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**************************************************************************

Campus Public Safety Implementation Advisory Committee (IAC)
February 20, 2015

Convened:  10:00 am

Topic:  Welcome and Introductions – Co-Chairs

Topic:  Minutes of January meeting reviewed and approved with changes.

•  Action:  Post Minutes to IAC webpage.

Topic:  Commitment and Plan of Operation Document

This document was introduced at the February 6 meeting.  IAC members requested some revisions which have been made by the co-chairs and are reflected in the version under consideration.

•  Discussion:  Two sections engendered the most debate: one having to do with the “openness” of meetings and the other with quorum; relative to decision making.

•  Decision:  The Committee agreed that “work of the Whole” - meetings of the full committee - will be open to the public, while subcommittee meetings will be closed.  Regarding quorum, the IAC agreed to change the proposed ratio from 51% of members present to 75% of same.  Decision making will be made by a majority + one of quorum.

•  Action:  Since a quorum of 75% was present, the co-chairs called for a show of hands for acceptance of the document as amended.  Vote:  11 in favor, 2 opposed, 0 abstentions.  Co-chairs to amend the document and have “Our Commitment and Plan for Operation” posted to the IAC website.

Topic:  Reports of the Topic Teams

Each co-chair leads an IAC Topic Team.  There are three:  Training and Recruitment, Policy, and Oversight.  Each Team gave a brief update of their activities.
**Topic Team: Training and Recruitment**

- This group has met three times so far
- In their last meeting they reviewed current CPSO recruitment policies
- They also reviewed existing criteria for the evaluation of new recruits
- The Team has reached out to the offices of Global Diversity and Inclusion, as well as Human Resources in their early efforts to better understand PSU’s employee recruitment process.
- They have also identified research questions and have begun work on these. They are:
  
  o *Are there examples of training and recruitment programs in campus police departments that would inform our work? Of particular interest would be training and recruitment programs that deal with equity, inclusion, life and context of an urban campus, multi-culturalism, de-escalation, etc.*

**Discussion:**

Q. Will an effort be made to provide de-escalation training to PSU Police?
A. We have a Conflict Resolution program with de-escalation expertise on campus. Perhaps this group could be involved in training.

**Topic Team: Policy**

- **Lexipol** is the policy contractor for PSU.
- This company tracks changes in campus police policies and provides policy “tweaks” to customers (based on statute and DOJ finding) on a monthly basis.
- PSU CPSO has 127 policies. The Policy Topic Team will be reading each one; in batches of ten.
- Although they plan to read every policy (and keep a promise to the PSU Board of Trustees to do so) the Policy Topic Team plans to focus on the PROCESS of policy development and utilization of policy as well as on its review of policies.
- Because their work overlaps, partnership with the Oversight Topic Team will be key to the effectiveness of the Policy Team
- At their next meeting, the Team will begin reading the policies.
- This Team has also identified relevant research questions and have begun work on these; they are:
  
  o *Are there useful examples of campus policies and procedures of direct relevance to our work, including, but not limited to, use of force and body cameras?*
  
  o *Are there examples of criteria or processes used to provide assessments of campus police units?*
  
  o *All of these questions focus on campus police units with those in urban serving universities likely of most relevance.*
  
  o *Is there a process for policy review at these other campuses?*
Discussion:

Q. How will the Team get access to the policies?
   A. CPSO will make them available and in a format that allows for markup.

Q. How will the policy readers record their feedback?
   A. CPSO will provide a shared Google doc set to “suggestion mode” that will allow policy readers to markup the policies without changing the original.

Topic Team: Oversight

Since this is a new policy area for PSU, this Topic Team is concentrating its early efforts on information gathering and education. They have formulated their initial research questions; these are:

- The question is: What do we know about community (campus) oversight groups in university campus police departments? What are models or best practices in this area?
- Background: There is an extensive literature and many examples of community oversight programs and processes for police departments. What we know little about is how such oversight groups work in a campus police department. Examples and best practices would be very useful. (Note: We did look at the UC-Davis example, a program created after the horrible and public event on that campus of students being pepper-sprayed.)
- Research: Look at the websites of campus police departments to find examples of community oversight committees and describe any patterns there might be in how campus police units handle complaints and provide oversight.

Topic: Outreach

Q. What are the available channels for communicating the plan, as well as for soliciting and receiving feedback from the campus community?
   A. Some of the forums available to the IAC are:

   - Surveys
   - Town Halls
   - Website feedback forms
   - IAC Email group
   - Other

Adjournment: To subgroups at 10:50 am.

Next scheduled meeting: March 6, 2015, 10:00 am, Meyer Memorial Boardroom, URBN 710.