The following documents were presented to Faculty Senate as background documents to agenda item C.2. Discussion Item – Campus Public Safety Recommendations.
Establishment of Special Committee on Campus Public Safety

None. This issue has not yet been considered by a committee.

In April 2013, President Wvetel established a Task Force on Public Safety and charged the task force with providing recommendations on how best to address safety concerns and improve the University’s response to criminal activity on campus. In November 2013, the task force issued its final report. (The full report is included in this docket item.) The task force’s Campus Public Safety Office (CPSO) recommendations are:

- **Recommendation 1.** 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.
- **Recommendation 2.** In addition to arranging for on-site access to fully sworn officers, PSU should maintain access to non-sworn Campus Public Safety Officers to continue providing duties that do not require sworn officer status.
- **Recommendation 3.** PSU should establish a permanent committee to provide an ongoing review of campus safety needs and best practices.
- **Recommendation 4.** CPSO leadership should provide safety presentations and other education at events such as staff onboarding meetings, student orientation sessions, and Administrative Briefings.

President Wvetel has accepted the report and its recommendations. Several of the recommendations have been implemented. For instance, CPSO has been switching campus buildings to electronic-only access, has improved community outreach, has improved lighting in key areas across campus, and is forming a campus security review committee, which will include faculty and students.

However, the recommendation regarding access to sworn police officers has not been implemented. Currently, CPSO officers are not sworn police officers. Rather, they are “special campus safety officers” with limited statutory authority.

This particular task force recommendation merits additional review by the campus community and by the Board of Trustees. In addition, under state law (CRS 352.115), the establishment of a university police department, and the
commissioning of university police officers with the privileges and immunities of police officers, would require the approval of the Board of Trustees.

Campus presentations and sessions regarding the implementation of this recommendation and the proposal to create a university police department are scheduled to occur in October. Following those sessions, the staff would like to bring a recommendation in November to a meeting of a special board committee on campus public safety. Any subsequent recommendation by the special board committee on campus public safety to create a university police department would then need to be brought to the full board for consideration.

SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE DISCUSSION: This issue has not yet been considered by a committee.

REQUESTED BOARD ACTION: Approval by the board of a motion to:

1. Establish a Special Committee on Campus Public Safety.
2. Charge the special committee with considering any recommendations brought forward by the staff regarding implementation of the Campus Public Safety Task Force’s recommendation regarding sworn police officers.
3. Direct the Chair of the Board to appoint officers and members to the special committee.
4. Direct the special committee to report back to the full board at the board’s December meeting.

ATTACHED DOCUMENTS:
1. Presidential Task Force on Campus Safety Updated Executive Summary, August 18 2014
2. Presidential Task Force on Campus Safety Final Report, November 1 2013
3. Urban 21, GUS Schools and FBI Crime Reports Campus Safety Officer and Staff Data

ADDITIONAL BACKGROUND READING: None.
Executive Summary: The Presidential Task Force on Campus Safety
August 18, 2014

Portland State is the largest university in Oregon, and has doubled over the last three decades. Yet it has only two more campus public safety officers than it did in the 1970s, and they are asked to perform an ever-growing list of duties. President Wim Wiewel formed a task force made up of faculty, staff, administrators, and students in 2013 to take a fresh look at campus security and make recommendations for improvement. The task force issued its final report to President Wiewel in November 2013.

Some of the Task Force’s Findings:

- The campus typically has two security officers for each eight-hour shift.
- Some security resources have not kept up with the times. For example, emergency “Blue Light” phones, located throughout campus and installed before the era of smartphones, are barely used.
- Parents and students have expressed concerns about safety on campus. The University must examine the perceptions of campus safety in order to recruit and retain students.
- The Campus Public Safety Office (CPSO) has no capacity to respond to and disrupt an active shooter on campus. For dangerous emergencies, it must rely on the Portland Police Bureau, which may not be able to respond quickly.
- CPSO also does not have the authority to fully and effectively investigate sexual assaults. Instead, it must rely on the Portland Police Bureau, leaving victims to wait and deal with an outside agency.
- Campus safety resources have not kept pace with the University’s growth.

