corrections officer or official employed by the DOC

Date / FTO    Date / RO

1.1.42 Recruit Officer has received and understands the current PSU Building Hours, and is able to perform the required locks and unlocks.

Date / FTO    Date / RO

1.1.43 Recruit Officer understands and demonstrates adherence to Policy 409 Alarm / Fire Response, as applicable to non-fire audible and silent alarms, to include:

• Invisible deployment considerations
• Phone call only when in position
• RP contact outside
• Coordination with dispatch and perimeter officers
• Housing specific notifications and cooperation

Date / FTO    Date / RO

1.1.44 Recruit Officer is able to identify and locate global diversity and inclusion resources available to the PSU Community. The FTO and Recruit Officer will check-off those resource locations they visited or made contact with, to include at least:

☐ Dean of Student Life Office
☐ Disabilities Resource Center
☐ Diversity and Multicultural Student Services
☐ International Student Services
☐ La Casa Latina
☐ Multicultural Center
☐ Native American Student and Community Center
☐ Queer Resource Center
☐ Student Legal Services
☐ Veteran’s Services
☐ Women’s Resource Center

Date / FTO    Date / RO

1.1.45 Recruit Officer and FTO have reviewed Policy 328 Discriminatory Harassment and the Recruit Officer understands the strict adherence to this policy, expected as a member of the Portland State University Police Department and the PSU Community.

Date / FTO    Date / RO
- Uses invisible deployment when responding to calls for service

1.3.2 Recruit Officer will demonstrate their understanding of the dispatching procedures utilized by the PSUPD.

1.3.3 Recruit Officer is able to operate the controls of the car and portable radios as required for effective and safe communications.

1.3.4 Recruit Officer correctly uses the most common radio, disposition and sensitive incident codes.

1.3.5 Recruit Officer is able to identify own unit number, cover officers/partners, and those of neighboring PPB districts.

1.3.6 Recruit Officer demonstrates proper radio procedures with clear, concise and complete transmissions that are audible and understandable to the dispatcher and other units without conveying unnecessary emotions or stress.

1.3.7 Recruit Officer demonstrates effective communication skills with the public that enhances PSUPD service, fostering increased community involvement and satisfaction.

1.3.8 Recruit Officer is able to communicate without the use of profanity, derogatory language, inappropriate cultural response, or ethnic slurs and conforms to the requirements of Policy 1060 Employee Speech, Expression and Social Networking.
1.3.25 Recruit Officer understands there are non-verbal factors that could contribute to a negative response from the public, including:

- Officious and disrespectful attitude
- Improper use of body language
- Improper cultural response

1.3.26 Recruit Officer is able to safely approach and contact persons with regard to the following:

- Time, location and environmental concerns
- Watching and controlling the hands
- Applicable cover circumstances
- Prior pertinent information
- Mere conversation considerations
- Stop and frisk considerations (131.615 and 131.625)
- Required documentation

1.3.27 Recruit Officer is able to articulate the dangers of making contacts while seated in the patrol car.

1.3.28 Recruit Officer safely demonstrates contacting persons under the following conditions:

- Walking same direction on same side of street
- Walking same direction on opposite side of street
- Walking opposite direction on same side of street
- Walking opposite direction on opposite side of street

1.3.29 Recruit Officer is able to articulate the differences between mental health disorders and intellectual disabilities, understanding some pitfalls during an interview, including admitting guilt for a crime not committed or providing information in order to please the officer.
Portland State University Campus Public Safety Office

Racial Bias Based Profiling

402.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE
The Portland State University-Campus Public Safety Office strives to provide law enforcement to our community with due regard to the racial and cultural differences of those we serve. It shall therefore be the policy and practice of this department to provide law enforcement services and to enforce the law equally and fairly without discrimination toward any individual(s) or group because of their race, ethnicity or nationality, religion, gender, sexual orientation or disability.

402.2 DEFINITION
Racial/Bias based Profiling - is the practice of stopping or detaining any individual(s) based solely upon the individual(s)' membership in a protected class of people without any individualized suspicion of the person being stopped.

402.3 POLICY
The practice of racial/bias based profiling is illegal and will not be tolerated by this department (Oregon Revised Statutes 810.410).

a) It is the responsibility of every member of this department to prevent, report, and respond appropriately to clear discriminatory or biased practices.

b) Every member of this department engaging in a non-consensual detention shall be prepared to articulate sufficient reasonable suspicion to justify the detention independent of the individual's membership in a protected class.

1. To the extent that written documentation would otherwise be completed (e.g., arrest report, F.I. card, etc.), the involved officer should include those facts giving rise to the officer's reasonable suspicion or probable cause for the contact.

2. Nothing in this policy shall require any officer to prepare documentation of a contact that would not otherwise involve such reporting.

