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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In the spring of 2013, Portland State University’s President Wim Wiewel convened the Task Force on Campus Safety to make recommendations about how Portland State University (PSU) can best address safety concerns and improve the University’s response to criminal activity on campus. The Task Force was comprised of various campus constituents who met from May 2013 to November 2013.

Members of the Task Force reviewed campus crime statistics from the Campus Public Safety Office, data from comparable institutions, and hosted a series of open forums with various stakeholders to gather information about their perspectives regarding safety at PSU. Members examined other relevant literature and research\(^1\) and reviewed campus safety best practices.

The Task Force provides official recommendations surrounding the PSU Campus Public Safety Office, access control and campus safety awareness.

---

\(^1\) National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE); City of Portland 22nd Annual Community Survey Results (Report #428; PSU Responses: Support of Trained Police Force on Campus; ASPSU 2013 Campus Safety Survey; Criminal History Analysis with Suspects Arrested at Portland State University; CPSO White Paper Report 1976; CPSO White Paper Report 2008; Report on Police Interactions with Persons in Mental Health Crisis.
INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Portland State University’s 50-acre campus is located in downtown Portland, Oregon. The campus buildings are mixed use, meaning that they house students, PSU classrooms and administration, city offices, and private businesses. Since its inception, PSU has undergone significant growth in geographic size, mission, and student population. Specifically, in 1976, PSU had 26 buildings, and a total enrollment of 15,296 students. As of 2012, PSU had 55 buildings, 28,713 students and approximately 6,900 employees.

PSU has a permeable boundary with the downtown Portland community because of its location and partnerships throughout the city. While this interconnectedness is a point of pride for PSU, there are inherent safety risks that come with an urban location. The connection between PSU and the metropolitan area is strengthened by the addition of the TriMet Bus Mall, which includes a street car line, multiple bus lines and a light rail line. These transit additions, along with a growing student population, call for PSU to redouble its efforts to provide essential campus safety services.

In 2008, PSU’s Vice President for Finance and Administration formed a committee to provide recommendations on further development of public safety and emergency operations. This committee was comprised of campus staff and executive leadership. The committee was charged with informing the Vice President of the opinions of the campus community, and it conducted interviews with various campus focus groups. The major findings of this committee were as follows:

- The committee recommended addressing statutory limitations on CPSO’s authority. The 2008 report recommended three possible solutions: 1) Elevating CPSO to a “regular” police force, 2) creating an Oregon University System police force, or 3) working with the Department of Public Safety Standards and Training to gradually bring Public Safety Officers to the status of “Peace Officers.” The committee specifically noted that “local control” of such a force was a “paramount” concern. The committee wanted to ensure that the special culture of a campus community was both respected and recognized by any of the three options.

- The committee also recommended that communications regarding safety be multi-modal (i.e. sent across various platforms), both high- and low-tech, and consistent to ensure the receiver understood the message. The report noted that emergency communications need to be both helpful and informative to the end user, so that the community would know how to respond to messages. This recommendation included a community training element on emergency communications.

In response to these recommendations, PSU improved processes and information provided to staff and students. This included changes to student conduct code processes, improvements to outdoor lighting, establishment of the Coordination, Assessment, Response and Education (C.A.R.E.) Team and educational outreach by the Campus Public Safety Office. However, the 2008 recommended CPSO staffing levels were not implemented.

2 http://www.fap.pdx.edu/floorplans/
3 http://www.oirp.pdx.edu/source/port1011/3_21.htm
4 http://www.fap.pdx.edu/floorplans/
5 http://www.oirp.pdx.edu/source/port1213/all_all.htm
CURRENT UNIVERSITY SAFETY RESOURCES

The following programs provide safety resources to the PSU campus community. The Task Force recognizes that there are other campus offices, student groups and community organizations not listed below that also provide a variety of other safety resources. Relevant issues associated with campus safety resources are also identified below.

Campus Public Safety Office (CPSO)

The Campus Public Safety Office is dedicated to fostering a safe environment by enforcing policies and laws, delivering emergency services, answering requests for assistance, and providing ongoing public safety education.

In the fall of 1969, Portland State University established the office to provide “safety and security services” to the campus. At that time, arrests by CPSO were only allowed under citizen arrest authority. CPSO had no police powers until 1995, when ORS 352.385 created “Special Campus Security Officers” with probable cause arrest authority on university owned and controlled property. CPSO officers are Special Campus Security Officers. Special Campus Security Officers are not full “Peace Officers” or “Police Officers” as described in ORS 133.005. Currently, the Campus Public Safety Office employs one Chief, one Lieutenant, one Communications Supervisor, twelve Officers, three Sergeants, five Dispatchers, one Detective, one Clery Coordinator, and two Access Control Specialists. With these staffing levels, Campus Public Security Officers are asked to complete an ever-growing list of tasks: provide a 24/7/365 patrol presence on campus, access control (i.e., unlock doors), respond to crimes, provide safety education, maintain safety data (i.e., Clery Act data), comply with Title IX mandates, etc. The Campus Public Safety Office also facilitates programs for students, parents, faculty and new employee orientations. CPSO and Emergency Management work with departments to provide education at individual departmental and University Administrative briefings.

The “Special Campus Security Officer” model limits CPSO in its ability to provide full law enforcement services. The challenges of the current CPSO model are explored below:

**Authority.** Under ORS 352.385, Special Campus Security Officers are unable to perform the following police functions: applying for search warrants that would facilitate thorough investigations, requiring involuntary detoxification of individuals under the influence of alcohol or drugs, police officer mental health holds, community caretaking (such as welfare checks on students off campus), and other actions inherent in a police officer's duty to protect and serve. This statutory limitation applies to all incidents, including sexual assault investigations, which require timely and delicate handling that CPSO is hampered in providing.

