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Introduction to the Report

Background
In spring 2013, Portland State University (PSU) President Wim Wiewel convened the Task Force on Public Safety to make recommendations to address growing concerns about campus safety. PSU’s current Campus Public Safety Office (CPSO) provides basic public safety services, but employs no sworn police officers and has limited law enforcement authority. The Task Force on Public Safety concluded that the limited authority of CPSO officers presented the greatest barrier to creating a safer campus.

Subsequently, the Board of Trustees established a Special Committee on Campus Public Safety that included a wide range of PSU stakeholders who gathered public input on the concept of establishing a PSU police department. Based on extensive public input, the Special Committee on Campus Public Safety drafted a resolution to establish a police department. The Board of Trustees adopted the resolution in December 2014, and directed the creation of an Implementation Advisory Committee for Campus Public Safety (IAC) to conduct research and gather public input on approaches for implementing the police unit. (The Board of Trustees resolution is included as Appendix A to this report).

The following report presents the IAC’s recommendations for review by the Special Committee on Campus Public Safety. Review by the Board of Trustees will follow. The Board will make a final vote on June 11, 2015, at which time CPSO will proceed with implementation in line with the Board’s decision.

The IAC’s Charge
In the Board of Trustees resolution, the IAC was directed to “make recommendations on any matters it determines to be relevant,” including recruitment and training of police officers, and creation of a University Public Safety Oversight Committee. The Vice President for Administration and Finance gave the IAC its charge, which included providing “advice on the implementation plan, including both the deployment of sworn, armed officers and larger issues of campus safety.” The IAC was also directed to—in all of its work—“make its recommendations after careful review of best practices in policing, both within a university context and more generally.” The overriding objective of the IAC was to craft a set of recommendations to propel PSU toward creation of an effective, community-centered approach to public safety at PSU. (The full text of the Vice President’s charge to the IAC is included in Appendix B to this report.)

IAC’s Diverse Membership
The IAC undertook its work with civility and respect in order to create an environment in which all IAC members were able to express their views. The IAC included a diverse set of 16 representatives of campus stakeholder groups, including faculty, staff, students, unions, and campus programs and academic units whose disciplines relate to public safety and student life. The IAC included a mix of individuals who had supported and opposed creation of a police unit, but who were all committed to
identifying best approaches to implementing the police unit in line with the IAC’s charge. IAC members were as follows:

- CeCe Ridder, Director, Diversity and Multicultural Student Services (Co-Chair)
- Stephen Percy, Dean, College of Urban and Public Affairs (Co-Chair)
- Charles Lopez, Global Diversity & Inclusion
- Lisa Hawash, American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Representative
- Tony Funchess, Associated Students of Portland State University (ASPSU) Representative
- Ukiah Hawkins, ASPSU Representative
- Gregory Marks, Public Safety Office, Service Employees International Union (SEIU) Representative
- Marc Nisenfeld, SEIU Representative
- Jessica Amo, Director, Women’s Resource Center
- Kris Henning, Criminal Justice Faculty Member
- Rob Gould, Conflict Resolution Faculty Member
- Marlene Howell, School of Gender, Race, & Nations Faculty Member
- Kirsten Keith, Assistant Coordinator, Queer Resource Center
- Michael Walsh, Director of Housing and Residence Life
- Marcy Hunt, Director of Counseling and Psychological Services
- Danielle Ali Cassim, ASPSU Representative

Mr. Mark Wubbold and Ms. Susan Klees provided valuable staff support for the Committee, and Mr. Jeffrey Bunn, a PSU graduate student, provided helpful research support.

IAC Process
The IAC divided itself into the following topic teams, each of which focused on a distinct part of the IAC charge:

- Policies and Practices for Campus Public Safety
- Recruitment and Training of Campus Public Safety Personnel
- Creation of an Oversight Committee for Campus Public Safety

From January through May 2015, the teams researched their topics. At the same time, the IAC conducted outreach to the campus community to solicit ideas and feedback about creating an effective sworn police unit appropriate for a large urban university. Outreach included the following:

- Ten listening sessions in April 2015, sponsored by different groups, to update the campus community and solicit feedback on the IAC’s work.
- A website requesting feedback on specific issues under consideration by the topic teams.
• A May 2015 PSU listening session in which the campus community provided feedback on a draft version of the IAC’s final report. The listening session was supplemented with a website for commenting online.

This final report provides the IAC’s recommendations based on its research and input from the campus community. It should be noted that a number of comments and feedback from a variety of sources have continued to express opposition to having armed police officers on campus.

This report is arranged into four sections that align with the work of the topic teams:

• Section 1: Policies and Practices for Campus Public Safety
• Section 2: Recruitment and Training for Campus Public Safety Personnel
• Section 3: Creating an Oversight Committee for Campus Public Safety
• Section 4: Supplemental Strategies for Advancing Campus Public Safety

The report reflects the IAC’s focused commitment to drawing on best practices in the field and building on the valuable input of the PSU community. The report presents a recommended preliminary map for establishing a PSU police unit that is dedicated to the proposition of collaborative, community-based policing, and well-equipped to ensure public safety, build strong relationships, and create a campus environment that is a positive place to learn and work.

The Implementation Advisory Committee wishes to express its appreciation to the many members of the campus community who provided ideas and feedback through the process of creating this report. This feedback was instrumental to many of the recommendations included in this report by the Committee.
Section 1

Recommendations for Campus Public Safety Policies

The Board of Trustees and the Vice President of Finance and Administration provided a charge to the Implementation Advisory Committee (IAC) to provide advisement on the following policy related topics: use of force; the appropriate use and implementation of relevant innovations, to include body cameras; and to consider specific needs of effective university-oriented policing. The Policy Topic Team reviewed proposed Campus Public Safety Office (CPSO) policies; researched topics include use of force and body cameras and concluded with a set of recommendations.

1 IAC Review of Proposed Campus Public Safety Office Policies

The topic team’s work included reviewing 127 proposed changes to Campus Public Safety Office (CPSO) policies. (The policies are available for viewing on the IAC website at go.pdx.edu/IAC.) CPSO’s proposed changes would define police authority and tactics, address training, and more. The proposed policies, as drafted, do not yet include full implementation procedures or training processes; however, CPSO will operationalize the policies by developing a detailed implementation procedure and an accompanying training curriculum once policies are agreed upon.

The proposed policy changes were drafted by Lexipol, a risk management provider that develops state-specific policy manuals, and provides frequent updates in response to federal and state law changes. Lexipol manuals are integrated with scenario-based training that prepares officers for high-risk, low-frequency policing events. Lexipol currently provides these policy-development services to PSU, the University of Oregon, approximately 100 other campuses, and more than 1,000 fire, rescue, and police departments nationwide.

The Policies and Practices Topic Team reviewed each proposed policy and made recommendations or posed questions for CPSO and Lexipol. Exhibit 1-A includes the team’s detailed analysis and response to all of the proposed policy changes. The team’s analysis involved comparing the proposed policies with policies drafted by Lexipol for the University of Oregon. The analysis also included a review of a wide range of relevant articles, films, and news stories. Research materials were provided by IAC members, campus community members, and via public feedback submitted online at the IAC website. Notes from the PSU listening sessions, included here as Exhibit 1-B, were also reviewed for relevant recommendations.

2 Comments on Proposed Campus Public Safety Office Policies

The topic team offers the following discussion and recommendations regarding the current CPSO policies:
2.1 Policy on communication with people with disabilities

At the request of the topic team, the PSU Disability Resource Center reviewed Policy 372: Hearing Impaired/Disabled Communications. The center’s suggested revisions are detailed in Exhibit 1-C. The IAC concurs with the suggestions and offers no additional suggestions.

In addition, the topic team recommends that Policy 384: Service Animals be revised to mirror PSU’s current policy on Assistance Animals.

2.2 Policy on mental health

In Exhibit 1-A, the topic team offers several recommendations, and poses questions about Policy 320: Responding to Persons Affected by Mental Illness or In Crisis. The discussion also addresses how to respond to community members who are perceived as homeless. Crisis Intervention Training and involuntary holds are also discussed. Note that the Portland Police Bureau (PPB) just released an update of their policy “Response to Mental Health Crisis.” (The policy is available at https://www.portlandoregon.gov/police/article/485645.) The topic team recommends that the PPB policy be thoroughly reviewed and perhaps mirrored or taken into consideration when deciding on PSU’s policy for responding to individuals who are in a mental health crisis. Also note that the work of the IAC Topic Team on Recruitment and Training of Campus Public Safety Personnel includes recommendations for mental health training in table 3 of section 2 of this report.

2.3 Use of force

Nationally, recent incidents in which police used force on a suspect have raised questions about how much force is appropriate. The question is complicated by the fact that researchers vary in their definition of force; for example, experts differ on whether force includes verbal coercion, physical coercion or both. Because of the discrepancies in how police use of force is measured, estimates of the frequency of use of force range from less than one percent of police-suspect interactions to 58% nationally.

Nonetheless, criminal justice researchers have examined many aspects of police use of force. Much of the research suggests that extralegal issues impact the likelihood that an officer will use force. For example, one study found that use of force is most likely to occur when a suspect is resistant to an officer, is a minority, and is younger than 30. Other research has found that a suspect being male, nonwhite, poor, and young was positively related to use of force. Research suggests that officers may be more likely to use force when responding to a call about property crime or violence and when a suspect poses a safety concern. Another study also found that interactions that began with police force—physical or verbal—were associated with citizen resistance and associated with use of force later in the interaction as well. (This study found that
officers used force in nearly half of the observations.) One study suggested that officer inexperience does not increase the likelihood that an officer will use force.

Because the criminal justice field has not clearly defined use of force, a police department should carefully consider its own understanding of what constitutes force and how the use of force affects interactions between police and the community. A report by the National Institute of Justice (Bulman, P., 2010) recommends that police departments consider a use-of-force continuum. The continuum may cover the spectrum from no use of force, in which having an officer present is enough to de-escalate a situation, to use of lethal force. The topic team recommends that CPSO consider what their continuum for use of force might be.

Policy 300 of the proposed CPSO policies defines use of force and recommends that officers understand and appreciate their authority and limitations. Some highlights of recommendations offered by the topic team regarding Policy 300 and the use of force include the following:

- Add the phrase "tactical retreat may be the best option," as one alternative to the use of force, and ensure, through training, that officers understand what tactical retreat means and when it is called for.
- Add a policy section that offers guidance about how to protect a suspect who may be engaged in self harm.
- Add a policy about responding to passive resistance.
- Consult with the University Oversight Committee prior to implementation of any policy which authorizes the use of tasers by personnel of Campus Public Safety.
- Consult with the University Oversight Committee prior to implementation of any changes in use of force policies.
- Conduct research on the carotid control hold since some police departments are reexamining the technique and may be eliminating it. Note that the vascular neck restraint is not taught at the Oregon Department of Public Safety Standards and Training (DPSST). It is also not an approved tactic or part of the current policy at the University of Oregon. However, CPSO Policy 300: Use of Force does mention the carotid control hold. If the carotid control hold will be included in CPSO policies, we recommend that CPSO be prepared to inform the campus community of the rationale for its use.

The topic team offers the following additional recommendations related to use of force:

- Consider evaluating officer views and training needs regarding the use of force. The Community Oriented Policing Services article, Emerging Use of Force Issues (March 2012) from the U.S. Department of Justice recommends using a survey to evaluate police officers’ mindsets about using force, and to assess where training may be needed.
• Consider establishing citizen police academies as a way to help the campus community understand CPSO policy. Citizen police academies provide police training courses to the general public in order to give community members insight into common police procedures. The academies would create space for conversations regarding issues such as use of force.

• Conduct a thorough discussion about the use of pepper spray or chemical agents (addressed in Policy 308). The discussion was beyond the scope of the IAC’s work due to time constraints.

• Hold a broader discussion between the Oversight Committee and CPSO regarding the types of weapons that may be in use.

### 2.4 Body cameras

Police departments in the United States rely on positive relationships with the public to maintain safety. Recent killings of unarmed, African American men in Missouri, New York, South Carolina, Baltimore, and elsewhere have caused many U.S. communities to question police tactics and to distrust officers. Cameras worn by officers now represent a check on the abuses of the police and a mechanism for transparency in police–citizen dealings. Law enforcement is increasingly using body-worn cameras to improve community relations, collect evidence, and encourage professional policing behavior.

Research indicates that police use of body cameras has been related to fewer use-of-force incidents and fewer complaints against officers. Additionally, law enforcement groups have noted that, because use of body cameras increases the accountability of officers, they may lead to improved relationships between the police and the people they serve. Nonetheless, the practice of using body cameras to film police interactions with citizens raises some concerns and questions. Questions include the following:

• What type of situations should officers film?
• Do officers need the subject’s consent before filming members of the public?
• How departments should handle public requests for videos?

According to a recent U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) report on implementing use of body cameras, law enforcement agencies should evaluate their needs and the community’s attitudes when creating policies about body cameras.

We recommend that, when developing policies about what type of situations officers should film, the CPSO refer to the University of Oregon Policy 450: Portable Audio/Video Recorders, particularly 450.5: Activation of the Audio/Video Recorder, which states:
Officers should activate the recorder during all enforcement stops and field interview situations when MAV is not used and any other time the member reasonably believes that a recording of an on-duty contact may be useful. Once started, recordings should continue without interruption until the contact ends, if feasible. Officers are allowed to de-activate the recorder when exchanging information with other officers and supervisors. Only primary officers should record contacts with portable recorders. Secondary or cover officers are not required to record the contact unless they take action or have conversations independent of the primary officer.

Unless body camera footage is being used for evidence, a department should determine how long to save the footage after it is downloaded from each camera at the end of each shift. DOJ recommends that, when developing policies regarding public release of body camera footage, departments create a policy that promotes transparency but is sensitive to releasing images of witnesses, victims, and people filmed in their homes. The report suggests that a law enforcement agency should base much of its video release policy around its state’s public disclosure laws.

After surveying police departments across the country and hosting a national conference of law enforcement officials, the authors of a DOJ report found that many departments cited the financial cost of cameras prohibitive. The cameras range from $800 to $1,200 each and departments incur additional costs for storing video footage.

According to an interview conducted by Mark Wubbold with the PSU President’s Office, Lieutenant Bechdolt of the University of Oregon reported that University of Oregon Police Department officers wear Axon and Puma body cameras. They have been using Puma cameras since 2013 and have recently been experimenting with the Tazer brand of Axon cameras as a possible alternative. However, they seem to be leaning towards continuing to use Puma cameras because they are familiar with the equipment and are able to store the digital content on secure servers they control. The ability to store content on their current servers helps limit the costs of the service, since to fully adopt the Puma cameras would require purchasing a new server or paying a subscription fee to use the Puma secure storage service.

The IAC offers the following recommendations regarding use of body cameras by the PSU police unit:

2.4.1 Implement Policy 450 (implements Body Camera Policy)

2.4.2 Based on the available evidence, the Chief’s interest, and the policy as proposed, move forward with use of body cameras.
2.4.3 Hold an in-depth conversation regarding collective bargaining agreements and human resources policies to explore any concerns or issues about use of body cameras.

2.4.4 Do a side-by-side comparison of the University of Oregon policy manual in order to determine what they have identified as key issues and how they chose to address those issues in the manual. We also recommend that the Oversight Committee have an in-depth conversation with the University of Oregon as a comparator university.

2.4.5 Research available models of body cameras. Given that body cameras are a relatively new technology, issues such as enhanced versus human vision, and video review prior to report writing, as well as other emerging matters need to be thoroughly explored. Due to time and resource constraints, the topic team was unable to conduct a thorough investigation of product features.

Undoubtedly, researchers will learn more about the use of body cameras as they become increasingly common. Law enforcement agencies should remain committed to learning about other departments’ experiences with cameras, and should understand the complexity of policies associated with the new technology. The University Oversight Committee should participate in the development of CPSO policies regarding the use of police body cameras.

2.5 Evaluating police effectiveness

We recommend that CPSO and the Oversight Committee develop a broader array of criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of PSU police. Criteria could include the following:

- The community perceives that the campus is safe (as determined through surveys)
- Police contacts are perceived to be positive (as determined through surveys)
- Police participation in campus events meets an established standard
- Effective liaison relationships are in place
- Departmental partners report positive relationships with police (as determined through surveys)

We recommend avoiding focusing solely on clearance rates, response time, and number of arrests when evaluating police effectiveness. There is still a significant amount of research that needs to be conducted on this issue.
3 Recommended Policy Processes

According to the Interim Report of the President’s task force on 21st century policing, March 2015, there are best practices for building trust and legitimacy in law enforcement agencies and the communities they serve. We recommend that CPSO adopt the following best practices:

- Consistently make CPSO policies available to the public.
- Create documents that are accessible to people who have visual impairments or use a screen reader.
- Define when and how the public will be invited to comment on CPSO policies.
- Define when and how decisions will be made regarding implementing public feedback.
- Have PSU General Counsel and the Unions (AFT, AAUP and SEIU) review all CPSO policies to identify employment issues and any overlap or conflicts with PSU policies. Identify a process for remedying any such policy overlap or conflicts. We recommend that, whenever Lexipol policies duplicate or conflict with PSU policies, the Lexipol policy be removed and a reference to the relevant PSU policy be inserted in its place.
- Have the Oversight Committee oversee a bi-annual review of policies.
- Examine policies through an equity lens. For more information on equity lenses, see the PSU Strategic Plan Equity Lens at https://www.pdx.edu/president/equity-lens or the Multnomah County Equity and Empowerment Lens at https://multco.us/diversity-equity/equity-and-empowerment-lens.
- Ensure that relevant departmental partners are closely involved in developing implementation procedures for policies that relate to their service programs (e.g., mental health policies and sexual assault policies)

4 Other Considerations

4.1 Clarify Jurisdiction

Jurisdictional authority should also be factored into decision making about CPSO policies. Clearly defining the jurisdictional authority of armed officers will ensure that officers from PSU and neighboring law enforcement agencies understand where their authority begins and ends. It is also important to consider whether the campus police department has a formal mutual aid agreement or memorandum of understanding (MOU) in place with the neighboring law enforcement agency. If these agencies do not have such an agreement in place, the university will need to develop one prior to arming PSU officers. According to King (2014), establishing such formal documentation ensures that agencies with adjacent jurisdictions clearly understand their roles and responsibilities.
4.2 Clarify which policies apply to sworn and non-sworn officers

Throughout the document, language must reflect a department that includes both sworn officers and campus safety officers. A series of inconsistencies was noted in the proposed policies. Maintaining clarity about which policies apply directly to each population of officers, and how those policies will impact each is extremely important. Policies could also be translated into non-English languages for maximum accessibility.
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Section 2

Recommendations for Recruitment and Training for PSU’s Public Safety Department

The recommendations listed below were made with the intent of building PSU’s Public Safety Department based on an ethos of trust and care and a mission of ensuring safety for everyone and upholding the values of equity, diversity and inclusion. The recommendations reflect careful consideration of online and in-person public input relevant to our topic area. See Exhibit 2-C for a full list of comments/feedback.

1. Create and Implement a Community-Policing Model for PSU

In order to promote effective university policing, we recommend the use of a community-policing model for PSU. (See the references list for articles that discuss the benefits of community-based policing.) The intent of implementing a community policing model is to develop intentional partnerships between all areas of the university and CPSO. (Some approaches for building those partnerships include participating in community events and public lectures, volunteering in the community, participating in committees, and making regularly scheduled visits to community partners.)

We recommend that the Chief of CPSO assign at least one officer (sworn or non-sworn) to explore mutually-agreeable engagement with each one of the nine clusters of PSU departments, divisions, and groups listed below. We also recommend that each of the groups identify one primary point of contact to facilitate discussions with the designated CPSO officers. We recommend that the partnerships be listed on the CPSO website.