3. While the practice of racial profiling is strictly prohibited, it is recognized that race or ethnicity may be legitimately considered by an officer in combination with other legitimate factors to establish reasonable suspicion or probable cause (e.g., suspect description is limited to a specific race or group).

The Portland State University-Campus Public Safety Office will investigate all complaints of alleged racial/bias based profiling complaints against its members. Employees found to be in violation of this policy are subject to discipline in accordance with this department's disciplinary policy.
402.4 TRAINING

a) All sworn members of this department will be scheduled to attend approved training on the subject of racial/bias based profiling.

b) Pending participation in such approved training and at all times, all members of this department are encouraged to familiarize themselves with and consider racial/bias based and cultural differences among members of our community.

c) Each member of this department undergoing initial approved training will thereafter be required to complete an approved refresher course annually or sooner if deemed necessary in order to keep current with changing racial and cultural trends.

402.5 ADMINISTRATION

Each January, the Patrol Lieutenant shall review the Department's effort to prevent racial/bias based profiling and submit an overview, including public concerns, to the Director of Public Safety. This overview shall not contain any identifying information regarding any specific complaint, citizen, or officer.
1. Disregard any reporting fields relating to department personnel/members or department identification numbers.

2. Please print your name, home address and telephone number in the fields identified as “complainant”.

3. Print the names, home addresses and telephone numbers in the fields identified as “complainant” witnesses.

4. Print a detailed narrative of what occurred to precipitate the complaint and be certain to include the date of the incident, precise location where the incident occurred, identifying information of the officer, badge number and name.

5. Print your name in the complaint affirmation section and provide your signature to the form below the affirmation section.

6. Be sure to attach any supporting information that will assist a representative of the Director of CPSO to contact you (i.e. home telephone, business telephone, cell phone, home address, etc.)
Officer-Citizen Complaint Form

Control Number

Member’s Name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complainant’s Name:</th>
<th>Home Address:</th>
<th>Home Phone:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(          )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Witness or Other Complainant:</th>
<th>Home Address:</th>
<th>Home Phone:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(          )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(          )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date and Time of Incident:</th>
<th>Location of Incident:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Details of the Complaint *(use additional pages if needed)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details Page 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Details Page 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details Page 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMPLAINT AFFIRMATION

I, __________________________, do hereby affirm that the foregoing information is true and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief. I understand that any false, misleading, or untrue statements or writings given to any person(s) investigating this complaint may subject me to civil prosecution by the accused.

I further realize that it may become necessary, during the investigation of this complaint, for me to meet with a member(s) of Portland State University's Campus Public Safety Office to discuss this complaint, either in the presence or absence of the accused department member(s) at the discretion of the department. I hereby accept the premise that if any action is initiated through a court or administrative hearing as a result of my complaint, my testimony at these hearings may be required. I hereby agree to make myself available to any such court or administrative hearing when requested to do so.

Signed __________________________

(First/MI/Last Name)

Name of Accepting Department Member __________________________

(Rank/First/MI/Last Name/Badge #)

Date: __________________________

(Mo/Day/Yr)

Time: __________________________ AM □ PM □
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Received:</th>
<th>Assigned To:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Complaint:</th>
<th>Date Investigation Initiated:</th>
<th>Date Investigated Terminated:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Departmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student, Faculty or Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TO BE COMPLETED BY THE SUPERVISOR

Commanding Officer's Determination/Recommendation: (Check One)

- [ ] Sustained
- [ ] Not Sustained
- [ ] Exonerated
- [ ] Unfounded
- [ ] Misconduct not Based on Original Complaint

Comments:

Signature of Supervisor: ____________________________ Date Forwarded to Director: ____________________________

TO BE COMPLETED BY THE DIRECTOR

Date of Review: ____________________________ Printed Rank & Name of Reviewing Officer: ____________________________

FINAL DISPOSITION (CHECK ONE)

- [ ] No Action Taken
- [ ] Suspension
- [ ] Other
- [ ] Oral Reprimand/Counseling
- [ ] Reduction in Grad/Rank
- [ ] Letter of Reprimand
- [ ] Termination

Comments/Final Recommendations

__________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________
Portland State University Campus Public Safety Office

Personnel Complaint Procedure

1020.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE
The purpose of this procedure is to provide guidelines for reporting, investigation and disposition of complaints regarding the conduct of members and employees of this department.

This policy describes the safeguards that apply when an employee is under investigation concerning a matter that may lead to economic sanctions or dismissal from employment, and when that employee will be interviewed regarding the matter. The policy is meant to ensure that any disciplinary action taken against an employee only occurs with just cause.

1020.1.1 DEFINITIONS
Disciplinary action - An action taken against an employee by the Portland State University-Campus Public Safety Office to punish the employee, including dismissal, demotion, suspension without pay, reduction in salary, written reprimand and transfer (ORS 236.350 (1)).

Employee - Any paid member of the Portland State University-Campus Public Safety Office with a property interest in his/her employment at the Portland State University-Campus Public Safety Office.

