Within the last six months, issues have been raised within the University pertaining to the Campus Safety and Security Office. The issues, including those identified by the Director of CSSO, members of the University Executive Committee and the Vanguard editorial staff, all center ultimately on the role which CSSO is - or should be - assuming within the University community.

The analysis and recommendations contained in this report represent an effort at a comprehensive review of the Campus Safety and Security Office. While many of the issues addressed in the report have been raised within the institution, the report itself is not limited to such issues. Regardless of whether the issues were voiced, there is a felt need for an indepth analysis of CSSO.

Therefore, the report is not intended as a criticism of existing practices within CSSO nor is the report a "knee-jerk" response to criticisms of the organization. Rather, the analysis is intended to represent a comprehensive evaluation of a program of the University.

Introductory Information

The PSU Campus Safety and Security Office is a relatively new organization, having been formally established in the fall of 1969. Prior to that year, the on-campus "safety and security" needs were handled by a single individual whose responsibilities were essentially those of a "watchman". With the retirement of the individual in 1969 and the intensification of on-campus student unrest, the University recognized the need for formalizing the services provided by such an office. In September, 1969, therefore, the Campus Safety and Security Office was established; a Director was hired along with two officers and a secretary-dispatcher.

Since 1969, CSSO has undergone substantial change. The office has been assigned a broader scope of responsibilities, budget support has been increased, and the quality of the personnel has been upgraded. These improvements were accelerated by the 1970 campus disturbances, although the character of the responsibilities of CSSO has not necessarily been couched to respond to the type of abnormal environment existing during the period of campus unrest. The 1970 events led directly to
a substantial budget increase for CSSO, but, in the aftermath of the disturbances, the CSSO budget was reduced to a level more commensurate with the on-campus environment. Likewise, the responsibilities of CSSO have undergone revisions as the on-campus situation changed. Throughout these changes, the CSSO suffered through periods of instability of personnel and focus.

With the appointment of the current director, John Wanjala, greater stability has been brought to the organization. The current staff of fourteen\(^2\) includes four individuals with five years of service. The average months of service of all CSSO employees is thirty-six, a dramatic change from the 1972-73 fiscal year when thirteen positions turned-over at least once. The stabilizing of personnel within the office has been accompanied by a refinement of internal procedures as well. While much work remains to be done, CSSO is significantly different when compared to the unstable organization of the early 1970's.

\(^1\)Two sources of support are available for the Campus Safety and Security Office. First, funds are budgeted in the regular budget account (-050-7503) and, secondly, support is also provided through the auxiliary services account for parking (-166-0001). The maximum number of full-time employees authorized for CSSO from these two accounts is summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>-050-7503</th>
<th>-166-0001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1969-70</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-71</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-75</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-76</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^2\)The current CSSO employees and the date of their employment at CSSO are: George Chenette (Patrolman 2), 5-1-69; John Wanjala (Program Executive 1), 8-1-70; Terrence Turnidge (Supervisor 1), 8-14-70; Dwight Gerber (Supervisor 1), 10-5-70; Grace Lugalia (Clerical Ass't.), 6-16-72; Paul Lazenby (Patrolman 2), 8-7-72; Pat Parsons (Supervisor 1), 2-5-73; Donald Parker (Patrolman 2), 10-1-73; Hayri Gokcay (Patrolman 1), 10-30-73; John Edwards (Patrolman 2), 2-20-74; Lawrence Paull (Patrolman 2), 3-1-74; Kim Fleming (Secretary), 1-1-75; William Moffenbeier (Patrolman 1), 6-12-75; and Lawrence Miller (Patrolman 1), 7-1-75.

