

UPSOC Attending:

Michael Alexander- Co-chair
Marcy Hunt- Co-chair
Clint Culpepper
Keith Kaufman
Thomas Lockett
Lisa Hawash
Jay Auslander
Shirley Jackson
Dana Walton-Macaulay
Jill Townley
Anastasia Amsden
Andres Guzman
Willie Halliburton

UPSOC Absent:

Constantin Severe
Luis Baldera-Villagrana

UPSOC Staff:

Cathy Kirchner
Mark Wubbold

University Public Safety Oversight Committee (UPSOC) – March 15, 2019

Convened: 1:01 pm

Topic: Welcome and review of meeting notes

Discussion: UPSOC members approved the February 15, 2018 meeting notes as written.

Action: Staff will post the meeting notes to the UPSOC website.

Topic: Discussion of Margolis Healy (MH) Report

Discussion: Given MH report’s complexity, length and breadth, UPSOC members completed an online feedback form to frame discussion for today’s meeting. UPSOC members prioritized the following thematic areas for discussion: CPSO staffing and organizational structure, communication/outreach/engagement within PSU and Portland community, and UPSOC’s role/scope of work. The MH recommendations for UPSOC totaled 11. The group decided that most of the recommendations were appropriate and that in particular, UPSOC should be an oversight body (rather than advisory). However, to succeed, the meaning of “oversight” must be clearly defined and UPSOC will need dedicated staff with the necessary technical expertise to support this work.

There were also questions about whether the committee, as currently constituted, contained the right representation of stakeholders. Generally, UPSOC members felt

it did, and would be able to provide unbiased oversight with the addition of dedicated staff.

We anticipate the Board of Trustees may request UPSOC's response to the MH report. This feedback could help prioritize the MH recommendations. Generally, UPSOC members were supportive of the recommendations outlined in the report, especially those that can be implemented quickly.

During this discussion, UPSOC members shared a number of other questions, including:

- Q. Will Board members be meeting with UPSOC to discuss the MH report?
- Q. The MH report calls for UPSOC to have a "dotted line" reporting structure to the Board. How would this work and what is meant by a "dotted line?"
- Q: UPSOC members questioned the accuracy of MH report vis-à-vis UPSOC. Is there an opportunity to correct these inaccuracies?
- Q: Does the Board plan to look at other models for UPSOC?

Another UPSOC model the committee discussed was the one originally proposed in the final report of the Implementation Advisory Committee (IAC). IAC was a Board appointed group that looked at how other sworn and armed university police forces operated and made recommendations for how to implement PSU's. Although many (if not most) of IAC's recommendations were adopted by the Board, they were not all implemented. For example, IAC called for the type of oversight recommended in the MH report, however "oversight" was changed to "advisory" when the oversight committee convened. In addition, consistent implementation of the training recommendations post the initial transition to a sworn force was questioned. Generally, UPSOC members who had also served on the IAC felt that the IAC report should be revisited and cross referenced with the MH recommendations.

Topic: Active Bystander Trainings

Discussion: An UPSOC member has been providing active bystander trainings through Illuminate, PSU's sexual and relationship violence prevention program. They would like to see more emphasis put on this public safety tool. Unlike many of the MH report recommendations, active bystander trainings are an example of a tangible intervention. UPSOC can promote and support that may improve campus safety at minimal cost. Seventy percent of first-year students went through PSU's active bystander training in 2017. Athletics is the only unit that requires the training.

Some UPSOC members would like to see the training required of all students. One way to enforce this would be to put a registration hold on those who do not complete it. If bystander trainings are required or expanded, UPSOC members would like to see more emphasis put on understanding the relationships between intersectionality and safety.

Topic: CPSO hiring update

Discussion: CPSO is interviewing for new police officers. A member asked if they should be hiring more safety officers than police officers. To better appreciate the staffing balance issues CPSO faces, it was suggested that UPSOC members attend a citizen's academy on policing.

Topic: MH Report Discussion...continued.

Discussion: UPSOC members returned to further questions on the MH report; including:

- Q: Regarding the Margolis Healy report, will the Board formally move to accept or reject the report? Will they formally acknowledge the report's findings?
- Q: Who (or what group) is doing the financial feasibility study on the MH reports' recommendations.
- Q: Is UPSOC to be part of the review and response to the MH report– in effect, a subcommittee of the Board?
- Q: What is the timeline for responding to the MH report and when will the Board render their decision on its findings?

Some UPSOC members are concerned the MH report does not accurately depict the work of the committee. Because of this, the recommendations they make to reform UPSOC may be plausible, but wrong. UPSOC wants to fix these inaccuracies, since they are the assumptions upon which the MH recommendations were made.

An UPSOC member shared that the President wanted to form an additional AD HOC committee to respond to the MH report. UPSOC's concern is that these duplicative efforts could end up canceling each other out. If called for, the General Counsel will be working with the Board to form the AD HOC committee.

Other Items: Government Relations shared two bills making their way through the state legislature which if adopted, would affect campus safety efforts. See HB 3387 (which is less likely to be adopted) and SB 576 (this one should pass).

Adjourned: 3:00 pm