CPSO Recommendations:

- Recommendation 1. 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.
- Recommendation 2. In addition to arranging for on-site access to fully sworn officers, PSU should maintain access to non-sworn Campus Public Safety Officers to continue providing duties that do not require sworn officer status.
- Recommendation 3. PSU should establish a permanent committee to provide an ongoing review of campus safety needs and best practices.
- Recommendation 4. CPSO leadership should provide safety presentations and other education at events such as staff onboarding meetings, student orientation sessions, and Administrative Briefings.

Actions Taken So Far:

Since the report came out, CPSO has been switching campus buildings to electronic-only access, and has improved lighting in key areas across campus. CPSO is forming a campus security review committee, which will include faculty and students. In May 2014, CPSO improved outreach by starting a twice monthly “Coffee with the Chief” in which anyone is welcome to visit with CPSO chief Phil Zerzan. Finally, different models for providing the campus with access to sworn officers were investigated and only one approach remains viable at this time: the creation of a campus police department with fully sworn officers.
Next Steps

The 2013 Task Force’s recommendation to have fully sworn officers on campus and the proposal for achieving this through the creation of a campus police department merits additional review by the campus community and Board of Trustees that will be achieved through the following events:

- **Thursday, September 11**: Presentation to the Board of Trustees, University Place, 8am-Noon
- **Monday, October 6**: Q&A session at Faculty Senate, Cramer Hall 53, 3pm-5pm
- **Tuesday, October 7**: Campus Safety Forum, Smith Memorial Student Union Ballroom, 9am-10:30am
- **Friday, October 10**: Administrative Briefing Presentation to staff and faculty, Smith Memorial Student Union 327-9, 10am-Noon
- **October/November**: Meetings with ASPSU (dates to be confirmed)
- **October/November**: Proposed Special Board of Trustees Committee Meeting (date to be confirmed)
Faculty Senate Monthly Packet November 2014

Portland State University Faculty Senate, "Faculty Senate Monthly Packet November 2014" (2014). Faculty Senate Monthly Packets, pp. 8-10, 24-29.
http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/senateminutes/306

[Excerpted below are:
Passage from 6 October 2014 Minutes, C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor – Campus Safety Update (pp. 8-10)
October Minutes Attachment B3 (pp. 24-29)]
Campus Safety Update

REYNOLDS said that he was seeking Senate input on the on-going dialogue around campus safety and the potential creation of a PSU police department. He reviewed the key findings of the Task Force on Campus Safety (see slides, minutes attachment B3), emphasizing that the number of campus safety officers has not kept pace with PSU’s growth and that there are more violent offenses and property crimes than many realize (B3, pp 1 & 3). He noted that PSU is the only one of the Urban-21 state-supported campuses not to have sworn police officers. He explained the operational differences between safety officers and sworn officers, and described the alternatives to PSU’s adding sworn police officers that had been explored and rejected (B3, p.4). He reviewed progress on other safety recommendations and the potential cost of and requirements for training and oversight, if sworn police officers were added (B3, p.5).
KARVANIC asked if there was concern that there were only 85 responses to the 2014 campus survey (B3, slide 5). REYNOLDS mentioned the campus forum planned for 10/7 to gather further comment. Phillip Zerzan, Chief of Campus Safety, clarified that the 85 responses were comments directed to the Task Force Report and the only survey he was aware of was the 2013 ASPSU survey [307 responses]. SCHULER asked if statistics were available on the number of safety officers who had been hurt on duty. ZERZAN said yes.

TAYLOR wondered if there had been sufficient outreach to the city, given that the only response cited was from the central police commander (B3, p. 4); and he expressed concern about replicating difficulties that the city police had been experiencing. REYNOLDS replied that the current system does not work, that there were Title 9 and jurisdictional issues, and situations when the Portland police responded with delay. ZERZAN noted that Campus Safety had worked cooperatively with the Portland Police, but there were important differences between campus and municipal policing. A campus police department would have the University as its priority. LIEBMAN clarified that the meeting had not moved to a committee of the whole, and minutes were being taken of the discussion of the administrative report.

GAMBURD asked how many universities did not have sworn police officers (compared to the 657 campuses that did). ZERZAN said he was not aware of any public campus with over 15,000 students without sworn police officers. Task Force member Chris Henning (AJ) noted that the FBI only tracks institutions with sworn police officers, but PSU appears to be an anomaly.