Because they do not have these powers, Campus Public Safety Officers must rely upon Portland Police Bureau for sexual assault investigations. This may leave survivors waiting and dealing with an external response agency that approaches the investigation with different goals than PSU's. The traditional law enforcement response to sexual assaults bases “success” on the ability to prosecute. Campus policing recognizes that a successful response to campus sexual assaults can be accomplished on a continuum that includes providing resources, institutional student conduct response, and Title IX compliance, as well as prosecution. CPSO has endeavored to improve its relationship with Portland Police Bureau to facilitate sexual assault

---

7 http://www.oregonlaws.org/ors/133.005
9 http://www.oregonlaws.org/ors/352.385
investigations. In 2012, CPSO hired a former Portland Police Detective and signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the Portland Police Bureau regarding sexual assault investigations. While this has led to an improvement in sexual assault response protocol, CPSO’s Detective is still restricted in conducting investigations due to statutory limitations.

Students in crisis often require immediate intervention and aid. Police officers have powers that assist them in providing these services, including compelled mental health evaluations, emergency aid entry authority, and non-criminal detoxification authority. PSU’s Campus Public Safety Officers do not have the power to perform these services, so they work closely with Portland Police to provide them as efficiently as possible.

Training. Special Campus Security Officers are not certified with the State of Oregon’s Department of Public Safety Standards and Training. Instead, they are only required to complete eight hours of instruction on procedural law. The Campus Public Safety Office endeavors to provide additional specialized training, but these costs must be paid by the university. In Oregon, the Department of Public Safety and Standards Training provide training for police officers, and those costs are funded by the state.

Capabilities. CPSO officers have limited authority on university owned and controlled property, and no special authority outside those geographical boundaries. Portland Police Bureau provides police services for incidents that occur on campus that are beyond the authority or capability of Campus Public Safety Officers. Complicating the matter, PSU has a patchwork of commercially leased space and mixed use buildings that operate under different and complex models of ownership and in some cases may make it difficult to determine where university owned and controlled property begins and ends. In times of crisis, Campus Public Safety Officers may have to decide whether to wait for Portland Police Bureau to provide service, or to respond outside of their jurisdiction, or in areas where jurisdiction is uncertain, and face possible consequences.

Staffing levels also impact CPSO’s ability to respond. Approximately three officers per eight-hour shift provide coverage for the duties described above. On occasion, only one Officer is on duty for the entire campus.

Unarmed Campus Public Security Officers frequently come in contact with violent career criminals and make considerable arrests of offenders not affiliated with the university. A recent study revealed considerable “dangerousness” of offenders apprehended at PSU. “The majority (87.2%) of suspects had been arrested at least once prior to their current arrest at PSU. 41.0% of the suspects had a recorded history of violent offending (e.g., assault, robbery, threats, stalking, harassment, and rape). 56.4% of the suspects had a history of property offending (e.g., burglary, auto theft, larceny, vandalism).” Some violent offenders have been arrested on campus while armed with knives or firearms.

While PSU has not faced an “active shooter situation,” such incidents have garnered considerable public interest and concern. Approximately 17% of all active shooter incidents occur in an academic setting and 37% in a workplace. Current “best practice” recommendations focus on prevention efforts that ensure protective and crisis response measures are in effect and up to date. Campus Public Safety has no capacity to respond to and disrupt an active shooter and must rely on the response of the Portland Police Bureau.

10 Henning, K., Peterson, C., Stewart, G., February 12, 2012, “Criminal History Analysis With Suspects Arrested at Portland State University”
Campus Safety Escorts
Campus Public Safety offers safety escort services 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, free of charge to students, faculty, staff, and visitors to their bus, car, apartment, or office on campus and up to two blocks off campus. Requests for the escort service are made daily (4 to 7 per week) and requests increase in number on weekends, especially during winter months. During a typical shift, CPSO has approximately three officers to patrol the 50-acre campus. At times officers must weigh whether to provide this service or address other incidents occurring on campus.

Emergency Communications
Emergency blue-light phones are stationed outside of campus buildings for immediate emergency contact to CPSO dispatch. These phones are for use when someone is injured, feels they are in danger, or is experiencing any other emergency situation. Blue phones located at Hoffman Hall and Shattuck Hall have a public address function, which allows CPSO dispatch to transmit information to the public in close proximity to the Blue Phone. Red and black emergency phones are located inside campus buildings and automatically connect to campus dispatch.

Blue phone technology was developed before much of the general campus population carried mobile communication devices. Only 22 calls were generated from Emergency "Blue Light" phones on campus in 2013 so far. All but four of these calls have been for routine requests (i.e. people locked out of classrooms, needing directions, etc.). In the past two years, there has only been one instance of a blue light phone being used to summon emergency aid for someone being stalked or attacked. There has also been one use of a blue-light phone to summon assistance for a second party not present at the phone (someone calling in a report of a problem elsewhere on campus). At PSU, blue phone costs are spread amongst Campus Public Safety Office, Facilities and Property Management and the Office of Information Technology. Red and black emergency phones located around campus are similarly funded. Thus, maintenance of these systems is dependent on resource allocations from those departments.

A campus-wide “emergency notification” will be issued if a situation is an immediate threat to the community. These notifications are issued through a variety of communication methods including text messages, email and local media outlets. A “timely warning” alert is issued when a situation represents a serious or continuing threat to students and employees. The warning is issued to all University email accounts.

The timely warning and emergency notification system maintains contact information for all campus members. PSU has adopted an opt-in strategy. This means that campus community members must enter in their contact information into the system. In 2012 the Office of Information Technology worked with the vendor to insert all campus members’ Gmail accounts into the database. While this was a positive step, a PSU server failure in fall 2012 revealed that campus Gmail accounts do not work if the PSU server farm is disabled.

Access Control
Access badges are issued to students, staff, and faculty to access campus buildings that use electronic security. In summer 2013, the Campus Public Safety Office standardized building hours to increase the safety of students and staff while reducing accessibility of people not affiliated with the university. Building hours are in place on weekdays for most academic buildings. Weekend classes and events after hours are accessible through single entrances.