Just cause - A cause reasonably related to the employee’s ability to perform required work. The term includes a willful violation of reasonable work rules, regulations or written policies (ORS 236.350 (2)).

Personnel complaint- Any allegation of misconduct or improper job performance against any department employee that, if true, would constitute a violation of department policy, federal, state or local law.

Inquiries about employee conduct which, even if true, would not qualify as a personnel complaint may be handled informally by a department supervisor and shall not be considered complaints.

This policy does not apply when a supervisor questions an employee in the normal course of an informal verbal admonishment or when the supervisor has other routine or unplanned contact with an employee. Nor does this policy apply to an investigation concerned solely with alleged criminal activities.

1020.1.2 CLASSIFYING PERSONNEL COMPLAINTS
Personnel complaints shall be classified in one of the following categories:

Informal - A matter in which the complaining party is satisfied that appropriate action has been taken by a department supervisor of rank greater than the accused employee. Informal complaints need not be documented on a personnel complaint form. The responsible supervisor shall have the discretion to handle the complaint in any manner consistent with this policy.

Formal - A matter in which the complaining party requests further investigation or when a department supervisor determines that further action is warranted. Such complaints may be investigated by a Lieutenant or of rank greater than the accused employee depending on the seriousness and complexity of the investigation.
Incomplete - A matter in which the complaining party either refuses to cooperate or becomes unavailable after diligent follow-up investigation. At the discretion of the assigned supervisor or the Lieutenant, such matters need not be documented as personnel complaints, but may be further investigated depending on the seriousness of the complaint and the availability of sufficient information.

1020.2 AVAILABILITY OF COMPLAINT FORMS AND ACCEPTANCE OF COMPLAINTS

1020.2.1 AVAILABILITY OF COMPLAINT FORMS
Personnel complaint forms will be available through the internet or made available at request from the CPSO office.

1020.2.2 SOURCE OF COMPLAINTS
   a) A department employee who becomes aware of alleged misconduct shall immediately notify a supervisor.
   b) A supervisor receiving a complaint from any source alleging misconduct of an employee which, if true, could result in disciplinary action, should immediately document that complaint and submit it to his/her immediate supervisor.
   c) Anonymous complaints and third-party complaints should be accepted and investigated to the extent that sufficient information is provided.

1020.2.3 ACCEPTANCE OF COMPLAINTS
A complaint may be filed in person, in writing, or by telephoning the Department. Although it is not required, every effort should be made to have the complainant appear in person. The following should be considered before taking a complaint:
   a) Complaints shall not be prepared unless the alleged misconduct or job performance is of a nature which, if true, would normally result in disciplinary action.
   b) A complaint need not be taken when the complainant is satisfied with the explanation, given by an uninvolved supervisor or the Patrol Sergeant, of the department policy or the procedures governing the incident and agrees that no further action is required.
   c) When the complainant is intoxicated to the point where his/her credibility appears to be unreliable. Identifying information should be obtained and the person should be provided with a personnel complaint form.
   d) Depending on the urgency and seriousness of the allegations involved, complaints from juveniles should generally be taken only with the juvenile’s parents or guardians present and after the parents or guardians have been informed of the circumstances prompting the complaint.

1020.2.4 COMPLAINT DOCUMENTATION
Formal complaints of alleged misconduct shall be documented by a supervisor on a personnel complaint form. The supervisor shall ensure that the nature of the complaint is defined as clearly as possible.

A supervisor may elect to document informal complaints as a supervisor or Patrol Sergeant notebook entry.
When a personnel complaint form is completed in person, the complainant should legibly write a detailed narrative of his/her complaint. If circumstances indicate that this is not feasible, the receiving supervisor should document the complaint based upon information received from the complainant. In an effort to ensure accuracy in any complaint, it is recommended that a recorded statement be obtained from the reporting party. However, a refusal by a party to be recorded shall not alone be grounds to refuse to accept a complaint. In all cases, the complainant's signature should be obtained at the conclusion of the statement. The complainant should be provided with a copy of his/her original complaint.

1020.3 SUPERVISOR RESPONSIBILITY

A supervisor who becomes aware of alleged misconduct shall take reasonable steps to prevent aggravation of the situation. Supervisors shall also maintain the ability to engage in the interrogation of an employee in the normal course of duty, counseling, instruction, informal verbal admonishment or other routine or unplanned contact.

In general, the primary responsibility for the investigation of a personnel complaint shall rest with the employee's immediate Supervisor. The Director of Public Safety or authorized designee may, however, direct that another supervisor investigate. That supervisor shall be responsible for the following:

(a) A supervisor receiving a formal complaint involving allegations of a potentially serious nature shall ensure that the Lieutenant and Director of Public Safety are notified as soon as practicable.

(b) A supervisor receiving or initiating any formal complaint shall ensure that a personnel complaint form has been completed as fully as possible. The original complaint form will then be directed to the Lieutenant for further action.