FINK asked for comment on the dichotomy between the image that PSU likes to project as a safe campus and the reality of the data. REYNOLDS invited Dean of Students Michele Toppe to respond. TOPPE said that PSU is in a very vulnerable position. She noted that incidents occur weekly, describing an assault on a PSU student in the Park Blocks last weekend. The Portland police did not file report on what was to them was a minor incident, although the student had a cut that required treatment.

LAYZELL agreed that Campus Safety was obviously understaffed and understood the worry, but asked if Campus Safety could cross off “armed” from its sworn officer description and still achieve 98% of what it needed to achieve. REYNOLDS noted that U of O, OHSU, and OSU had not gone down that route. Task Force member and Asst. Dean of Student Life Domanic Thomas argued that PSU would have to advocate for the legal authority at the state level to avoid jurisdictional issues arising from having unarmed officers. ZERZAN stated that sworn officers are required to have weapons training, but are not always required to carry a weapon; however, he argued that in the U.S., we are policing an armed populace. GRECO was struck by the fact that of the 21 urban campuses, although PSU has many fewer safety officers, it already has the lowest violent crime rate (B3, slide 11). She asked how much can be changed by introducing armed police officers? REYNOLDS emphasized that PSU’s numbers have remained constant over the last five years, although crime rates generally have declined. ZERZAN added that there are still underlying authority
issues that hamper the response of safety officers to incidents. LINDSAY asked why staffing had not increased to offset PSU’s growth. REYNOLDS replied that the decision had been a deliberative process.

LIEBMAN thanked the presenters for informing the Senate in the spirit of promoting an open discussion of the issues. [Applause.]
Campus Safety: Faculty Senate

October 6, 2014

2013 Presidential Task Force On Campus Safety

Committee Members
Jacqueline Balzer, Staff (chair)
Kris Henning, Faculty
Valerie Holdahl, Student
Debbie Kirkland, Staff
Chas Lopez, Staff
Nicole Morris, Student
Heather Randol, Staff
P.K. Runkles-Pearson, Staff
Domanic Thomas, Staff

Ad Hoc Members
Phil Zerzan, Staff
Bryant Haley, Staff

Taskforce Report: Part Of A Larger Dialog (Activities & Outreach)

2013:
• CPSO presentation to Office of Academic Affairs, 2/11/13
• CPSO presentation to Academic Leadership Team, 3/20/13
• CPSO gave 39 presentations and trainings across campus
• A survey on campus safety by ASPSU 307 responses
• Campus Safety Task Force held conversations with 18 departments and community partners
• Campus Safety Task Force held 2 open forums, promoted via university-wide email

2014:
• CPSO meeting with SEIU leadership, 2/5/14
• An online campus safety survey yielded 85 responses 2/14-8/14
• PSU Currently released Task Force report with link to full report and feedback, 3/3/14
• Vanguard released Task Force report, 3/3/14
• Virtual Viking released Task Force report, 4/8/14
• Coffee with the Chief, began on 5/1/14 and is promoted campus wide (Vanguard, PSU Today, CPSO website, Flyers in SMSU, Facebook) – 10 have taken place so far
• Presentation on Task Force findings at Faculty Senate by Dr Kris Henning 5/5/14
• CPSO outreach email to ASPSU candidates 5/14/14

More Serious Crime & CPSO Activity Than People Realize

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime/CPSO Activities</th>
<th>5-yr Average</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violent Offenses (rape, robbery, agg. assault)</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>12 - 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Offenses (burglary, MV theft, major larceny)</td>
<td>325.6</td>
<td>274 - 375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calls for Service</td>
<td>6,706.6</td>
<td>5,754 - 8,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrests/Cite-in-Lieu</td>
<td>198.6</td>
<td>137 - 259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trespass Warnings</td>
<td>114.4</td>
<td>80 - 154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Campus Remains An Attractive Location for Potential Offenders

**Access:** Easy to get here, get into our buildings

**Anonymity:** Blend in with students, faculty, staff; hang out in buildings

**Availability:** Plenty of easy targets, things to steal, places to use drugs

**Limited Guardianship:** 2012-13 CPSO officers to cover campus 24/7/365

---

### Most Offenders Are Not From PSU

- 87% have prior arrest(s) in Portland metro area*
- 56% arrest(s) for prior property crimes e.g. burglary, auto theft, larceny
- 41% arrest(s) for prior violence e.g. assault, robbery, rape, homicide