Briefly, the 14 full-time employees are organized as follows: overall supervision is provided by the Director (Wanjala); the services of a secretary are available in the Office; the day shift is covered by a supervisor and four officers; the swing shift is covered by a supervisor, two officers, a clerical assistant and student employees; and the graveyard shift is covered by a supervisor, two officers and student employees.
During the six and one half year life of CSSO, two statements describing the role of the office have been adopted. The first statement was adopted on February 19, 1971, while the second was contained in an October 24, 1973 document submitted to a State Board Committee. Both statements authorize CSSO to render aid and assistance to the injured, enforce University parking regulations and provide for the safety and security of persons and property. In addition, both statements clearly indicate that CSSO officers will be unarmed. On the other hand, however, the two statements have some striking differences. The earlier statement authorizes CSSO to investigate criminal activity on the campus, to collect and maintain files on criminal activity, to assist state and local authorities in the serving of warrants or in the arrest of a member of the University community, and to prevent the occurrence of a criminal act. Furthermore, the 1971 statement specifically limits the authority of CSSO to the University campus. The 1973 statement prohibits CSSO from investigating criminal activity, and collecting and maintaining files. In addition, the later statement authorized CSSO to detain and hold persons suspected of criminal activity, to function as a "watchman," to keep unauthorized persons from campus grounds and buildings or remove them, if necessary, to provide such miscellaneous services as starting automobiles with dead batteries, providing information to visitors and locating parents of lost children. The 1971 statement would appear to reflect the campus events of 1970 while the 1973 statement would appear to react to the instability of the 1972-73 period. The earlier document authorized CSSO to perform "security" functions while the later statement reduced the on-campus visibility of the office. A major question results: what should the role of CSSO be in 1976 and in the future?

The files in the office of the Vice President for Finance and Administration contain an undated copy of the statement which apparently was presented on October 24, 1973 to a State Board committee as part of an overall institutional review. The files do not contain an indication of formal University approval of the statement. However, it seems reasonable that since the statement was presented to the State Board committee, it had University approval, whether recorded or not. Therefore, the October 24, 1973 statement is undoubtedly the effective policy statement on the Campus Safety and Security Office. If, however, the 1973 document is in force, CSSO is in violation of University policy, since the statement prohibits the office from the investigation of crimes, the collection of information on criminal activity, and the maintenance of files on members of the University community. In order to resolve the question, the President should be asked to officially approve a statement on the role of CSSO.

The functions to be performed by the Campus Safety and Security Office should reflect the need for such services. Statistical information compiled by CSSO provides a perspective on incidents of criminal activity on the campus, and can be used as a tool for evaluating the requirement for security services. The 1974-75 Annual Activity Report of CSSO includes the following summary which compares criminal activity for 1972-73 and 1974-75;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime</th>
<th>1972-73</th>
<th>1974-75</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Offenses</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Trespass</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorderly Conduct</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>(32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Activity-Drugs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating False Report</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>315</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note that theft accounts for a major part of the criminal incidents on campus - 68 percent of the total. The report does not contain information on the number of non-University individuals compared to members of the University community involved in incidents of crime, although the introduction to the report does indicate that CSSO records "show that the majority of disruptive and/or criminal acts that have occurred since the establishment of CSSO have been attributable to persons not connected with the University."

CSSO records also indicate that the number of non-criminal incidents has increased substantially between 1972-73 and 1974-75. During the earlier period, 69 non-criminal incidents occurred, while 189 such incidents were recorded in 1974-75 - an increase of 173% over the two year period. The majority of the non-criminal reports involve first aid, information reports and found property; together, these three constitute.71 percent of all non-criminal reports written in 1974-75 by CSSO.

Finally, records in the Business Office indicate that CSSO has had substantial activity in issuing parking citations. During 1972-73, 16,975 citations were issued by CSSO, and the number fell to 14,400 during the last fiscal year.

The statistical information on criminal, non-criminal and parking activities does not adequately describe all current workloads of CSSO nor do the data fully describe the University community's requirements for "safety and security" services. Other needs which can not be reduced to statistics exist on the campus; such activities include informational services, securing of doors, providing a visible presence, identifying potential safety or security problems, and so on. Therefore, the statistical information is provided as a means of describing only some of the conditions which require services by CSSO, but the data are not intended to fully define the workload of CSSO.
The introductory information is intended to provide a "snapshot" of the organization and role of the Campus Safety and Security Office, and of some of the campus conditions which require CSSO services.