1. During the preliminary investigation of any complaint, the supervisor should make every reasonable effort to obtain names, addresses and telephone numbers of additional witnesses.

2. Photographs of any injuries alleged by the complainant, as well as accessible areas of non-injury, should be taken once immediate medical attention has been provided.

3. In circumstances where the integrity of the investigation could be jeopardized by reducing the complaint to writing or where the confidentiality of a complainant is at issue, a supervisor shall orally report the matter to the employee's Lieutenant or the Director of Public Safety who will initiate appropriate action.

(c) A supervisor dealing with an accused employee shall ensure that the procedural rights of the employee are followed.

(d) When the nature of a personnel complaint relates to sexual, racial, ethnic, or other forms of prohibited harassment or discrimination, the supervisor receiving the complaint shall promptly contact the Department of Human Resources and the Director of Public Safety for direction regarding the investigation and/or addressing the complaint.

1020.4 ASSIGNMENT TO ADMINISTRATIVE LEAVE

When a complaint of misconduct is of a serious nature or when the circumstances reasonably dictate an undue risk for the Department, the employee, other employees or the public, a supervisor with consultation with Human Resources, may assign the accused employee to inactive duty pending completion of the investigation or the filing of administrative charges.
1020.4.1 ADMINISTRATIVE LEAVE

An employee placed on administrative leave may be subject to the following guidelines:

a) The employee shall continue to receive regular pay and benefits, pending the imposition of any discipline.

b) An employee may be required by a supervisor to relinquish any badge, department identification, assigned weapon(s) and any other department equipment.

c) An employee may be ordered to refrain from taking any action as a department employee or in an official capacity. The employee shall be required to continue to comply with all policies and lawful orders of a supervisor.

d) An employee may be temporarily reassigned to a different shift (generally normal business hours) during the pendency of the investigation. The employee may be required to remain available for contact at all times during such shift and report as ordered.

e) It shall be the responsibility of the assigning supervisor to promptly notify the employee's Lieutenant and the Director of Public Safety.

f) At such time as any employee placed on administrative leave is returned to full and regular duty, the employee shall be returned to his/her regularly assigned shift with all badges, identification card and other equipment returned.

1020.5 ALLEGATIONS OF CRIMINAL CONDUCT

When an employee of this department is accused of potential criminal conduct, a separate supervisor or detective shall be assigned to investigate the criminal allegations apart from any administrative investigation. Any separate administrative investigation may parallel a criminal investigation.

The Director of Public Safety shall be notified as soon as practical when an employee is formally accused of criminal conduct. In the event of serious criminal allegations, the Director of Public Safety may request a criminal investigation by an outside law enforcement agency.

An employee accused of criminal conduct shall retain all of the rights and privileges afforded a civilian. The employee may not be administratively ordered to provide any information to a criminal detective.

1020.6 ADMINISTRATIVE INVESTIGATION OF COMPLAINT

Except as necessary to gain a general overview and sufficient facts of an incident to assess the necessity of an inquiry, or in order to obtain pertinent public safety information, an officer shall not be required to answer questions until he/she has been told of the facts and the nature of the investigation in a manner that is reasonably sufficient to inform the officer of the circumstances surrounding the allegations.

Whether conducted by a supervisor or an assigned member of the Lieutenant, the following procedures and those set forth in ORS 236.360 shall be followed with regard to the accused employee(s):

a) Unless the seriousness of an investigation requires otherwise, interviews of accused employees shall be conducted when the employee is on-duty or during the employee's normal waking hours. If the interview is conducted while the employee is off-duty, the employee shall be appropriately compensated (ORS 236.360(2)(a)).

b) No more than two interviewers at a time may ask questions of an accused employee (ORS 236.360(2)(c)).
c) Interviews may not last an unreasonable amount taking into consideration the gravity and complexity of the matter under investigation.

d) The employee's physical needs shall be reasonably accommodated (ORS 236.360 (2)(f)).

e) The interviewers shall inform the employee of their authority to compel a statement and of the identity of the investigators and all persons present during the interview (ORS 236.360 (2)(d)).

f) No employee shall be subjected to offensive or threatening language, nor shall any promises, rewards or other inducements be used to obtain answers. An employee being interviewed may not be threatened with punitive action. However, during a compelled interview solely for non-criminal purposes, an employee who refuses to respond to questions or refuses to be interviewed must be informed that refusal may lead to disciplinary action (ORS 236.360 (2)(h)). Nothing administratively ordered may be provided to a criminal investigator.

h) When practicable, the interviewer should record all interviews of employees and witnesses. An employee may record his/her own interview. If the employee has been previously interviewed, a copy of that recorded interview, written statement or transcript (if prepared) shall be provided to the employee prior to any subsequent interview (ORS 236.360 (2)(h)).

i) All employees subjected to interviews that could result in punitive action may have a representative of the employee’s choosing present at the interview (ORS 236.360 (2)(b)). However, in order to maintain the integrity of each individual employee’s statement, involved employees shall not consult or meet with a representative or attorney collectively or in groups prior to being interviewed.

j) In a disciplinary or administrative investigation, the employee’s chosen representative cannot be required to disclose, or be subject to disciplinary action for refusing to disclose, statements made by the employee to the representative for purposes of the representation (ORS 236.360 (2)(k)).

k) All employees shall provide complete and truthful responses to questions posed during interviews.

l) No employee may be compelled to submit to a polygraph examination nor shall any refusal to submit to such examination be mentioned in any investigation.