12 Campus Public Safety Data.
Students and staff requiring access after-hours, including access to study areas, must obtain an access badges and request access through Campus Public Safety Office. PSU also uses various contractors to complete University projects and provide on-going services (i.e. Norris Beggs and Simpson, etc.) who are granted access to sensitive University areas. Overall responsibility for the access control program is spread across several departments: CPSO, Facilities and Property Management and the Office of Information Technology. The Campus Public Safety Office employs both an Access Control Coordinator and an Access Control Specialist. These individuals work in concert with Facilities Project Managers and Electricians to manage installations, upgrades and general system maintenance.

Emergency Response Team
The Emergency Response Team coordinates PSU’s response to incidents that impede normal operations. This group establishes procedures concerning incident communications, response and recovery activities on campus and approves mutual aid agreements with local response agencies. The Emergency Response Team is comprised of university staff members from the following units: Finance Administration, Public Safety, University Communications, Housing, Enrollment Management and Student Affairs, Facilities and Property Management, Information Technology, and University Financial Services.

Department of Risk Management
Risk Management works to minimize exposure to risk by providing consultation and risk services to the PSU community. This includes identifying sources of loss, assessing the impact of losses, selecting or recommending risk management solutions, implementing risk management strategies, and monitoring risk management solutions for effectiveness. Emergency Management, Environmental Health and Safety, and Risk Management and Property are integral parts of Risk Management.

Office of the Dean of Student Life
The Office of the Dean of Student Life serves all students, faculty, and staff in resolving issues of concern involving students. Additionally, this office houses the PSU student conduct program which enforces academic and campus integrity standards. A staff designee from this office sits on the C.A.R.E. team. The Office of the Dean of Student Life acts in conjunction with the Campus Public Safety Office when necessary in times of student crisis.

The Dean of Student Life Office houses the C.A.R.E. team. This multi-disciplinary leadership body monitors, assesses, intervenes, consults, and refers students when they experience barriers to their success and well-being. This team promotes campus community well-being through coordination of resources, and assessment of risk, and protects varying campus perspectives. This team also monitors the response to concerning behavior, campus community crisis, and provides education to the University community to create and maintain an ethos of care.

Center for Student Health and Counseling
The Center for Student Health and Counseling (SHAC) provides counseling, testing, medical/dental and other health services to eligible PSU students. This department also works in conjunction with other offices during various health and safety emergencies, including the Women’s Resource Center, University Housing and Residence Life, Office of the Dean of
Student Life, and the Campus Public Safety Office. A staff designee from SHAC sits on the C.A.R.E. team.

**University Housing and Residence Life**

The PSU Housing and Residence Life department provides on-campus housing for approximately 2,000 students. This department partners with various PSU units to provide education, safety drills and emergency response procedures. Department partners include the following offices: Women’s Resource Center, Campus Public Safety Office, Fire Safety, Emergency Management and the Center for Student Health and Counseling. A staff designee from Residence Life department sits on the C.A.R.E. team. Personal safety and preparedness programming is also provided to on-campus residents. The Center for Student Health and Counseling works with the PSU Residence Life office to provide 24-hour on-call medical assistance for resident emergencies.

**Women’s Resource Center (WRC)**

The Women’s Resource Center provides services that are integral to student well-being and safety. Interpersonal violence advocacy services provide students with peer support and connect students to various resources and university faculty/staff. A staff designee from the WRC sits on the C.A.R.E. team. The WRC works with other departments on a variety of emergency situations.
SUMMARY OF THE OPEN FORUMS HOSTED BY THE TASK FORCE

The Task Force identified qualitative data as an asset to evaluation because it aids in capturing personal feelings, opinions, and perceptions. To gather this information, the Task Force provided several opportunities for the campus community to provide input.

An invitation was extended to all students, faculty and staff to participate in open forums with the Task Force on Campus Safety. Two forums were held to accommodate varying schedules. Comments and perceptions reported to the Task Force in the open forums include the following:

- A smartphone application about campus safety awareness and resources might help provide information to the campus community.
- Additional information about how and when to communicate with CPSO would be helpful.
- It seems that PSU could do more to provide information about campus safety resources by way of signage, reminders, and word of mouth.
- The Dean of Student Life Office seems very responsive to student behavior issues.
- PSU Transportation and Parking Services have replaced light bulbs in parking garages and are exploring options for surveillance cameras.
- PSU Transportation and Parking Services enforcement employees are students who receive training in safety measures.
- PSU could do more to improve bike security on campus.
- At times people are uncertain of what to do if they see someone tampering with bikes.
- Concerns of bike theft deter riders from parking in certain areas on campus.
- Safety concerns related to the transient population coming to campus were expressed.
- CPSO is the first responder to a crisis and it seems that training to handle those events on our campus should be a priority.
- At times the language in the timely warnings seems to be tempered and does not reflect the severity of the incident.
SUMMARY OF THE CAMPUS STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS HOSTED BY THE TASK FORCE

The Task Force also hosted a series of conversations with students and various department personnel. The following list represents those that participated in interviews:

- Athletics
- Campus Public Safety Office
- Campus Recreation
- Campus Safety Committee
- Capital Projects and Construction
- Dean of Student Life Office
- Environmental Health and Safety
- Facilities and Property Management
- Finance and Accounting Services
- Finance and Administration
- Human Resources
- Library
- Multnomah County District Attorney
- Office of Academic Affairs
- Student Activities and Leadership Programs
- University Housing and Residence Life
- University Housing Safety Committee
- Women’s Resource Center

The following is a list of questions created by the Task Force that were asked during group interviews:

Specifically, what are your perceptions about general campus safety regarding:

- Safety resources
- PSU Alert Notification System
- Access Control
- Campus Public Safety Office

- Do you feel safe and/or secure when you work, attend classes, or visit on campus?
- Do you think the campus community knows what to do in the event of an emergency? Why or why not?
- How do you feel about PSU’s ability to respond to crimes on or near campus?
- Do you feel that safety and/or security on campus could be improved? In what way?
- What else would you like the Task Force to know?