- Diversity and Multicultural Student Services (DMSS), Cultural Resource Centers, Global Diversity & Inclusion (GDI), International Affairs, Intensive English Language Program (IELP), and Student Activities and Leadership Program (SALP).
- Queer Resource Center (QRC), College of Liberal Arts & Sciences (CLAS), Social Science and Arts & Letters Departments, Library, and Conflict Resolution Center.
- Resource Center for Students with Children, Helen Gordon Center, College of the Arts (COTA), Graduate School of Education (GSE), and PSU Foundation.
- Women’s Resource Center (WRC), Office of the Dean of Student Life (DOSL), Equity & Compliance/Title IX Coordinator, Residence Life, Athletics, and Office of General Counsel.
- Maseeh College of Engineering, Research & Strategic Partnerships (RSP), Environmental Health & Safety, Risk Management, CLAS National & Physical Science Departments, Collaborative Life Science Building/OHSU.
- Human Resources (HR), Office of Academic Affairs (OAA), Enrollment Management & Student Affairs (EMSA), Admissions, Financial Aid & Scholarships, Registrar’s Office, University Communications, Financial Services, Office of Information Technology (OIT), Government Relations, and the President’s Office.
- College of Urban & Public Affairs (CUPA), School of Business Administration (SBA), and local businesses on and around campuses.
- Associated Students of Portland State (ASPSU), and general student body undergraduate and graduate students.

1.1 Add the following statement to all position descriptions and job postings regarding the type of PSU Public Safety Officer we are seeking.

“The PSU Public Safety Department values equity, diversity and inclusion. The PSU Public Safety Department strives to consistently provide excellent service to the entire campus community with a specific focus on an ethos of trust and care and upholding the values of equity, diversity and inclusion.”

1.3 Add evaluation of community policing to officers’ yearly performance evaluations.
Focus evaluation specifically on the officer’s efforts to engage in the community, and the quality of the partnerships the officer builds. As part of the review process, we recommend the evaluator seek input from campus partners.

1.4 Make the roles of PSU sworn and non-sworn officers clear to the PSU community.
Use a decision matrix to clarify which type of officer (sworn or non-sworn) will be dispatched in various situations.

1.5 Consider adopting preferences for seeking “least harm” resolutions.

1.6 Consider uniforms for Public Safety Department Officers that would allow for proper identification while at the same time promote community-policing efforts (e.g., park ranger uniforms).

2 Recruitment and Hiring of a Diverse and Well-Qualified Pool of Candidates
We offer the following recommendations for attracting and selecting diverse and well-qualified candidates for CPSO officer positions. We recommend that any of the recommendations that are adopted be incorporated into CPSO policy 1000: Recruitment and Selection. Our recommendations are as follows:
2.1 Conduct targeted recruitment of diverse candidates and utilize Affirmative Action data for benchmarking.

2.2 Post any CPSO job offering on the PSU Human Resources website for 4–6 weeks.

2.3 Make a good faith effort to obtain a diverse applicant pool by advertising and engaging in local and national outreach with, at a minimum, the following:

- International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Agency (IACLEA)
- Western Association Campus Law Enforcement Agency (WACLEA)
- Law Enforcement Data System (LEDS)
- Various College and University Department Communication Resources such as email distribution lists. (Examples of potential departments to advertise with include Criminology/Criminal Justice, Sociology, Social Work, Conflict Resolution, and Student Affairs.)
- Resource Fairs
- Diverse Police Officer Associations (e.g., Black Police Officers Association, LGBT Police Officers Association).

2.4 Expand search committees to include diverse representation from the entire campus community.

Search committee representatives should be nominated by their respective manager or above, their chair or above, their student-body government executive officer or their authorized union representative. Possible search committee members could include representatives from the following groups:

- Student Health and Counseling
- Women’s Resource Center
- Queer Resource Center
- Diversity & Multicultural Student Services and the Cultural Resource Centers
- Global Diversity & Inclusion
- PSU’s Board of Trustees (one board member)
- ASPSU student representative (one student representative)
- The general student body (one student)
- SEIU representative
- AAUP representative
- PSU Faculty Association representative
- Faculty Senate representative
- Public-at-large member

2.5 Add scenario-type questions to employment applications.
2.6 Expand the time allotted for in-person campus interviews, and host a campus-wide meeting with applicants.
In-person campus interviews should be expanded from 20–30 minutes to a minimum of 60 minutes, if necessary. Hosting a campus-wide meeting with applicants would allow the campus community an opportunity to engage with the prospective officers.

2.7 Expand interview questions and add scenario-based interview questions.

2.8 Review the new hiring processes adopted by Portland Police Bureau (PPB).

2.9 Consider starting an internship program for students interested in law enforcement.

2.10 If allowable, consider instituting a service commitment requirement based on the amount of training received.

3 Training of CPSO Sworn and Non-Sworn Officers
We begin by providing an overview of the training that will be received by sworn officers at the Department of Public Safety Standards and Training (DPSST) (a.k.a. the Police Academy). Non-sworn officers will not attend DPSST. We then make a series of recommendations for enhancing training, both initially and then on an ongoing basis, for both sworn and non-sworn CPSO to provide them with the necessary tools to best serve the PSU community.

3.1 Police Academy Training for Sworn Officers
Candidates attending the Department of Public Safety Standards and Training (DPSST) will receive 640 hours of basic police curriculum (See, Exhibit 2-A for a breakdown of DPSST curriculum).

The summary of initial DPSST training and requirements, totaling a minimum of 1,500 hours, includes:

- 90 hours Orientation, Policies, Reports, Firearms, CLERY, Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), National Incident Management System (NIMS), Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED)
- 640 hours Department of Public Safety Standards and Training (DPSST) Basic Police Academy (see Exhibit 2-A for a breakdown of DPSST curriculum)
- 800 hours Field Training and Evaluation Program (FTEP) training (prior to operating as a solo officer)
DPSST requires *sworn officers* to complete annual training as follows:

- 8 hours  Firearms / Use of Force
- 20 hours  Other training at discretion of department

DPSST requires *sworn supervisors* to complete annual training as follows:

- 8 hours  Firearms / Use of Force
- 8 hours  Leadership
- 20 hours  Other training at the department's discretion

3.2  **Recommendations for enhancing CPSO officer (both sworn and non-sworn) training**

We recommend the following actions to ensure that CPSO officers are well-trained to serve the PSU community:

3.2.1  Require all CPSO officers to complete all training listed in tables 1–10. Some of the training will occur before the basic DPSST basic policy academy training, some will occur after, and some of the training will be ongoing.

3.2.2  CPSO will track all training and report out to the Oversight Committee.

3.2.3  Consult and include PSU students the training recommended in tables 1–10. Potential student participants could be nominated by ASPSU, Student Activities and Leadership Program (SALP), and/or Enrollment Management & Student Affairs Departments, etc.

3.2.4  Sworn and non-sworn officers should be trained to gather demographic data of individuals with whom they engage; official questioning; and the ultimate disposition of the encounter.

3.2.5  Consider consulting with the Center for Policing Equity at
http://cpe.psych.ucla.edu/

"The Center for Policing Equity (CPE) is a research consortium that promotes police transparency and accountability by facilitating innovative research collaborations between law enforcement agencies and empirical social scientists . . . .The CPE is committed to research transparency and, as such, does not charge participating law enforcement agencies for access to our expert researchers."
3.2.6 The CPSO Director and the Vice President of Finance and Administration develop a budget to accomplish the recommended trainings.

3.2.7 Consider drawing on the training curriculum recommendations from some of the urban universities that are comparators for PSU and Oregon University Police Departments. Suggestions are detailed in Exhibit 2-B.

3.2.8 Review the 10-Point Justice: National Urban League Police Reform and Accountability Recommendations (available at http://nul.iamempowered.com/content/10-point-justice-plan)

3.2.9 CPSO officers visit the following mental health site locations:
- SHAC
- OHSU Emergency Department/Inpatient Unit (and Unity Center for Behavioral Health once it opens)
- Crisis Line/Project Respond/Cascadia
- Homeless Shelter

3.2.10 CPSO officers attend panel discussions or interactive experiences with:
- Students who have experienced or experience mental health conditions or the National Alliance for the Mentally Ill (NAMI Oregon)
- Parent or another family member of a student who has experienced or experiences a mental health issue
- Hearing Voices—a video/learning module through the National Empowerment Center
- Veteran's Justice Outreach

3.2.11 Conduct a half-day of scenario training with SHAC and other departments.

3.2.12 Establish routine bi-monthly meetings between SHAC personnel and CPSO officers the title of sergeant and above to review interactions with individuals with mental illness or in mental health crisis.

3.2.13 Review and incorporate the “Remedial Measures” outlined in the September 12, 2012, Department of Justice (DOJ) Report. The report documents DOJ's investigation of the Portland Public Police Bureau (PPB) in the context of current best practices for interactions between police and individuals with mental illness or in mental health crisis. (Note that some of the DOJ recommendations
have been made in other areas of this IAC report). The DOJ report offers the following remedial measures:

“1. In addition to exposing all officers to crisis intervention training, have a specialized unit of crisis intervention officers who are selected based on their temperament, experience and desire to interact with individuals with mental illness or in mental health crisis.

2. Revise policies to place greater emphasis on de-escalation techniques and require officers to consider less intrusive alternatives before employing force.

3. Implement scenario-based training to ensure officers do not use excessive force and only use force justified to meet the government interest.

4. Train officers to go hands on following the first application of less-lethal force, when feasible, to effectuate the arrest, and to use as few cycles of the ECW as possible.

5. Train and require officers to avoid using more intrusive forms of force, such as beanbag guns and ECWs, on individuals who do not pose a threat to the safety of officers and others or who are suspected of committing minor offenses.

6. Train and require officers to give warnings, where feasible, before using force.

7. Monitor all uses of force to ensure practice consistent with these standards and affirmatively enforce these standards when force is used in an inconsistent manner.

8. Conduct on-site supervisory investigations of all uses of force, including contemporaneous public safety and investigatory statements subject to constitutional protections against self-incrimination.

9. Require that PPB officers document each citizen contact, including the reason they stopped the subject, whether the subject consented to the conversation, whether the officer informed the subject that he/she had the right to decline consent, whether the mere conversation
escalated further, and demographical information about the subject. Require that supervisors conduct timely reviews of this data.

10. Adopt policies and practices to streamline the investigation of all allegations of officer misconduct to increase efficacy of corrective action. This should include a mandate to address investigative inadequacies identified by CRC. PPB should also keep complainants actively informed and involved of the process.

11. Require PPB to develop a community engagement and outreach plan, with the goal of creating robust community relationships and sustainable dialogue with Portland's diverse communities."

3.2.14 Make 24-hour interpretation services or technology available to any students, faculty, staff or visitors who request interpretation services.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Pre- or Post-Academy</th>
<th>Potential Instructor(s)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSU’s Creating a Culture of Respect Learning Module</td>
<td>Pre-Academy</td>
<td>Online Module</td>
<td>Once</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU Policy Review (Prohibited Discrimination and Harassment, Disability and Religious Accommodation, Consensual Relationship Policy)</td>
<td>Pre-Academy</td>
<td>Equity and Compliance Office</td>
<td>Once and repeated annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Standards of Conduct</td>
<td>Pre-Academy</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>Once and repeated annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title IX and Sexual Violence Awareness</td>
<td>Pre-Academy</td>
<td>Office of Equity and Compliance—Title IX Coordinator, Women’s Resource Center and the Office of the Dean of Student Life</td>
<td>Once and repeated annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic Experiential Trauma Investigations</td>
<td>Post-Academy</td>
<td>Detective Carrie Hull and Oregon Attorney General Sexual Assault Task Force</td>
<td>Once and repeated as necessary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 The instructors listed are only potential instructors for consideration. A more robust list of instructors both internal to Portland State University and external community experts will be developed and updated on an ongoing basis.
Table 2. Oregon’s History, Micro-aggressions, Unconscious Bias, Mindfulness Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Pre- or Post-Academy</th>
<th>Potential Instructor(s)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historical Education of Marginalized Populations in Oregon</td>
<td>Pre- and Post-Academy</td>
<td>Faculty from School of Gender Race &amp; Nations and other PSU Faculty with specific scholarship in the area. Also outside consultants from surrounding community</td>
<td>Once and repeated annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiracism</td>
<td>Post-Academy</td>
<td>Crossroads Antiracism Organization &amp; Training</td>
<td>Once and repeated annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro-Aggressions</td>
<td>Pre-Academy</td>
<td>City of Portland</td>
<td>Once and repeated every six months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit/Unconscious Bias</td>
<td>Pre-Academy</td>
<td>Marshall ACM</td>
<td>Once and repeated every six months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawfulness &amp; Legitimacy in Law Enforcement</td>
<td>Portions Pre-Academy</td>
<td>To be Determined</td>
<td>Once and repeated as necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindfulness in Policing</td>
<td>Post-Academy</td>
<td>Consult with Hillsboro Police Department</td>
<td>Once and repeated as necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-culturalism</td>
<td>Post-Academy</td>
<td>Cultural Resource Centers</td>
<td>Once and repeated annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Pre- or Post-Academy</td>
<td>Potential Instructor(s)</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Awareness</td>
<td>Pre-Academy</td>
<td>Student Health and Counseling (SHAC)</td>
<td>Once and repeated as necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brain and Mental Health Issues</td>
<td>Post-Academy</td>
<td>SHAC</td>
<td>Once and repeated as necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood Disorders (Depression, Anxiety, Bi-Polar, PTSD)</td>
<td>Post-Academy</td>
<td>SHAC</td>
<td>Once and repeated as necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug and Alcohol Disorders</td>
<td>Post-Academy</td>
<td>SHAC</td>
<td>Once and repeated as necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thought Disorders and Schizophrenia</td>
<td>Post-Academy</td>
<td>Early Assessment and Support Alliance (EASA)</td>
<td>Once and repeated as necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicide Prevention &amp; Response</td>
<td>Post-Academy</td>
<td>SHAC</td>
<td>Once and repeated as necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autism</td>
<td>Post-Academy</td>
<td>SHAC</td>
<td>Once and repeated as necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat Assessment/CARE Team</td>
<td>Post-Academy</td>
<td>SHAC</td>
<td>Once and repeated as necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trauma Informed Care</td>
<td>Post-Academy</td>
<td>SHAC</td>
<td>Once and repeated as necessary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4. Individuals with Disabilities Awareness Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Pre- or Post-Academy</th>
<th>Potential Instructor(s)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disability Awareness</td>
<td>Pre-Academy</td>
<td>Portland Commission on Disabilities, Group that is overseeing the DOJ Settlement for the City of Portland regarding policing and persons with disabilities, Director Disability Resource Center</td>
<td>Once and repeated annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ableism/Language/Stigma</td>
<td>Post-Academy</td>
<td>Disability Resource Center</td>
<td>Once and repeated annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5. Veterans Awareness Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Pre- or Post-Academy</th>
<th>Potential Instructor(s)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Veteran Experiences and Resources</td>
<td>Pre-Academy</td>
<td>Veteran Resource Center</td>
<td>Once and repeated annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6. LGBTQ Awareness Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Pre- or Post-Academy</th>
<th>Potential Instructor(s)</th>
<th>Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ Awareness</td>
<td>Pre-Academy</td>
<td>Queer Resource Center</td>
<td>Once and repeated annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7. Religious Awareness Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Pre- or Post-Academy</th>
<th>Potential Instructor(s)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious Awareness</td>
<td>Pre-Academy</td>
<td>Ecumenical Ministries of Oregon and Special interest groups on campus</td>
<td>Once and repeated annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8. International Students and Staff Awareness Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Pre- or Post-Academy</th>
<th>Potential Instructor(s)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Students</td>
<td>Post-Academy</td>
<td>Associate Director of International Student Life and Director of Intensive English Language Program</td>
<td>Once and repeated annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9. De-escalation Techniques Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Pre- or Post-Academy</th>
<th>Potential Instructor(s)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Interpersonal Neurobiology of Conflict</td>
<td>Post-Academy</td>
<td>Conflict Resolution Faculty</td>
<td>Once and repeated annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security through Restorative Justice</td>
<td>Post-Academy</td>
<td>Conflict Resolution Faculty</td>
<td>Once and repeated annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Verbal Judo, CLARA (Calm, Listen, Affirm, Respond, And other Information), Redirection, Reframing, Redefining</td>
<td>Post-Academy</td>
<td>Conflict Resolution Faculty and Students</td>
<td>Once and repeated annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Conflict Communication</td>
<td>Post-Academy</td>
<td>Conflict Resolution Faculty</td>
<td>Once and repeated annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowd Management to Preserve Civil Rights/Community Policing</td>
<td>Post-Academy</td>
<td>Conflict Resolution Faculty and Student</td>
<td>Once and repeated annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation in the field</td>
<td>Post-Academy</td>
<td>Conflict Resolution Faculty and Student</td>
<td>Once and repeated annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating nonviolent campus culture</td>
<td>Post-Academy</td>
<td>Conflict Resolution Faculty and Student</td>
<td>Once and repeated annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Pre- or Post-Academy</td>
<td>Potential Instructor(s)</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal De-Escalation</td>
<td>Post-Academy</td>
<td>Internal Verbal De-escalation Instructor</td>
<td>Once and repeated annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASP Baton</td>
<td>Post-Academy</td>
<td>Internal Use of Force Instructor</td>
<td>Once and repeated annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepper Spray</td>
<td>Post-Academy</td>
<td>Internal Use of Force Instructor</td>
<td>Once and repeated annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taser X2</td>
<td>Post-Academy</td>
<td>Internal Use of Force Instructor</td>
<td>Once and repeated annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beanbag Shotgun</td>
<td>Post-Academy</td>
<td>Internal Use of Force Instructor</td>
<td>Once and repeated annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Section 3

Recommendations for Creating and Implementing a University Oversight Committee for Campus Public Safety

The IAC offers the following recommendations regarding establishment of an Oversight Committee for Public Safety.

1 Mission, Goals, and Objectives

The University Oversight Committee for Public Safety (also referred to in this document as the "Oversight Committee") shall provide counsel, advice and oversight to campus leadership in order to advance overall public safety on the PSU campus. In pursuing this objective, the Committee shall:

1.1 Voice: Expand the voice of the PSU campus community into matters of public safety services and outcomes.

The intent of this action will be to advance social justice, fair treatment, and confidence in the provision of campus public safety.

1.2 Policy Review. Review, when appropriate, campus policies, procedures, and practices related to public safety and the Campus Public Safety Office.

Based upon this review and its understanding of the diverse needs and interests of the PSU campus community, the Oversight Committee shall make recommendations regarding new or modified policies, procedures or practices. Further, Campus Public Safety shall, when making significant policy changes, share the proposed policy changes with the Committee (or a subcommittee thereof) for comment and feedback. Campus Public Safety will also share all proposed Memorandum of Understanding with other law enforcement agencies with the Oversight Committee for review and comment.

1.3 Review Recruitment and Training: Review, and when appropriate, make recommendations regarding the recruitment and training of personnel in the Campus Public Safety Office.

Provide the review and recommendations in order to enhance delivery of culturally-competent public safety services in an urban university environment. To facilitate this work, Campus Public Safety shall provide to the Oversight Committee once a year a report that summarizes the recruitment of any personnel hired in the unit and the professional development training received by each person in the unit.
1.4 Review of Activities and Practice: Regularly review the practices, activities and public safety incidents that occur on campus.

A. Review significant public safety incidents that occur.

Conduct the reviews in order to provide advice and counsel, where appropriate, on how such incidents might be avoided or better responded to. This may include recommendations concerning changes in policy and practice.

B. Review relevant data on crime, complaints, and police activity on at least a quarterly basis to understand and address any systematic concerns or in public safety. This will include, but not be limited to, examination of:

- Crime report data by type of incident (for the most recent time period and longitudinally)
- Complaints made against police personnel by type of incident, including final disposition of the complaint
- Documentation of citizen contacts

The Oversight Committee is empowered to request other types of information that it may deem necessary to carry out its oversight responsibilities.

C. Review with Campus Public Safety all cases of use of force above simple handcuffing and including custody techniques.

Current Campus Public Safety Policy requires that incident reports be submitted for all uses of force above simple handcuffing.

1.5 On the basis of its reviews of police incidents as described in items 1.5 and 1.6 above, the Oversight Committee shall make any recommendations it deems appropriate to advance public safety at PSU.

The recommendations will be made to the University President, Vice President for Administration and Finance, and Chief of the Campus Public Safety Office, and the Vice President of Enrollment Management, Student Affairs, and Associated Students of Portland State University (ASPSU). This shall include recommendations regarding policy, procedure, and practice.
1.6  Proactive Outreach

In order to inform its work and achieve its mission, the Oversight Committee will:

A. Solicit ideas, input, concerns and feedback from the full PSU campus community concerning the provision of campus public safety on a regular basis (excluding complaints as described in Section 2 (“Complaint Investigations”) below.