---

### CPSO Staffing At PSU Is Very Low Compared To Most Schools

**FBI Uniform Crime Reports (2012)**
- 657 Universities and Colleges with full Police Department
- Average of 2.5 officers per 1,000 students
- Average of 1.6 civilian employees per 1,000 students
- If PSU was in "average range" we would have 121 employees at CPSO*
  - Currently have 19 officers and staff members
  - Bottom 5th percentile

*Based on 2013 data for students & CPSO staff (OIRP)

---

### PSU Has The Lowest CPSO Employee Rate Of The Urban 21

**2012 FBI Uniform Crime Reports City Data:**
- Portland ranked 21st in violent crime rate
- Portland ranked 10th in property crime rate

---

### PSU Is The Only School In The Urban 21 Without A Sworn Police Dept.

---

### Three Public Oregon Universities Have Sworn Police Officers

---
PSU Has The Lowest CPSO Staffing Of Oregon's Public Universities

2012 FBI Uniform Crime Reports
City Data:
- Portland ranked 1st in violent crime rate
- Portland ranked 1st in property crime rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sq. Feet (1,000)</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Faculty (Full &amp; Part-time)</th>
<th>Staff (Class. &amp; Acad. Prof.)</th>
<th>CPSO Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>3,351</td>
<td>14,342</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>3,668</td>
<td>20,026</td>
<td>1,114</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>4,186</td>
<td>25,147</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td>1,075</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4,856</td>
<td>29,818</td>
<td>1,791</td>
<td>1,315</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>4,846</td>
<td>29,452</td>
<td>1,818</td>
<td>1,409</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1998 data used for faculty, staff, & CPSO in 1995; 2014 data used for 2013 building space

Safety/Emergency Recommendations

1. Create a public safety awareness campaign
   - Continued Outreach planned for 14-15 academic year

2. Communicate expectations of staff and students in emergency situations
   - Ongoing, including training across campus and attendance at all new student orientation sessions

3. Require sign-up for PSU alert system
   - All PSU employees automatically receive PSU Alerts, though they have the ability to opt-out
   - All PSU employees automatically receive timely warnings and nobody has the ability to opt-out

Access Control Recommendations

1. Establish official business hours and where possible, regulate access to buildings outside of these hours through electronic systems
   - Consolidation of classes and events outside of business hours is in progress

2. Establish a long-term goal of transitioning all exterior building doors to electronic access control
   - Program in place

3. Recognize the PSU ID card as the only official form of PSU identification and the only method of electronic access control
   - Program in place – free PSU ID cards now available to all faculty, staff and students

Progress

- Improved access control in buildings
- Better lighting in parking garages and Park Blocks
- Creation of C.A.R.E. Team (Coordination, Assessment, Response, Education)
- Enhanced coordination with WRC (Women's Resource Center)
- Emergency preparedness training and communications
- New CAD (Computer Aided Dispatch) system at CPSO and sexual assault investigator
- Increased outreach to students
- All faculty, staff and students included in PSU alert and timely warnings

2013 Task Force Recommendations

**Campus Public Safety Office:**

1. Explore ways to ensure access to sworn officers who are appropriately trained in campus policing and available on-site to the PSU campus community
   - Options to consider:
     - Creation of PSU Police Force
     - Collaboration with OHSU
     - Contract with Portland Police
     - Contract with Oregon State Police

2. Maintain access to non-sworn Campus Public Safety Officers
2013 Task Force Recommendations

Guiding Principle:

"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 police officer status"

---

Differences Between CPSO & Sworn Police Officers

Only Sworn Police Officers can:
- Cite for violations
- Apply a search warrant
- Perform community caretaking
- Perform off-campus investigations and follow-up for cases e.g. sexual assaults, mental health checks
- Apply a mental health hold
- Apply an involuntary detox
- Be armed
- Have full powers of arrest and detainment
- Attend State Police Academy training
- Obtain and maintain certification as sworn law enforcement officer
- Receive line of duty death benefits

- It is a crime to escape, resist, or interfere with a sworn police officer

---

Options - Creation Of A PSU Campus Police Department

“This option is the most common practice throughout the United States. A PSU Campus Police Department would provide the greatest amount of control and direction by the university in recognition of the uniqueness of campus policing, as well as the specific nature of this campus.”