Discussion of Issues

The nature of the issues affecting CSSO covers a broad range of activities and responsibilities, and, a discussion of the individual issues tends to submerge the raison d'etre of the department. "Zeroing-in" on a specific issue, such as access to files maintained by CSSO, should, therefore, be cast against a background of the purpose for which such an organization exists as a part of the University.

The general statements of purpose of CSSO contained in the February 19, 1971 and October 24, 1973 descriptions of CSSO provide two perspectives of the attitude of the University toward the department. The earlier statement describes the functions of CSSO as providing "for the safety and security of persons, buildings, vehicles, and equipment on campus from fire, theft, vandalism, and personal harm," seeking to "prevent the occurrence of criminal acts," investigating "committed crimes and violations of University rules and regulations," enforcing "campus parking regulations with the view to making maximum beneficial use of available parking facilities" and rendering "aid and assistance to persons in need." The October 1973 statement identified the "mandate" of CSSO in a somewhat different manner. CSSO, according to the more recent statement, described the functions as maintaining "calm on the campus," controlling crime, and "providing assistance to the University community."

The two existing statements on the purpose of the Campus Safety and Security Office appear to concentrate on specific activities to be performed rather than upon the relationship of the organization within the University. CSSO is not a primary means by which the major mission of the University (e.g., instruction, research and public service) is realized, but is a supportive and service activity by which the University's major mission is achieved. If CSSO is to function as a part of the University, the statement of purpose should clearly establish this relationship, or, if CSSO is to function as a "police" or "quasi-police" organization partially separate from the main stream of the University, the statement should clearly establish this role.

As implied above, a general theme incorporated into this review of the Campus Safety and Security Office is the premise that CSSO is a service and supportive activity of the University committed to assisting in the achievement of the primary mission of the institution. Therefore, the discussion of the issues is affected by the general premise.
At least eight major issues appear to be central to the activities and expected performance of CSSO. These issues, which will be individually discussed in this section of the review, include the following:

1. Jurisdiction
2. Parking
3. General Safety and Security
4. Criminal Activity
5. Health Services
6. Drivers' Training Program
7. Relationship with Portland Police Bureau
8. General Operating Procedures

The conclusions resulting from the review have been incorporated into a proposed statement on CSSO, which is attached as Exhibit A.

Jurisdiction. Oregon law provides that the State Board of Higher Education is responsible for the control and management of property (ORS 351.060), enforcement of traffic regulations (ORS 352.360) and general administration (ORS 351.070) of the institutions of higher education. AR 12.110 delegates to the institutional presidents the "full authority and responsibility to administer the affairs of his institution in accordance with Board policies, plans, budgets and standards."

Furthermore, the State Board's "Statement of Board Policies on Institutional Governance", under the heading of "General Grant of Authority to Insitutional Presidents," provides that the president, as the chief executive officer of the institution, is "responsible to the chancellor and the state board of higher education for all aspects of the institution's operation including the custodianship of all real and personal property owned or controlled by the institution whether on or off the campus...."

Therefore, the President of Portland State University is the source of authority and jurisdiction for the PSU Campus Safety and Security Office, subject to State Board policies.

The jurisdiction of CSSO is limited to the authority delegated to the President of Portland State. CSSO's jurisdiction extends geographically to the PSU buildings, properties and facilities, whether on-campus or off-campus, and their responsibility pertains only to activities related to the management of the University, but is not limited to students, staff and faculty of PSU, since the "management" of the University may involve non-University people.