B. Disseminate information on access to public safety strategies and policies to the full PSU campus community.

C. Disseminate information on policies and mechanisms through which members of the PSU campus community may register a complaint or voice a concern about the actions or policies of the Campus Public Safety Office.

1.7  Conduct an annual assessment of the Campus Public Safety Office and the status of public safety on the PSU campus.

This report will utilize the performance metrics identified in 1.4 above. The assessment shall also include appropriate information from the campus community about perceptions of crime and safety efforts gathered through such methods as town hall meetings, electronic surveys, listening sessions, and focus groups. The annual report shall be provided to the President, the Vice President for Finance and Management, the Vice President for Enrollment Management and Student Affairs, other members of the President’s Executive Committee, the Director of Campus Public Safety, Associated Students of Portland State University and the PSU Board of Trustees one week before its public release. The report shall be made available to the entire PSU campus community (along with a response from campus leadership if so desired).

1.8  Make recommendations to campus leadership on strategies to enhance public safety and the effective performance of campus public safety personnel.

Such recommendations may include efforts to enlist members of the PSU campus community in efforts to increase public safety.

1.9  Consider creation of learning programs/curriculum that can advance the public safety knowledge and practice of students.

The overall capacity of students to enhance their own public safety as well as contribute to public safety and security on campus and in urban communities could be enhanced by learning modules, seminars, events and curriculum that include such items as knowing individual rights and responsibilities under the law regarding public safety, civil rights and liberties, conflict management and de-escalation, and personal safety strategies. The Oversight Committee could take a lead in facilitating conversations and action regarding such learning.
2 Complaint Investigations

The Campus Public Safety Office is responsible for investigating all citizen complaints about police personnel according to the Portland State University-Campus Public Safety Office Policy 1020: Personnel Complaint Policy and in concert with the PSU Human Resources Office. Such complaints may result in discipline, training recommendations or policy change. The complaints and their disposition shall be reviewed by the Oversight Committee (possibly with names redacted from the complaint reports when so required by Human Resources and other relevant campus policies and procedures).

The Oversight Committee will recognize, and not interfere with, the respective responsibilities of the Office of Equity & Compliance and the Office of Human Resources which also may have responsibility to investigate or become involved in personnel matters related to complaints against police personnel, including those which involve discrimination and harassment as defined by relevant campus policies and law.

3 Membership and Governance

3.1 Independence in its work

The Oversight Committee on Campus Public Safety shall oversee its own operations within the overall framework outlined in this proposal. The Oversight Committee shall act independently and its members shall perform their responsibilities in the overall best interest of the PSU campus community.

3.2 Membership and selection

A. Guiding Principles

The membership of the Oversight Committee shall be composed with reference to the following guiding principles:

1. Committee membership shall represent a wide spectrum of roles at PSU, including students, academic professionals, staff, faculty and administrators.
2. Committee membership shall include community members who are not formally affiliated with PSU and who can contribute knowledge and expertise in (1) mental health in criminal justice and (2) civil rights, liberties and social justice.
3. Committee membership shall include representation from traditionally marginalized groups.
4. Committee members should demonstrate expertise, experience and/or interest in campus public safety.
B. Rotating Terms

The Oversight Committee members shall have rotating terms of office so that only one half of committee members have terms that expire in any given year.

C. Selection of Oversight Committee Members

The Oversight Committee shall select new members each year to fill expiring terms. The Committee shall invite applications from any member of the campus community who may wish to serve on the Oversight Committee. Applications should be brief and focus upon the experience, expertise and/or interest that the applicant has regarding campus public safety at PSU. Interest in the position will be assessed as highly as experience or expertise.

Start-Up: The membership of the Oversight Committee at its start shall be appointed by a special subcommittee of the Implementation Advisory Committee established for this purpose. This is a one-time only mechanism designed to support initial start-up of the Committee. The members of the special subcommittee shall not be eligible to serve on the Oversight Committee in the first two years of operation.

3.3 Term of office

The term of office for members of the Oversight Committee will generally be two years. At the start-up of the Committee, half the members will serve for one year in order to stagger terms.

3.4 Leadership

At the start of the academic year, members of the Committee shall elect from among themselves a Chair and Vice Chair. These leaders will be responsible for calling meetings, creating agendas, and maintaining communication among the members.

3.5 Student stipends

Recognizing the anticipated time commitment of work on this Committee, student members shall receive a $500 stipend a year to support purchase of textbooks and academic study at PSU.

3.6 Learning program

In order to prepare themselves for the responsibilities of this Committee, the Committee shall create its own learning program that will advance the public safety knowledge of members. The learning program, activated each year, may include such things as attendance at police training sessions, ride-a-long or walk-a-long with campus police officers, and presentations by faculty representatives from disciplines with deep connection to public safety including the Division of
Criminology and Criminal Justice, the School of Social Work, the School of Gender, Race & Nations, and the Conflict Negotiation Program. Presentations by the campus C.A.R.E. Team and other providers of campus emergency response services will also be an appropriate part of learning sessions.

For the start-up of the University Oversight Committee, to inform its work in its formative year, a special subcommittee of the Implementation Advisory Committee will create a learning program for the incoming members of the newly formed University Oversight Committee.

3.7 Expectations

Members of the Oversight Committee will be expected to:

- Regularly attend committee meetings
- Protect confidentiality where legally required or appropriate
- Participate in the learning program developed by the Committee for its members

3.7 Time Commitment

Members of the University Oversight Committee will be expected to devote time and energy in support of their role on the committee. It is expected that the campus overall and the respective units which are home to members of the Oversight Committee will recognize this time commitment and important contribution to university service.

3.8 Committee operation

In order to maintain independence, votes of the Committee on decision-making matters may be done by confidential paper ballot. The total votes (for-against-abstain) on any motion of vote shall be made public.

It will be important for the campus to provide appropriate staff resources to support the work of the Oversight Committee.

4 Reporting Responsibility

The Oversight Committee reports directly to the President of the University. The Committee may, at its own discretion, also share reports with the Chief of the Campus Public Safety Office, the Vice President for Finance and Administration, and the Vice President for Enrollment Management and Student Affairs, other members of the President’s Executive Committee and the Associated Students of Portland State University.
Through its annual report, the Oversight Committee will communicate its assessment of campus public safety to the PSU campus community.

The Oversight Committee shall maintain a website that provides information concerning, but not limited to, Committee membership, Committee meetings and activities, procedures for communicating with the Committee about public safety issues and concerns, and presentation of its Annual Report.
Section 4

Supplemental Strategies for Advancing Campus Public Safety

In addition to its other work, the Implementation Advisory Committee for Public Safety had the chance to briefly explore alternatives to traditional public safety strategies that seem relevant to public safety in a university policing unit. While the Committee did not have time to explore these strategies in detail, we feel that they may be potentially useful to advancing public safety training on campus. For this reason, we recommend that appropriate campus units consider implementation of these strategies to advance campus public safety

1 Bystander Intervention Training

Colleges are increasingly broadening their outreach to students to maintain safety. This is particularly the case with sexual assault prevention and bystander intervention trainings. A 2014 report by the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault summarizes college campus campaigns that target sexual assault. The authors cite a Center for Disease and Control report that stated that bystander intervention training may be an effective strategy to prevent sexual assaults. The CDC’s Preventing Sexual Violence on College Campus: Lessons from Research and Practice references two programs that teach college students how to intervene when they believe someone is at risk for sexual victimization. Bringing in the Bystander, an evidence-based program, offers trainings that discuss how to safely intervene when someone may be at risk of sexual assault; how to use college resources to prevent sexual assault and how to support a victim. Green Dot is another widely used sexual assault prevention program. It is bystander focused.

Bystander programs typically educate specific groups about interventions. Groups often include resident assistants, faculty, staff and student groups, such as athletic teams and fraternities and sororities, according to the CDC report. The CDC report includes a catalogue of what trainings colleges are offering to address sexual assault. Two Oregon institutions are named – Western Oregon University for its bystander intervention program and Eastern Oregon University for its Sex Matters: Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Program.

The CDC, through notalone.gov, references bystander trainings that have yet to be researched but are being used on campuses nationwide. The University of Montana, for example, offers a training for all students on how to be an effective bystander. Emory University, on the other hand, has a three-hour training for men that includes information on bystander intervention. The CDC document also mentions an app entitled Circle of 6 that helps people contact a support system when in fear of victimization. Some colleges, such as the University of Michigan, California State and Rutgers, use interactive theater during orientations to model ways of intervening.
Public feedback generated comments regarding a wish to implement bystander intervention as an alternative to sworn police response to campus sexual violence. The Committee recommends supporting bystander intervention programming on campus, but does not view bystander intervention as an "alternative" to sworn police, but rather a "supplement." Violence prevention and response are not mutually exclusive - our campus needs both. Given that CPSO is responsible for incident response, the committee does not recommend that this service be housed in CPSO. The University recently approved funding for a Sexual and Relationship Violence Prevention Coordinator, who will be housed in the Center for Student Health and responsible for planning and implementing primary prevention activities on campus, including bystander intervention. The Committee suggests that community recommendations regarding sexual violence prevention be coordinated with this new role.
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2 Student Patrols

Student patrols are used by many campus police departments nationwide to supplement the work of sworn and non-sworn officers. According to Bromley and Reaves (1999), who surveyed 578 college law enforcement entities, 79% of campus police departments with sworn officers used student patrol. Some 50% of departments with non-sworn officers used student patrols. The authors state that student patrols allow students to act as "additional 'eyes and ears' for the campus law enforcement agency and are used to report crimes or other suspicious activities" (270).

An argument could be made that student patrol affects feelings of the legitimacy of campus police departments – though this has not been studied. Legitimacy theorists argue that the community should feel that officers share the concerns of community members. If campus police departments employed students to patrol, some members of the campus community – students, in particular – might feel that the department better represents them. A study by Johnson and Bromley (1999) found that students and facility were two to three times less likely to know a campus officer than campus staff members. The authors then argued that campus should look to increase the number of positive interactions between officers and community members. One would be curious to know how student patrols affect satisfaction rates for campus police.
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3  Blue Light Emergency Communication Systems

The Oversight Implementation received a few recommendations regarding use of blue lights on campus as an alternative to sworn police. National organizations have demonstrated that blue lights are not effective tools for either preventing or responding to campus sexual assault. For example, see Safer Campus report, which further highlights the need for primary sexual and relationship violence prevention activities. The Committee instead encourages support of existing sexual violence prevention and response services.
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Appendix A

Resolution Regarding the Commissioning of Sworn Officers by the University Public Safety Department
RESOLUTION REGARDING THE COMMISSIONING OF SWORN OFFICERS
BY THE UNIVERSITY PUBLIC SAFETY DEPARTMENT

Approved by the Special Committee on Campus Public Safety
December 3, 2014

Approved by the Full Board
December 11, 2014

BACKGROUND

A. Portland State University is currently served by a Campus Public Safety Office (CPSO) that provides basic public safety services to the campus. CPSO officers are “special campus security officers” under Oregon state law. As such, CPSO officers are not police officers under state law and possess only limited law enforcement authority. CPSO officers’ geographic authority is limited to the boundaries of the University’s porous and noncontiguous campus. In addition, such officers may not issue violation citations, apply for search warrants, engage in community caretaking, perform mental health holds, perform off-campus investigations, require an individual to submit to an involuntary detox, or perform other customary duties of police officers. CPSO officers are not eligible for Oregon police training or certification.

B. Portland State University is unique among large urban universities in the United States, and unique among large universities in Oregon, in that the University lacks access to sworn, dedicated university police officers. All other members of the Urban 21, a coalition of urban-serving universities across the country, are served by dedicated university police officers, as are Oregon State University, the University of Oregon and Oregon Health and Sciences University.

C. Currently, the Portland State University campus is policed almost exclusively by the Portland Police Bureau (PPB). The University is within PPB’s Central Precinct, which is a 41 square mile area of the City of Portland. The availability of a police response to the campus at any particular time is dependent on limited staffing and other demands existing in the Central Precinct at the time, which often results in considerable wait times to calls for a police response. PPB has conveyed its support for this Resolution.

D. In the Spring of 2013, President Wim Wiewel convened a Task Force on Campus Safety to make recommendations regarding growing campus safety concerns and potential improvements to the University’s response to criminal activities. The task force issues its final report in November 2013.

E. A key conclusion of the task force is that current “limitations on CPSO authority, jurisdiction and capability are the most concerning safety issue on campus.” The task force concluded that “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 officer status” and recommended that PSU “explore ways to ensure access to sworn officers who are appropriately trained in campus policing and available on-site to the PSU campus community.”

F. Subsequently, the University explored various options to implement the task force’s recommendation, including contracting with the Portland Police Bureau, Oregon State Police or Oregon Health and Sciences University for the provision of a dedicated campus police force. Following those consultations, it was determined that creation of a University Police Department is the best and most viable option to meet the safety needs of the campus.

G. The Portland State University Board of Trustees is authorized by Oregon Revised Statutes 352.118 to establish a university police department and to commission employees as police
officers with all of the privileges and immunities of police officers under the laws of the State of Oregon.

H. The Board established a Special Committee on Campus Public Safety to consider the recommendation that the University commission and employ university police officers.

I. The Committee held three public meetings, heard several hours of public comment, received numerous letters from members of the campus community, and reviewed over 200 comments submitted electronically. The Committee has recommended this Resolution to the Board for approval.

RESOLUTION

Now, therefore, be it Resolved by the Board of Trustees, that:

1. The Portland State University Public Safety Department is authorized to employ and commission sworn police officers, with all of the privileges and immunities customarily provided to sworn police officers, in a manner consistent with Oregon law, subject to the terms and conditions of this Resolution.

2. The University Public Safety Department is to operate based on a philosophy of university- and community-oriented policing, which focuses on building ties and working closely with members of the Portland State University community. The department is to be guided by best practices and is to work with other student- and community-focused University departments to develop and foster the systematic use of partnerships and problem-solving techniques that address public safety concerns in a manner that focuses on dialogue and defusing situations.

3. The University Public Safety Department is to be a bifurcated department, with both sworn, armed police officers and unsworn, unarmed public safety officers. The University Public Safety Department is to maintain an adequate number of unsworn, unarmed public safety officers and not rely unnecessarily on sworn, armed police officers.

4. Prior to the deployment of sworn, armed police officers, the University shall develop a University Public Safety Department Management and Implementation Plan. The University Public Safety Department Management and Implementation Plan is to be developed with the assistance of an Implementation Advisory Committee, which is to include faculty, staff and student representatives and is to be chaired by a dean of the University. The Board will appoint at least one liaison to the Implementation Advisory Committee.

5. The Implementation Advisory Committee shall consider and make recommendations on any matters it determines to be relevant, which are to include, at a minimum:
   a. The recruitment and hiring of a diverse and well-qualified pool of candidates to be University police officers.
   b. The training of University police officers. In addition to basic police training through the Oregon Department of Public Safety Standards and Training, the Implementation Advisory Committee is to consider and make recommendations regarding specialized training on topics including:
      i. the specific needs of effective university-oriented policing,
      ii. cultural competency,
      iii. unconscious bias,
      iv. mental health issues and interacting with persons with disabilities, and
      v. alternatives to the use of lethal force for ensuring public safety.
   c. The creation of a University Public Safety Oversight Committee, which includes faculty, staff and student representatives, and which is authorized to receive and act on
complaints regarding the University Public Safety Department’s policies or the actions of its officers;
d. A complaint process regarding the University Public Safety Department;
e. The appropriate use and implementation of relevant innovations, such as police officer body cameras;
f. Proposed policies governing the University Public Safety Department, including policies regarding the use of force that demonstrate a high regard for the value of human life and prioritize the use of the least amount of force reasonably necessary in light of the facts and circumstances;
g. A schedule for the implementation and incorporation of sworn police officers into the University Public Safety Department; and
h. The development of performance indicators to enable future assessment of the effectiveness of the new University Public Safety Department.

6. The Implementation Advisory Committee is to continue to make recommendations and provide oversight regarding the University Public Safety Department until a University Public Safety Oversight Committee is established and has begun meeting.

7. The Board recognizes that various campus constituencies have urged that the Board and University consider other approaches and innovations to enhance public safety in ways that do not rely on sworn, armed police officers, such as the establishment of trained student patrols, bystander intervention training and greater focus on nonviolent dispute resolution. The commissioning of university police officers and the consideration and implementation of other approaches and innovations to enhance public safety are not mutually exclusive. University police officers are only one component of a strong and student-focused safety net. The Implementation Advisory Committee is encouraged to consider such other approaches and innovations as it deems appropriate and may include recommendations regarding such matters in either the University Public Safety Department Management and Implementation Plan or in separate recommendations to the University Public Safety Department.

8. The Special Committee on Campus Public Safety intends to remain engaged and informed as this Resolution is implemented and will remain in place until the Implementation and Management Plan is complete and until the University Public Safety Oversight Committee is established and has begun meeting. The Committee will provide guidance to the Implementation Advisory Committee and provide updates to the full Board.

9. At its March and June 2015 meetings, the full Board will be updated and provided an opportunity to discuss the development of the University Public Safety Department Management and Implementation Plan and the implementation of this Resolution. The Board is required to approve the Plan prior to the deployment of sworn, armed officers. For at least the next five years thereafter, the Board is to be updated at least semi-annually regarding the implementation of this Resolution and its impact on the campus and its students, faculty and staff.

APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
DECEMBER 11, 2014

Secretary to the Board
APPENDIX B

Charge Given to the Implementation Advisory Committee for Campus Public Safety
Introduction

At its December 11th meeting, the Board of Trustees approved a resolution authorizing the Portland State University Public Safety Department to employ and commission sworn police officers, with all of the privileges and immunities customarily provided to sworn police officers, in a manner consistent with Oregon law. At its March and June 2015 meetings, the full Board will be updated and provided an opportunity to discuss the development of the University Public Safety Department Management and Implementation Plan and the implementation of their resolution. The Vice President for Finance and Administration and the Chief of the Campus Public Safety Office are tasked with assembling this plan with support from an Implementation advisory committee (IAC). The Board is required to approve the plan prior to the deployment of sworn, armed officers.

Implementation Advisory Committee (IAC) Charge

The committee will be formed in January 2015 to provide advice on the development of the implementation plan, including both the deployment of sworn, armed officers and larger issues of campus safety. The IAC will provide their input in a timely and collaborative manner in order to reach the timeline established by the Board of Trustees. In all of its work, the IAC is expected to make its recommendations after careful review of current best practices in policing, both within a University context and more generally.

A. Deployment of sworn, armed officers:

At a general level, the IAC will provide advice on achieving a University Public Safety Department with sworn armed officers which operates based on a philosophy of university-and community-oriented policing, and focuses on building ties and working closely with members of the Portland State University community. The department will be guided by best practices and will work with other student and community focused University departments to develop and foster the systematic use of partnerships and problem solving techniques that address public safety concerns in a manner that focuses on dialogue and defusing situations.

Specifically, the IAC shall consider and make recommendations on the following:

a. Recruitment and hiring of a diverse and well-qualified pool of candidates to be University Police Officers.
b. Training of University Police Officers. In addition to basic police training through the Oregon Department of Public Safety Standards and Training (DPSST), the IAC will consider and make recommendations regarding specialized training on topics including:

- i. the specific needs of effective university-oriented policing,
- ii. cultural competency,
- iii. unconscious bias,
- iv. mental health issues and interacting with persons with disabilities, and
- v. alternatives to the use of lethal force for ensuring public safety.