1020.6.1 ADMINISTRATIVE SEARCHES

An employee of this department may be administratively ordered to submit to a blood, breath or urine test for alcohol and drugs under any of the following circumstances:

a) When the employee, whether on- or off-duty, is involved in a shooting or job-related death.

b) When the employee is involved in an injury or fatal accident while on-duty.

c) When the employee is involved in an injury or fatal accident while operating any Campus-owned vehicle, whether on- or off-duty.

d) When the employee is found to be exhibiting objective symptoms of intoxication or drug influence while on-duty.

The results of tests compelled by the Department shall be restricted to the administrative investigation.

Any employee may be compelled to disclose personal financial information pursuant to proper legal process, if such information tends to indicate a conflict of interest with official duties or if the employee is assigned to, or being considered for, a special assignment with a potential for bribes.
Employees shall have no expectation of privacy in or when using offices, desks, lockers, vehicles, telephones, computers, radios or other communications provided by the Department.

Assigned lockers, offices, desks, vehicles and storage spaces are the property of the employer and may be administratively searched by a supervisor for work-related purposes (e.g. obtaining a needed report or radio).

All other non-assigned areas (shared desks, common office space, shared vehicles) may be administratively searched by a supervisor for non-investigative purposes.

An investigative search of such areas shall only be conducted with the approval of the Director of Public Safety or authorized designee upon a reasonable suspicion that official misconduct is involved.

1020.6.2 ADMINISTRATIVE INVESTIGATION FORMAT
Investigations of personnel complaints shall be detailed, complete and essentially follow this format:

Introduction - Include the identity of the employee(s), the identity of the assigned investigator(s), the initial date and source of the complaint.

Synopsis - Provide a very brief summary of the facts giving rise to the investigation.

Summary of allegations - List the allegations separately (including applicable policy sections) with a very brief summary of the evidence relevant to each allegation. A separate recommended finding should be provided for each allegation.

Evidence as to each allegation - Each allegation should be set forth with the details of the evidence applicable to each allegation provided, including comprehensive summaries of employee and witness statements. Other evidence related to each allegation should also be detailed in this section.

Conclusion - A recommendation regarding further action or disposition should be provided.

Exhibits - A separate list of exhibits (e.g., recordings, photos, documents) should be attached to the report.

1020.6.3 STEPS PRIOR TO DISCIPLINARY ACTION
If an investigation discloses misconduct or improper job performance that was not alleged in the original complaint, the investigator shall take appropriate action with regard to any additional allegations.

Disciplinary action may not be taken against any employee without just cause (ORS 236.360 (4)). The Director of Public Safety shall ensure the following before any disciplinary action against an employee is taken:

a) Notification is made to the employee in writing of the charges against the employee and the proposed disciplinary action (ORS 236.360 (5)(a)).

b) The employee is given an opportunity to respond to the charges at an informal hearing, which may be recorded, that is attended by the person or persons having authority to impose the proposed disciplinary action (ORS 236.360 (5)(b)).
1020.6.4 REOPENING AN INVESTIGATION
An investigation may be reopened if significant new evidence is discovered that is likely to affect the outcome of the investigation, provided the evidence resulted from the employee’s pre-disciplinary response and could not have been discovered without resorting to extraordinary measures (ORS 236.360 (7)).

1020.6.5 INAPPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN SAFEGUARDS
The safeguards of an administrative investigation listed in Policy Manual § 1020.6 do not apply in the following instances (ORS 236.370):

a) Investigations related to acts or omissions made during a probationary period.

b) Where the terms of a collective bargaining agreement provide for the safeguards.

c) Where the investigation is of the:
   1. Chief executive officer of a law enforcement unit, as defined in ORS 181.610.
   2. Supervisory employees, as defined under ORS 243.650, where a collective bargaining agreement is in effect.

d) Where the employee is represented by a collective bargaining unit if the collective bargaining agreement provides for procedures and safeguards of the sort provided for in ORS 236.350 to 236.370.

1020.7 DISPOSITION OF PERSONNEL COMPLAINTS
Each allegation shall be classified with one of the following dispositions:

Unfounded - When the investigation discloses that the alleged act(s) did not occur or did not involve department personnel. Complaints that are determined to be frivolous will fall within the classification of unfounded.