---

Options - Portland Police Bureau

“strives to provide an adequate emergency response to the entire city of Portland”

“response is tailored to the best practices for municipal policing”

“may not represent the best practices to the unique service requirements of campus policing”

“specialized area of law enforcement ...formalized through the creation of Campus Police Departments”

---

Oregon Health and Science University

“Initially, we chose to pursue contracting with an outside agency and began to transition our Department of Public Safety into an unarmed police force with enhanced training. We put carefully selected officer candidates through a 16-week live-in state certification program. Meanwhile, we reached out to other academic institutions that were using a contracting model — the University of Oregon and Oregon State — and found, in both cases, low levels of satisfaction. There were a variety of concerns, including poor service, lack of oversight, and the cultural mismatch of traditional law enforcement in an academic setting.”


---

Oregon State Police

“Please accept this notification that the Oregon State Police is not interested in entering into a contract with Portland State to provide police services.”

Superintendent Rich Ivens, Oregon State Police, October 11, 2013
**Seeking Input on the Creation of a Campus Police Department**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How would it work?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• What values would the department have?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What accountability and oversight would there be?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What training would officers undertake?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How much would a police department cost?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• When would it start?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Police Department: Values &amp; Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• As a University entity, a campus police department would retain the same values as CPSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A campus police department would continue to report to the Vice President of Finance and Administration and like all other PSU entities, would be accountable to Global Diversity and Inclusion and adhere to all University policies and procedures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Police Department: Oversight Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Membership determined by the University President would consist of faculty, staff and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Committee would report to the University President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Function as a civilian review board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ability for University community to report issues and complaints directly to the committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Committee could meet monthly or as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Committee would have access to adjudicated force reports and crime log data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Police Department: Training &amp; Cultural Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment - Diverse applicant pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training - Campus police officers would attend:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Basic Police Academy training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local Field Training Evaluation Program (FTEP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus involvement:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Utilization of campus academic experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Oversight committee would have the ability to evaluate and provide input into an initial and ongoing training program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget for Creation of a Campus Police Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Increase of $1.5 million at completion:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 1 Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Police Lieutenant/1 Public Safety Lieutenant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 3 Police Sergeants/2 Public Safety Sergeant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 12 Police Officers/1 Police Detective/10 Public Safety Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 3 year implementation plan (approx. 6 police officers in year 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Investment would begin to move campus safety personnel in the right direction:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Current officer/student ratio = 0.6/1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Proposed officer/student ratio = 1.1/1000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increased Cost for Creation of a Campus Police Department - Perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• PSU History of Investments - linked to mission and values:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tenure track hires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• University advancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Diversity and inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strategic enrollment management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Commitment to our faculty, staff, students and visitors - making PSU a safe place to work, learn and visit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5
Commitment - Safety, Training & Resources
Our Officers Need To Protect Our Community

Feedback
- Comments: Today
- Comments at Safety Forum: Tomorrow, 9am-10:30am, SMSU 355
- Online: PSU homepage

Summary of Frequently Asked Questions & Answers
- Online tomorrow: PSU homepage

Other Events
- Friday, October 10: Presentation at Administrative Briefing to staff and faculty
- Monday, October 20: Presentation at ASPSU Senate Meeting
- To be confirmed: Meetings with student groups
- To be confirmed: Special Board of Trustees Committee Meeting
[Excerpts from:]

Faculty Senate Monthly Packet December 2014

Portland State University Faculty Senate, "Faculty Senate Monthly Packet December 2014" (2014). Faculty Senate Monthly Packets, Paper 308, pp. 8, 31-36.

http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/senateminutes/308

[Excerpted below are:

Passage from Minutes of 3 November 2014 meeting, Discussion Item: Should Faculty Senate offer a resolution on campus safety? (p. 8)

December Packet Attachment E.3, Faculty Senate Resolution on Campus Public Safety; and background statement by SSW Faculty (pp. 31-16)]
Discussion item: Should Faculty Senate offer a resolution on campus safety?

