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1. 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 access to sworn, dedicated university police officers. All other members of the Urban 21, a coalition of urban-serving universities across the country, are served by dedicated university police officers, as are Oregon State University, the University of Oregon and Oregon Health and Sciences University.

C. Currently, the Portland State University campus is policed almost exclusively by the Portland Police Bureau (PBB). The University is within PBB’s Central Precinct, which is a 41 square mile area of the City of Portland. The availability of a police response to the campus at any particular time is dependent on limited staffing and other demands existing in the Central Precinct at the time, which often results in considerable wait times to calls for a police response. PPB has conveyed its support for this Resolution.

D. 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.

E. 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.”

F. 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.

G. 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 police
officers with all of the privileges and immunities of police officers under the laws of the State of Oregon.

H. The Board established a Special Committee on Campus Public Safety to consider the recommendation that the University commission and employ university police officers.

I. The Committee held three public meetings, heard several hours of public comment, received numerous letters from members of the campus community, and reviewed over 200 comments submitted electronically. The Committee has recommended this Resolution to the Board for approval.

RESOLUTION

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

1. The Portland State University Public Safety Department 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. The University Public Safety Department is to operate based on a philosophy of university- and community-oriented policing, which focuses on building ties and working closely with members of the Portland State University community. The department is to be guided by best practices and is to work with other student- and community-focused University departments to develop and foster the systematic use of partnerships and problem-solving techniques that address public safety concerns in a manner that focuses on dialogue and diffusing situations.

3. The University Public Safety Department is to be a bifurcated department, with both sworn, armed police officers and unsworn, unarmed public safety officers. The University Public Safety Department is to maintain an adequate number of unsworn, unarmed public safety officers and not rely unnecessarily on sworn, armed police officers.

4. Prior to the deployment of sworn, armed police officers, the University shall develop a University Public Safety Department Management and Implementation Plan. The University Public Safety 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 Board will appoint at least one liaison to the Implementation Advisory Committee.

5. The Implementation Advisory Committee shall consider and make recommendations on any matters it determines to be relevant, which are to include, at a minimum:
   a. The recruitment and hiring of a diverse and well-qualified pool of candidates to be University police officers.
   b. The training of University police officers. In addition to basic police training through the Oregon Department of Public Safety Standards and Training, the Implementation Advisory Committee is to consider and make recommendations regarding specialized training on topics including:
      i. the specific needs of effective university-oriented policing,
      ii. cultural competency,
      iii. unconscious bias, and
      iv. mental health issues and interacting with persons with disabilities.
   c. The creation of a University Public Safety Oversight Committee, which includes faculty, staff and student representatives, and which is authorized to receive and act on
complaints regarding the University Public Safety Department’s policies or the actions of its officers;
d. A complaint process regarding the University Public Safety Department;
e. The appropriate use and implementation of relevant innovations, such as police officer body cameras;
f. Proposed policies governing the University Public Safety Department, including policies regarding the use of force that demonstrate a high regard for the value of human life and prioritize the use of the least amount of force reasonably necessary in light of the facts and circumstances;
g. A schedule for the implementation and incorporation of sworn police officers into the University Public Safety Department; and
h. The development of performance indicators to enable future assessment of the effectiveness of the new University Public Safety Department.

6. The Implementation Advisory Committee is to continue to make recommendations and provide oversight regarding the University Public Safety Department until a University Public Safety Oversight Committee is established and has begun meeting.

7. The Board recognizes that various campus constituencies have urged that the Board and University consider other approaches and innovations to enhance public safety in ways that do not rely on sworn, armed police officers, such as the establishment of trained student patrols, bystander intervention training and greater focus on nonviolent dispute resolution. The commissioning of university police officers and the consideration and implementation of other approaches and innovations to enhance public safety are not mutually exclusive. University police officers are only one component of a strong and student-focused safety net. The Implementation Advisory Committee is encouraged to consider such other approaches and innovations as it deems appropriate and may include recommendations regarding such matters in either the University Public Safety Department Management and Implementation Plan or in separate recommendations to the University Public Safety Department.

8. The Special Committee on Campus Public Safety intends to remain engaged and informed as this Resolution is implemented and will remain in place until the Implementation and Management Plan is complete and until the University Public Safety Oversight Committee is established and has begun meeting. The Committee will provide guidance to the Implementation Advisory Committee and provide updates to the full Board.