Two areas of concern are not addressed in the specific delegation of jurisdiction to the President of Portland State. First, the Park Blocks area is not part of the University properties, and the Portland Police Bureau has been reluctant to exercise jurisdiction in the area. The agreement between Portland State and the City Parks Bureau is silent on the question of PSU jurisdiction, and an effort should be made to either amend the agreement to
extend PSU authority over the Park Blocks or to reach agreement with the Portland Police Bureau on their jurisdiction for the area. Secondly, the lease with Portland Student Services, Inc. delegates responsibility for the management of PSS facilities to PSS. Discussions between PSU and PSS should specifically address the question of the role of CSSO in providing services to PSS residents and facilities.

Parking. The Campus Safety and Security Office is the department of the University which is responsible for the enforcement of the State Board policies and the University's regulations on parking. ORS 352.360 provides that the "State Board of Higher Education may enact such regulations as it shall deem convenient or necessary to provide for the policing, control and regulation of traffic and parking of vehicles on the property of any institution under the jurisdiction of the board. Such regulations may provide for the registration of vehicles, the designation of parking areas, and the assessment and collection of reasonable fees and charges for parking . . . ." In carrying out the authority granted in ORS 352.360, the State Board, through "procedures adopted by the board," may impose "administrative and disciplinary sanctions . . . against students, faculty and staff for violations of the regulations, including but not limited to, a reasonable monetary penalty . . . The regulations enacted . . . may also be enforced by the impoundment of vehicles . . . ." Finally, the board, "for the purpose of enforcing its rules and regulations governing traffic control, may appoint peace officers who shall have the same authority as other peace officers . . . ."

The Campus Safety and Security Office at Portland State has been designated as the institutional department responsible for the enforcement of parking regulations. Enforcement of parking regulations is one of the major workloads of CSSO, constituting approximately twenty to twenty-five percent of the total effort. Financial support has been provided from parking revenues to aid CSSO, with the parking account supporting two patrolmen, student employees and miscellaneous services and supplies. Effective July 1, 1976, it is recommended that the two patrolmen positions plus student assistance and services and supplies expenditures be transferred to the CSSO budget, with parking, in turn, providing service credits for the support of CSSO. This accounting transfer essentially involved consolidation of expenditure responsibility under CSSO, but provides for continuing support from parking revenues for enforcement of parking regulations.

Enforcement of parking regulations is a major workload of CSSO, and is, in my opinion, exceeded in significance only by responsibility for the general safety and security of the University.

General Safety and Security. Probably the most important function performed by the Campus Safety and Security Office is maintaining the general safety and security of the University community and the University properties. Portland State is an "open" campus in an urban area and is subject to problems of the urban area.
CSSO, by its presence and through its actions, constitutes a "shield" which should permit members of the University community to function. The mere presence of CSSO is an influential force in maintaining an environment free of internal and external impediments to the normal operations of the University. The continuous visibility of uniformed CSSO personnel on the campus is essential, but criminal and non-criminal acts will occur regardless. CSSO personnel, in addition to maintaining a visibility on the campus, should also serve as the University's agent when persons menace or attempt to harass others within University boundaries, provided such can be done without a threat to the personal safety of CSSO personnel and other persons. The issue of the "power" of CSSO personnel will be reviewed in greater depth in the discussion of "criminal activity."

A second facet of the "general safety and security" issue pertains to the protection of University buildings, properties and facilities. The issue of safety is complicated by federal OSHA requirements involving compliance with federal rules and regulations. The physical plant office at Portland State is responsible for monitoring on-campus physical situations which may constitute hazards to members of the University community, and/or members of the general public. CSSO is responsible for advising the physical plant of conditions on campus which may be hazardous, although the focal point of attention for physical safety matters must remain with the physical plant because of external requirements, such as workmen's compensation, OSHA, and so on. The security of University buildings, properties and facilities should be a function of CSSO, however. Whether labeled "watchmen" or "security personnel," the University does have need for individuals responsible for continuously monitoring the security of University properties, and CSSO is in the best position to perform this function. Regardless of the best intentions of people, doors will be left unlocked, ajar, or open, and properties of the University will be vulnerable to theft. CSSO personnel should continuously monitor the campus to insure the security of University equipment, buildings, facilities and properties.