LIEBMAN reminded senators of the previous meeting’s report from Kevin Reynolds and the campus-wide forum on Campus Safety and the committee hearing held by the Board of Trustees on the subject. The purpose of today’s discussion was to take some measure of faculty feeling around next steps and to give guidance to the Board.

REESE/BRODOWICZ MOVED the session to a committee of the whole at 3:47 pm.

LIEBMAN returned the meeting to regular session at 4:30 pm. He encouraged senators to forward additional questions and comments to the Steering Committee.

REYNOLDS said further questions could be posted to the Campus Safety website: http://www.pdx.edu/fadm/campus-safety

Minutes of the PSU Faculty Senate Meeting, November 3, 2014
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 1900 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
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Joseph Nicholas DeFilippis, Adjunct Faculty
Roxanne Dinca, Staff
JoAnn M. Dohn, Staff/MSW Student
Ted Donlan, Faculty
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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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3. Resolution on Campus Public Safety

LIEBMAN drew senators’ attention to the handout with background information from General Counsel David Reese (minutes attachment B5) and the report from the School of Social Work (E.3a) in the agenda packet. He invited Michael Taylor (SSW) to present the Resolution on behalf of the proposers.

TAYLOR explained that the resolution grew from concerns of members of his faculty, based on their experience and ethics as social workers; it was co-sponsored by 14 senators from 10 departments. He acknowledged both the number of public forums on the administration’s proposal and the concerns of campus public safety officers. He invited a fact-based discussion and shared a handout with a series of discussion points (see minutes attachment B6).

HOLLIDAY/DONLAN MOVED the Campus Safety Resolution, as published in E-3.

TAYLOR noted that Reese’s memo makes clear that a sworn police force is, essentially, an armed police force. Commenting on the talking points, he stated that crime statistics in the Clery Report don’t show rising problems of armed conflict on campus, and noted that it continues to be hard to define campus space and what is shared space with the Portland community on the Park Blocks.

Sponsors of the Resolution offered statements:

GRECO read excerpts from an article in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* (October 8, 2014; see http://chronicle.com/article/For-Safetys-Sake-Get-Rid-of-/149275/) The authors, professors in the School of Criminal Justice at the University of Cincinnati and the College of Criminology at Florida State, raise concerns about inherent conflict of interests and lack of impartiality that arise when campus police forces are under the direct control of university administrators and a dual system of justice is created.

TAYLOR drew attention to the extensive obligations the University would take on with sworn officers and a statement from faculty in the proposed School of Gender, Race and Nations, concerned about how investigation of sexual assault will go forward as a collaborative enterprise.

LAYZELL advocated for raising philosophical and ethical objections to what seemed to be a rush to arm campus police. He expressed the belief that it was a question of what kind of society we want to live in and ultimately, for him, taking a stand in opposition was a question of personal conscience. He argued that we know that, around the country, people who are not guilty of capital offenses are being gunned down by police; and, in reality, if a sworn officer claims to feel under threat, it is nearly impossible for a grand jury to indict. (Applause).

LIEBMAN opened the floor for questions and discussion of the resolution.

HARMON asked what “supervision” in second part of the resolution meant.
TAYLOR said it endorsed a review board that looks at complaints. ZURK noted the duties that only sworn officers could fulfill and asked if Portland police were functioning adequately on our campus as needed. REESE reiterated the broader authority of sworn officers. ZERZAN said that the Portland Police Bureau does what campus security cannot on their timeline, and in some cases things were not getting done.

CHRZANOWSKA-JESKE asked if concerns had been raised with the city and county, and if the situation would change if more money were added to the current security budget? ZERZAN affirmed that the charge to municipal police to provide services to the city doesn’t fit well with policing a university; he offered an example of a four-day wait to follow up on a sexual assault in the dorms. REYNOLDS cited Commander Day of the Portland police, who said that they can provide an emergency response to the campus. REESE said providing more money to the current campus force would not solve the problem; safety officers would still lack authorization to conduct certain investigations.