9. At its March and June 2015 meetings, the full Board will be updated and provided an opportunity to discuss the development of the University Public Safety Department Management and Implementation Plan and the implementation of this Resolution. After the Plan is completed, the Board will be provided with the Plan and briefed in detail regarding its contents. For at least the next five years thereafter, the Board is to be updated at least semiannually regarding the implementation of this Resolution and its impact on the campus and its students, faculty and staff.

APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
DECEMBER __, 2014

______________________________
Secretary to the Board
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 access to a dedicated University Police Department officers. All other members of the Urban 21, a coalition of urban-serving universities across the country, are served by a dedicated university police department officers, as are Oregon State University, the University of Oregon and Oregon Health and Sciences University.

B.C. Currently, the Portland State University campus is policed almost exclusively by the Portland Police Bureau (PBB). The University is within PBB’s Central Precinct, which is a 41 square mile area of the City of Portland. The availability of a police response to the campus at any particular time is dependent on limited staffing and other demands existing in the Central Precinct at the time, which often results in considerable wait times to calls for a police response. PPB has conveyed its support for this Resolution.

C.D. 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.E. 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.F. 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.
G. 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.

H. The Board established a Special Committee on Campus Public Safety to consider the recommendation that the University commission and employ university police officers.

I. The Committee held three public meetings, heard several hours of public comment, received numerous letters from members of the campus community, and reviewed over 200 comments submitted electronically. The Committee has recommended this Resolution to the Board for approval.

RESOLUTION

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

1. The Portland State University Police Public Safety 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. The University Public Safety Department is to operate based on a philosophy of university- and community-oriented policing, which focuses on building ties and working closely with members of the Portland State University community. The department is to be guided by best practices and is to work with other student- and community-focused University departments to develop and foster the systematic use of partnerships and problem-solving techniques that address public safety concerns in a manner that focuses on dialogue and diffusing situations.

3. The University Public Safety Department is to be a bifurcated department, with both sworn, armed police officers and unsworn, unarmed public safety officers. The University Public Safety Department is to maintain an adequate number of unsworn, unarmed public safety officers and not rely unnecessarily on sworn, armed police officers.

4. Prior to the creation and deployment of the University Police Department and the employment of sworn, armed police officers, the University shall develop a University Police Public Safety Department Management and Implementation Plan. The University Police Public Safety 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.

5. The Implementation Advisory Committee University Police Department Management and Implementation Plan shall consider and make recommendations on any matters it determines to be relevant, which are to include, at a minimum:
   a. Plans for the recruitment and hiring of a diverse and well-qualified pool of candidates to be University police officers;
   b. Details regarding the training of University police officers. In addition to including basic police training through the Oregon Department of Public Safety Standards and Training, the Implementation Advisory Committee is to consider and make recommendations regarding as well as specialized training regarding topics including:
      i. the specific needs of effective University-oriented policing,
      ii. cultural competency,
iii. unconscious bias, and

iv. mental health issues and interacting with persons with disabilities;

b. 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 the University Police Department;

e. The appropriate use and implementation of relevant innovations, such as police officer body cameras;

f. Proposed policies governing the University Police Department, including policies regarding the use of force that demonstrate a high regard for the value of human life and prioritize the use of the least amount of force reasonably necessary in light of the facts and circumstances; and

7. A schedule for the establishment and full implementation and incorporation of sworn police officers into the University Police Department; and

h. The development of performance indicators to enable future assessment of the effectiveness of the new University Public Safety Department.

6. The Implementation Advisory Committee is to continue to make recommendations and provide oversight regarding the University Public Safety Department until a University Public Safety Oversight Committee is established and has begun meeting.

7. The Board recognizes that various campus constituencies have urged that the Board and University consider other approaches and innovations to enhance public safety in ways that do not rely on sworn, armed police officers, such as the establishment of trained student patrols, bystander intervention training and greater focus on nonviolent dispute resolution. The commissioning of university police officers and the consideration and implementation of other approaches and innovations to enhance public safety are not mutually exclusive. University police officers are only one component of a strong and student-focused safety net. The Implementation Advisory Committee is encouraged to consider such other approaches and innovations as it deems appropriate and may include recommendations regarding such matters in either the University Public Safety Department Management and Implementation Plan or in separate recommendations to the University Public Safety Department.