The following categories of comments that emerged from those interviews reflect the safety concerns that were expressed to the Task Force.

Urban Environment. PSU is physically located in an urban setting, which includes corridors, hallways, the Park Blocks, sidewalks, campus buildings, spaces in between campus buildings, and other adjacent city property. This permeable relationship poses safety risks because people not affiliated with the university come to campus to engage in conduct that does not align with the mission of the institution. Certain areas such as the Park Blocks, Neuberger Hall, and PSU parking structures are especially vulnerable to safety risks. Other comments and concerns reported to the Task Force by staff and students include the following:

- Some parents of students report they are concerned about safety, and they frequently inquire about campus safety services and practices when attending Orientations.
- Dimly lit areas around campus are causing concern for some people, and they may pose safety risks for students taking evening classes, and for employees working in the evenings.
- Open access to buildings, more specifically the hours of accessibility to non-university members, is concerning to some people.
- TriMet transit stations throughout campus may present unique safety issues to PSU because they raise the number of individuals on campus who are not part of the PSU community.
- Some people feel safer parking their vehicles in the PSU parking garages during the day than in the evenings.
- Some students engage in behavior on- and off-campus that poses risks for the institution.
- Familiarity with the urban environment makes some people less concerned about safety risks.

**Emergency Preparation and Knowledge.** During interviews with stakeholders, the Task Force learned that PSU alert notifications make some people feel less concerned and more informed during emergencies. Conversely, the alerts can also make people more concerned when there is no follow up alert, or if the material in the alert is disturbing. Other comments and concerns reported to the Task Force by staff and students include the following:

- At times people may be unfamiliar with how or when to report incidents to the Campus Public Safety Office.
- Staff members are sometimes unsure how to act during campus emergencies.
- There are sometimes inconsistent security measures and procedures across campus buildings.
- Some external PSU partners may want to opt-in to PSU Alert notifications.
- The option for PSU students, staff and faculty to opt-out of PSU Alert notifications is concerning to some people.
- Some people observe a lack of transparency as to why certain information is withheld from PSU Alerts.
- Some people believe they lack knowledge about all campus safety resources that are available to them.
- Some people believe that they lack full knowledge of how the Campus Public Safety Office operates in various situations.

**Campus Climate and Services.** The culture of this campus community – including a culture of safety – is created by the students and staff within it, not just by the services provided. One perception reported to the Task Force is that some PSU students fail to demonstrate interest in building a community that cares about safety, for example, by letting unknown persons into buildings that are electronic access only. Other comments and concerns reported to the Task Force by staff and students include the following:

- Some are concerned about low staffing levels at Campus Public Safety.
- Some believe officers should be more visible around campus.
• Some believe there is lack of visibility of the CPSO office location.
• CPSO officer response times are perceived to range from 20-30 minutes or more.
• Some people expressed support for installation of “panic buttons” in offices.
• Some believe CPSO dispatch seems unfamiliar with PSU Student Code of Conduct and other institutional policies.
• Some report that CPSO dispatch customer service is concerning because they don’t seem professional on a consistent basis or minimized concerns of callers.
• Some believe having a fully sworn police department at PSU would make them less concerned about safety issues on campus, since officers would be better equipped with more authority and jurisdiction.
• Some believe that lack of staffing across many campus offices creates lack of monitoring at front desks and other points of access.

While interest surrounding campus safety was consistent throughout these interviews, there are divergent views surrounding topics such as emergency communications and CPSO functions. The committee found that while some community members possessed a passion for the topic of Campus Safety, there was a noticeable lacking in the understanding in how CPSO operates and the issues they face. To that end, these conversations with the Task Force demonstrate that PSU needs to help the campus community understand what campus safety means, as the institution continues to grow. This includes finding more forums for CPSO to provide the community with educational opportunities around the topics of personal and campus safety issues.
Table 1: PSU Growth

The following information summarizes building, enrollment and CPSO staffing growth at PSU since 1950. The Task Force studied the significant increase within all three areas, including CPSO Officers.

*Enrollment is represented in thousands.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Buildings</th>
<th>Era Built/Bought</th>
<th>Enrollment *</th>
<th>Officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>1.349</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>4.552</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>9.125</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>11.354</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>15.389</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>16.875</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>14.832</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>14.977</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>14.342</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>17.239</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>22.198</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>25.647</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Staffing chart is Uniform Officers only.
1.0 FTE Uniform Officer was added to the CPSO staff in 2012.
Table 2: Portland State University Clery Data

- The Jeanne Clery Disclosure Act of Campus Security and Campus Crime Statistics Act (the Clery Act) requires that post-secondary schools, participating in Title IV student financial aid programs, publish a statistical report of crimes occurring on or near the institution’s campus and provide information about security policies, procedures and programs. The report includes data from two years prior to the most recent year. This particular report shows data for calendar years 2012, 2011, and 2010 (the most recent available).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>On Campus</th>
<th>Residential Halls</th>
<th>Public Property</th>
<th>Off-Campus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder / Non-Negligent Manslaughter</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negligent Manslaughter</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Forcible Sex Offenses</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Forcible Sex Offenses</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Motor Vehicle Theft</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor Law Arrests</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor Law Referrals</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapon Possession Arrests</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapon Possession Referrals</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Law Arrests</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Law Referrals</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Hate/Bias Crimes</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On-Campus Residential Bldg. are included in On-Campus count.

*Hate/Bias Crimes are associated with PART I Crimes, Larceny, Simple Assault, Intimidation and Destruction, Damage, or Vandalism of Property.

Statistics numbers are based on local police, public safety, and university official data.