The committee will make practical recommendations both on initial and ongoing training of officers. The initial training will need to be asynchronous (officers will not join at the same time) and will potentially involve one or two officers at a time. It is anticipated that during a multi-year phased implementation, less than 5 officers a year will be recruited. At full implementation, the number of officers trained each year will likely be fewer and driven only by personnel turnover.

c. The creation of a Campus Safety Oversight Committee (CSOC) which includes faculty, staff and student representatives, and which is authorized to receive and act on complaints regarding the Campus Public Safety Department's policies or the actions of its officers.

d. A complaint process regarding the University Public Safety Department for complaints that do not involve allegations of protected class discrimination and harassment, which will continue to be investigated by the Office of Equity & Compliance.

e. A use-of-force policy that demonstrates a high regard for the value of human life. This policy will prioritize the use of the least amount of force reasonably necessary in light of the facts and circumstances and establish reporting, investigation, and oversight systems to ensure that all incidents are consistently reported and investigated in a prompt, thorough, and unbiased manner.

f. The appropriate use and implementation of relevant innovations, such as police officer body cameras.

g. A schedule for the implementation and incorporation of sworn police officers into the University Public Safety Department.

h. The development of performance indicators to enable future assessment of the effectiveness of the new University Public Safety Department.

i. The specific needs of effective university-oriented policing.
B. Campus Safety Writ Large:

The Board of Trustees recognized that various campus constituencies have urged them and the University to continue to consider other approaches and innovations to enhance public safety in ways that do not rely on sworn, armed police officers, such as the establishment of trained student patrols, bystander intervention training and greater focus on nonviolent dispute resolution. Other suggestions included continued improvements in lighting, greater use of security cameras and greater access control to campus buildings. The IAC is encouraged to consider such other approaches and innovations as it deems appropriate and may include recommendations regarding such matters in either the PSUPSDMIP or in separate recommendations to the University Public Safety Department. The IAC is also tasked with considering whether its role providing advice on campus safety should continue as a Campus Safety Advisory Committee (CSAC) after establishment and first meeting of the Campus Safety Oversight Committee (CSOC).

Membership

The IAC will be co-chaired by an Academic Dean (Dr. Stephen Percy) and the Director of Multicultural Student Services (Dr. CeCe Ridder). At least one member of the PSU Board of Trustees will act as a liaison. The IAC will have a representative from the Office of Global Diversity and Inclusion, and at least one representative from SEIU, ASPSU, AAUP and AFT. Each of these groups will be asked for multiple nominations. Members will be appointed to the committee after consultation among the IAC co-chairs, the Vice President for Finance and Administration and the Chief of the Campus Public Safety Office. This same group will also consider IAC membership of others who bring key knowledge, expertise, and perspectives. All members of the IAC are expected to focus on the specific charge to the committee, to be collaborative, and to have open but respectful dialogue.

The core committee is anticipated to be approximately 20 members in order to be manageable and effective.

Process and Outreach

The IAC core team will meet at least bi-monthly from January through June 2015. Meetings will be open and advertised. The IAC will establish a process that is deliberative, inclusive and transparent. It is suggested that members of the IAC reach out to their appropriate constituencies to keep them abreast of the work and to solicit input. Other approaches such as open forums, online surveys, consultancy with different groups and constituencies, a website, and newsletters will be considered. The IAC will provide a detailed report of their work and outreach for the presentation to the Board of Trustees in March and June 2015.
EXHIBIT 1-A

COMMENTS, QUESTIONS, SUGGESTIONS ON CPSO's PROPOSED POLICIES
EXHIBIT 1-A

COMMENTS, QUESTIONS, SUGGESTIONS ON CPSO’s PROPOSED POLICIES

Note: text provided in italics comes directly from the proposed policies generated for CPSO by Lexipol. The version we reviewed was dated 02/05/2015.

100 - Law Enforcement Authority

Sworn members of this Department are peace officers pursuant to Oregon Revised Statutes 161.015. Peace officer authority extends to any place in the State of Oregon.

- Recommendation: Clarify the jurisdiction and authority as controlled by PSU property.

101 - Public Safety Certification

- Recommendation: Certification references DPSST, "executive officers", etc. May be helpful to provide organizational chart for readers not familiar with CPSO structure and relationship to state organizations.

103 - Oath of Office

Officers of this department are sworn to uphold the federal and state constitutions and to enforce federal, state and local laws.

- Question: How does this work when federal, state, and local laws conflict (e.g., marijuana laws)?
- Question: Should Lexipol be asked to address what other states are doing with federal regulations in regard to marijuana laws?

105 - Policy Manual

PERIODIC REVIEW OF THE POLICY MANUAL. The Director of Public Safety will ensure that the Policy Manual is periodically reviewed and updated as necessary.

- Recommendation: This policy should be coordinated with the Oversight committee to ensure that the policies herein are periodically reviewed by a broader range of people on campus.

200 - Organizational Structure and Responsibility

- Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

204 - Departmental Directive

- Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

206 - Emergency Operations Plan

- Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

212 - E Mail

- Comment: Policy should more completely conform to University retention schedule OAR 166-475-0105
214 - Administrative Communications
• Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

216 - Staffing levels
• Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

300 - Use of Force

300.1.1 Force - It is not a use of force when a person allows him/herself to be searched, escorted, handcuffed or restrained.
• Question: Do officers have a responsibility to inform people of their rights to refuse a search? Racial Profiling often comes into play here as well.
• Recommendation: Change “allows” to "gives consent".
• Recommendation: CPSO should consider a PSU policy to inform people. 'I am about to do a search, you do not have to consent to do this'.
• Recommendation: Offer training on de-escalation.

300.2 POLICY - The use of force by law enforcement personnel is a matter of critical concern, both to the public and to the law enforcement community. Officers are involved on a daily basis in numerous and varied interactions and, when warranted, may use reasonable force in carrying out their duties.
• Question: Is this policy for the sworn officers or the whole CPSO office?
• Recommendation: When referencing “Officers”, clarify whether definition is Sworn officers or Campus safety officers.
• Recommendation: Clarify when “department” is referenced if this includes entire department.

300.2.1 DUTY TO INTERCEDE  Any officer present and observing another officer using force that is clearly beyond that which is objectively reasonable under the circumstances shall, when in a position to do so, intercede to prevent the use of unreasonable force. An officer who observes another employee use force that exceeds the degree of force permitted by law should promptly report these observations to a Supervisor.
• Question: Are there provisions in the policy to ensure that people will not be fired/mistreated for reporting such events?

300.3 USE OF FORCE - Officers shall use only that amount of force that reasonably appears necessary given the facts and circumstances perceived by the officer at the time of the event to accomplish a legitimate law enforcement purpose.
• Recommendation – In last sentence of full statement, add "though a tactical retreat may in some circumstances be the best option."

300.3.1 - USE OF FORCE TO EFFECT AN ARREST - An officer is justified in using force upon another person only when and to the extent that the officer reasonably believes it necessary (ORS 161.235)
• Recommendation: add parenthesis (see policy 300.3.2)
• Comment: "Tactical retreat" is something some PDs are moving toward in the wake of Ferguson and other events. Might it be worth adding something here that mediates this statement - currently it sounds like retreat may not be a good option.
• Question: What about protecting the suspect when the suspect is engaged in self harm? What will CPSO’s policy be on intervening with suicidal students, employees, etc.?

300.3.3 PAIN COMPLIANCE TECHNIQUES - Pain compliance techniques may be effective in controlling a physically or actively resisting individual. Officers may only apply those pain compliance techniques for which they have successfully completed department approved training. Officers utilizing any pain compliance technique should consider:
• Recommendation: What is the use of force policy for passive resistance and how is this defined in the document? For a college campus in Portland, this may be useful to define.
• Question: What is compliance and how is it achieved? This needs a clear definition in the policy. What about physical signs to indicate when pain compliance should be terminated (i.e. eyes rolling back, seizure, loss of consciousness, etc)?

300.3.4 CAROTID CONTROL HOLD - The proper application of the carotid control hold may be effective in restraining a violent or combative individual. However, due to the potential for injury, the use of the carotid control hold is subject to the following:
• Questions: Given that other Oregon Universities are not allowing this, it would be helpful to provide additional justification (i.e., research) to warrant this at PSU. Should we as a campus decide which force tactics we allow or is this something solely at the discretion of CPSO? Certainly this is worth further discussion.
• Question: Bar choke - this is very complex and deals with Eric Gardner case. Do we have something that says whether this will be allowed or banned here? There are many nuances with different types of holds.
• Recommendation: This policy definitely needs more discussion. If this tactic is available, there should be further investigation of the effectiveness, the context of the college campus, etc.

300.4 - DEADLY FORCE APPLICATIONS - Use of deadly force is justified in the following circumstances:
• Question: What is the policy on whether officers should get into a suspect's vehicle or removing a person from his/her vehicle (i.e., Kendra James)?
• Recommendation: Statement should be added that officers should not create their own exigent circumstances.

...Any individual exhibiting signs of distress after such an encounter shall be medically cleared prior to booking.

• Question: How do we operationally ensure this?

300.5 REPORTING THE USE OF FORCE - When a Sergeant is able to respond to an incident in which there has been a reported application of force, the Sergeant is expected to: .....(f) Review and approve all related reports. .....In the event that a Sergeant is unable to respond to the scene of an incident involving the reported application of force, the Sergeant is still expected to complete as many of the above items as circumstances permit.
• Question: Is this referencing a standardized “use of force report”? Has the report been reviewed by the campus community, administration, etc.? This is important to do from the outset since
the data from these forms will be later used to examine force incidents in aggregate and on a case-by-case basis for an oversight committee.

- Recommendation: CPSO should make their use of force report form available for review by the forthcoming Oversight Committee.
- Recommendation: The timing of officer’s use of force reports has been a controversial issue around the country. CPSO needs a clear policy to guide the timing of these reports if one is not already available.

300.5 USE OF FORCE REVIEW BOARD - The Portland State University Public Safety Oversight committee shall have the discretion to review use of force incidents as they deem appropriate. The Campus Public Safety Office, in consultation with the Multnomah County District Attorney’s Office and the Office of General Counsel will assist in these reviews. On an annual basis, all adjudicated use of force reports will be provided to the O Portland State University Oversight Committee for review.

- Recommendation - Coordinate this with IAC Oversight subcommittee

300.7 SUPERVISOR RESPONSIBILITY - When a supervisor is able to respond to an incident in which there has been a reported application of force, the supervisor is expected to: (a) Obtain the basic facts from the involved officers. Absent an allegation of misconduct or excessive force, this will be considered a routine contact in the normal course of duties.

- Question: Timing of interviews with officers after Use of Force is highly contentious. What happens in cases where the complaint is lodged a week after a person gains consciousness?
306 - Restraint

306.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE - This policy provides guidelines for the use of handcuffs and other restraints during detentions and arrests.
- Recommendation: Clarify what is meant by “other” restraints. It would also be helpful for the general campus to define an “arrest” and clarify if this differs from a “detention.”

306.2 POLICY - The Portland State University-Campus Public Safety Office
- Question: Is this the correct name for the organization (e.g., CPSO) and is it consistently used throughout this policy document?

306.3 USE OF RESTRAINTS - Only members who have successfully completed Portland State University-Campus Public Safety Office-approved training on the use of restraint devices described in this policy are authorized to use these devices....When deciding whether to use any restraint, officers should carefully balance officer safety concerns with factors that include, but are not limited to....
- Comment: The criteria listed for deciding when to use restraint are all quite vague - for example the direction of the relationship is not really clear. Do use more or less restraint when someone is pregnant? What do we mean by “demeanor” and what demeanors justify greater restraint?

306.3.2 RESTRAINT OF PREGNANT PERSONS - Persons who are known to be pregnant should be restrained in the least restrictive manner that is effective for officer safety. No person who is in labor shall be handcuffed or restrained except in extraordinary circumstances and only when a Supervisor makes an individualized determination that such restraints are necessary to prevent escape or injury.
- Recommendation: CPSO and the forthcoming Oversight Committee should explore the likely campus concerns about this policy and consider alternative strategies or restrictions on the use of force versus pregnant women.

308 - Control Devices and Techniques

308.3 ISSUING, CARRYING AND USING CONTROL DEVICES - Control devices described in this policy may be carried and used by members of this department only if the device has been issued by the Department or approved by the Director of Public Safety or the authorized designee....Only officers who have successfully completed department approved training in the use of any control device are authorized to carry and use the device.
- Recommendation: Policy would be easier to interpret/follow if it cross-referenced training curriculum.

308.4 OLEO CAPSICUM (OC) GUIDELINES - Chemical agents, OC spray and pepper projectiles, are weapons used to minimize the potential for injury to officers, offenders, or persons.
- Recommendation: Clarify in document what specific devices will CPSO be using.

308.4.2 TREATMENT FOR OC EXPOSURE - Persons who have been sprayed with or otherwise affected by the use of OC should be promptly provided with clean water to flush the affected areas and moved, where practicable to an uncontaminated environment. These persons who complain of further severe effects shall be examined by appropriate medical personnel.
• Question: Who will provide clean water? Will it be necessary for CPSO to carry clean water if they carry OC? Will officers allow affected person to freely be carried by others to uncontaminated area?

310 - Officer-Involved Shooting

310.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE - The purpose of this policy is to establish policy and procedures for the investigation of an incident in which a person is injured as the result of an officer involved shooting. The intent of this policy is to ensure that such incidents be investigated in a fair and impartial manner.

• Question: Why narrow this oversight process to just officer involved shootings as opposed to officer involved injuries more broadly?
• Recommendation: Share this information with IAC Oversight subcommittee

310.2 TYPES OF INVESTIGATIONS - Officer involved shootings involve several separate investigations. The investigations may include:

• Recommendation: It would be helpful to specify which investigations and outcomes (including any sanctions) would be shared with the campus community, and which are confidential. And to have a clear community communication process around these kinds of investigations. How will transparency of process and outcome be assured when HR/administration processes and sanctioning are confidential?

310.4.3 NOTIFICATIONS - The following persons shall be notified as soon as practical...

• Question: Is this the complete list of people who will be notified?

310.4.5 INVOLVED OFFICERS - Once the involved officers have arrived at the station, the Patrol Sergeant should admonish each officer that the incident shall not be discussed except with authorized personnel or representatives. The following shall be considered for the involved officers (ORS 181.789):

• Question: What does “admonish” here mean? Is this the best choice of terms?

310.4.5 INVOLVED OFFICERS ......Interviews with a mental health professional will be considered privileged and will not be disclosed except to the extent that the officer is or is not fit for return to duty.......Have received training in counseling and in providing emotional and moral support to public safety personnel or emergency services personnel who have been involved in emotionally traumatic incidents by reason of their employment.

• Question: Should counselors working with officers involved in shootings be licensed by the state?

310.5.2 CRIMINAL - ......(d) Absent consent from the involved officer or as required by law, no administratively coerced statements will be provided to any criminal investigators.

• Recommendation: This policy, like many others in the document needs to be coordinated with unions, HR, etc.
310.6 ADMINISTRATIVE INVESTIGATION - In addition to all other investigations associated with an officer involved shooting, this department will conduct an internal administrative investigation to determine conformance with department policy. This investigation will be conducted under the supervision of the Lieutenant and will be considered a confidential peace officer personnel file.

- Recommendation: The committee recommends that the implementation process include an articulated communication plan regarding process and findings in the event of an officer-involved shooting. The process should clearly communicate what information will be shared with the public campus community in the event of an officer-involved shooting, and, in the event that all information is confidential, what steps will be taken to address community concerns regarding transparency and accountability.

313 - Firearms

313.2.1 Officers, while on-duty and working in uniform or plainclothes......

- Question: What about off-duty? If they are taking classes for example are they allowed by policy to carry a firearm on campus?

313.2.2 AMMUNITION - Officers desiring to carry a secondary weapon are subject to the following restrictions. The weapon shall be of good quality and workmanship (e.g., Colt, Smith & Wesson, Browning, SigSauer, etc.) Only one secondary weapon may be carried at a time. The purchase of the weapon and ammunition shall be the responsibility of the officer. The weapon shall be carried out of sight at all times and in such a manner as to prevent accidental cocking, discharge, or loss of physical control. The weapon shall be subject to inspection whenever deemed necessary

- Question: Why are officers being allowed to carry a Department issued and secondary firearm?

- Recommendation: The Committee recommends that the implementation process include communication around the possibility of officers carrying more than one gun, and be prepared to address community concerns regarding this issue since this was not raised previously.

313.2.5 ALCOHOL AND DRUGS - Weapons shall not be carried by any officer who has consumed an amount of an alcoholic beverage or taken any drugs that would tend to adversely affect the officers senses or judgment.

- Question: Should this be “tend to adversely affect” or “has adversely affected”?

314 - Vehicle Pursuit Policy

3.14.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE - Vehicle pursuits expose innocent citizens, law enforcement officers and fleeing violators to the risk of serious injury or death. The primary purpose of this policy is to provide officers with guidance in balancing the safety of the public and themselves against law enforcements duty to apprehend violators of the law.

- Recommendation: This policy needs better clarification on the boundaries of PSU and where pursuits are permissible. For example, how far from campus can a pursuit be maintained?

314.2 Office Responsibilities - (g) The mission of the Portland Police Bureau in policing the area surrounding the campus.
316 - Motor Vehicle Stops

316.2 - It is the policy of this department that motor vehicle stops shall be performed professionally and courteously. This department will maintain a view towards educating the public about proper driving procedures while recognizing and taking steps to minimize the dangers involved in this activity for the officer, the motorist, and other users of the highway. While Campus Police Officers have the authority to conduct traffic stops on the City Streets adjacent to the Portland State University Campus, they are the responsibility of the Portland Police Bureau, to include the primary responsibility for traffic safety.

- Recommendation: This policy needs language more appropriate to a campus environment (i.e., “highway”).

316.3 - Special Campus Security Officers are prohibited from conducting traffic stops on motor vehicles including cars, trucks and motorcycles. For the purpose of this policy, traffic stop is defined as the halting of a moving vehicle by the use of emergency lighting, audible signal, or other directions, from an officer operating a patrol motor vehicle.

- Question: Who are the special campus security officers? Who is being prohibited from making traffic stops and does this represent a departure from prior practice at CPSO?

316.4 Procedures - Officers are prohibited from stopping vehicles under the guise of legal authority when in fact the stop is based solely on the officers prejudice concerning a person’s race, ethnicity, sex, or similar distinction.

- Recommendation: This seems to suggest that "prejudice" is required for problematic stops. The definition of this term becomes very important in this context.

316.4 Procedures - Most persons form their perceptions of the police based on brief encounters with officers during stops for traffic violations. As such, officers should adopt a customer service and educational approach when dealing with otherwise law-abiding members of the public who have violated traffic laws. This approach includes the following measures....

- Recommendation: Currently the policy seems to limit the “customer service” approach to just traffic stops. The Committee encourages CPSO to infuse the entire policy manual with the notion that officers should adopt a customer service and educational approach for ALL citizen contacts. They should adopt those behaviors because they are dealing with fellow humans deserving of respect.

316.4 Procedures - Use command presence as compared to an aggressive or condescending approach, tone of voice, or facial expressions.

- Recommendation: Define what is meant by “command presence”. There is growing interest (and evidence supporting the benefits of) in legitimacy-based policing. Most of the items listed in this section of the policy address this, but there are others that could be considered.

316.4 Procedures - (h) Issuing Citations
• Question: Are policies regarding documentation of traffic stops (i.e., race, gender, search results, etc.) covered in another area? These data will be needed to evaluate whether there are disproportionate stops/searches involving people of color. As such the forms and data being collected should be reviewed by the forthcoming Oversight Committee to ensure that appropriate data are being collected from the outset.

317 - Police-Citizen Contacts

317.4 PROCEDURES - 1. Citizen contacts may be initiated by an officer when the officer believes that it may serve the interests of a police investigation, inquiry or other bonafide police business.

• Recommendation: Broaden this to address community engagement and building relationships on campus. As currently written these contacts have an investigatory feel to them that conforms more closely to traditional police activities rather than campus safety.

317.4 PROCEDURES - Do not create a physical or other barrier to the citizen’s ability to leave, such as keeping a driver’s license or by creating a physically imposing and intimidating presence.

• Question: Is there a specific training and/or guidelines as to what physically imposing and/or intimidating presence looks like? We are not sure about CPSO, but this has a wide range of interpretations in other agencies.

317.4 PROCEDURES - 11. Persons who identify as Portland State University Students are required by the Student Code of Conduct to provide their student identification when requested to do so. Failure to provide this is not a criminal violation and does not constitute authority to arrest. Failure to provide student identification should be referred to the Dean of Students Office and the person instructed to leave the space.

• Question: What about faculty and staff? We need a way to verify that people are allowed in locations where public traffic should normally be limited. Also, should this reference the Student Code of Conduct and not DOSL?

318 - Officer Response to Calls

3.18.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE - This policy provides for the safe and appropriate response to emergency and non-emergency situations whether dispatched or self-initiated.

• Question: Do we need a policy for Code 3 (and general) calls for bicycles?