8. The Special Committee on Campus Public Safety intends to remain engaged and informed as this Resolution is implemented and will remain in place until the Implementation and Management Plan is complete and until the University Public Safety Oversight Committee is established and has begun meeting. The Committee will provide guidance to the Implementation Advisory Committee and provide updates to the full Board.

9. The Board is to be updated at its March and June 2015 meetings, the full Board will be updated and provided an opportunity to discuss regarding the development of the University Public Safety Department Management and Implementation Plan and the implementation of this Resolution. After the Plan is completed, the Board will be provided with the Plan and briefed in detail regarding its contents. For at least the next five years thereafter, the Board is to be updated at least semi-annually regarding the implementation of this Resolution and its impact on the campus and its students, faculty and staff.

APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
DECEMBER __, 2014
Secretary to the Board
### Campus Safety Feedback Form Responses: November 24, 2014-December 2, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>11/24/14</td>
<td>Students come here to learn. I would hate to see students getting into trouble with the law, and in light of the public controversy at this time in the media, armed security would be under lots of scrutiny and they would probably be ineffective at this time. When our City and State policing system learns to not be &quot;TRIGGER HAPPY&quot;, then I feel that PSU can utilize armed security and they too will also have to be accountable for any adverse reactions that hopefully DOESN'T occur. But if so, does PSU want or need that type of publicity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>11/24/14</td>
<td>The only experience I had with campus security was when I accompanied a friend to visit the security office regarding my friend and a dispute with her abusive ex-husband who was on campus. They were very attentive and responded to the best of their ability. As for a campus police force, I think that would be intimidating, especially to the homeless and to communities of color.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>11/24/14</td>
<td>As both an undergrad and graduated grad student, I have spent a lot of time on campus. I have witnessed &quot;intentional&quot; reasonable campus police response, and I have seen arrogant, immature, driving about both on campus and around the city, including the other side of the Broadway Bridge. My point is that some of the officers, some of the time, operate in a meaningful and mindful manner, while others operate as &quot;boys&quot; after school sport team. Campus Cops are not prepared to deal with chaos that could best be contained without the use of weapons. There should be NO guns allowed on campus, ever...and certainly not routinely. As an Alum my support ends when campus cops have guns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>11/24/14</td>
<td>I have now testified twice against the idea of arming campus security. I have taught at PSU for 14 years. In the past, under previous campus security leadership, I was approached to help provide security for a few events, since I have done nonviolent security for decades (and I'm a co-founder of the Portland Peace Team, which does just that). When we've done that, it worked very well. I was quite proud of PSU as someplace that opened a Q Center and, when the Westboro Baptist Church decided to come protest, I was asked to coordinate a nonviolent security response, which I happily did. A former dean asked me at another time to de-escalate between Palestinian students and Jewish students. Happy to. Unarmed security is the future; guns are the past. Dr. Randy Jantzen at Selkirk College in British Columbia has a database on unarmed peacekeeping globally. His research shows we have a better protection rate than armed security. Dr. Erica Chenoweth and Dr. Maria Stephan conducted a massive study on the efficacy of nonviolence v violence, examining 323 cases, and found the success rate of nonviolence is double that of violence. More studies are emerging on the unarmed violence interrupters in gangland Chicago, showing their enviable record and other studies on unarmed accompaniment of those under active death threat began to be published 15 years ago. Portland State University should get out in front and not worry about &quot;catching up&quot; to the militarization of other campuses. Let's see some Portland pride in doing something better, not emulating negative trends. Please, no guns on campus, not for anyone, and on this evening, when the grand jury in Ferguson, Missouri, has just announced that shooting a young unarmed black man of 18 six times is somehow justified, we need to vow another way.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 194 | 11/25/14    | (Received via email) Hello. I have been listening to the debate that is currently going on about arming the security guards around Portland State. I have seen the protests and heard the negativity and personally, this shocks me. As an alumni graduating in the summer of 2014, I can tell you that I would have felt much safer having armed security guards on campus. As long as they have the proper training and what not, I think this is a great idea. Portland State is a large campus. There are a lot of secluded areas and when it gets dark in the evenings or even early mornings, it can be very scary. There is a large homeless population that hangs around the area as well making it an unnerving walk to classrooms or transportation. Knowing there are security guards is great, but if you were in serious trouble or there was a threat, such as a gun
on campus, I would be much more at ease if I knew there were armed individuals close by. The protesters have made comments that the police are nearby so why should it matter, but when it comes down to it, do you really want to have to wait for a police officer to receive the call, get through traffic, find where the incident is happening, and then take action? I know that I would much rather have an armed security guard right there in a matter of seconds. I also believe that having these armed security guards would deter people from committing crimes in the first place (such as rape and burglary). Guards would also feel more protected knowing that they can defend themselves and others if need be. Don't leave this campus open to threats and dangers, protect your students.