Finally, an adequate program of prevention is necessary. CSSO has initiated a Crime Prevention Program and will work with departments of the University in implementing the program. In addition, a request has been submitted to the University administration for converting an existing position in CSSO to one which would have direct responsibility for such a program.

The Campus Safety and Security Office has a significant responsibility for (a) maintaining an on-campus visibility as a deterrent, (b) protecting members of the University community, provided such can be done without threat to CSSO personnel, (c) monitoring the security of University properties, and (d) providing an effective Crime Prevention Program for the University. These functions constitute the most important service of CSSO to the University community.
Criminal Activity. The one issue which generates the greatest amount of discussion is the role of CSSO in responding to criminal activity on the campus. The existence of criminal activity on the campus is demonstrated by the information presented on pages 3 and 4 of this report. The issue is: what role should CSSO assume in dealing with this level of criminal activity?

Involved in the discussion is not only the role of CSSO but the availability of assistance from the Portland Police Bureau. While the relationship between PPB and Portland State is discussed in more detail later in this report, it should be noted at this point that the PPB is willing to provide assistance in situations involving "felonies and those misdemeanors which require immediate dissemination of information about suspects."

Currently, CSSO officers are unable to deal directly with persons suspected of misdemeanors or felonies, except as provided under ORS 133.225, which allows citizens to make arrests for any "crime committed in their presence," provided "he has probable cause to believe the arrested person committed the crime." If the act is not committed in their presence, however, CSSO officers can not legally stop, apprehend, detain, or treat an individual suspected of committing a crime. The Portland Police Bureau will assist CSSO officers in some felonies or misdemeanors, but only those requiring "immediate dissemination of information about suspects," which means that lesser crimes must be handled by CSSO personnel.

Suggestions have been made to request a "special commission" for CSSO officers which would allow CSSO to be designated as a "peace agency" for purposes of making arrests, detaining and holding in custody under the provisions of ORS 133.235. During the 1975 Legislative session, a bill was drafted which would have authorized the State Board of Higher Education to appoint peace officers, but the Chancellor's office was opposed to the introduction of this bill. Discussions have also been held with the Governor's office, the Multnomah County Sheriff's Office and the Portland Police Chief, all of whom are either unwilling or unable to provide a special commission to CSSO.

Under current circumstances, CSSO personnel are uncertain as to how they are to respond to situations which may involve criminal acts. If the act is committed in their presence, they can arrest under the provisions of ORS 133.225 if they have "probable cause to believe the arrested person committed the crime." However, if the act was not committed in the presence of CSSO personnel, they can not stop, detain, hold in custody or arrest; in such cases, the Portland City Police must be called. If the situation involves "lesser crimes" which will not be processed by PPB, CSSO personnel are left wondering without having the authority.
In the discussion of "General Safety and Security," a suggestion was made to convert an existing position in CSSO to one with responsibility for the PSU Crime Prevention Program. The new position could play a key role in the investigation of criminal activity, and should special commissions be authorized, for serving as the coordinating agent at PSU for the making of arrests on the campus. It is my opinion that this authority for making arrests under ORS 133.225 should continue but, additional authority could be granted to a select group of CSSO personnel acting under the direction of the individual who would assume the new position. It is suggested that the CSSO director and the person appointed to the new position be given, through a special commission, the authority for detaining, holding in custody and frisking persons who may have committed criminal acts outside the presence of CSSO personnel. It is recommended that these two individuals have the authority to delegate such responsibility to no more than 3 other CSSO officers—one supervisor of each of the three.

Of course, it almost goes without saying that CSSO should perform this function without the arm of any kind.

A subsidiary question on criminal activities pertains to investigating, maintenance of records, access to records and destruction of records.