*Data not included.
Table 3: Number of Arrests by PSU Campus Public Safety

The following summarizes the number of custody, cite-in-lieu and total arrests made by CPSO Officers from 2008 until October, 2013. Approximately 90% of the arrests made on campus are persons with no affiliation with the university.
Table 4: PSU Conduct and Community Standards Data for 2010-2013

The PSU Student Code of Conduct aims to protect the safety, respect and integrity of students attending PSU. Cases of alleged student misconduct are heard by the senior conduct officer or the student conduct committee. The information below is a summary of student conduct cases concerning safety-related offenses for the last three academic years, 2010-2013.
2013 Associated Students of Portland State University (ASPSU) Campus Safety Survey

In 2013, ASPSU developed a survey to gather information from students regarding campus safety. ASPSU gathered this information using an unscientific methodology, by posting the survey on its Facebook page for community members who viewed and visited their web page. This survey had 307 respondents.

Highlights of findings from that survey include:

- 69% of respondents reported “agree” or “strongly agree” to the prompt “I feel safe on campus.” Of the students who self-identified, women felt less safe compared to men.

- 56% of respondents replied “disagree” or “strongly disagree” to the prompt “I am aware of the services CPSO provides.”

- 50% of respondents replied “disagree” or “strongly disagree” to the prompt “I know how to contact CPSO if I need assistance.”

- 45% of respondents replied “agree” or “strongly agree” to the prompt “PSU should have more Special Campus Safety Officers.” 34% of respondents reported “neutral.”

- 34% of respondents replied “strongly disagree” or “disagree” to the prompt “I think PSU should have its own sworn police force.” 36% replied “strongly agree” or agree.” 29% replied “neutral.”
TASK FORCE FINDINGS

As detailed above, the Task Force conducted a comprehensive review to assess PSU’s current public safety landscape. Among other things, this included objective crime and calls-for-service data from CPSO, PSU statistics (e.g., students, buildings), survey findings from students and Portland residents, local and national reports addressing crime in University settings, open campus forums, and interviews with key constituents. The Task Force generated the following conclusions based on its analysis of accumulated information:

1. **PSU must make reasonable efforts to address known safety concerns.** The dependency on student credit hours requires that PSU examine the impact of campus safety perceptions on the ability to recruit and retain students. This consideration should include a thoughtful review of Title IX issues, potential legal liability and the potential impact of critical incidents on campus on morale and safety perception.

2. **Perceptions of safety may be misleading.** Although perceptions about campus safety are important for the reasons described above, perceptions (both positive and negative) are not necessarily grounded in reality. Some campus community members may not be aware of the serious offenders visiting campus. Others who feel unsafe may in fact be safe. Although the majority of PSU’s students, faculty, and staff feel safe on campus, perceptions vary by gender, time of day, and efforts of a person to be cautious.

3. **There have been improvements with campus policy development.** New campus leaders in areas such as Equity and Compliance and CPSO have brought improvements to policies regarding Title IX and access control. Cooperation between departments during student and campus safety emergencies has also improved with the establishment of the C.A.R.E Team.

4. **The complexity of PSU’s daily operations has increased.** The expansion of campus services and partnerships with vendors and tenants of leased spaces increases the complexity of CPSO’s response to service calls and conduct of investigations.

5. **The complex nature of campus law enforcement is changing with increased service demands.** As PSU continues to expand its footprint with businesses and community partners, the responsibilities of the Campus Public Safety Office are increasing. Increased access to campus via the expansion of public transportation routes, including access by criminal offenders, adds to the complexity of PSU’s policing needs.

6. **Resources allocated to CPSO and campus safety in general have not kept pace with the level of growth.** PSU has undergone considerable growth over the past 25 years including a doubling of the student population and the addition of new buildings and square footage. Campus services, faculty and staff have also continued to grow. Throughout this rapid expansion, investments to campus safety have been limited.
The Task Force believes that the continuing transformation of this campus and ongoing safety challenges should lead PSU to prioritize more proactive safety efforts. In order of highest priority, the Task Force presents the following recommendations to improve PSU’s response to changing safety concerns:

**Campus Public Safety Office**

The Task Force has spent a considerable amount of time developing a thorough understanding of Campus Public Safety Office history and operations. The Chief of the PSU Campus Public Safety Office provided documentation and made presentations to the Task Force to support that learning. This group also worked to learn more about the roles and capabilities of local law enforcement agencies and other community resources.

Considering the charge to the Task Force, a significant amount of time was spent reviewing the authority, capabilities and service challenges of the Campus Public Safety Office.

The Task Force believes 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.

After careful review and discussion, the Task Force believes that the limitations on CPSO authority, jurisdiction and capability are the most concerning safety issue on campus. The Task Force puts forth the following recommendations about CPSO:

**CPSO Recommendation #1:** PSU should explore ways to ensure access to sworn officers who are an appropriately trained in campus policing and available on-site to the PSU campus community.

As described above, CPSO officers are limited by law in their ability to address safety concerns that may extend outside of campus’s vaguely defined borders, as well as in their ability to provide many essential law enforcement services, such as community caretaking and detoxification or mental health holds. The Task Force believes that these functions are important to meeting the needs and growing expectations of this urban campus. It is also important that those functions be provided by officers who share the PSU community ethos.

The following chart outlines authority differences between a fully sworn Peace Officer (aka Police Officer), private security personnel and a Special Campus Security Officer (which is PSU’s current model of authority). The Task Force believes the most ideal model is one that allows PSU access to dedicated professionals, who are part of the PSU ethos and community, who have the powers of sworn police officers.
The Task Force has identified two potential ways for PSU to obtain these services:

- Transitioning the Campus Public Safety Office to a department that has both fully sworn police officers and non-sworn Campus Public Safety officers, or
- Contracting with an outside agency that can provide PSU constant access to dedicated fully sworn police officers. If PSU pursues this route, it is critical that
the outside agency officers be dedicated to community policing and receive specific training necessary to operate within the urban university culture.