195  11/25/14  I am a white male in the Master's of Social Work Program and have never felt unsafe on the PSU campus. I have spoken with many different people (undergrad, grad, male, female, latino, black, white, faculty) about the proposal to create an armed police force at PSU and attended the community meeting last night with the board of trustees. The meeting was a waste of time because after an hour of student, faculty and staff passionate statements in opposition to the plan to authorize an armed police force at PSU the board decided that they were going to move forward with the plan to deputize campus security officers. The board of trustees are charged with acting in the best interest of the people of PSU and I find it deplorable that when at least 50 people of PSU passionately express their opinions in opposition to the boards plan and they move forward without regard for those concerns. It is paternalistic and NOT inclusive, a term that was used often last night by the board members as a goal of theirs. I also found it offensive that the president and two board members were too busy to attend this meeting. I recognize that they are busy people but if this matter (arming campus security) were truly as important as the presidents' letter made it seem he would have taken the time to be present. This move is made solely as a reaction to fear, fear of a shooter bringing a gun to campus; more than one board member expressed that they would feel personally responsible for lives lost if this were to happen. But I ask the question: when future armed PSU officers murder an unarmed person on our campus who will be responsible then? Will the board accept responsibility for those lives? Will the officer? I believe that history is showing that the person who is blamed is whoever is most convenient to preserve the status quo. I do not believe that PSU, its president or its board of trustees are upholding the Universities commitment to reciprocal exchange with the community and stake holders. The decision to create an armed police force at PSU has already been made by the board of trustees and the president and community input is being sought after the fact. I am ashamed of this oligarchical rule that is being imposed on PSU and the surrounding community.

196  11/25/14  Difficult decisions lie ahead. Should the Board of Trustees move forward with an amended resolution, please take into serious consideration increasing the number of student perspectives needed on the Implementation Advisory Committee. Any critical thought and purposeful meeting time spent to consider adding an equal number of PSU students or at least, no less than three-- in addition to those PSU professionals presently slated to participate --will more likely than not, be time well spent. Thank you for your time to read and absorb this feedback. Your gifts of time to do so are valued and appreciated.

197  11/25/14  My only experience with campus security is in passing. I always get a smile and hello. I want to have security officers armed. It's ridiculous that people are allowing naivety to get in the way of common sense.

198  11/25/14  I think blue-light phones usually go unnoticed and for years I didn't realize what they were for. I have not used the escorts. I do like electronic ID cards for access to buildings and I would support having more security on campus but I'm hesitant about arming our officers. Do we really need that when Portland's Police are so close by?