KARAVANEC asked to yield to Karen Kennedy. KENNEDY asked if the mayor and police chief had been engaged in the discussion, noting the contribution that the campus makes to the downtown economy, and the cost of duplicating services that are, or could be, provided by the Portland police. REYNOLDS said the cost of an additional Portland Police officer would be three times greater than adding a sworn officer to PSU. ZERZAN reiterated that a municipal police department is not charged with Title 9 or Clery Act compliance. REYNOLDS added that there would be limited control and no oversight committee with service from the Portland Police. PADIN speculated on the public policy implications of the discussion and doubted that other busy neighborhoods would be authorized to have a sworn police force. He asked if the current campus security department was unable to perform the Title 9 and Clery functions. ZERZAN repeated that what they could and could not do had been delineated, and argued that many communities with singular functions and requirements have their own security forces—transit authorities, hospitals, airports.

LONEY asked why trained, sworn officers could not function without carrying firearms. LABISSIERE inquired how having a gun makes a better officer. REESE stated that nothing in the law requires a sworn officer be armed, but sworn officers have a legal obligation to act, for instance, to make an arrest in the face of evidence of domestic violence. To have an unarmed officer in that kind of volatile situation creates new problems. LABISSIERE said that the argument had been made that the campus was a different kind of community; he suggested that more time was needed to figure out collectively what different approaches were needed. ZERZAN said that he could not ask unarmed officers to do police work without being trained and equipped as police officers. REYNOLDS reminded that unarmed campus officers would then have to wait for an armed response.

MESSER (for Carder) noted evidence suggesting that some criminal activities that happen on campuses, like sexual assaults, are better handled by regular police, not university security. SMITH asked if campus safety officers were trained to use some other forms of self-defense; the portrayal seemed to suggest
guns were their only option. ZERZAN said yes, but there were limitations. SANTELMANN asked how many domestic violence calls were received on the PSU campus and what was the danger of waiting. ZERZAN said 12 to 20 a year, from student housing; and the risk was primarily for potential victims.

WIEWEL stated that the campus discussion had convinced him that it would be irresponsible not to move forward with the proposal to arm campus police. He acknowledged the importance of questions of training and oversight, and said they would be part of the resolution brought to the Board of Trustees. He thought continued discussion would only yield continued stress and aggravation. He had heard broad agreement that officers needed the authority of sworn officers; arming them to be able to confront volatile situations that were a reality on campus also seemed a necessity. He rejected the argument for voting for the world we might ideally want to live in and asked senators not to support the resolution.

REESE (Susan) asked if police officers were always trained to shoot to kill and gave a moving example of where that outcome ought to have been an avoidable. ZERAN said police officers are not trained to shoot to kill; they train to shoot to stop the threat, and to use a lesser level of force unless they are precluded from doing that.

REESE/HOLLIDAY called the question.

The Campus Public Safety Resolution as published in E3 PASSED, 38 in favor, 14 opposed, with 3 abstentions (recorded by clicker).
Date: November 26, 2014

To: Professor Bob Liebman
Presiding Officer, Faculty Senate

From: David Reese
General Counsel

Subject: Legal Requirement Regarding Sworn Peace Officers

Issues Presented

The following questions were recently asked of my office:

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

Discussion

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

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

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

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

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

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

1 “Stop and frisk” authority is the authority to stop a person that an officer reasonably suspects has committed or is about to commit a crime in order to make a reasonable inquiry and to frisk the person being stopped for dangerous or deadly weapons if the officer reasonably suspects the person to be armed and dangerous. ORS 131.605-131.625.
2 “Probably cause arrest” authority is the authority of an officer to arrest a person without a warrant if the officer has probable cause to believe that the person has committed (a) a felony, (b) a misdemeanor, (c) an unclassified offense for which the maximum penalty allowed by law is equal to or greater than the maximum penalty allowed for a Class C misdemeanor, or (d) any other crime committed in the officer’s presence. ORS 133.310(1).
serious harm to persons or property, to render aid to injured or ill persons, or to locate missing persons (ORS 133.055);