The following chart includes some of the Task Force’s thoughts on how PSU might go about obtaining dedicated, sworn police services. It should be emphasized that these are early explorations which may or may not prove accurate on further scrutiny. Should the Task Force’s recommendation be adopted, a future individual or committee should further explore these ideas before making any determination about how to implement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Feasible</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transition to Campus Police Department</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>- Local control&lt;br&gt;- Reflects University mission and values&lt;br&gt;- In alignment with modern campus policing&lt;br&gt;- Unit within the university&lt;br&gt;- Responsiveness to the university mandated by statute&lt;br&gt;- Ability to respond to all emergencies</td>
<td>- Cost&lt;br&gt;- Requires some buy-in from constituents&lt;br&gt;- Recruiting and retention costs are absorbed by PSU&lt;br&gt;- Difficulties in building a police department from the ground up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract with Portland Police Bureau (PPB)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>- Fully functioning existing law enforcement agency.&lt;br&gt;- Enhanced specialized capabilities including investigations, SWAT, etc.&lt;br&gt;- Recruiting and retention costs are already in place and absorbed by agency</td>
<td>- University control and input limited&lt;br&gt;- Different core mission&lt;br&gt;- Some FERPA issues&lt;br&gt;- Personnel compensation are determined by the PPB&lt;br&gt;- Lack of familiarity with the intricacies of campus policing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract with Oregon State Police (OSP)</td>
<td>No (OSP is not currently open to this option)</td>
<td>- Fully functioning law enforcement agency&lt;br&gt;- Enhanced specialized capabilities including investigations, SWAT, etc.&lt;br&gt;- Recruiting and retention costs already in place and absorbed by agency&lt;br&gt;- Familiarity with campus policing through the OSU experience</td>
<td>- University control and input limited&lt;br&gt;- Personnel compensation are determined by OSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborate with Oregon Health and Science University (OHSU)</td>
<td>Yes (OHSU has been responsive to discussing)</td>
<td>- Shared cost and infrastructure&lt;br&gt;- Similar missions as educational institutions&lt;br&gt;- Familiarity with campus policing&lt;br&gt;- Flexibility in resource deployment&lt;br&gt;- Experience in managing shared spaces</td>
<td>- Operate under different statutory authority&lt;br&gt;- Requires cooperation between two large institutions&lt;br&gt;- OHSU has unique service demands as a medical provider&lt;br&gt;- Operate under different personnel compensation agreements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• **Creation of a PSU Campus Police Department:** This option would represent the gradual transition of the Campus Public Safety Office to a bifurcated department with both sworn Campus Police Officers providing general police services to the campus, and non-sworn Public Safety Officers performing those duties not requiring fully trained and empowered police authority. 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.

ORS 352.385 requires that a university-created police force has university oversight. “When a university establishes a police department and commissions one or more employees as police officers, the president of the university, in cooperation with the chief of the police department, shall establish a process by which the university will receive and respond to complaints involving the policies of the police department and the conduct of the police officers.” No other option has this requirement.

• **Contract with the Portland Police Bureau:** This option would require a contractual agreement with the Portland Police Bureau to provide a dedicated PPB contingent to the campus. These officers would be subject to the policies and collective bargaining agreements of the Portland Police Bureau Union. The assignment, hiring, discipline, use of force, and oversight of the officers would be under the direction of the Portland Police Bureau. Portland Police Officers are fully trained and authorized to provide police services to the City of Portland, including the Portland State University Campus. Specific university needs and requirements such as Clery, FERPA and Title IX would require additional training. Further, depending on the terms of the contract with PPB, there may be no guarantee that PSU would be given a dedicated rotation of officers. For example, officers not experienced with the campus and its sensitive intricacies could be assigned on varying shifts.

• **Contract with the Oregon State Police:** The Oregon State Police has experience in campus policing through their arrangement with Oregon State University. However, the Oregon State Police is not interested in pursuing this option with Portland State University. See Appendix D.

• **Collaborate with OHSU:** Both OHSU and PSU have unique law enforcement service demands as educational institutions, and they are currently navigating how to provide service in a shared space, the Collaborative Life Sciences Building. Portland State University has a unique residential community, and OHSU has unique requirements as a medical provider. OHSU currently provides police authority per legislative changes in 2013 that expanded the authority of OHSU Police, as well as granted the authority to be armed. OHSU policy has limited this authority to the OHSU campus. As previously noted, CPSO current authority would prohibit CPSO from exercising police authority on the OHSU campus. Collaboration with OHSU should be explored and any policy implications could be identified and resolved.
CPSO 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. These functions include assisting in safety escorts, access control, and other such services. Non-sworn officers can provide these services at a lower cost, thus stretching the reach of available services.

CPSO Recommendation #3: PSU should establish a permanent committee to provide ongoing review of campus safety needs and best practices. As a campus grows and changes so do its safety needs. A standing committee will ensure that PSU responds to changes promptly and efficiently.

CPSO Recommendation #4: Campus Public Safety leadership should provide safety presentations and other education at events such as staff onboarding meetings, student orientation sessions, and Administrative Briefings. These presentations will help to mobilize the campus community in support of the safety awareness that is an essential element of any safety effort. Campus safety resources cannot address concerns unless they know about them; helping the community to know where to report and receive assistance is a critical mission.

Access Control

While current efforts are underway to reduce building accessibility to people not affiliated with the university, the Task Force finds that additional measures should be implemented to increase the safety of campus community members while addressing concerns with visitors not affiliated with the university who do not seek to advance PSU’s mission and goals.

Access Control Recommendation #1: PSU should establish official business hours and, where possible, regulate access to buildings outside of these hours through electronic systems. PSU should consolidate scheduling of classes and events so that buildings are locked outside of normal business hours (for example, 7:00 a.m. - 9:00 p.m. Monday - Friday) or outside of scheduled events. Outside of those times, building entrance points should remain accessible through electronic access for members of the PSU community with a valid keycard. This system allows for simplified planning and a universal understanding regarding access for all campus buildings. Access outside of business hours for anyone without a keycard should be coordinated through CPSO.