199  11/26/14  Dear all, I am a nationally touring novelist and teacher who has been invited to speak at PSU this spring. I have heard you are considering arming your security with guns. This does not make me feel safer or inclined to visit your campus. Our nation has too many guns in too many hands. There is only one purpose for a gun and that is to shoot - and kill - another human being. Studies have shown that this approach does not make people safer in their communities. I urge you to train your security forces in unarmed peacekeeping skills instead. Thank you.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/30/14</td>
<td>I've recently had an interesting conversation with a policeman/emergency medical technician who is applying to our MA program in the Anthropology Department. He, like other law enforcement officials, is concerned about his safety and the safety of his colleagues when they enter dangerous situations. In the statement of purpose in his application, he talked about two forms of technology that law enforcement can use. He suggested that one form tends to make things better, and another tends to make things worse, when dealing with people's reactions during potentially volatile situations. What makes things better? Cameras that both parties know are running, recording, and being monitored. What makes things worse? Large, armored SWAT-team hum-vee vans. Thinking about the situation in Ferguson and the question about arming campus security officers at PSU, I wonder whether we could discuss where guns fall in that continuum of 'technology that makes things better or worse in volatile situations.' At the very least, could we talk about whether adding cameras to guns might reduce the likelihood of having an armed police officer shoot one of our students on campus?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/28/14</td>
<td>The report does not account for the intensive process of taking on 'sworn officer' authorities, including arrest and relationships with the courts and time for testimony. Extending the reach of campus security to make them a sworn force reaching into the neighborhood is expensive and duplicative of public policing already provided and paid for by City of Portland taxpayers. The timing for the Board to make this decision in the face of majority opposition by faculty and students is unwise in the face of public protests around the country about the state of policing powers. PSU will take on unneeded liability and create mistrust with students to move ahead with this proposal. The scope of the 'problem to be solved' has not been articulated. Best for PSU Administration to pull back on the proposal now, or if necessary the Board to represent the input of the public and campus community -- no expansion of the current CPSO to an sworn and armed police force, no escalation of arms on campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/30/14</td>
<td>The fact that PSU does not have a sworn Police department, is not because it is at the cutting edge of innovation for University security. PSU is stuck in an outdated version of security that predates Rodney King, Columbine, September 11, and every act of terror and school shooting that has become a norm in our Society. Cities and counties across the US have moved to implement School Resource Officers (Sworn Police) on K-12 level campuses, and every University in the US has an armed Police force except PSU. Recent Universities have had school shootings that the campus Police have responded to in a matter of minutes (see FSU). The Task Force has recommended an armed Police Force, State and Local police commanders have recommended PSU establish it's own Police Department. Whatever you may want to think, there is no alternative in an emergency situation that to have a well trained, professional responding. By creating it's own PD, PSU can guarantee a fast response and an intimate knowledge of the Campus that other police officers do not have the time to learn. Conflict resolution may work in certain situations, however, there are certain people that become suicidal or homicidal, or are so far gone on a bad drug trip, that reasoning with them is out of the question. A Police Officer can place a medical/mental hold on these individuals and get them the help they need. Campus Public Safety can not. To vote no on establishing a Police Department, says that all of the research and recommendations are for nothing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/30/14</td>
<td>Board of Trustees Safety Sub Committee--It is the opinion of myself and my peers that having a sworn, armed police force is neither a solution to campus structural weaknesses, nor to the issues of sexual assault occurring on our campus. We cannot agree that it is the best choice financially or for the entirety of the student body you seek to serve. We have not interpreted this disagreement as malice on your part. We are seeing this issues through different lenses, and certainly that does not mean we think ours are without their own tint. This being clear, we recognize that you may very likely pass this measure. While we will not change our minds that is not the wisest or most beneficial solution, we would like to make some statements in regards to how we believe compromises could be made to create a more equitable measure for all involved. Certainly you can see that we are all involved. The first issue we would bring forward is the issue of arming. In the October meeting, it was mentioned by the board that not all campuses police forces have been immediately armed. We would understand this to mean that not arming them with guns is an option. We would like to be clear of our strong preference that sworn officers on our campus do not carry guns. We understand that your officers will be trained to do what they believe is best. We would like shooting not to be one of those options. There are more controlled ways of maintaining the peace than firearms, such as tasers, clubs and words. It is difficult to imagine a campus where we feel safe when there are guns present. This brings us to our second request being trainings, other than those that are state-provided. To be straightforward, the officers in this country who have shot unarmed people of color have received diversity trainings, the St Louis Police</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Department included. We have found these to be wanting (See Citations list: “Police Training Officer...” for more detail on standard trainings). We would ask that the school seek the input and expertise of the school of Social Work, as well as the Conflict Resolution Program, in its choices of training. One such training would be on the treatment and self-awareness required around vicarious trauma. Police have some of the highest levels of vicarious trauma of any profession and the compassion fatigue that understandably accompanies it can become dangerous. For protection of themselves and the students of your school, we would ask they are taught to deal with this appropriately. We do not believe police violence happens because police officers are bad people. We believe police violence happens because our armed forces have been trained to fear and react to those they are sworn to protect. We could talk for a long time about how this happens, but in the end what we really want is a restorative relationship between the Police and the common people. Attached are a list of resources to consider in creating a restorative justice oriented Police force on our campus. PSU has an opportunity in front of itself to not follow in the footsteps of other cities and schools, but to create an example of what the Police beings truly safe for the people can look like. We appreciate the opportunity to have our voices heard and ask that you take them seriously. The Class of SW 539