319 - Sexual Assault

3.19.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE The purpose of this policy is to provide officers and investigators with guidelines for responding to reports of sexual assault, assisting victims, collaborating with local health and service agencies, and conducting interviews with victims, witnesses, and suspects.

• Recommendation: This policy needs to be coordinated with WRC, CARE & SHAC.

• Recommendation: Information on required training related to sexual assault and Intimate Partner Violence needs to be added (for both responding officers and detective). Also needs to
ensure that this policy covers dating/domestic violence and stalking, or that there are separate policies for those. The procedures should be the same as those outlined here, so it might be most efficient to have one sexual assault/IPV policy.

- Question: Can we look at Ashland PD’s “You Have Choices” program/sexual assault policy for reference?

319.2 DEFINITIONS Definitions related to this policy...Sexual Assault- As used in the policy refers to all crimes of sexual violence. (ORS 163.305)

- Recommendation: This specific ORS does not appear to use the term "sexual violence" - they refer to "forcible compulsion"

319.3 POLICY - A victim’s distress may create an unwillingness or psychological inability to assist in the investigation. Officers and investigators play a significant role in both the victim’s willingness to cooperate in the investigation and ability to cope with the emotional and psychological after effects of the crime. Therefore, it is especially important that these cases be handled from a nonjudgmental perspective so as not to communicate in any way to a victim that the victim is to blame for the crime.

- Comment: This is a good addition.

3.19.4 INITIAL RESPONSE - (2) Victim Assistance...d. Supply victims of sexual assault with victim advocate information for the Portland State University (PSU) Women’s Resource Center (WRC) (503-725-5672) and/or the Portland Women’s Crisis Line (PWCL) (503-235-5333)

- Recommendation: The timeline for this needs to be specified (i.e., when the advocate should be called by dispatch, when the detective is called). Need to ensure that the advocate is present for the victim interview.

3.19.4 INITIAL RESPONSE - b. Contact a victim advocate as soon as possible to provide assistance throughout the reporting and investigative process. c. Notify appropriate Portland State University officials.

- Question: Does this notification process get detailed in the procedures or is it needed here?

3.19.4 INITIAL RESPONSE - (C) Detective - 1. Respond to the crime scene, take control of the investigation, and interview the victim. 2. Notify (1) the PSU Center for Student Health and Counseling (SHAC) for a Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner (SANE) nurse if applicable to the crime (2). SAFE (3) Kits should be obtained 84 hours post assault (4).

- Recommendation: (1) Detective should explain the option of receiving SANE care and forensic evidence collection, clarifying that evidence collection is not required to receive medical care. Explain the investigatory implications of collecting forensic evidence. If the student wishes to receive SANE services, notify SHAC. (2) and requested by the victim. (3) Forensic SAFE (4) After hours, Detective should offer SANE care via OHSU. SANE wellness exams are available up to 7 days after assault at OHSU. Detective should explain that an advocate can be present for the exam based on victim wishes.

3.19.4 INITIAL RESPONSE - (C) Detective - (a) Respond and conduct initial interview. (b) Initiate advocate response.
• Recommendation: This order should be changed, so the advocate is present before/during the initial interview.

3.19.4 INITIAL RESPONSE - e) Contact and coordinate for student services with the appropriate PSU offices, Dean of Student Life (DOSL), WRC, and SHAC as necessary.

• Recommendation: Can we add, "...make follow-up plan with victim, clarify next steps in the process, ensure victim knows who to call with questions, is registered with VINE if applicable, explain investigation timeline, etc." Also, can we outline how the Detective acts as liaison to criminal justice process?

320 - Responding to Persons Affected By Mental Illness or In Crisis

320.2 Policy ...In the context of enforcement and related activities, officers shall be guided by this state's law regarding the detention of persons affected by mental illness or in crises. Officers shall use this policy to assist them in determining whether a person's behavior is indicative of mental illness or crisis and to provide guidance, techniques, and resources so that the situation may be resolved in as constructive and humane a manner as possible.

• Question: What about the laws of the city? Are officers really equipped/trained to determine of a person is experiencing a mental health crisis?

320.3 DEFINITIONS - Mental illness: An impairment of an individual's normal cognitive, emotional, or behavioral functioning, caused by physiological or psychosocial factors. A person may be affected by mental illness if he or she displays an inability to think rationally (e.g., delusions or hallucinations); exercise adequate control over behavior or impulses (e.g., aggressive, suicidal, homicidal, sexual; and/or take reasonable care of his or her welfare with regard to basic provisions for clothing, food, shelter, or safety.

• Question: How does this definition include/exclude pharmacological effects of drugs/alcohol? Might need to clarify this.

320.4 PROCEDURES - ...(e) Hallucinations of any of the five senses (e.g., hearing voices commanding the person to act

• Recommendation: Add visual hallucinations to list.

320.4 PROCEDURES - (g) Assessing Risk

• Comment: There are a few other risk factors we might include (See Witt meta-analysis on factors associated with violence among people with psychosis). This includes a history of or current suicidal ideation/attempts, medication or treatment noncompliance, and recent victimization.

320.4 PROCEDURES - Response to Persons Affected by Mental Illness or in Crisis...to help and that the person will be provided with appropriate care....communicate with the individual in an attempt to determine what is bothering him or her. If possible, speak slowly and use a low tone of voice. Relate concern for the persons feelings and allow the person to express feelings without judgment. Where possible, gather information on the individual from acquaintances or family members and/or request
professional assistance if available and appropriate to assist in communicating with and calming the person....Do not threaten the individual with arrest, or make other similar threats or demands, as this may create additional fright, stress, and potential aggression....Avoid topics that may agitate the person and guide the conversation toward subjects that help bring the individual back to reality....always attempt to be truthful with the individual. If the person becomes aware of a deception, he or she may withdraw from the contact in distrust and may become hypersensitive or retaliate in anger. In the event an individual is experiencing delusions and/or hallucinations.

- Comment: These are good suggestions for all citizen & suspect contacts. Interesting that we state this more clearly for people with mental illness.
- Comment: We wonder if this policy spends too much time telling officers to treat mental illness as a threat rather than making it policy that we don't treat those who exhibit signs of mental illness as anything other than a person who should be respected -- and that it is the behavior that informs the actions and decision making of an officer regardless of the mental health status of the person.

320.4 PROCEDURES - Request assistance from individuals with specialized training in dealing with mental illness or crisis situations (e.g., Crisis Intervention Training (CIT) officers, community crisis mental health personnel,

- Question: Will all officers have CIT training or just select officers? If the latter, how feasible is it to have a CIT officer always available on campus given our low staffing levels?

320.4 PROCEDURES - Taking Custody or Making Referrals to Mental Health Professionals...1. Based on the totality of the circumstances and a reasonable belief of the potential for violence, the officer may provide the individual and/or family members with referral information on available community mental health resources, or take custody of the individual in order to seek an involuntary emergency evaluation. Officers should do the following:

- Question: Are involuntary holds & applicable policies regarding this covered elsewhere?
- Comment: If it's not covered here, we must have a policy on that topic as it is an ever present concern on campus, especially the residential campus.

322 - Domestic Violence

322.3 OFFICER SAFETY - The Department's policy with respect to domestic violence stresses the enforcement of the laws to protect the victim and is intended to communicate the attitude that violent behavior is criminal behavior and will not be tolerated. Campus Public Safety Officers will respond to domestic violence reports on campus, assist the Portland Police Bureau in such responses, and provide university resources to students, staff and faculty. The Portland Police Bureau will be notified of all arrests for domestic violence.

- Recommendation: We need a policy for how off campus DV, stalking, and harassment cases will be handled.

322.4 INVESTIGATIONS - (c) Officers should list the full name and date of birth (and school if available) of each child who was present in the household at the time of the offense. The names of
other children who may not have been in the house at that particular time should also be obtained for follow-up.

- Comment: This language is odd for a university campus, except inasmuch as CPSO would respond to off campus domestic violence cases. But still, language should be reconsidered considering context.

322.4 INVESTIGATIONS - (i) Seize any firearms or other dangerous weapons in the home, if appropriate and legally permitted, for safekeeping or as evidence.

- Comment: In the campus residential community there is no question, nor any legal issues, with confiscating guns or weapons. This should be noted here.

322.4.2 IF NO ARREST IS MADE If no arrest is made, the officer should: (a) Advise the parties of any options, including but not limited to: 1. Voluntary separation of the parties. 2. Appropriate resource referrals (e.g., counselors, friends, relatives, shelter homes, victim witness unit). (b) Document the resolution in a report.

- Comment: For the residential campus, officers should notify University Housing so they can take administrative action to separate the parties.

324 - Search & Seizure

324.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE - Both the federal and state Constitutions provide every individual with the right to be free from unreasonable searches and seizures. This policy provides general guidelines for Portland State University-Campus Public Safety Office personnel to consider when dealing with search and Seizure issues.

- Recommendation: We might need some specific language regarding residence hall rooms and personal offices.
- Question: What is the protocol for female officers' searches?

326 - Temporary Custody of Juveniles

- Reviewed - no comments, suggestions, questions

328 - Elder Abuse

- Reviewed - no comments, suggestions, questions

330 - Discriminatory Harassment

330.2 POLICY ... The non-discrimination policies of the Department may be more comprehensive than state or federal law. Conduct that violates this policy may not violate state or federal law but still could subject a member to discipline.

- Question: Is "member" the right word here?

330.3.1 DISCRIMINATION - The Department prohibits all forms of discrimination, including any employment related action by a member that adversely affects an applicant or member and is based on race, color, religion, sex, age, national origin or ancestry, genetic information, disability, military service, sexual orientation and other classifications protected by law.
• Recommendation: “or” instead of “and”

330.3 - Examples of inappropriate behavior include: sexual or derogatory comments; grabbing or touching parts of the body; and sending letters, notes, cartoons, emails, text or audio messages of a sexually suggestive nature. Sexual harassment does not refer to occasional compliments of a socially acceptable nature.

• Comment: The last sentence here seems unnecessary.

330.5 INVESTIGATION OF COMPLAINTS
• Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

332 - Child Abuse Reporting
• Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

333 - Missing Persons

333.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE This policy provides guidance for handling missing person investigations....
• Comment: Three general comments: First, the university already has a "missing person's policy" and this policy should refer and/or quote that policy. Second, we suggest this policy speak more intentionally about how we will coordinate a missing person's response with other agencies, especially Portland. And finally, as currently written, this policy seems to pertain more to "juveniles" or those under 18.

337 - Emergency Notification System
• Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

338 - Victim Witness Assistance

338.3 CRIME VICTIM LIAISON - Every employee reporting or investigating a crime where a victim has suffered injury as a direct proximate cause of that crime will ensure the victim has been provided with information about the existence of the local victim assistance resources. This advisement shall include presenting the victim with a Victim of Violent Crime form, which should include the case number for the specific Crime report (Oregon Revised Statutes 147.365).
• Question: Is this limited to physical injuries? What about mental injury?

338.5 INFORMATION...(k) A statement of legal rights and remedies available to victims of abuse, as required by ORS 133.055.
• Recommendation: Consider adding the text from the given ORS so people have access to it in the policy document.
340 - Hate Crimes

340.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE - This department recognizes and places a high priority on the rights of all individuals guaranteed under the Constitution and the laws of this state. When such rights are infringed upon by violence, threats or other harassment, this department will utilize all available resources to see that justice is served under the law. This policy provides members of this department with guidelines for identifying and investigating incidents and crimes that may be motivated by hatred or other bias.

- Question: Is this policy aligned with GDI/E & C's Discrimination Policy?
- Recommendation: We suggest adding something about CPSO liaisons after creation of the new police department.

340.6 TRAINING - All members of this Department will receive periodic approved training on hate crime recognition and investigation.

- Recommendation – Make sure this is coordinated with the IAC’s Recruitment and Training team.

342 - Disciplinary Policy

342.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE - This policy establishes standards of conduct that are consistent with the values and mission of this department and are expected of its members. The standards contained in this policy are not intended to be an exhaustive list of requirements and prohibitions but they do identify many of the important matters concerning member conduct. Members are also subject to provisions contained throughout this manual as well as any additional guidance on conduct that may be disseminated by the Department or the member’s supervisors.

- Question: Is this policy aligned with the union contracts, HR regulations, etc.?
- Recommendation: Make sure this is coordinated with the forthcoming Oversight Committee regarding information available to the community on outcomes and sanctions.

342.2.1 DUE PROCESS - No disciplinary action shall be taken against an employee without just cause. All discipline shall be processed in accordance with the current Collective Bargaining Agreement.

- Comment: What is the definition of “just cause”? And what about at-will employees? Cause is not necessary for them.

342.2.2 PROGRESSIVE DISCIPLINE - … Nothing in this policy is intended to preclude the administration of more serious forms of discipline, including termination, for a first offense if the seriousness of the offense warrants it.

- Comment: Nor does this policy preclude any existing standards for the administration of justice prescribed already by the university.

342.3.1 ATTENDANCE - (d) Failure to notify the Department within 24-hours of any change in residence address, home phone number, or marital status. (j) Seeking restraining orders against individuals encountered in the line of duty without the express permission of the Director of Public Safety.
• Question: Why include marital status here? What if the Director engages in any of these behaviors?

342.6 EMPLOYEE RESPONSE - The pre-discipline process is intended to provide the accused employee with an opportunity to present a written or oral response to the Director of Public Safety after having had an opportunity to review the supporting materials and prior to imposition of any recommended discipline. The employee shall consider the following....

• Suggestion: It just seems that this entire section needs to talk a lot more about current processes through HR and via the unions regarding employee discipline, especially as it relates to termination.

344 - Department Technology Use

344.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE - This policy describes the use of department computers, software and systems.

• Comment: This policy should reference OIT policies already in place.

346 - Report Preparation

• Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

348 - News Media Relations

348.2 RESPONSIBILITIES - The Office of University Communications has the responsibility for releasing and coordinating media relations. Incidents involving media interest shall be discussed and coordinated with the Office of University Communications. The ultimate authority and responsibility for the release of information from this office to the media shall remain with the Director of Public Safety, however, in situations not warranting immediate notice to the Director of Public Safety and in situations where the Director of Public Safety has given prior approval, Lieutenants, may prepare and release information to the media in accordance with this policy and the applicable law.

• Comment: This is not exactly the clearest language possible. Who is to decide whether a situation warrants notice to the Director?

348.2.1 MEDIA REQUEST - Any media request for information or access to a law enforcement situation shall be referred to the Lieutenant or Director. Prior to releasing any information to the media, employees shall consider the following...

• Comment: This needs to be coordinated with FERPA restrictions.

350 - Court Appearance and Subpoenas

• Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

354 - Mutual Aid and Outside Agency Assistance

354.1.1 ASSISTING OUTSIDE AGENCIES - Generally, calls for assistance from other agencies are routed to the Sergeant/Lead Workers office for approval. When an authorized employee of an
outside agency requests the assistance of this department in taking a person into custody, available officers shall respond and assist in making a lawful arrest.

- **Comment:** Given that we are surrounded on all sides by PPB controlled space, are there reasonable limits that can/should be placed on the assistance provided?

**358 - Registered Offender Information**

**358.3** Sex offenders in any of the above categories are required to register at one of several criminal justice locations...

- **Comment:** The categories do not appear to be listed in the policy.
- **Comment:** There may be sex offender requirements specifically of colleges that this policy might need to refer to.

...The Portland State University Public Safety Office will not register sex offenders. Any person requested such services will be referred to a law enforcement agency.

- **Question:** Is this consistent with current CPSO practices?

**358.4** MONITORING OF REGISTERED OFFENDERS - The patrol supervisor should establish a system to periodically, and at least once annually, verify that a registrant remains in compliance with his/her registration requirements after the initial registration.

- **Question:** Is this being done currently by CPSO? How will this change with move to sworn officers?

**360 - Major Incident Notification**

**360.1** PURPOSE AND SCOPE The purpose of this policy is to provide guidance to members of this department in determining when, how and to whom notification of major incidents should be made...

- **Question:** Should this include info on Clery timely warnings and alerts, to ensure the information is aligned and in one central policy?
- **Comment:** The current policy does not specify who should be notified.

**362 - Death Investigation**

**362.1** PURPOSE AND SCOPE - The investigations of cases involving death include those ranging from natural cause to homicide. Some causes of death may not be readily apparent and some cases differ substantially from what they appeared to be initially. The thoroughness of death investigations cannot be emphasized enough...

- **Comment:** This should be aligned with the forthcoming Oversight Committee’s charge.

**364 - Identity Theft**

- Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

**366 - Private Persons Arrests**

- Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions
370 - Limited English Proficiency Services

370.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE This policy provides guidance to members when communicating with individuals with limited English proficiency (LEP) (42 USC 2000d).

- Question: who serves as the interpreters? Are these people from campus? How quickly would they be expected to get to the situation and how are they trained?

372 - Hearing Impaired/Disabled Communications

- Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

378 - Stalking

378.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE This policy establishes procedures for the investigation and enforcement of stalking complaints (Oregon Revised Statutes 163.730 to 163.755).

- Recommendation: This policy needs to be reviewed for consistency with the IPV and sexual assault policies & protocols, with a focus on ensuring early & consistent advocate involvement.

378.2 UNIFORM STALKING COMPLAINT - The Department will make available an Oregon Uniform Stalking Complaint form to any person desiring to file a stalking complaint regardless of where the violation is alleged to have occurred. Officers will provide reasonable assistance as necessary to petitioners to properly complete and sign the form.

- Question: Does the protocol map out the distinction between these stalking citations and civil stalking orders?

... (d) If the citation is served on the respondent, the DAs office will initiate the hearing process. 1. A private attorney, 2. Legal Aid, 3. The District Attorneys office Victims Assistance Unit

- Question: What happens with these three resources? Is the policy intended to say they're referrals that will be given? If these are from CPSO, can SLS be included?

378.4 ARREST Officers may arrest or cite a suspect for any criminal offense committed (including stalking) if the statutory elements have been met, as well as issue a (civil) Uniform Stalking Citation; the two actions are not mutually exclusive.

378.4.1 STALKING PROTECTIVE ORDERS Once the court issues a Stalking Protective Order and it is served on the Respondent, officers may arrest the respondent for violating the terms of the order (Oregon Revised Statutes 163.750).

378.5 RESTRAINING ORDERS Court stalking orders and restraining orders are different and are not mutually exclusive. Stalking reports may be appropriate even if a valid restraining order is in place.

- Comment: We thought stalking order violations were a mandatory arrest. Need to verify language here with state law.

- Comment: Would be good to check the protocol to ensure that both the officer and the advocate give students info on both the stalking and RO processes, including SLS referral if
eligible.

382 - Child Safety Policy
- Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

384 - Service Animals
- Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

386 - Public Safety Camera System

Public and media requests for video images captured by public safety cameras will be made available only to the extent required by law.
- Comment: A reference to the statute for public records requests of video would be helpful here, or guidance for the minimum required response to public records requests of video.

386.6 ANNUAL REVIEW OF THE PUBLIC SAFETY CAMERA SYSTEM - The Director of Public Safety or his/her designee will conduct an annual review the agency’s use of the public safety camera system. The annual review will include an inventory of video monitoring installations, date of installation, summary of their purpose, adherence to this policy and any proposed policy changes.
- Question: What about any data supporting the continued use of cameras? Criminal cases using tape, etc.? Are there opportunities for groups/units/buildings to request the addition of camera surveillance?

390 - Off-Duty Law Enforcement Actions

Officers are not expected to place themselves in unreasonable peril. However, any sworn member of this department who becomes aware of an incident or circumstance that he/she reasonably believes poses an imminent threat of serious bodily injury or death, or significant property damage may take reasonable action to minimize the threat.
- Comment: In cases involving sexual abuse of children this applies to all PSU employees now (i.e., post Penn State). Do we need to coordinate language here with that new law?

390.3 FIREARMS State law prohibits Campus Public Safety Officers from being armed, as such officers do not have possession of an authorized firearm.
- Comment: This obviously will change. Policy should reflect that officers will have a firearm and possibly a secondary weapon.

Firearms shall not be carried by any officer who has consumed an amount of an alcoholic beverage or taken any drugs that would tend to adversely affect the officer’s senses or judgment.
- Comment: This should be referred to the Oversight Committee.

400 - Patrol Function
- Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions
402 - Racial/Bias Based Profiling

402.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE - This policy provides guidance to department members and establishes appropriate controls to ensure that employees of the Portland State University-Campus Public Safety Office do not engage in racial- or bias-based profiling or violate any related laws while serving the community.