Access Control Recommendation #2: PSU should establish a long-term goal of transitioning all exterior building doors to electronic access control. As part of this goal, all new campus construction and remodeling that affects building access points should include electronic access as a project requirement. Electronic access systems are essential to the full implementation of the business hours recommended above. These systems also serve as keyless entry devices and added security measures. They allow for remote lockdowns in emergency situations and identify doors that are propped or forced open. Integration with Banner would facilitate allowing only authorized users to enter PSU buildings.
Access Control Recommendation #3: PSU should recognize the PSU ID card as the only official form of PSU identification and the only method of electronic access control. Further, PSU should continue to explore ways for PSU personnel to be easily identified. This could include requiring employees to carry or wear access badges as identification. All students should be strongly encouraged to carry their access badge as the institution is currently moving toward the access badge being the single form of student identification.

Safety Awareness and Emergency Preparation

Improving campus safety at PSU is a significant and collaborative undertaking that will require commitment. PSU should continue to engage university members in creating a culture of greater safety and awareness. Departments should continue striving to make their safety programs and resources more widely known to students, staff and faculty. The Task Force also recommends the following regarding safety awareness at PSU:

Safety/Emergency Recommendation #1: PSU should consider creating a campus safety marketing campaign that will foster a culture shift and help campus community members to identify safety risks and behaviors. As resources become available, PSU should add staffing to CPSO that has a primary focus of campus crime prevention and safety education activities.

Safety/Emergency Recommendation #2: PSU should consider ways to better communicate expectations of staff and student employees in emergency situations. This could take place through trainings for designated staff acting in the capacity of a building coordinator. Campus Public Safety should provide leadership of this effort.

Safety/Emergency Recommendation #3: All PSU employees should be required to sign up for PSU Alert. It is imperative that the university be able to communicate with all staff during campus emergencies.
RECOMMENDED NEXT STEPS

The Task Force recognizes that the recommendations regarding CPSO are similar to the 2008 recommendations regarding provision of dedicated, fully trained and empowered police services to the PSU campus. Those recommendations also recognized that the manner in which this is accomplished involves the option of either contracting out for this service, or creating a Campus Police Department. While other important recommendations from the 2008 report were implemented, the Task Force noted further that the 2008 CPSO recommendations were not implemented. The Task Force recognizes that implementing these recommendations will require additional analysis of available options.

In light of the importance of this recommendation, The Task Force is suggesting the next specific steps to perform this analysis.

Phase I: Fact Finding

   a. Create a data gathering tool to identify important considerations (Sample 1)
   b. Gather data from the three identified options.
      1. Creation of PSU Police Department
      2. Contracting with PPB
      3. Collaborative agreement with OHSU

Phase II: Review and Analysis of Data Collected
Phase III: Final Decision and Implementation Planning

SAMPLE 1

1. Would your agency be willing to enter into a contractual agreement to provide police services to Portland State University?
2. Can this agreement provide for PSU to exercise control over policy, procedure, and the manner in which police services are provided?
3. If not, what role would Portland State University have regarding personnel assignment, use of force, discipline, promotion and complaint investigations?
4. Can this agreement require that police officers are specifically assigned to the campus, i.e. that PSU is the duty station where they report to work and that their activity is restricted to a clearly defined campus patrol area?
5. Some restrictions regarding FERPA prohibit the sharing of student information with law enforcement outside of the campus. Would your officers be able to comply with this regulation within your existing command structure?
6. What would be the annual cost of providing 12 Police Officers, 3 Sergeants, a Detective, a Lieutenant, and a Chief dedicated to the PSU Campus? (for comparison purposes)
7. When would your agency be capable of providing this service?
Appendix A – Task Force Charge

Office of the President

Portland State University

Date: April 25, 2013
To: Campus Community
From: Wim Viewel, President
Re: Task Force on Campus Safety (TFCS) Charge

Over the course of the last year, various segments of our campus community have been engaged in a conversation regarding safety at PSU. In particular, an issue has developed concerning whether or not PSU’s Campus Public Safety Office should become a fully sworn police department, to better deter and respond to campus crime. All of these conversations have been genuine and sincere; however, they have not always been well informed by facts and data. Moreover, while the transformation of CPSO represents one strategy for more effectively addressing campus crime, it certainly is not the only strategy. Finally, without the relevant facts and data as context, campus leadership cannot determine appropriate next steps that would address life/safety concerns at PSU.

Accordingly, I am convening a Task Force on Campus Safety, and charging the TFCS to provide me with a set of recommendations on how best to address safety concerns, and to improve the University’s response to criminal activity on campus. I ask that your work involve the following actions steps.

First, before July 1, 2013, I would like the TFCS to host a series of conversations with all interested constituencies to obtain information regarding how safe various stakeholder groups feel going to school at PSU, or working, or visiting the campus. The purpose of these initial conversations is to elicit from our community how safe people feel on campus, and why, as opposed to how to address real or perceived safety risks. The list of groups the TFCS should talk with include, but is not limited to: students (including the ASPSU), faculty (including the Faculty Senate), staff (including representatives from SEIU), members of the community that frequently do business or otherwise interact with the campus, representatives from both the PSU Foundation and Alumni Association, a representative group of parents of students, community safety experts (e.g. the Portland Police Bureau, federal law enforcement with local offices), and individuals on campus who have specific responsibility for keeping the University and its constituencies safe (e.g. the Chief of CPSO, members of the Emergency Response Team, the Dean of Student Life, the Associate Vice President for Human Resources, the Director of Environmental Health & Safety, and the University Risk Manager).

Second, over the course of the summer, I would like the TFCS to review the information gathered during the above-described conversations, against the body of facts and data PSU has available to it regarding the actual nature and extent of crime on campus, how the University currently addresses life/safety issues, and how PSU compares to other institutions. Based upon this analysis, I would like the TFCS to develop a set of findings, driven by the hosted conversations and data reviewed, and preliminary recommendations on how the University should respond to those finding.