Exonerated - When the investigation discloses that the alleged act occurred but that the act was justified, lawful and/or proper.

Not sustained - When the investigation discloses that there is insufficient evidence to sustain the complaint or fully exonerate the employee.

Sustained - When the investigation discloses sufficient evidence to establish that the act occurred and that it constituted misconduct.

Policy issue - When everything in the complaint is determined to be accurate, including the officer’s actions, but the issue appears to require a modification of policy the finding for the officer should be exonerated. The need for potential policy modification shall be immediately directed to the Director of Public Safety for action.

In investigation discloses misconduct or improper job performance which was not alleged in the original complaint, the investigator shall take appropriate action with regard to any additional allegations.

1020.8 COMPLETION OF INVESTIGATIONS
The Administration Supervisor shall ensure that investigations are completed and employees are provided notification of intended discipline no later than six months from the date of the first interview. The Director of Public Safety or Administration Supervisor may extend the investigation to a maximum of 12 months from the date of the first interview, provided that, before the extended period begins, the employer gives written notice explaining the reason for the extension to the employee and the employee's chosen representative and union representative, if any (ORS 236.360 (6)(a)).
The above time limits do not apply when (ORS 236.360 (6)(b)):

a) The investigation involves an officer who is incapacitated or unavailable.

b) The investigation involves an allegation of workers’ compensation or disability fraud by the officer.

c) The officer, in writing, waives the limit.

d) The investigation requires a reasonable extension of time for coordination with one or more other jurisdictions.

e) The investigation involves more than one officer and requires a reasonable extension of time.

f) The alleged misconduct is also the subject of a criminal investigation or criminal prosecution. Time does not run for the period during which the criminal investigation or criminal prosecution is pending.

g) The investigation involves a matter in civil litigation in which the officer is a named defendant or the officer's actions are alleged to be a basis for liability. Time does not run for the period during which the civil action is pending.

h) The investigation is the result of a complaint by a person charged with a crime. Time does not run for the period during which the criminal matter is pending.

Upon completion of an investigation, the report should be forwarded through the chain of command to the Director of Public Safety and the involved employee’s supervisor.

Once received, the Director of Public Safety may accept or modify the classification and recommendation for disciplinary action contained in the report.

Any complaining party who is not satisfied with the findings of the Department may contact the Director of Public Safety to discuss the matter further.

1020.8.1 CONFIDENTIALITY OF PERSONNEL FILES

All investigations of personnel complaints shall be considered confidential peace officer personnel files. The contents of such files shall not be revealed to other than the involved employee or authorized personnel, except pursuant to lawful process.

In the event that an accused employee (or the representative of such employee) knowingly makes false representations regarding any internal investigation, and such false representations are communicated to any media source, the Department may disclose sufficient information from the employee's personnel file to refute such false representations.

Disciplinary action resulting from sustained complaints shall be maintained in the employee's personnel file. Complaints and any investigative reports shall be maintained by the Lieutenant apart from the employee's personnel file.

1020.8.2 ANNUAL REVIEW OF PERSONNEL COMPLAINTS

During February of each year, the Lieutenant or his/her designee shall provide to the Director of Public Safety an annual report of personnel complaints from the preceding year. The report will focus on complaint trends as well as training needs and needed policy changes. A copy of the report shall be maintained with each year’s completed complaint file. Specific detail, including items such as officer names, case numbers and location of occurrence, is not needed for this purpose and therefore will not be part of this process.
Considerations Regarding Establishment of a University Police Oversight Committee
November 17, 2014

Background

If Portland State University establishes its own police department and commissions one or more employees as police officers, the president of the university, in cooperation with the chief of the police department, must establish a process by which the university will receive and respond to complaints involving the policies of the police department and the conduct of the police officers. ORS § 352.118(1)(b). Different oversight models could be utilized, with benefits and disadvantages existing for each type, so it will be important for PSU to carefully weigh and examine the characteristics and features it deems to be the most desirable and effective in implementing any system. An oversight mechanism could have only an internal review process that does not involve a citizen/public review board, or it could be a citizen-only review process that is meant to be fully external and independent of the police department, or it could be a hybrid-type system that allows for internal review over most issues, with public oversight for escalated or appealed issues. Oregon law does not mandate any particular model. See ORS § 352.118. Universities across the country have adopted various mechanisms and models for handling the oversight of police conduct and reported complaints.