The October, 1973 statement prohibits CSSO from conducting "criminal investigations" while the February 19, 1971 statement authorized CSSO to investigate crimes. The total prohibition against "criminal investigations" does not seem appropriate, given the environment of the campus and the level of assistance from the Portland Police Bureau. In cases of "felonies and those misdemeanors which require immediate dissemination of information . . . about suspects," the recommendation was made that the PPB assume responsibility. However, "lesser crimes and activities occurring on campus will be processed by CSSO." Therefore, I would recommend that the investigating authority of CSSO be limited to those activities falling under the jurisdiction of CSSO, subject to all conditions on the collection and maintenance of files as prescribed by the University. Complete responsibility for the investigations would be vested in the new position in CSSO, thereby releasing all CSSO personnel to concentrate on other services to the University.

The October, 1973 statement is silent on the issue of the collection and maintenance of files on students, University personnel or non-University individuals. The earlier 1971 document does speak to the issue and provides specific guidelines on what evidence or files can be assembled and maintained, what restrictions pertain to such activities, when the files are to be destroyed, who has access to the files and how the files are to be arranged. The current analysis of the issue has a new element injected into the discussion, namely, the "student records" issue raised by the so-called "Buckley amendment." The federal regulations on the Buckley amendment have not been published, and,
therefore, some uncertainties exist. It does appear, however, that the CSSO files would have to be maintained separate from other institutional files on students, and thereby, CSSO would be prohibited from accessing other student files on campus. Until the Buckley amendment's regulations are released, it is recommended that CSSO be allowed to maintain records on activities under its jurisdiction but "under no circumstances" shall CSSO maintain a file or record of the activities of any member of the University community, unless an event has occurred that could subject such member to criminal action or University disciplinary action in connection therewith. Furthermore, "to the extent permitted by law, file records of an event or incident will be destroyed as soon as criminal or University disciplinary action on the event or incident has been completed or as soon as it has been determined that no action will be taken."

Finally, CSSO should be prohibited from maintaining any file on a member of the University community pertaining to the academic activities, membership activities, political activities or employment performance of such persons.

The question of access to CSSO records appears to be subject to (a) the Portland State University Statement on Student Rights and Freedom, (b) the Administrative Rules of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education, (c) in all probability, the Buckley amendment. First, with regard to student members of the University community, the Statement on Student Rights and Freedom specifies that "no information from any student files not designated as part of the public domain shall be available to unauthorized persons on campus, or to any persons off campus without the express consent of the student involved except under legal compulsion or in cases where the safety of persons or property is involved." The OSBHE Administrative Rules (AR 30.040(1)) also state that "Personal records designated as confidential shall be available only to institutional personnel who have to fulfill their official, professional responsibilities as defined in institutional regulations. These records may not be released to any other person or agency without the student's written consent, unless upon receipt of a subpoena or other court order or process . . . ." However, "The institutional executive, or his designated representative, may make exception to the foregoing rule when he determines that there is a clear and present danger to the safety of the student or others and/or property and that disclosure of relevant personal information about the student is essential in order to avoid or substantially minimize the danger." Secondly, ORS 351.065 speaks to the issue of all "personal records" which are maintained "by the institution, division or department concerning a student or faculty member." A personal record is defined by the statute as "records containing information kept by the institution, division or department concerning a student or faculty member and furnished by him or by others about him at his or at the institution, division or department's request, including but not limited to, information concerning discipline, counseling, membership activity, employment performance or other behavioral records of individual persons." In addition, ORS 351.065 indicates that "Regulations adopted . . . shall require that personal records
be subjected to restrictions on access unless upon a finding by the institutional executive that the public interest in maintaining individual rights to privacy in an adequate educational environment would not suffer by disclosure of such personal record. Access to personal records may be limited to designated classes of information or persons, or to stated times and conditions, or to both . . . ." The OSBHE Administrative Rules state that "Personal records, designated as subject to restricted access . . . shall be available only to institutional personnel, i.e., faculty, administrators, and those students serving on official committees who have a demonstrably legitimate need to review them in order to fulfill their official professional responsibilities . . . . These records may not be released to any other person or agency without the faculty member's written consent unless upon receipt of a valid subpoena or other court order or process or as required by state statute, federal law, or valid federal or state rules, regulations, or orders." Finally, the Public Records statute (ORS 192.500) provides for the exemption from disclosure of certain public records; exempt from disclosure is "Investigatory information compiled for criminal law purposes, except that the record of an arrest or the report of a crime shall not be confidential unless and only so long as there is a clear need in a particular case to delay disclosure in the course of an investigation." Therefore, in keeping with the spirit of the Oregon statutes, the OSBHE Administrative Rules and the Statement on Student Rights and Freedom, we recommend that "all CSSO files and records be designated as confidential, except that any record or an arrest or report of a crime shall not be confidential unless "there is a clear need in a particular case to delay disclosure in the course of an investigation," or, unless the "victim" or the person committing the act signs a release, or, "unless appropriate legal steps are followed." In addition, CSSO files on members of the University community shall be available only to institutional personnel who have to fulfill their official professional responsibility and have a demonstrably legitimate need for such information. CSSO may release statistical or demographic reports as long as individuals are not identified.