| 204 | 12/1/14 | I have no experience with campus security or any of the resources offered. I don’t have enough information to give an opinion about access to buildings. I wonder if there is a need for an expanded security force on campus. I am absolutely against campus security having guns. Tasers or other non-lethal weapons may be an answer. |
| 205 | 12/2/14 | From my experience, CPSO has been responsive when I have needed assistance accessing a building after hours. I have not had to call on them for other reasons, however I do believe they would assist if able when I called. I know there is a proposal to increase staffing and/or fully deputize some officers at PSU. From all of the documentation I have been able to read, the process to determine the current proposal is lacking in research, literature and alternatives to arming. I believe CPSO needs to have more support in order to better support the campus and feel safe themselves, however I do not agree the current proposal is the answer. I hope a more comprehensive violence and safety prevention plan will be created using solid research and literature to define what makes sense for the PSU community, including supporting CPSO. |
Senate meeting
Faculty Senate Resolution on Campus Public Safety
December 2014

Whereas the PSU Administration has made a recommendation for creating an armed
Campus Police force based on the Task Force on Campus Safety report calling for a
larger campus security presence on our campus and the surrounding neighborhood;

Whereas the Administration has not provided data that makes a convincing case for arming
of PSU Campus Public Safety officers nor created a plan for policies and services
beyond policing which will make all in our community feel safer;

Whereas a substantial body of data and research shows that interpersonal and sexual
violence does not generally occur in public spaces, and that the introduction of
weapons into communities often increases risks of violence, with students of color
and people in emotional distress at the most risk;

Whereas the Administration’s recommendation lacks a commitment to create a campus
committee for oversight and supervision of a PSU Campus Police,

Be it resolved the members of the PSU Faculty Senate express their:

1. Opposition to arming PSU Campus Public Safety officers;

2. Support for the creation of a campus committee for oversight and supervision of the
PSU Campus Public Safety Office as a necessary condition for implementation of changes in
campus policing policies, including alternatives to an armed police force. The campus
committee must be comprised of administrators, faculty & students.

*from Senators Vicki Cottrell, Ted Donlan, Mindy Holliday, Michael Taylor, David Layzell, Yves
Labissiere, Annabelle Dolidon, Susan Reese, Jose Padin, Gina Greco, Evgenia Davidova,
Swapna Mukhopadhyaya, Sharon Carstens

Background (on the following page)
Background.

School of Social Work faculty and staff statement in response to a proposed armed CPSO force

October 24, 2014

Members of the Portland State University’s School of Social Work are strongly opposed to the PSU administration’s recent proposal to hire armed officers to protect the PSU community. As a school and profession that is concerned with social justice and the well-being of individuals and communities, we have seen the negative impacts of policing, and would instead propose that PSU explore other options for increasing campus safety. We oppose the notion that more guns on campus would make PSU a safer campus and assert that arming PSU officers will, in fact, have the inverse effect. The proposal draws on PSU’s urban location and porous campus to instill fear and support for an armed security force. But this rhetoric is incomplete. As a porous campus, we have a responsibility to not only consider who comes to campus but what campus introduces to the broader community. We hear the concerns from colleagues regarding crisis response times, and feel this is an opportunity to collaborate with the City Council and Police force to clarify our respective roles to better “serve the City.” We are deeply concerned that an armed security presence at PSU would not contribute to a healthier campus community, but would instead create an unsafe environment and even endanger the lives of many including people of color, people in distress, and young women.

The administration cites fears of a school shooting and the need to conduct sexual assault investigations as reasons for the need for an armed security force. However, violent crimes and school shootings are very rare. Only 0.1% of reported crimes on U.S. campuses are murders or manslaughter (Drysdale, Modzeleski, & Simons, 2010). Research also shows that the overwhelming majority of school shootings are not committed by outsiders. They are committed by people who have a relationship with the school (i.e. undergrad and graduate students, faculty, and staff) (Bonanno & Levenson, 2014). In over 90% of all college campus shootings in the United States from 1990 through 2008, the perpetrator had a connection with the institution (Drysdale, Modzeleski, & Simons, 2010). Consequently, the administration’s emphasis on the porous campus as cause for fear is irrelevant to a school shooting scenario; it is highly likely that any hypothetical shooter would be otherwise welcome on campus and known to the victims.