- Comment: Since the policy applies to race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, etc., should the policy name reference "Racial"? Does that give greater concern to one demographics over others? "Bias-based Profiling" is the more inclusive term to use here.

402.2 POLICY - The Portland State University-Campus Public Safety Office is committed to providing law enforcement services to the community with due regard...

- Question: "With due regard" means essentially to respect the differences which is a good sentiment, but is not exactly congruent with the last sentence here. Without regard would imply treating people equally regardless of race, etc.

402.4 MEMBER RESPONSIBILITY Every member of this department shall perform his/her duties in a fair and objective manner and is responsible for promptly reporting any known instances of racial- or bias-based profiling to a supervisor.

- Question: Does this need to be aligned with the Oversight Committee?
- Comment: It would be hard to report this when the policy above does not clearly define what "inappropriate reliance" actually means.

402.4.2 REPORTING TRAFFIC STOPS - 402.4.2 REPORTING TRAFFIC STOPS Each time an officer makes a traffic stop, the officer shall report (ORS 131,906).... (c) The individual's gender.

- Recommendation: The forthcoming Oversight Committee should review the form used to capture stop data. Unless the right data are collected it is very difficult to review stops data to assess biased-based policing.
- Comment: Recording of gender and race of people stopped usually means the officer's perception of these characteristics. This may not be the same as how the person self-identifies.

(b) Supervisors should periodically review MAV recordings, IMDTMDC) data and any other available resource used to document contact between officers and the public to ensure compliance with this policy.

- Comment: This probably needs significant review with the union. Also need to define terms (MAV, IMDTMDC).

402.7 ADMINISTRATION - Each year, the Patrol Lieutenant shall review the efforts of the Department to prevent racial- or bias-based profiling and submit an overview, including public concerns and complaints, to the Director of Public Safety. This report should not contain any identifying information regarding any specific complaint, citizen or officers. It should be reviewed by the Director of Public Safety to identify any changes in training or operations that should be made to improve service.

- Recommendation: This process needs significant input from the IAC Oversight team and
forthcoming Oversight Committee.

406 - Crime and Disaster Scene Integrity
- Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

410 - Ride-Along Policy

...if the participant is under 18-years of age, a parent guardian must be present to complete the RideAlong Form.
- Comment: Given our population, does it really make sense to offer a ride along to minors who more than likely are not part of the PSU campus?

412 - Hazardous Material Response
- Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

414 - Hostages and Barricaded Suspects

414.4 FIRST RESPONDER CONSIDERATIONS - First responding officers should promptly and carefully evaluate all available information to determine whether an incident involves, or may later develop into, a hostage or barricade situation.
- Question: Does this apply to sworn and/or unsworn officers? The latter would be unarmed.

416 - Response to Bomb Calls
- Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

418 - Civil Commitments

418.3 An officer shall also take a person into custody at the direction of the community mental health program director when the director has probable cause to believe the person is imminently dangerous to him/herself or to another person. The director is mandated to prepare a report for the officer to deliver to the treating physician (ORS 426.2282).
- Question: Will this still be Project Respond? Will the protocol outline coordination with SHAC?
- Comment: During SHAC hours of operation, it would likely be SHAC coordinating if person was a PSU student; after hours, it would need to be coordinated with Project Respond; past after hour instances, Project Respond has coordinated with SHAC, but strengthening the coordination would be important (SHAC would take responsibility for doing this).

If, upon delivery of the person to the facility, the attending physician finds the person is not in need of emergency care or treatment for mental illness, the person is to be released from custody. The officer or the program director shall return the person to the place where he/she was taken into custody, unless the person declines that service.
- Question: Should this specify who has this authority for PSU?
- Comment: From SHAC Currently, some, not all, of SHAC's licensed clinicians have the director hold authority; we plan to update staff credentials this summer
• Question: Just sworn officers will have the authority to transport and this passage suggests that the transporting officer will have to wait for the medical evaluation. Do we realistically have enough coverage to provide this service?

418.3.1 VOLUNTARY EVALUATION - If officers encounter an individual who may qualify for a civil commitment, they may inquire as to whether the person desires to voluntarily be evaluated at an appropriate facility. If the individual so desires, the officers should:
• Question: Will this still be done by campus safety officers (non-sworn)?

418.3.2 EXTREMELY DANGEROUS PERSONS - 418.3.2 EXTREMELY DANGEROUS PERSONS An officer may take into custody an individual on conditional release from a state hospital pursuant to an order of revocation. The written order does not have to be in the possession of the officer, and may be confirmed through the Law Enforcement Data System (LEDS) (OAR 859-200-310).
• Question: Will this still be done by campus safety officers (non-sworn)?

420 - Citation Releases

420.3.3 DISQUALIFYING CIRCUMSTANCES In certain circumstances, cite and release may not be appropriate. Those situations include: 2. the person lacks ties to the area, such as a residence, job or family.
• Comment: This suggests homeless people may be disproportionately arrested.

422 - Arrest or Detention of Foreign Nationals
• Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

424 - Active Shooter
• Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

426 - Reporting Police Activity Outside of Jurisdiction
• Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

428 - Immigration Violations

428.7 INFORMATION SHARING No member of this department will prohibit, or in any way restrict, any other member from doing any of the following regarding the citizenship or immigration status, lawful or unlawful, of any individual (8 USC 1373):
• Question: How does this interact with FERPA?

430 - Emergency Utility Service
• Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

436 - Field Training and Evaluation Program

36.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE PSU Campus Public Safety (CPSO) has an obligation to the Portland State University (PSU) Community to provide the most current, professional and effective knowledge and skills to CPSO members....
• Question: Is this policy aligned with the training recommendations?
• Question: Does this apply to sworn officers and campus safety officers?

**d) Administer ADORE software program.**

• Question: Has this acronym been previously identified?

436.5 **REQUIRED TRAINING** Recruit officers will be required to successfully attain Phase V (solo) status, prior to the end of the probationary period, which is twenty-four (24) weeks. Phase I through completing Phase IV, is projected to require sixteen (16) weeks. Recruit officers then continue in Phase V (solo) status through the end of the probationary period. Recruit officers may progress through Phases at a faster rate, depending upon demonstrated performance and experience level. All recruits, regardless of performance experience, must complete a minimum four (4) weeks in Phase IV. Recruit officers will be assigned to a minimum of two (2) FTOs and two (2) shifts.

• Comment: This policy paragraph seem to contain conflicting statements.

440 - Detentions and Photographing Detainees

**440.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE** The purpose of this policy is to establish guidelines for conducting field interviews (FI) and pat-down searches and the taking and retention of photographs of persons detained in the field but not arrested. Due to a variety of situations confronting the officer, the decision to Flor photograph a field detainee shall be left to the discretion of the involved officer based on the totality of the circumstances available to them at the time of the detention.

• Question: Are there protocols around communicating with people why they're being photographed?

**Detentions and Photographing Detainees ....(a) The appearance or demeanor of an individual suggests that he/she is part of a criminal enterprise or is engaged in a criminal act.**

• Comment: This may raise concerns about targeting based on physical characteristics (i.e., race, ethnicity, etc.).

• Question: People are also photographed when they’re excluded, right?

• Comment: We think it would be helpful to have a protocol that speaks to communicating reasons for this to people who are photographed.

442 - Criminal Organizations

• Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

444 - Patrol Sergeants

• Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

450 - Portable Audio/Video Recorders

**450.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE - This policy provides guidelines for the use of portable audio/video recording devices by members of this department while in the performance of their duties. Portable audio/video recording devices include all recording systems whether body-worn, hand held or integrated into portable equipment.**

• Question: Is this aligned with the Oversight Committee?
450.2 POLICY - The Portland State University-Campus Public Safety Office may provide members with access to portable recorders, either audio or video or both, for use during the performance of their duties.

- Comment: Language listed in statement suggests recorders will be provided, not may (at least for uniformed officers).

450.3 MEMBER EXPECTATION- All recordings made by members acting in their official capacity shall remain the property of the Department...

- Question: Will administrators have access to these videos? What policies exist to prevent the administration from using videos against victims suing the university, against faculty, etc.?

450.5.5 EXPLOSIVE DEVICE

- Comment: repetition of 450.5.5

Recordings that unreasonably violate a person's privacy or sense of dignity should not be publicly released unless disclosure is required by law or order of the court.

- Comment: Court orders but not subpoenas, correct?

458 - Foot Pursuit Policy

458.3 GUIDELINES FOR FOOT PURSUIT

- Question: The vehicle pursuit policy addresses jurisdictional boundaries. I didn’t see this addressed here. Also, does this same policy apply to bike pursuits?

458.5 The initiating officers shall complete the appropriate crime arrest reports documenting, at minimum, the following:

- Question: Will officers always file a written report for every pursuit, regardless of whether an arrest is made/offense is reported? The full range of pursuits is needed to study and monitor this activity (i.e., we want the denominator not just the numerator)

460 - Bicycle Patrol Unit

- Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

464 - Homeless Persons

- 464.1.1 It is the policy of the Portland State University-Campus Public Safety Office to provide law enforcement services to all members of the community while protecting the rights, dignity and private property of the homeless. Homelessness is not a crime and members of this department will not use homelessness solely as a basis for detention or law enforcement action.

- Comment: We recommend highlighting this to the campus community.
465 - Public Recording of Law Enforcement Activity

465.3 Members of the public who wish to record law enforcement activities are limited only in certain aspects

- Question: What if they are recording victims? What rights do victim have in Oregon that might conflict with the right to record in public settings?

(a) Recordings may be made from any public place or any private property where the individual has the legal right to be present.

- Question: Are there some situations on campus where they have a right to be present but not record?

500 - Traffic Collision Reporting

500.4.3 TRAFFIC COLLISIONS INVOLVING OTHER CAMPUS EMPLOYEES OR OFFICIALS The Patrol Lieutenant or Patrol Sergeant will request assistance from the Portland Police Bureau for the investigation of any traffic collision involving any Portland State University official or employee where a serious injury or fatality has occurred.

- Question: Shouldn't this specify whether the crash happened on campus vs. off campus? Also, does this include crashes that were outside of the employees work duties?

508 - Vehicle Towing

508.5 VEHICLE SEARCHES Case law regarding search and seizure is ever changing and frequently subject to interpretation under the varying facts of each situation.

- Comment: We thought the benefit of using Lexipol was to keep this updated. Seems kind of difficult to leave this up to each officers' "familiarity with relevant case law." That is what this Lexipol's policy updates should provide.

514 - Traffic Citations

514.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE This policy outlines the responsibility for traffic citations, the procedure for dismissal, correction, and voiding of traffic citations,

- Question: we are assuming more will be added here...also needs clarification regarding moving vehicles versus parked. How is latter coordinated with the PSU Parking office? Another question concerns traffic patrols in/around campus. As a full Police department, will CPSO be making more traffic stops to address driving infractions?

518 - Disabled Vehicles

- Recommendation: use language like inoperative.
600 - Investigation and Prosecution

The Campus Police Detective is available for assistance as well as Detective assistance from the Portland Police Bureau...

- Question: Portland police will be on call to campus?

600.2 MODIFICATION OF CHARGES FILED Employees....

- Question: Does this mean CPSO employees or broader university employees and administrators? This topic is important given some recent events where campuses have been accused of discouraging officers from filing charges.

608 - Confidential Informants

....(p) Update on active or inactive status of informant. The informant files shall be maintained in a secure area within the Campus Public Safety Office. These files shall be used to provide a source of background information about the informant, enable review and evaluation of information given by the informant, and minimize incidents that could be used to question the integrity of officers.

- Comment: This statement might need additional clarification.

608.3 USE INFORMANTS - Before using an individual as a confidential informant, an officer must receive approval from the Director. The officer shall compile sufficient information through a background investigation in order to determine the reliability, credibility and suitability, of the individual, including age, maturity and risk of physical harm.

608.3.1 The use of juvenile confidential informants is discouraged due to a number of risks. They will only be used when the investigation is of such a nature as to justify the risks. The district attorney should be consulted and a parent or legal guardians written consent shall be secured. Final approval to use a juvenile confidential informant must be obtained from the Director of Public Safety.

- Question: Given the broader historical context of feds infiltrating student groups in the 60s and 70s, it seems like the need for and conditions surrounding the use of informants should be more clearly defined. Where does it say that informants will only be cultivated in regards to specific criminal investigations as opposed to broader information gathering? This seems to require further explaining. Would students be used as CIs?

608.5.1 PAYMENT - The amount of funds to be paid to any confidential informant will be evaluated against the following criteria.

- Question: Do we realistically expect a need for paid informants on campus? Would like to see broader argument in favor of this being provided, one that is specific to campus policing.

(b) A confidential informant may receive a cash amount for each quantity of drugs seized whether or not assets are also seized.

- Question: Would students be involved in these situations?
610- Eyewitness Identification

610.1.1 DEFINITIONS Blind Presentation The presenter does not know who the suspect is; this is also known as double blind presentation.

Blinded Presentation - The equivalent of a blind presentation; used the when presenter knows who the suspect is. To be conducted so that the presenter does not know which photograph is being presented to the witness.

- Comment: This section needs further clarity. Not sure this is accurate terminology - a double-blind means neither the presenter nor the witness would know who the suspect is. There are also grammatical issues in this policy as currently written and it lacks the clarity of other policies. Given the extensive body of research on eyewitness testimony and the concerns we should have with photo line-up procedures we suggest that further work be done to clarify this policy. It might also be a good idea to preface the policy with a bit more caution regarding the problems of eye-witness testimony and limitations of traditional police line-ups.

612 - Brady Material Disclosure
- Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

700 - Department Owned and Personal Property
- Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

702 - Personal Communication Devices

(c) Employees shall promptly notify the Department in the event the PCD is lost or stolen.
- Question: Will PSU cover this cost?

(g) Use of a personally owned PCD constitutes consent for the Department to access the PCD to inspect and copy data to meet the needs of the Department, which may include litigation, public records retention and release obligations and internal investigations.
- Question: Is this true also for other PSU employees? That our personal cell phones are subject to inspection?

704 - Vehicle Maintenance.
- Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

706 - Vehicle Use

704.5 NON-SWORN EMPLOYEE USE Non-sworn employees using marked vehicles shall ensure all weapons are removed from vehicles before going into service. Non-sworn employees shall also prominently display the out of service placards or lightbar covers at all times. Non-sworn employees shall not operate the emergency lights or siren of any vehicle unless expressly authorized by a supervisor.

Marked vehicles released to non-members for service or any other reason shall have all weapons removed and out of service" placards or lightbar covers in place.
• Question: Does this represent a change from current CPSO practice with Public Safety Officers? If yes, why is this being changed? And “marked vehicle” sentence is unclear.

800 - Communication Operations
• Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

802 - Property and Evidence
• Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

804 - Records Procedures
• Reviewed – Coordinate with Oversight Committee

806 - Restoration of Firearm Serial Numbers

806.2.2 PROPERTY BOOKING PROCEDURE Any employee taking possession of a firearm with removed/obiterated serial numbers shall book the firearm into property following standard procedures. The employee booking the firearm shall indicate on the property form that serial numbers have been removed or obliterated.

• Question: Will we have our own property and evidence control unit or is this being coordinated with PPB? If the latter, may need to revise language presented here to indicate partnership.

808 - Records Release and Security

• Question: Is this aligned with the work of the Oversight committee? Seems like there is a lot to balance here with wish for transparency and legal regulations.

808.3 REPORT RELEASE RESTRICTIONS - The procedures set forth in Policy are to be applied in conjunction with the Oregon Public Records Law and the Bar Press Guidelines.
• Question: What is Bar Press Guidelines?

(a) The arrested person’s name, age, residence, employment, marital status and similar biographical information.

• Question: Does this mean race...ethnicity? Why Marital status? What about children at home? Might be nice to have something stated that guides the specific information released. Explicitly state the standard information (e.g., name, age, gender) released on all arrests and then list secondary information that can be released when there are extenuating circumstances that make this necessary. This helps to avoid possible biases in what information gets released on different suspects.

FERPA gives parents certain rights with respect to their children's education records. These rights transfer to the student when he or she reaches the age of 18 or attends a school beyond the high school level. Students to whom the rights have transferred are eligible students."

74
• Question: Does FERPA give parents rights to access CPSO records? Not clear to us how FERPA and police department records (and laws governing the latter) interact and which has precedence. Certainly something our general council needs to review in depth.

808.5.1 MEDICAL RECORDS, SEALED RECORDS, IN CUSTODY RECORDS AND STUDENT RECORDS
• Comment: Coordination of this with WRC, SHAC, etc. is important given recent U of O case.

810 - Computerized Criminal Offender Information/Computerized Criminal History (Cch)
• Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

811 - Security Surveillance Cameras

811.7 POLICY REVIEW AND OVERSIGHT - At the instigation of the Campus Public Safety Office this policy may be reviewed two years after it is accepted, and every two years thereafter. Recommendations will then be forwarded to the Director of Public Safety.
• Comment: Not clear why this one policy is being reviewed like this. All policies should be reviewed in a uniform fashion.

812 - Computers and Digital Evidence
• Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

818 - Animal Control
• Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

820 - Jeanne Clery Campus Security Act

820.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE - The purpose of this policy is to establish guidelines to ensure this department fulfills its obligation in complying with the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act (Clery Act).
• Comment: We don’t see anything in here regarding how CPSO should handle efforts (if any) by others at PSU to under-report, reclassify, or suppress crime data. Might this be something that is needed given recent cases at other institutions? Something about the independence of authority of CPSO to document crimes?

900 - Temporary Holding Facility

900.1.2 DETENTION IN THE TEMPORARY HOLDING AREA - It is the policy of the Portland State University-Campus Public Safety Office that prisoners detained in the Temporary Holding Room shall be released or transported to another facility, per the provisions of this manual, as soon as possible and practical.
• Comment: This needs greater specificity and/or approval of a supervisor beyond a set amount of time.
900.1.3 NON-DETAINABLE PRISONERS Arrestees who fall within the following classifications should not be detained in the Temporary Holding Room. They should be transported to the county jail, the designated medical facility or the county mental health facility as appropriate:

(f) Any person suspected of being under the influence of a hallucinogen, hyperglycemic agent, psychotropic medication, narcotic, sedative, tranquilizer, anti-neoplastic (cancer) drug, research medication or any person suffering from withdrawals of the above.

• Comment: Given that research finds 60-70% of jail inmates test positive for recent drug use, this would seem to exclude holding most people.

900.1.6 INTOXICATED PERSONS

Any officer encountering a person who is intoxicated or under the influence of controlled substances in a public place and who is incapacitated, whose health appears to be in immediate danger, or there is reasonable cause to believe the person is dangerous to him herself or to any other person, shall summon designated authority (Portland Police Bureau) or community resources, to transport the individual to the nearest appropriate treatment facility (ORS 430.399).

If the person is in need of medical attention, an ambulance should be summoned to transport the person to the nearest emergency room.

Any person who is arrested for a criminal offense and who is in need of emergency medical treatment due to drug or alcohol intoxication, or any other reason, shall immediately be taken to the nearest appropriate treatment facility.

• Comment: This seems to contradict some current practices. It is our understanding that CPSO sometimes transports students to OHSU when in crisis or intoxicated. This text makes it seem CPSO can only do this now if the person is a suspect. Clarification needed.

902 - Custodial Searches

• Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

904 - Prison Rape Elimination

904. 1. 1 Definitions related to this policy include:

The Portland State University-Campus Public Safety Office will take immediate action to protect prisoners who are reasonably believed to be subject to a substantial risk of imminent sexual abuse (28 CFR 115.162).

• Comment: The term "prisoners" does not seem to be defined in the policy. Does this apply to people being interviewed, detained, involuntarily or voluntarily transported to OHSU, etc.?

1000 - Recruitment and Selection

• See attached appendix

1002 - Evaluation of Employees
• Needs to align with collective bargaining and human resources.

1004 - Promotional and Transfer Policy
• Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

1006 - Grievance Procedure
• Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

1008 - Anti-Retaliation
• Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

1010 - Reporting of Employee Convictions
• Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

1012 - Alcohol and Drug Use Policy
• Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

1014 - Sick Leave Reporting
• Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

1016 - Communicable Diseases
• Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

1018 - Smoking Policy

1018.2 POLICY - Although the Campus does not base employment decisions on the fact that an applicant or employee may smoke while off-duty, smoking is not permitted inside department facilities, within 25 feet of any building, or any department vehicle. It shall also be the responsibility of all employees to ensure that no person smokes inside department facilities and vehicles.
• Comment: As currently written, this is not going to be in compliance with PSU’s smoke free campus. We’ll just want to be sure this fits in with the smoke free campus.