Below is a sample of various other public universities’ approaches to a police oversight review board:

University of Oregon – Complaint Resolution Committee

Purpose/Role: The Complaint Resolution Committee was developed at the University of Oregon to hear complaints about police policy or serious conduct issues. The mission of the
committee is to provide recommendations to the University Vice President of Finance and Administration to help ensure that complaints are resolved in a fair, thorough, reasonable, and expeditious manner. The committee has an advisory role in reviewing the police department’s investigations of alleged serious misconduct or criminal behavior committed by officers. The Committee is not an investigative body itself and limits its assessments to the administration of the complaint review process. The Committee may, however, make the following recommendations to the VP of Finance and Administration in the review of any investigation conducted: (1) that the adjudication was thorough, fair and reasonable; or (2) that the adjudication was thorough, fair and reasonable but a review of policy, practice or training is recommended; or (3) that concerns exist that require further inquiry.

**Composition:** Members are appointed by the University President and include 2 students (1 undergrad, 1 graduate student) appointed for one-year terms, 3 full-time employees (from represented groups) appointed for two-year terms, 4 at-large members (1 of whom must be a former law enforcement professional) appointed for two-year terms, and 2 ex-officio members from the UOPD and Dean of Student’s Office.

http://vpfa.uoregon.edu/sites/vpfa.uoregon.edu/files/uploads/UOPD%20Complaint%20Resolution%20Final.pdf

**University of California, Berkeley – Campus Police Review Board**

**Purpose/Role:** The Berkeley Campus Police Review Board has a dual role in reviewing and auditing complaints against the University of California Police Department. The Review Board’s primary role is reviewing appeals taken from civilian complaint investigations. This occurs when a Complainant is not satisfied with the UCPD investigative findings and appeals the decision directly to the Review Board. When an appeal is filed, a three member panel of the
Review Board reviews the investigative findings of the UCPD and determines whether to summarily affirm the investigation, remand to UCPD with a request for further investigation or clarification, or it refers the Complaint on to the full Board for an external investigation. In appropriate cases, the Review Board has the power to order the department to reopen its investigation or to conduct its own independent investigation and hearings in matters. The Board also performs an audit role, examining the overall performance of the department's complaint process and the quality of police-community interactions, making policy recommendations concerning those issues as appropriate. In both its appeal review and audit capacities, the Board reports to the Vice Chancellor-Administration.

**Composition:** The Board consists of 8 members including, 2 students (1 undergrad and 1 graduate student selected by student government councils); 2 faculty members (recommended by the Academic Senate); 1 member of campus staff; 1 retired police officer; 1 member of the off-campus community; and 1 Chair (selected by the Vice Chancellor-Administration). Members are initially appointed for one-year terms, but may be reappointed for one or two year terms by the Vice Chancellor-Administration.

http://vcaf.berkeley.edu/police-review

**Washington State University - Police Advisory Board**

**Purpose/Role:** The Advisory Board’s purpose is to advise and make recommendations to the VP for Business Affairs and Chief of Police concerning police protection and safety services within the University. The Board addresses both specific concerns and broader matters of policy and procedure on a range of issues from pedestrian safety and IT security, to sexual assault and alcohol awareness. Each member for the Board is responsible for reporting information
regarding campus safety issues or events of interest from their areas of departments of WSU. The board meets monthly to exchange information with WSU police regarding campus safety issues or events of interest from their areas or departments at the university. The board also meets once a year with the Pullman Police Advisory Board to discuss overlapping concerns. The board reviews emails submitted concerning public safety issues and concerns, but it does not appear to have the power to review formal complaints or conduct investigations. That process appears to be handled by an internal police complaint process.

**Composition:** The Board is comprised of 17 primary members from various represented student and staff groups, with an alternate member also selected for each position. All board members are appointed by the Chair and WSU Chief of Police subject to confirmation by the VP for Business Affairs. Student appointments are for 1 year, non-student are for 2 years.

http://pab.wsu.edu/About.html

**University of Michigan – Oversight Committee**

**Purpose/Role:** The University of Michigan independent oversight committee addresses grievances and complaints by persons against university police officers or the department. The committee meets when it is in receipt of a grievance that has been filed directly with the committee, plus twice a year to receive and discuss a semi-annual report made by the police chief regarding grievances submitted directly to the department. The committee may refer matters directly to the Police Chief to investigate or it can conduct hearings and investigations on its own. The committee may then make recommendations concerning such grievances to the University of Michigan Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, including recommendations for disciplinary action.
**Composition:** The six-member committee is comprised of two student members, two faculty members (one Senate faculty and one non-Senate faculty), and two staff members (one union and one non-union), who are nominated and elected by their peers for two-year terms.

http://hr.umich.edu/umpd/procedures.html

**Considerations Regarding Creation of an Oversight Committee**

Traditional citizen-oversight committees are defined as groups composed of community members, which may include non-sworn civilians, who review complaints about police on behalf of the citizenry. They investigate instances of excessive use of physical and deadly forces, allegations of harassment of various groups, and other allegations regarding the conduct of police officers. Today, many police departments have adopted “hybrid” systems of oversight, which borrow features from both internal and external models for handling complaints. The most common features of hybrid systems adopted for municipal police departments include having: (1) civilian and police-employee members involved; (2) paid and volunteer members; (3) ability to recommend and/or issue discipline; (4) ability to make policy recommendations; (5) ability to compel cooperation; and (6) ability to conduct independent hearings, investigations, and community outreach.