Third, in the Fall, I would ask the TFCS to share its preliminary finding and recommendations with the same stakeholder groups it interviewed at the start of this process, for feedback and reaction. I then would suggest that the TFCS amend their preliminary findings and recommendations to reflect feedback it receives, so that by November 1, 2013, the TFCS could deliver to me a final set of findings and responsive recommendations regarding safety at PSU.
October 1, 2013

Dr. Jackie Balzer, VP EMSA
Campus Safety Task Force
Portland State University
1914 SW Park, Suite 148
Portland, Oregon 97201

Dear Dr. Balzer:

As the Central Precinct Commander for the Portland Police Bureau I am responsible for providing basic law enforcement services to 41 square miles of the city that includes all of downtown and Portland State University. The precinct is broken into districts which are generally staffed with one officer, with the ability to pull additional officers from adjacent patrol areas as needed. The Portland State University campus covers several city blocks and is a part of a singular district, typically patrolled by one officer.

The Portland Police Bureau continues to struggle with budgetary constraints, and strive to provide an adequate emergency response to the entire city of Portland. This response is tailored to best practices for municipal policing and may not represent best practices to the unique service requirements of campus policing, long recognized as a specialized area of law enforcement throughout the United States, and formalized through the creation of Campus Police Departments.

Our officers often work with Campus Public Safety Officers, and are frequently called to complete tasks that Campus Public Safety Officers often encounter, but lack the authority to remedy. This includes areas such as students in mental health crises, intoxicated persons, welfare checks, or even completing basic criminal investigations.

The Portland Police Bureau has devoted significant training and resources to providing a trained response to an active shooter. Extensive analysis of active shooter incidents requires that the response by police should be focused on reducing a shooter’s ability to inflict death or serious physical injury. Campus Public Safety Officers have an intimate familiarity with the campus, as well as the ability to respond in a timely manner. In the event of an active shooter, responding Portland Police Officers would need to partner with Campus Public Safety to allow us to gain access to secure areas, to find the most efficient way around the university and direct other resources to respond in the quickest way possible.
Dr. Jackie Balzer  
Portland State University Campus Safety Task Force  
October 1, 2013  
Page 2

Under the current model, Campus Public Safety does not possess the ability to interrupt an active shooter. They would have to wait for our response and when they join us, they would be at great risk.

The Portland Police Bureau has a positive partnership with Campus Public Safety and is supportive of the movement towards an adequately trained, equipped and empowered Campus Police Department to work together for the benefit of students, faculty, staff, and visitors to both the campus, and the City of Portland.

We join our partners at the Eugene Police Department as they provided support for a similar move by the University of Oregon, as well as our support for a similar transition by Oregon Health Sciences University.

Sincerely,

ROBERT H. DAY  
Commander  
Central Precinct  

RHD/jp
Appendix C – Letter of Support from Portland State Women’s Resource Center (Page 1)

Women’s Resource Center
Portland State University
Post Office Box 781
Portland, Oregon 97207-0781
503-725-5605 tel wr@pdx.edu

Date: August 5, 2013
To: Task Force on Campus Safety
From: Jessica Amo, WRC Director
Re: Proposed CPSO Changes

I am writing to express my support for transitioning CPSO to a fully sworn police force. In my role as the Director of the PSU Women’s Resource Center I am responsible for the Interpersonal Violence (IPV) Program, PSU’s advocacy program for students affected by sexual and relationship violence. My experiences with this program have shown me that sexual assault survivors would be significantly served by having a fully sworn police force on campus.

The WRC’s broader community of student staff and volunteers has a variety of opinions on the proposed change, and some disagree with my position. I recognize that there are concerns regarding law enforcement in general that will need to be addressed, and I am confident that the process will ensure these concerns are taken into account. However, when considering the needs of sexual assault survivors who wish to access law enforcement, transitioning to a fully sworn police force is essential.

Sexual assault is a significant health concern and barrier to student success on campuses nationally, and one that is difficult to quantify due to underreporting. As identified by the American College Health Association, the prevalence of sexual assault on campus is characterized by “high rates of sexual violence on college and university campuses and low levels of reporting of these incidents by students.” Therefore, when a student does decide to make a police report regarding sexual assault it is critical that they receive a comprehensive, sensitive and professional response.

When students working with the IPV Program have decided to make a police report, I have seen significant barriers arise related to navigating off-campus law enforcement. For example, I have had a student have to make three separate efforts to report an assault due to patrol officers referring her to other jurisdictions and officers. Students have to report the same incident multiple times (to a patrol officer and then to a Detective), and may have to travel to other counties to report. In “cold call” cases where the crime is not in progress, students have to wait until off-campus officers are free to respond. In contrast, when I call CPSO they provide an immediate and coordinated response, which now includes a specialized Detective dedicated to sexual assault cases.

1American College Health Association, Campus Violence White Paper, 2007
Establishing CPSO as a sworn police force will allow students affected by sexual and relationship violence to make a report on campus in a familiar environment. An advocate will be present during the reporting, and we will be able to ensure that medical, housing, and academic services are coordinated. Students will not have to duplicate reporting, as the report can be shared with our Conduct process when appropriate.

CPSO has demonstrated their commitment to working collaboratively with the WRC and other campus partners to address sexual violence in our campus community. Establishing CPSO as a police force will further support PSU’s capacity to ensure that students are able to safely access their education.

I am happy to talk further with the committee regarding this issue – please let me know if there’s any other information I can provide.
Chief Zerzan,

Please accept this email as notification that the Oregon State Police is not interested in entering into a contract with Portland State to provide police services. Though an incredibly important mission the Oregon State Police doesn’t currently have adequate resources to provide this service and the mission is not consistent with our state wide mission.

I will follow up this email with a letter from Superintendent Evans in the near future.

Thanks,

Jeff

Captain Jeff R. Lanz

Oregon State Police