- the authority to take into custody and deliver to a hospital a person believed to be dangerous to self or to any other person and in need of immediate care or treatment for mental illness (ORS 426.228);
- the authority to take or send home a person under the influence of controlled substances or, if the person is incapacitated or appears to be in immediate danger, to take such person to a treatment facility (ORS 430.399);
- an obligation, when responding to incidents of domestic violence, to arrest a person believed to have committed an assault between family or household members, or believed to be placing another family or household member in fear of imminent serious physical injury (ORS 133.055);
- the authority to recover a child pursuant to a custody order under the Family Abuse Prevention Act (ORS 107.732);
- the duty to arrest and prosecute violators of animal cruelty laws (ORS 133.379); and
- eligibility for benefits provided to police officers killed in the line of duty under federal and state law, which include financial assistance to surviving spouses and children, education assistance for surviving children, and burial expenses. Some of these benefits may not be currently applicable to CPSO officers because they are not police officers by definition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Oregon law does, however, explicitly require all peace officers to perform certain tasks that should generally and safely be performed only by armed police officers. For instance, ORS 133.55 requires a police officer, when responding to incidents of domestic violence, to arrest a person believed to have committed an assault between family or household members, or believed to be placing another family or household member in fear of imminent serious physical injury. One might assume that the Legislature would not have mandated that an officer effectuate an arrest in a highly volatile domestic violence situation if the officer were unarmed and unable to defend him or herself.

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

Police officers encounter dangerous situations on a regular basis. According to the FBI, 27 law enforcement officers were feloniously killed in the line of duty in 2013, a marked decrease of more than 44 percent when compared to the 49 officers killed in 2012. By circumstance, in 2013, seven officers were killed as a result of ambushes (four during unprovoked attacks and three due to entrapment/premeditated situations). Five officers died from injuries inflicted as a result of answering disturbance calls (three of which were domestic disturbances), and five officers were engaged in tactical situations. Three officers sustained fatal injuries while they were investigating suspicious persons or circumstances, three were conducting traffic pursuits or stops, and three officers were responding to robberies in progress or pursuing robbery suspects. One officer was killed as a result of an investigative activity. FBI Releases 2013 Preliminary Statistics for Law Enforcement Officers Killed in the Line of Duty,

The authorities provided to police officers that are currently unavailable to CPSO officers—i.e., to conduct investigations, to respond in tactical situations (such as an active shooter situation), to handle domestic violence calls, to conduct traffic stops, etc.—are the very situations that put officer safety most at risk. Due to these risks, according to the Vice President for Finance and Administration and the Chief of Campus Public Safety, unarmed university police officers would not be permitted to perform these high-risk tasks. Unarmed officers would not conduct traffic stops, enter dwellings, engage criminal suspects believed to be armed, or perform other similar tasks, because doing so would create an unacceptable risk of harm to the officer, as well as an unacceptable risk of civil liability to the university. Rather, unarmed university police officers would call and rely on Portland Police to perform such tasks, as is currently the case. In certain domestic violence situations, where Oregon law requires a police officer to arrest a person, an unarmed officer would be in a particularly difficult situation.

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

-----

I encourage members of the Faculty Senate to review the FAQs regarding this issue at http://www.pdx.edu/insidepsu/campus-safety-faq. The FAQs are updated as additional questions are submitted. In addition, further information, such as the Task Force report, presentations, and materials for the Board of Trustees can be found at http://www.pdx.edu/fadm/campus-safety.
Campus Public Safety Resolution and Discussion points

Opposition to arming PSU Campus Public Safety officers;

Support for the creation of a campus committee for oversight and supervision of the PSU CPSO 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.

- Data does not reveal a rising rate of violent crimes at Portland State. (Clery report)
- Confrontations between campus security employees and the public is a concern, but does not justify major policy change. (Task Force Report, 2013)
- Legal/Ethical conflicts of interest exist with in-house supervision of police investigations (Chronicle of Higher Education, 2014)
- Costs of extending policing functions raise concerns about a need for increased collaboration between PSU and Portland Police (SGRN Faculty statement)
- No tally of total cost of sworn officer investigations, and officer time for court appearances.
- These responsibilities and costs are currently a function of the Portland Police.
- Cost for a sworn and armed police force will add 1.5 million/year to current budget (PSU Admin)
- Most sexual assaults are perpetrated by acquaintances in private spaces (White House Council, 2014)
- Inefficiencies and delays in investigations of sexual assaults require mediation with PPB, not introducing weapons (SGRN faculty statement)
- Mandatory arrest and investigation of sexual assaults may place PSU employees in adversarial position with students (Chronicle of Higher Education, 2014)

Armed police increases risk of injury to students of color and other vulnerable groups (SSW Faculty Statement)

Given the disproportionate rates of arrest and deaths in communities of color, now is not the time to escalate armed policing on the PSU campus.