Health Services. By agreement with the PSU Health Services, CSSO personnel will be responsible for providing first aid and other assistance required by injured or ill individuals. Arrangements are being made to implement these agreements.

Relationships with Portland Police Bureau. The relationships between the Portland Police Bureau (PPB) and Portland State University have been spelled out in two memoranda. First, a November 2, 1970 memorandum from the Commanding Officer of the PPB Records Division to Mr. William R. Johnson, the PSU Safety and Security Director, authorized CSSO to send to the PPB "only those reports which substantiate the fact that a crime had been committed, or that contained information thought to be of significant value to the Police Bureau . . . ." Conversely, CSSO was to have access to certain files of the PPB, but this privilege
was subsequently withdrawn in light of legislation in Oregon. Today, the PPB information available to CSSO is limited to notification of whether an individual is wanted or not.

The second memorandum dated February 8, 1972 from Capt. N.F. Reiter of the PPB relates to the scope of the activities of the PPB vis-a-vis Portland State University. "All felonies and those misdemeanors which require immediate dissemination of information about suspects will be handled by this Bureau (PPB) and the reports written by members of this Bureau," Capt. Reiter indicated. "Lesser crimes will be processed by the security unit (CSSO) who will provide reports to this Bureau." In addition, "In the event of demonstrations or social action occurrences, District Officers will check with their Commanding Officers before taking action, except in those situations where life is endangered or major property damage taking place." Subsequently, on May 9, 1972, Robert J. Low, Vice President for Administration at Portland State, informed the Chief of the PPB that the "University will continue in effect its policy of providing to the senior administrative official present on campus, and only that person, to make a decision to request police assistance in the event of a mass or large-group disturbance."

In my opinion, the following principles should be followed in defining relationships between the PPB and Portland State:

1. All felonies and those misdemeanors which require immediate dissemination of information, as determined by either the new Investigator 2 position or by the senior CSSO officer on duty, about suspects will be handled by the PPB and the reports will be written by the PPB.

2. Lesser crimes and activities occurring on campus will be processed by the new Investigator 2 position in CSSO, and reports written will be subject to University policies regarding public release of such information.

3. The University will continue its policy of providing the senior administrative official present on campus, and only that person, with the authority to make a decision to request PPB assistance in the event of a mass or large-group disturbance; if at all possible, the President will be contacted.

4. The PPB, when serving a warrant or arresting a member of the University community, will act through CSSO.

5. CSSO access to PPB files or information must be governed by applicable statutes, PPB policies or executive orders.

In order to evaluate the impact of the application of these principles, I recommend that Mr. Wanjala be authorized to enter into discussions and negotiations with appropriate PPB representatives, subject to final approval by the President of Portland State and city officials.
Driver's Training Program. By executive order, all state agencies are required to provide a driver's training program for all employees using state vehicles. CSSO has been designated as the University department responsible for providing such training to University employees, and, $5,014 for 1976-77 has been requested for the purpose of implementing the program.