Similarly, only a small minority of sexual assaults are committed by strangers (The White House Council on Women and Girls, 2014). Most sexual assault is perpetrated by acquaintances, and rarely does it happen in public places that are patrolled by armed officers. We understand the need for sworn officers to conduct sexual assault investigations but dispute that guns are needed to carry out this work. PSU administrators should note that police departments across the country have a track record of
disrespectful responses to victims of sexual assault and failure to follow up when charges have been filed (Perez-Pena & Bogdanich, 2014). Consequently, many victims of sexual assault never report the crime to the police. Rather than arming PSU officers, we must work to change the culture of rape common to campuses and across mainstream society and continue to build meaningful prevention and support services regarding these issues on our campus.

News outlets across the country are filled with reports of systemic police harassment and profiling of people of color. Often, this harassment and profiling even escalates to people being killed by police officers. Every 28 hours, a person of color is killed by a police officer or security guard in the U.S. (Movement, 2013). Given this statistic, in discussions about safety on campus and in the surrounding community, we wonder how that community is defined. Whose safety is being considered? Communities of color, both those within and beyond the PSU community, will not be kept safer by bringing in more armed officers. We are concerned that more police on campus could equal more police harassment, more police brutality, and more police-committed killings against members of the PSU community (and members of the surrounding Portland community) who are people of color.

In addition, we are concerned about how people experiencing extreme emotional distress will be treated by potentially armed campus safety officers. Although the City of Portland recently signed a settlement agreement regarding the use of excessive force against people with mental illness and those in emotional distress with the USDOJ, much work remains to be done to address concerns within the community. In general, police are not adequately equipped to work with people experiencing extreme emotional distress or mental health crises. Increasing the number of armed officers on campus could result in the deaths of more people (both those who are members of the PSU community and those who are not).

Finally, we believe that an armed police force may make our female students and staff less safe than they are currently. Male law enforcement officers are accused of sexual assault 1.5 times more than the general male population (Cato Institute, 2011; Carter, 2011), suggesting that armed officers may well inspire reactions of fear and mistrust rather than increased safety. We believe that the administration is mistaken when it claims that additional police will decrease the incidence of sexual assault, and it might, in fact, increase it.

The last thing we need to do is expand the militarization of our communities in the name of increased safety. It would seem that the $1.5 million that PSU wants to spend on armed security would be better directed towards more mental health professionals on campus, so that potential shooters can be identified, students can be better educated to prevent sexual assaults before they happen, and possibly more unarmed campus safety officers could be hired. In addition, the administration may consider alternative strategies to enhance safety on campus including increased student support services, and additional unarmed security officers. There are numerous alternatives. For example, we recommend that the administration look to how other schools have prioritized mental health services over armed police.
(e.g., Massachusetts Department of Higher Education, n/d). We also recommend that the administration work with PSU’s Conflict Resolution faculty to investigate other options. And we recommend that PSU put the needs of its most marginalized community members first when considering the implications of this proposal.

Sincerely,

(Alphabetical listing)
Kate Allen, Adjunct Faculty
Ben Anderson-Nathe, Faculty | CFS Program Director
Lew Bank, Faculty
Jared Israel Best, Graduate Research Assistant
Jennifer Blakeslee, Research Faculty
Bill Boyd, Adjunct Faculty
Sarah Bradley, Faculty/MSW Program Director
Eileen Brennan, Research Faculty
Danica Love Brown, Adjunct Faculty
Katie Cagle, Staff
Beckie Child, Adjunct Faculty
Matt Chorpenning, Research Fellow
Kate Constable, Academic Professional
Lisa Cordova, Faculty
Vicki Cotrell, Faculty
Miranda Cunningham, Adjunct Faculty
Ann Curry-Stevens, Faculty
Kate Davis, Adjunct Faculty
Mandy Davis, Research Associate
Julie Kates, Faculty
Joseph Nicholas DeFilippis, Adjunct Faculty
Roxanne Dinca, Staff
JoAnn M. Dohn, Staff/MSW Student
Ted Donlan, Faculty
Wende Garrison, Faculty
Sarah Geenen, Research Faculty
Charlotte Goodluck, Faculty/BSW Program Director
Denise Grant, Faculty
Lisa Hawash, Faculty
Mindy Holliday, Faculty
Michael Hulshof-Schmidt, Faculty
Veronika Ivanova, Faculty
Pauline Jivanjee, Faculty
Tom Keller, Faculty
Ericka Kimball, Faculty
Miriam Miranda-Diaz, Graduate Research Assistant
Molly Oberweiser Kennedy, Graduate Research Assistant
Laurie Leasure, Staff
Junghee Lee, Faculty
Sandy Leotti, Adjunct Faculty
Emily Lott, Graduate Research Assistant
Analucia Lopezrevoredo, Adjunct Faculty
Alec Martinez, Staff/Student
Michele Martinez Thompson, Faculty
Bowen McBeath, Faculty
Gita Mehrotra, Faculty
Rhen Miles, Graduate Teaching Instructor
Celeste Moser, Research Associate
Christina Nicolaidis, Faculty
Mary Oschwald, Faculty
John Ossowski, Research Associate
Meg Panichelli, Adjunct Faculty
Monica Parmley, Faculty
Melissa Penners, Staff
Janet Putnam, Faculty
Jessica Schmidt, Research Associate
Teresa Schmidt, Adjunct Faculty
Gary Smith, Faculty
Claudia Sellmaier, Adjunct Faculty
Susie Snyder, Faculty
Kameron Taber, Staff
Michael Taylor, Faculty
Gretchen Thiel, Faculty
Alma M.O. Trinidad, Faculty
Shannon Turner, Senior Researcher Assistant
Christine Velez Klug, Adjunct Faculty
Stephanie Wahab, Faculty
Erika Woods, Staff
Katie Winters, Research Associate
Jim Carlton, Senior Research Assistant
Diane Yatchmenoff, Adjunct Faculty
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WHEREAS, SEIU Local 503, OPEU worked with our Legislative allies toward passage of Senate Bill 405 which provided each of the seven Oregon public universities, the ability and authority to form a campus police force; and