1020 - Personnel Complaint Procedure
• Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

1022 - Seat Belts
1024 - Body Armor

• Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

1026 - Personnel Files

1026.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE This section governs the maintenance, retention and access to personnel files in accordance with established law. It is the policy of this department to maintain the confidentiality of personnel records pursuant to Oregon Revised Statutes 192.502.

• Comment: As with many of the policies in Chapter 10, this should be aligned with HR and the union contracts.

1028 - Request for Change of Assignment

• Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

1030 - Employee Commendations

• Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

1032 - Fitness for Duty

• Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

1034 - Meal Periods and Breaks

• Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

1035 - Lactation Break Policy

• Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

1036 - Payroll Record Procedures

• Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

1038 - Overtime Payment Requests

• Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

1040 - Outside Employment

• Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions
1042 - On Duty Injuries
  • Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

1044 - Personal Appearance Standards
  • Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

1046 - Uniform Regulations
  • Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

1050 - Nepotism and Conflicting Relationships
  • Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

1052 - Employee Involved Domestic Violence
  • Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

1054 - Department Badges
  • Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

1056 - Modified Duty Assignments
  • Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions

1060 - Employee Speech, Expression and Social Networking
  • Reviewed – no comments, suggestions, questions
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IAC - Listening Sessions and Online Public Comments

Policy, Procedures and Assessment Topic Team

Summary: These comments were submitted to the Implementation Advisory Committee (IAC) by the campus community between April 3 and April 28, 2015. They were submitted via an online form and through “listening sessions” held across campus during this time period. For purposes of this report, the comments have been organized by content area: policy, procedures, assessment. When a comment does not fit into any of these categories, it has been put into an “others” category. The online submissions are taken verbatim from the submission form and are unedited. The “listening session” comments are taken from staff notes.

Policy:

- Policy # 212.4 - MANAGEMENT OF E-MAIL - should more completely conform to the University’s retention schedule: OAR 166-475-0105 (Safety and Security Records) or alternately refer to 804.1.2. "E-mail that the employee desires to save" lacks the backbone to ensure compliance with state records law. If at all possible CPSO should not be advising the printing of it's e-mail as doing so robs the message of essential metadata. Instead encourage using services such as Google Takeout for retention of e-mail records.
- Will all new officers hired be armed?
- What type of arms will the PSU Police use?
- What policies will be implemented to assure that de-escalation techniques are favored over use of force?
- What will the new CPSO’s jurisdiction be? I.E., will they be called for incidents that involve PSU students that are off-campus?
- With the new sworn/armed police, will there be changes in how PSU Police deal with the homeless who live on campus?
- Will body cameras be used? If yes, what will the policy be for when they are turned on and off? This group felt they should be turned on at the beginning of an officer’s shift and remain on throughout the shift. However, there was some discussion about whether it was really necessary to keep cameras on during breaks, and other non-service related activities (filing reports, giving testimony...etc.)
- Will the bifurcation of the PSU police allow for specialized training for the unarmed officers? The QRC group expressed an interest in having unarmed officers trained to serve as the “bridge builders” that will be needed in a community policing setting.
- Will it be the policy of the PSU Police to provide liaisons to the different multi-cultural centers that represent marginalized communities on campus?
- What will be the “description of suspects” policy? There was concern that black students in particular are more likely to be inadequately described in police bulletins, which make it inevitable that this community will be more broadly targeted.
- What type of side arm and magazine capacity will the use of force policy call for? This group wants the minimum magazine size.
- Will the CPSO have policies on the use of force when children or the elderly are present?
- What will be the minimum standards for securing PSU Police weapons on campus? Will the policy for officers accessing their arms be written to prioritize fast access or safe access?
- Will there be a body cam policy for PSU Police? If so, what will its elements be?
- Given the cultural and linguistic complexity of our campus, will there be an interpretation policy that allows for adequate communication with our non-native English speakers?
- Has PSU considered a policy of using police dogs as an alternative to - or augmentation of - lethal force on campus?

Procedures:

- Increase numbers of officers, install more campus help lines, hire non-hetero/non-white officers, and arm officers with non-lethal weaponry. Enforce PSU perimeter as well. I support CPSO, and invite them to remember that giving officers firearms is detrimental to student safety. CPSO deals mostly with idiotic students, not gun-toting felons, and with the exception of the drug addicts that make their way onto campus, the people they are arresting are harmless.
- Observe, Report, and say Hello to everyone. A smile let people know you are there and care.
- There needs to be increased hiring of CPSO officers. The force should be expanded to match the increasing size of the PSU student body. A suggested ratio is 3 officers to every 1000 students.
- If all officers are to be sworn, but only some are to be armed, how will it be decided who is armed and who is not?
- What will be the procedure for selecting officers who are to be trained to be armed?
- With sworn and armed officers on campus, will RA’s still need to contact the PPD for certain types of service calls? If so, what will those service calls be?
- Will there be a way to visually differentiate armed officers from unarmed officers...for example, will they wear a different uniform?
- When dispatching officers, will it be possible to request that an unarmed officer respond to a service call?
- Will PSU community be able to initiate a service request using a text message?
Assessment:

- How would we compare PSU’s implementation to the implementation of other campuses?
- The QRC group spent quite a bit of time discussing the importance of using the six month probationary period for new employees as a screening mechanism for new officers. Two of the questions they had: should armed officers have a longer probationary period; and should the evaluation of probationary officers include input from the campus community?

Other:

- There needs to be increased hiring of CPSO officers. The force should be expanded to match the increasing size of the PSU student body. A suggested ratio is 3 officers to every 1000 students.
- It makes me extremely uncomfortable and makes me feel unsafe on campus to know that CPS officers carry firearms. It is unacceptable and unnecessary; it is only a matter of time before a violent gun crime occurs and such an event would be only aggravated by an armed CPS officer if not committed with their gun.
- Saw an email suggesting CPSO’s may become armed in the future. I believe that is a horrible idea. The risk high density area and training involved is counter intuitive to the officer’s primary function as someone who observes, reports, and provides visual deterrence on campus. Much of the downtown security, as a former security officer, has unarmed security. In short, call emergency responders if there is an issue. It will save money, careers, and potentially lives.
- As an institution of higher education, we ought to promote the active use of persuasion that does NOT involve lethal weaponry. Firearms are antithetical to everything that we stand for with respect to the power and appeal of reason.
- No guns. That simple.
- With the change in force, there may be more arrests requiring detention on-campus, if so will PSU build a jail?
- It is clear that more marketing needs to be done to inform the PSU campus community about how to access CPSO. When asked...few people in this “listening group” knew about the 4404 or 4407 line, the function and location of blue phones, and/or the physical location of CPSO.
- The QRC group wanted to know why PSU has gone from pepper spray and batons to fully armed officers without phasing in lethal force through experience with and use of - tazers and other non-lethal options?
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Section for Hearing Impaired/Disabled Communications (Policy 372)

Disability Resource Center comments:

1. Language used to define/describe people with disabilities is outdated.
   a. “Disabled” should not be used unless there is no other appropriate
   b. Recommend: “Communication with People with Disabilities” instead of “Disabled Communications”
   c. Recommend: “people with disabilities” instead of “people who are

2. Section 372.1.1. Consider inclusion of other types of disabilities which can cause communication issues in definitions: traumatic brain injury, cognitive impairment, auditory processing disorders, etc.

3. Section 372.3(e). “Developing procedures that will enable...” Recommend: “Developing procedures and trainings”

4. Section 372.4(a). “When there is any doubt...” Recommend: “Whether there is any doubt” as officers cannot readily assess for all types of disabilities/conditions which may affect understanding.

5. Section 372.5. “use of all gestures, and verbal and written...” Recommend: “use of all gestures, verbal, and written...”

   1. Section 372.7. In order to be clear about access, recommend adding “closed captioning for all video content”.

7. Section 372.9. TTY and relay services are relatively old technologies.

Recommend inclusion of online video relay services, texting, and instant messaging. (Example of online video relay: Purple http://www.purple.us)

8. Section 372.13.1. Consider adding “(f) Paraphrasing or using different terminology when appropriate” or similar concept.

9. Section 372.18.1. Consider inclusion of training in online video relay, texting, and instant messaging to required trainings.
Exhibit 1-D
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Recruitment and Selection

1000.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE
The employment policy of the Portland State University shall provide equal opportunities for applicants and its employees regardless of race, sexual orientation, age, pregnancy, religion, creed, color, national origin, ancestry, physical or mental handicap, marital status, veteran status, or sex, and shall not show partiality or grant any special favors to any applicant, employee or group of employees. The rules governing employment practices for this department are maintained by the Portland State University Department of Human Resources.

1000.2 RECRUITING
The Portland State University Campus Public Safety Office values multiculturalism and inclusiveness consistent with providing services to a diverse and international campus community. Efforts in recruiting a diverse workforce will include specific efforts to achieve this goal by reaching out to community groups and organizations that provide services to multicultural populations. Examples include multicultural centers and academic disciplines centered on traditionally marginalized groups. These efforts will include presentations and outreach on available career opportunities in the Campus Public Safety Office.

1000.3 APPLICANT QUALIFICATIONS AND SELECTION PROCESS
Candidates for job openings will be selected based on merit, ability, competence and experience by the following method:

- Position is posted on the PSU-HR website for 2-3 weeks. Job is advertised through other law enforcement agencies: IACLEA (International Association Campus Law Enforcement Agency), WACLEA (Western Association Campus Law Enforcement Agency), LEDS (Law Enforcement Data System), and the FIServ for CCJ (Criminology/Criminal Justice) students.

- Officer candidates are invited to take an eighty-three minute written test: Standard & Associates National Police Officer Selection Test. Officer Supervisor candidates take a written test: ESO Metrics' Sergeant Promotional Exam. Candidates must obtain 80% or better to pass.

- Candidates who pass the test will have an on-site interview with the Hiring Board for 20-30 minutes. The Hiring Board is chaired by the Lieutenant of Operations and consists of community members on campus that Officers will have direct contact with and will require collaborative team work. Hiring Board Members may include Student Health and Counseling, Women's Resource Center, Queer Resource Center, The Dean of Students Office, and Multi-Cultural Centers.

- Based on the Hiring Board's rankings, candidate(s) will be sent a background packet to fill out. Campus Public Safety hires a background investigator to provide an in-depth background check.
Portland State University Campus Public Safety Office

Policy Manual

Recruitment and Selection/

1000.1 PURPOSE, AND SCOPE, AND VALUES

The Portland State University Campus Public Safety Office values equity, diversity and inclusion. The Campus Public Safety Office strives to consistently provide excellent services to the entire campus community with a specific focus on an ethos of care.

The employment policy of the Portland State University shall provide equal opportunities for applicants and its employees regardless of age, disability, national origin, race, color, marital status, veteran status, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity and expression, genetic information, or any other basis protected by federal, state or local law race, sexual orientation, age, pregnancy, religion, creed, color, national origin, ancestry, physical or mental handicap, marital status, veteran status, or sex, and shall not show partiality or grant any special favors to any applicant, employee or group of employees. The rules governing employment practices for this department are maintained by the Portland State University Department of Human Resources.

1000.2 RECRUITING

Position is posted on the PSU-HR website for 4-6 weeks. Good faith efforts will be made to obtain a diverse applicant pool by advertising and doing local and national outreach with, at a minimum: IACLEA (International Association Campus Law Enforcement Agency), WACLEA (Western Association Campus Law Enforcement Agency), LEDS (Law Enforcement Data System), various college and university department communication resources such as listservs (e.g. of potential departments to advertise with: Criminology/Criminal Justice, Sociology, Social Work, Conflict Resolution, etc.), resource fairs, and diverse police officer associations (e.g., Black Police Officers' Association, LGBT Police Officers, etc.).

The Portland State University Campus Public Safety Office values multiculturalism and inclusiveness consistent with providing services to a diverse and international campus community. Efforts in recruiting a diverse workforce will include specific efforts to achieve this goal by reaching out to community groups and organizations that provide services to multicultural populations.

Examples include multi-cultural centers and academic disciplines centered on traditionally marginalized groups. These efforts will include presentations and outreach on available career opportunities in the Campus Public Safety Office.

1000.3 APPLICANT QUALIFICATIONS AND SELECTION PROCESS;

Candidate will submit an online application on PSU's website.
Candidates for job openings will be selected based on merit, ability, competence and experience by the following methods:

Position is posted on the PSU HR website for 1-6-2-3 weeks. Good faith efforts will be made to obtain a diverse applicant pool by advertising and outreach with: Job is advertised through other law enforcement agencies: IACLEA (International Association Campus Law Enforcement Agency), WACLEA (Western Association Campus Law Enforcement Agency), LECO (Law Enforcement Data System, and the list serve for PSU-CGO (Criminology/Criminal Justice) students, resource fairs, diverse police officer associations (e.g., Black Police Officers Association, LGBT Police Officers, etc.).

Officer candidates are invited to take an eighty-three minute written test: Standard & Associates' National Police Officer Selection Test. Officer Supervisor candidates take a written test: ERGO Metrics' Sergeant Promotional Exam. Candidates must obtain 80% or better to pass.

Candidates who pass the test, will have an onsite interview with the search committee Hiring Board for a minimum of 20-350 minutes. The search committee Hiring Board is chaired by the Lieutenant of Operations and consists of community members on campus that Officers will have direct contact with and will require collaborative team work. The search committee Hiring Board members should include a diverse representation of the entire campus community (representatives should be nominated by their respective manager or above/Chair or above/student body government executive officer or authorized union representative) and may include representatives from: Student Health and Counseling, Women's Resource Center, Queer Resource Center, The Dean of Students Office, and Multicultural Centers, Diversity & Multicultural Student Services (DMSS), DMSS Cultural & Resource Centers, Global Diversity & Inclusion, 1 member of the PSU Board of Trustees, 1 ASPSU student representative, 1 student from the general student body, SEIU representative, AAUP representative, AFT representative, and a community member.

Based on the search committee Hiring Board's rankings, candidate(s) will be sent a background packet to fill out. Campus Public Safety contracts hires a background investigator to provide an in depth background check.
Recruitment and Selection

on candidates(s). This process takes an average of 40 hours a week per person. The background investigator gives a final evaluation of the candidate. Disqualifying behaviors are defined in Policy.

If the candidate passes the background evaluation, they will then require a Psychological Evaluation by a Licensed Psychologist. The psychological evaluation is an eight hour process. The psychologist screens for: Social Competence; Team Work; Adaptability-Flexibility; Conscientiousness-Dependability; Impulse Control-Attention to Safety; Integrity-Ethics; Emotional Regulation & Stress Tolerance; Decision-Making & Judgment; Assertiveness-Persuasiveness; and Avoiding Substance Abuse & Other Risk-Taking Behavior. The psychologist will give a recommendation to hire or not.

Depending on psychological evaluation, a Medical Exam Form (DPSST FORM F2) is given to the candidate to have completed by a Licensed Physician or Surgeon.

Candidates for Campus Police Officer must additionally pass the Oregon Police Agility Test (ORPAT).

If candidate completes all steps successfully, candidate is hired for position.

1000.3.1 MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

All persons hired by this department must meet the applicable minimum standards established by law, in addition to any standards established by this department. The Administration supervisor shall ensure that:

(A) Persons hired as law enforcement officers by this department meet the minimum employment standards and requirements set by the Oregon Department of Public Safety Standards and Training (DPSST) (OAR 259-008-0010 and OAR 259-008-0070).

(B) Persons hired as telecommunications by this department meet the minimum employment standards and requirements set by the DPSST (OAR 259-008-0011 and OAR 259-008-0070).

(C) Persons hired for any other position meet the requirements established by this department.

(D) Personal history investigations for law enforcement officer and telecommunication positions are conducted and retained appropriately and that all applicants are interviewed personally, prior to employment, by the Director of Public Safety or the authorized designee (OAR 259-008-0015).

1000.4 STANDARDS

Employment standards shall be established for each job classification and shall include minimally, the special training, abilities, knowledge and skills required to perform the duties of the job in a satisfactory manner. The Portland State University Department of Human Resources maintains standards for all positions.

The dilemma facing the Department is one of developing a job-valid and non-discriminatory set of policies which will allow it to lawfully exclude persons who do not meet the Portland State University or State of Oregon hiring standards. The disqualifiers listed below are examples and
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This process takes an average of 40 hours a week per person. The background investigator gives a final evaluation of the candidate. Disqualifying behaviors are defined in Policy and Oregon Administrative Rules.

If the candidate passes the background evaluation, they will then be required to take a Psychological Evaluation by a Licensed Psychologist. The psychological evaluation is an eight hour process. The psychologist screens for: Social Competence; Team-Work; Adaptability-Flexibility; Conscientiousness-Dependability; Impulse Control Attention to Safety; Integrity-Ethics; Emotional Regulation & Stress Tolerance; Decision Making Judgment; Assertiveness-Persuasiveness; and Avoiding Substance Abuse & Other Risk Taking Behavior. The psychologist will give a recommendation to hire or not hire.

Depending on psychological evaluation, a Medical Exam Form (DPSST FORM) is given to the candidate to have completed by a Licensed Physician or Surgeon.

Candidates for Campus Police Officer must additionally pass the Oregon Police Agility Test (ORPAT)

A candidate must complete all steps successfully to be considered for employment. If candidate completes all steps successfully, candidate is hired for position.

1000.3.1 MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

All persons hired by this department must meet the applicable minimum standards established by law, in addition to any standards established by this department. The Administration supervisor shall ensure that:

(a) Persons hired as law enforcement officers by this department meet the minimum employment standards and requirements set by the Oregon Department of Public Safety Standards and Training (DPSST) (OAR 259-008-0010 and OAR 259-008-0070).

(b) Persons hired as telecommunicators by this department meet the minimum employment standards and requirements set by the DPSST (OAR 259-008-0011 and OAR 259-008-0070).

(c) Persons hired for any other position meet the requirements established by this department.

(d) Personal history investigations for law enforcement officer and telecommunicator positions are conducted and retained appropriately and that all applicants are interviewed personally, prior to employment, by the Director of Public Safety or the authorized designee (OAR 259-008-0015).

1000.4 STANDARDS

Employment standards shall be established for each job classification and shall include minimally, the special training, abilities, knowledge and skills required to perform the duties of the job in a satisfactory manner. The Portland State University Department of Human Resources maintains standards for all positions.

The dilemma facing the Department is one of developing a job valid and non-discriminatory set
of policies which will allow it to lawfully exclude persons who do not meet the Portland State University or State of Oregon hiring standards. The disqualifiers listed below are examples and
Recruitment and Selection

are not intended to be all inclusive. Other factors may also disqualify applicants. Final decisions will be at the discretion of the Director of Public Safety.

The following standards have been adopted for public safety applicants:

1000.4.1 OPERATION OF A MOTOR VEHICLE
(a) The ability to possess a valid Oregon driver’s license
(b) The ability to drive safely
(c) The ability to control a motor vehicle at high speeds
(d) The ability to operate a motor vehicle in all types of weather conditions
(e) The following shall be disqualifying:
   1. Receipt of three or more moving violations (of any single instance of a potential life threatening violation, such as reckless driving, speed contest, suspect of a pursuit, etc.) within three years prior to application. Moving violations for which there is a factual finding of innocence shall not be included.
   2. Involvement as a driver in two or more chargeable (at fault) collisions within three years prior to date of application.
   3. A conviction for driving under the influence of alcohol and/or drugs within three years prior to application or any two convictions for driving under the influence of alcohol and/or drugs.

1000.4.2 INTEGRITY
(a) Refusing to yield to the temptation of bribes, gratuities, payoffs, etc.
(b) Refusing to tolerate unethical or illegal conduct on the part of other law enforcement personnel.
(c) Showing strong moral character and integrity in dealing with the public.
(d) Being honest in dealing with the public.
(e) The following may be disqualifying:
   1. Any material misstatement of fact or significant omission during the application or background process shall be disqualifying, including inconsistent statements made during the initial background interview (Personal History Statement or Supplemental Questionnaire) or discrepancies between the background investigation and other investigations conducted by other law enforcement agencies.
   2. Any forgery, alteration, or intentional omission of material facts on an official employment application document or sustained episodes of academic cheating.
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are not intended to be all inclusive. Other factors may also disqualify applicants. Final decisions will be at the discretion of the Director of Public Safety.