Operating Procedures Manual. A detailed internal operating procedures manual has been prepared by the Campus Safety and Security Office which will clarify the mode of operation required of all CSSO personnel. The implementation of the manual should aid in the elimination of uncertainties among CSSO personnel on acceptable and expected performance.

Conclusion

The purpose of this review is to evaluate the Campus Safety and Security Office. The analysis and comments are not intended to be critical of CSSO, since it is my opinion that they have served - and will continue to serve - an important function on the Portland State campus.

As a result of the review, a proposed statement of the role and function of CSSO has been prepared, and is attached. The proposed statement is presented for discussion and consideration by appropriate committees and persons.
CAMPUS SAFETY AND SECURITY OFFICE

General Purpose

The Campus Safety and Security Office of Portland State University provides services to members of the University community, including students, staff, faculty and visitors to campus. The office functions as a supporting and service-oriented department of the University. The office is responsible for the safety and security of persons, buildings, vehicles and equipment on campus; seeks to prevent the occurrence of criminal acts; investigates committed crimes and violations of University rules and regulations; and renders aid and assistance to persons in need.

In carrying out these responsibilities, the office will be guided by and be subject to all State laws and Portland City ordinances, and all University policies and regulations, including regulations governing parking on University property established by the Oregon State Board of Higher Education.

Jurisdiction

The operations of the Campus Safety and Security Office will be limited to the land, structures, streets, roadways, parking facilities, and all other property and facilities under the control of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education which have been designated for the use of Portland State University and the Division of Continuing Education.

Responsibilities

In the exercise of their responsibility to promote campus safety, Campus Safety and Security officers will cooperate closely with:

1. all members of the University community;
2. appropriate City and County authorities; and
3. the Portland State University Student Health Services.

The Campus Safety and Security Office is responsible for;

1. Monitoring and enforcement of all parking rules and regulations adopted by the Oregon State Board of Higher Education;
2. In case of injury, illness or accident, providing emergency first aid, where possible, and requesting immediate medical assistance when appropriate;
3. Identifying potential safety hazards on campus and reporting such hazards to appropriate University officials for correction;

4. Promoting an atmosphere of security and safety among the members of the University community;

5. Protecting the security and safety of members of the University community, persons visiting Portland State University, and the building, properties and facilities of the University insofar as possible.

Authority

The Campus Safety and Security Office is subject to all applicable City and County ordinances; laws of the State of Oregon and the United States, and all rules, regulations or directives of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education, the University or any federal or state official or agency.

The Campus Safety and Security Office shall have authority to maintain such confidential files on criminal activities as may be permitted by law or by the administrative rules of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education or the University. All criminal records are to remain confidential except as limited by law or by the administrative rules of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education or the University. Under no circumstances shall a record or file of any member of the University community be collected or maintained unless an event has occurred that could subject such member to criminal action or University disciplinary action in connection therewith. Access to such files and records is permitted only to the complainant or complainants, the alleged violator or violators, the Dean of Students, the Vice President for Finance and Administration, Assistant to the President, the President or to institutional personnel who have a demonstrably legitimate need to review such records or files in order to fulfill their official responsibilities. To the extent permitted by law, all records or files of an event or incident will be destroyed as soon as the criminal or University disciplinary action on the event or incident has been completed or as soon as it has been determined that no action will be taken.

The Campus Safety and Security Office may arrest an individual for any crime committed in their presence, provided there is a clear and present danger to members of the University community or to University buildings, properties or facilities. Except in such extraordinary circumstances, the Campus Safety and Security Office will refer to the Portland Police Bureau for the making of arrests.

The Campus Safety and Security Office may, either alone or in cooperation with the Portland Police Bureau, engage in investigations of criminal activities or events within the scope of the office's jurisdiction, and, when engaged in such investigations, the office
is subject to all applicable federal and state laws, and administrative rules of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education and the University.

The Campus Safety and Security Office may release statistical and demographic information pertaining to their activities provided that such information does not identify individuals.