WHEREAS, Public safety has been a rising concern of the PSU campus community; and

WHEREAS, President Wiewel empaneled the Task Force on Campus Safety (TFCS) to research public safety concerns and make recommendations on addressing these concerns; and

WHEREAS, The TFCS would include, in its research, discussions with all constituent groups at PSU as well as citizens of the surrounding community; and

WHEREAS, The Associated Students of Portland State University (ASPSU) conducted independent studies; and

WHEREAS, The task force has completed its work and submitted its report; and

WHEREAS, The results of the ASPSU study and TFCS report have identified similar safety concerns; and

WHEREAS, The TFCS has, as part of their report, included the statement, “After careful review and discussion, the Task Force believes that the limitations on CPSO authority, jurisdiction and capability are the most concerning safety issue on campus;” and

WHEREAS, To address these concerns, the TFCS has recommended one (1) scenario that transitions our Campus Public Safety Office into a Campus Police Force; and

WHEREAS, To address these concerns, the TFCS has recommended three (3) scenarios that contract out the CPSO duties to an external police force; and

WHEREAS, Status quo is not an option and President Wiewel will make his final decision on which TFCS recommendation to adopt, now, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED by the membership of SEIU Local 503, OPEU, Sub-Local 089 that we support keeping CPSO a PSU organization and we oppose any recommendation that involves contracting any part of CPSO to an outside agency.
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that we recommend, to President Wiewel, that he adopt the TFCS Recommendation Number 1 which states, “PSU should explore ways to ensure access to sworn officers who are appropriately trained in campus policing and available on-site to the PSU campus community.”

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the TFCS statement, “the way to achieve this is by transitioning the Campus Public Safety Office to a department that has both fully sworn police officers and non-sworn Campus Public Safety officers,” is the direction he should take.

Marc Nisenfeld, Sub-Local 89

6-20-19
Date
Memorandum

TO: Portland State University’s Board of Trustees’ Special Committee on Campus Public Safety

FROM: Charles J. Lopez, Interim Chief Diversity Officer

DATE: December 2, 2014

RE: Follow-up on Information Request

Outlined below are the questions raised during the Board of Trustees’ Special Committee on Campus Public Safety. The answers are listed in bold text.

1. Were there any appeals made to the Oregon University Chancellor’s Office from any of the students or former students who brought complaints of discrimination/profiling against PSU’s Campus Public Safety Officers? Yes, there was one appeal to the Chancellor’s Office and the decision was made by the Chancellor’s Office to affirm the decision without a separate hearing.

2. What was the percentage of substantiated PSU policy violations? In 2013, the percentage in which the office of Equity & Compliance found a policy violation was 7%. Note, however, that a complainant may allege more than one form of discrimination, harassment, etc., which means that a single complaint, with multiple allegations is counted multiple times in this total.

3. What was the average number of days a case is open during the investigation? Approximately 50 days.