**Elements for Consideration**

- **Complaint Process:** One system to review all complaints? Internal, external, or hybrid review process? How long does someone have to file a complaint? Informal vs. formal complaint process separate or integrated? Means by which a complaint can be made (e.g. electronic complaint form)?
• **Membership:** Who will sit on the committee(s)? Do committee members need to have any specialized skills, knowledge, or training? Will positions be appointed or by application/qualifications, or election? How will members be recruited? How will members be removed?

• **Power & Responsibility:** Will the committee conduct independent hearings and investigations or just oversee the internal investigation process? Will the committee recommend or issue discipline, or both?

• **Governance:** Who will oversee the committee?

• **Goals:** What are the goal(s) of the committee? Should these be self-set by the committee or the University?

**Further Reading**


RESOLUTION REGARDING ESTABLISHMENT OF
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY POLICE DEPARTMENT

Approved by the Special Committee on Campus Public Safety
November __, 2014

Approved by the Full Board
December __, 2014

BACKGROUND

A. Portland State University is currently served by a Campus Public Safety Office (CPSO) that provides basic public safety services to the campus. CPSO officers are “special campus security officers” under Oregon state law. As such, CPSO officers are not police officers under state law and possess only limited law enforcement authority. CPSO officers’ geographic authority is limited to the boundaries of the University’s porous and noncontiguous campus. In addition, such officers may not issue violation citations, apply for search warrants, engage in community caretaking, perform mental health holds, perform off-campus investigations, require an individual to submit to an involuntary detox, or perform other customary duties of police officers. CPSO officers are not eligible for Oregon police training or certification.

B. Portland State University is unique among large urban universities in the United States, and unique among large universities in Oregon, in that the University lacks a sworn, dedicated University Police Department. All other members of the Urban 21, a coalition of urban-serving universities across the country, are served by a dedicated university police department, as are Oregon State University, the University of Oregon and Oregon Health and Sciences University.

C. In the Spring of 2013, President Wim Wiewel convened a Task Force on Campus Safety to make recommendations regarding growing campus safety concerns and potential improvements to the University’s response to criminal activities. The task force issues its final report in November 2013.

D. A key conclusion of the task force is that current “limitations on CPSO authority, jurisdiction and capability are the most concerning safety issue on campus.” The task force concluded that “the most ideal campus safety staffing model is one that allows PSU access to dedicated professionals, who are part of the PSU ethos and community, who have sworn officer status” and recommended that PSU “explore ways to ensure access to sworn officers who are appropriately trained in campus policing and available on-site to the PSU campus community.”

E. Subsequently, the University explored various options to implement the task force’s recommendation, including contracting with the Portland Police Bureau, Oregon State Police or Oregon Health and Sciences University for the provision of a dedicated campus police force. Following those consultations, it was determined that creation of a University Police Department is the best and most viable option to meet the safety needs of the campus.

F. The Portland State University Board of Trustees is authorized by Oregon Revised Statutes 352.118 to establish a University Police Department and to commission employees as University Police officers with all of the privileges and immunities of police officers under the laws of the State of Oregon.
RESOLUTION

Now, therefore, be it Resolved by the Board of Trustees, that:

1. The Portland State University Police Department is established. The President or the President’s
designee is authorized to employ and commission sworn police officers, with all of the privileges
and immunities customarily provided to sworn police officers, in a manner consistent with
Oregon law, subject to the terms and conditions of this Resolution.

2. Prior to the creation of the University Police Department and the employment of sworn police
officers, the University shall develop a University Police Department Management and
Implementation Plan. The University Police Department Management and Implementation Plan
is to be developed with the assistance of an Implementation Advisory Committee, which is to
include faculty, staff and student representatives and is to be chaired by a dean of the
University. The University Police Department Management and Implementation Plan shall
include, at a minimum:
   a. Plans for the recruitment of a diverse and well-qualified pool of candidates to be
      University police officers;
   b. Details regarding the training of University police officers, including basic police training
      through the Oregon Department of Public Safety Standards and Training, as well as
      specialized training regarding University policing, cultural competency, unconscious
      bias, and interacting with persons with disabilities;
   c. Details regarding the creation of a University Police Oversight Committee, which
      includes faculty, staff and student representatives, and which is authorized to receive
      and act on complaints regarding the University Police Department’s policies or the
      actions of its officers;
   d. Details of a complaint process regarding University Police;
   e. Proposed policies governing the University Police Department, including policies
      regarding the use of force; and
   f. A schedule for the establishment and full implementation of the University Police
      Department.

3. The Board is to be updated at its June 2015 meeting regarding implementation of this
Resolution.

APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
DECEMBER __, 2014

____________________________________
Secretary to the Board