Listed below are the standards that have been adopted for public safety applicants and potential reasons for disqualification (the following are not intended to be all inclusive. Other factors may also disqualify applicants. Final decisions will be at the discretion of the Director of Public Safety):

(a) The ability to possess a valid Oregon drivers license
(b) The ability to drive safely
(c) The ability to control a motor vehicle at high speeds
(d) The ability to operate a motor vehicle in all types of weather conditions
(e) The following shall be disqualifying:

1. Receipt of three or more moving violations (or any single instance of a potential life threatening violation, such as reckless driving, speed contest, suspect of a pursuit, etc.) within three years prior to application. Moving violations for which there is a factual finding of innocence shall not be included.
2. Involvement as a driver in two or more chargeable (at fault) collisions within three years prior to date of application.
3. A conviction for driving under the influence of alcohol and or drugs within three years prior to application or any two convictions for driving under the influence of alcohol and or drugs.

1000.4.2 INTEGRITY

(a) Refusing to yield to the temptation of bribes, gratuities, payoffs, etc.
(b) Refusing to tolerate unethical or illegal conduct on the part of other law enforcement personnel.
(c) Showing strong moral character and integrity in dealing with the public.
(d) Being honest in dealing with the public.
(e) The following may be disqualifying:

1. Any material misstatement of fact or significant omission during the application or background process shall be disqualifying, including inconsistent statements made during the initial background interview (Personal History Statement or Supplemental Questionnaire) or discrepancies between this background investigation and other investigations conducted by other law enforcement agencies.
2. Any forgery, alteration, or intentional omission of material facts on an official employment application document or sustained episodes of academic cheating.
1000.4.3 CREDIBILITY AS A WITNESS IN A COURT OF LAW
(a) The ability to give testimony in a court of law without being subject to impeachment due to
higher honesty or veracity (or their opposites) or due to prior felony conviction.
(b) The following may be disqualifying:
   1. Conviction of any criminal offense classified as a misdemeanor under Oregon law
      within three years prior to application
   2. Conviction for two or more misdemeanor offenses under law as an adult
   3. Conviction of any offense classified as a misdemeanor under Oregon law while
      employed as a peace officer (including military police officers)
   4. Admission(s) of having committed any act amounting to a felony (including felonies
      treated as misdemeanors at sentencing) under Oregon law, as an adult, within five
      years prior to application or while employed as a peace officer (including military
      police officers)
   5. Admission(s) of administrative conviction of any act while employed as a peace
      officer (including military police officers) involving lying, falsification of any official
      report or document, or theft
   6. Admission(s) of any act of domestic violence as defined by law, committed as an
      adult
   7. Admission(s) of any criminal act, whether misdemeanor or felony, committed against
      children (including but not limited to molesting or abusing children, child abduction,
      child abuse, lewd and lascivious acts with a child, or indecent exposure. Acts of
      consensual unlawful intercourse accomplished between two minors shall not be
      included, unless more than three years difference in age existed at the time of the
      acts
   8. Any history of actions resulting in civil lawsuits against the applicant or his/her
      employer may be disqualifying.

1000.4.4 DEPENDABILITY
(a) A record of submitting reports on time and not malingering on calls
(b) A record of being motivated to perform well
(c) A record of dependability and follow through on assignments
(d) A history of taking the extra effort required for complete accuracy in all details of work
(e) A willingness to work the hours needed to complete a job
(f) The following may be disqualifying:
   1. Missing any scheduled appointment during the process without prior permission

**DRAFT**
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1000.4.3 CREDIBILITY AS A WITNESS IN A COURT OF LAW

(a) The ability to give testimony in a court of law without being subject to impeachment due to his/her honesty or veracity (or their opposites) or due to prior felony conviction.

(b) The following may be disqualifying:

1. Conviction of any criminal offense classified as a misdemeanor under Oregon law within three years prior to application
2. Conviction for two or more misdemeanor offenses under law as an adult
3. Conviction of any offense classified as a misdemeanor under Oregon law while employed as a peace officer (including military police officers)
4. Admission(s) of having committed any act amounting to a felony (including felonies treated as misdemeanors at sentencing) under Oregon law, as an adult, within five years prior to application or while employed as a peace officer (including military police officers)
5. Admission(s) of administrative conviction of any act while employed as a peace officer (including military police officers) involving lying, falsification of any official report or document, or theft
6. Admission(s) of any act of domestic violence as defined by law, committed as an adult
7. Admission(s) of any criminal act, whether misdemeanor or felony, committed against children including but not limited to: molesting or annoying children, child abduction, child abuse, lewd and lascivious acts with a child, or indecent exposure. Acts of consensual unlawful intercourse accomplished between two minors shall not be included, unless more than three years difference in age existed at the time of the acts
8. Any history of actions resulting in civil lawsuits against the applicant or his/her employer may be disqualifying

1000.4.4 DEPENDABILITY

(a) A record of submitting reports on time and not malingering on calls
(b) A record of being motivated to perform well
(c) A record of dependability and follow through on assignments
(d) A history of taking the extra effort required for complete accuracy in all details of work
(e) A willingness to work the hours needed to complete a job
(f) The following may be disqualifying:

1. Missing any scheduled appointment during the process without prior permission,
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2. Having been disciplined by any employer (including military) as an adult for abuse of leave, gross insubordination, deviation of duty or persistent failure to follow established policies and regulations.

3. Having been involuntarily dismissed (for any reason other than lay-off) from two or more employers as an adult.

4. Having a work history that indicates an inability to maintain a long-term relationship with an employer or to establish and work toward achieving long-term goals.

5. For officer applicants having undergone personal bankruptcy more than once, having current financial obligations for which legal judgments have not been satisfied; currently having wages garnished; or any other history of financial instability. The credit history of an applicant or employee shall not be used or obtained as part of an employment decision, including hiring, discharge, promotion or demotion, unless the position qualifies as a public safety officer as defined in OAR 683-005-0079 (ORS 659A.320).

6. Resigning from any paid position without notice may be disqualifying, except where the presence of a hostile work environment is alleged.

7. Having any outstanding warrant of arrest at the time of the application.

1000.4.5 LEARNING ABILITY
(a) The ability to comprehend and retain information.
(b) The ability to recall information pertaining to laws, statutes, codes, etc.
(c) The ability to learn and to apply what is learned.
(d) The ability to learn and apply the material, tactics and procedures that are required of a law enforcement officer.
(e) The following may be disqualifying:
1. Being under current academic dismissal from any college or university where such dismissal is still in effect and was initiated within the past two years prior to the date of application.
2. Having been academically dismissed from any DPSBST certified basic law enforcement academy wherein no demonstrated effort has been made to improve in the deficient areas, except: subsequent successful completion of another DPSBST basic law enforcement academy shall rescind this requirement.

1000.4.6 PERSONAL SENSITIVITY
(a) The ability to receive problems in a way that shows sensitivity for the feelings of others.
(b) Empathy.
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2. Having been disciplined by any employer (including military) as an adult for abuse of leave, gross insubordination, dereliction of duty or persistent failure to follow established policies and regulations

3. Having been involuntarily dismissed (for any reason other than lay-off) from two or more employers as an adult

4. Having a work history that indicates an inability to maintain a long-term relationship with an employer or to establish and work toward achieving long-term goals

5. For officer applicants having undergone personal bankruptcy more than once; having current financial obligations for which legal judgments have not been satisfied; currently having wages garnished; or any other history of financial instability. The credit history of an applicant or employee shall not be used or obtained as part of an employment decision, including hiring, discharge, promotion or demotion, unless the position qualifies as a public safety officer as defined in OAR 839-005-0075 (ORS 659A.320).

6. Resigning from any paid position without notice may be disqualifying, where notice is required, except where the presence of a hostile work environment is alleged

7. Having any outstanding warrant of arrest at the time of the application

1000.4.5 LEARNING ABILITY

(a) The ability to comprehend and retain information

(b) The ability to recall information pertaining to laws, statutes, codes, etc.

(c) The ability to learn and to apply what is learned

(d) The ability to learn and apply the material, tactics and procedures that are required of a law enforcement officer

(e) The following may be disqualifying:

1. Being under current academic dismissal from any college or university where such dismissal is still in effect and was initiated within the past two years prior to the date of application (follow-up with Phil re: academic dismissal and no bachelor's degree being required).

2. Having been academically dismissed from any DPSST certified basic law enforcement academy wherein no demonstrated effort has been made to improve in the deficient areas, except: subsequent successful completion of another DPSST basic law enforcement academy shall rescind this requirement

1000.4.6 PERSONAL SENSITIVITY

(a) The ability to resolve problems in a way that shows sensitivity for the feelings of others.
(b) Empathy

(c) Discretion, not enforcing the law blindly

(d) Effectiveness in dealing with people without arousing antagonism

(e) The ability to understand the motives of people and how they will react and interact

(f) The following may be disqualifying:

1. Having been disciplined by any employer (including the military and/or any law enforcement training facility) for acts constituting racial, ethnic, or sexual harassment or discrimination based on a person's age, disability, national origin, race, color, marital status, veteran status, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity and expression, genetic information, or any other basis protected by federal, state or local law

2. Uttering any epithet derogatory of another person's age, disability, national origin, race, color, marital status, veteran status, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity and expression, genetic information, or any other basis protected by federal, state or local law, race, religion, gender, national origin, or sexual orientation, or any other protected class outlined in paragraph two of the policy.

3. Having been disciplined by any employer as an adult for fighting in the workplace

(a) The following examples of illegal drug use or possession will be considered automatic disqualifiers for public safety applicants, with no exceptions:

1. Any adult use or possession of a drug classified as a hallucinogen within seven years prior to application for employment

2. Any adult use or possession of marijuana within one year prior to application for employment

3. Any other illegal adult use or possession of a drug not mentioned above (including cocaine) within three years prior to application for employment

4. Any illegal adult use or possession of a drug while employed in any law enforcement capacity, military police, or as a student enrolled in college accredited courses related to the criminal justice field

5. Any adult manufacture or cultivation of a drug or illegal substance

6. Failure to divulge to the Department any information about personal illegal use or possession of drugs

7. Any drug test of the applicant, during the course of the hiring process, where illegal drugs are detected

(b) The following examples of illegal drug use or possession will be considered in relationship to the overall background of that individual and may result in disqualification:

1. Any illegal use or possession of a drug as a juvenile

2. Any illegal adult use or possession of a drug that does not meet the criteria of the
automatic disqualifiers specified above (e.g., marijuana use longer than one year ago or cocaine use longer than three years ago.)

3. Any illegal or unauthorized use of prescription medications
Recruitment and Selection

(c) Discretion, not enforcing the law blindly
(d) Effectiveness in dealing with people without arousing antagonism
(e) The ability to understand the motives of people and how they will react and interact
(f) The following may be disqualifying:
   1. Having been disciplined by any employer (including the military and/or any law enforcement training facility) for acts constituting racial, ethnic or sexual harassment or discrimination
   2. Uttering any epithet derogatory of another person's race, religion, gender, national origin or sexual orientation
   3. Having been disciplined by any employer as an adult for fighting in the workplace

1000.4.7 JUDGMENT UNDER PRESSURE
(a) The ability to apply common sense during pressure situations
(b) The ability to make sound decisions on the spot
(c) The ability to use good judgment in dealing with potentially explosive situations
(d) The ability to make effective, logical decisions under pressure
(e) The following may be disqualifying:
   1. Admission(s) of administrative conviction or criminal convictions for any act amounting to assault under color of authority or any other violation of federal or state Civil Rights laws
   2. Any admission(s) of administrative conviction or criminal conviction for failure to properly report witnessed criminal conduct committed by another law enforcement officer

1000.4.8 ILLEGAL USE OR POSSESSION OF DRUGS
(a) The following examples of illegal drug use or possession will be considered automatic disqualifiers for public safety applicants, with no exceptions:
   1. Any adult use or possession of a drug classified as a hallucinogenic within seven years prior to application for employment
   2. Any adult use or possession of marijuana within one year prior to application for employment
   3. Any other illegal adult use or possession of a drug not mentioned above (including cocaine) within three years prior to application for employment
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4. Any illegal adult use or possession of a drug while employed in any law enforcement capacity, military police, or as a student enrolled in college-accredited courses related to the criminal justice field.

5. Any adult manufacture or cultivation of a drug or illegal substance.

6. Failure to divulge to the Department any information about personal illegal use or possession of drugs.

7. Any drug test of the applicant, during the course of the hiring process, where illegal drugs are detected.

(b) The following examples of illegal drug use or possession will be considered in relationship to the overall background of that individual and may result in disqualification:

1. Any illegal use or possession of a drug as a juvenile.

2. Any illegal adult use or possession of a drug that does not meet the criteria of the automatic disqualifiers specified above (e.g., marijuana use longer than one year ago or cocaine use longer than three years ago).

3. Any illegal or unauthorized use of prescription medications.
EXHIBIT 2-A

Department of Public Safety Standards
And Training
Basic Police Curriculum Breakdown
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE SUBJECT</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAW AND LEGAL TOPICS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 Alcohol, Controlled Substances Offenses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102 Civil Liability and Civil Rights Violations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103 Definitions, Intro to Crimes Against Persons</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105 Federal Weapons Possession</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106 Harassment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108 Intro to Criminal Justice System</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109 Juvenile Law</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 Offenses against Property</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111 Offenses against State, Public Health and Animals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112 Officer in Court</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113 Procedural Law</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>Vienna Convention ORS 181.642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114 Sex Crimes, Family Offenses, Related Crimes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115 Theft, Offenses Involving Fraud and Deception</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116 Use of Force Law and Application</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117 Weapons, Public Order Offenses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bias Crimes ORS 181.642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMUNITY RELATIONS AND HUMAN BEHAVIOR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201 Community Policing and Problem Solving</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202 Critical Incident Stress Awareness</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203 Cultural Awareness and Diversity</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204 Emotional Survival</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205 Ethics and Professionalism</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2 Additional Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206 Mental Health and Disabilities</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mandated ORS 181.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208 Tactical Communication and Defusing Hostility</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209 History of Law Enforcement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NEW CLASS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210 Veteran’s</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NEW CLASS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211 Veteran’s Awareness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NEW CLASS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PATROL PROCEDURES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301 Bombs and Explosives</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302 Communicable Diseases/Bloodborne Pathogens</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303 Drugs that Impair Driving</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304 Gang Awareness (2 Hrs shared with Mental Health class)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305 Intoxilizer Certification</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306 Investigative Report Writing &amp; Note Taking</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307 MVC / Traffic Law Enforcement</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308 Patrol Procedures</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309 Standardized Field Sobriety Testing</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310 Weapons of Mass Destruction</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INVESTIGATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>Controlled Substance Investigation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>Crash Investigation</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>Criminal Investigations</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>Domestic Violence</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>Elder Abuse Investigation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>Forensics</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>Interview and Interrogation</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td>MDT Child Abuse Investigation</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td>Missing and Abducted Children</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>OLCC Investigation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411</td>
<td>Sexual Assault Investigation</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>Unattended Death Investigation</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501</td>
<td>Building Searches</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502</td>
<td>Defensive Tactics</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503</td>
<td>Emergency Vehicle Operation</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504</td>
<td>Firearms Skills</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505</td>
<td>Health and Fitness</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506</td>
<td>Less Lethal Options and Concepts</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>507</td>
<td>Range 3000</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>508</td>
<td>Vehicle Stops</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601</td>
<td>Confrontational Simulation</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602</td>
<td>Mock Trials</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>Patrol Shift</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>604</td>
<td>Solo Officer Response</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605</td>
<td>Tactical Safety Briefing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>606</td>
<td>SC - Crime Scene and Interview &amp; Interrogation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>607</td>
<td>SC - Domestic Violence</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>608</td>
<td>SC - DUI</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>609</td>
<td>SC - Felony Assault</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>610</td>
<td>SC - Forensics</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611</td>
<td>SC - Incident Command/WMD</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>612</td>
<td>SC - Pursuit Decision Making (EVO)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>613</td>
<td>SC - Pursuit Termination (EVO)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>614</td>
<td>SC - Tactical Firearms</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wet Lab</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.5</td>
<td><strong>Certification Workshop / Revocation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examinations / Review</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Misc. Administrative</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>640</td>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revised 5/23/2013
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IAC - Recruitment and Training Outreach

Note: The following information was gathered through phone calls, face-to-face interviews and emails between April and May 15, 2015.

Research Task: Speak to the OHSU’s Police training supervisor about the following:

- Pre and Post DPSST training
- Community Policing at OHSU
- Supplemental training on de-escalation, working with the homeless and working with individuals suffering a mental health crisis
- How OHSU officers are armed
- Implicit Bias Training
- Employee Assistance Programs for officers after a use of force incident

Interviewed:

OHSU Deputy Chief Heath Kula
Phone: 503-494-0086
kula@ohsu.edu

Pre and Post DPSST training: In addition to DPSST training, OHSU officers (they are a bifurcated force) receive 140 additional hours of supplemental skills training before they are armed. This training is specific to OHSU’s community standards and focuses on empathy, de-escalation, policy and policing in a clinical setting. Regardless of whether they are armed or not, once officers are trained they must complete 10 additional hours per month of in-service training to remain employed. This training is topical and focuses on current events and changes in policy.

Community Policing at OHSU: Deputy Chief Kula emphasized that effective Community Policing is specifically tailored to the community being policed. At OHSU, this means their police force is trained to emulate the cultural norms of a clinical environment. Sensitivity and a safety first bias are the characteristics they look for in their recruits. They inculcate these values through policy. For example, they have a dis-engagement policy that spells out the conditions under which their officers are given discretion to “stand down” during an encounter. Chief Kula described several instances where this would be appropriate in a clinical setting. He went on to say that not only did this policy help ensure that individuals received proper care (even if they were involved in illegal behavior) but it gave officers
support if they made a judgment call to dis-engage and the encounter went badly. Although OHSU uses Lexipol, community standards—like those resulting in the dis-engagement policy—have caused them to create their own, or significantly modify, fully one third of the policies Lexipol provides.

**Supplemental training on de-escalation, working with the homeless and working with individuals suffering mental health crises:** In addition to the dis-engagement policy described previously, OHSU provides supplemental training on *trauma informed policing*. This training teaches officers how to engage with subjects in a way that illicit information about their background and history that may inform the interaction. The example he cited was the physical search of a transgender subject. In this example, the officer was able to use trauma informed communication techniques to determine it would be more effective to allow this person—who was experiencing a psychotic episode—to remain in their street clothes (which they equated with their identity) rather than to require them to change into medical scrubs, which is policy in the type of search required. Supplemental training is done in-house utilizing experts from the external community. Deputy Chief Kula indicated his willingness to collaborate with the PSU Police Force in the future to either/or share trainings and collaborate on creating new trainings of interest to both forces.

**How OHSU officers are armed:** OHSU’s is a bifurcated force. Community Service Officers carry Tasers, Pepper Spray and a Baton. Armed officers carry the aforementioned, plus a Glock 17mm handgun, secured in a level 4 retention (Note: PPB officers holsters are level 3) holster. The uniforms for the two types of officers differ from each other; armed officers wear additional insignia indicating their qualification to carry a gun. OHSU guns are secured in the access controlled room where officers have their lockers. The lockers themselves have an additional lock box in which officers are expected to keep their guns when they are off duty. OHSU police do not currently use body cams. Because they work in a clinical environment, in order to be compliant with federal HIPAA regulations, they are precluded from filming subjects because they must maintain extraordinarily high levels of patient privacy. A campus policy committee is considering whether to enable the use of body cams, and under what circumstances. NOTE TO THE IAC: PSU is now in the process of trying to get HIPAA status so it can be compliant with the terms of several large federal grants it already has, and compete for additional ones in the future.

**Implicit Bias Training:** Deputy Chief Kula took PPB’s implicit bias training and does not feel it adequately meets OHSU’s needs. Instead, he pulled together a panel of community experts from the Mayor’s Office, the Albina Ministerial Alliance and other local organizations to create a more appropriate training. Led by Dr. Alisha Moreland, OHSU created the program and then ran simulations and table top scenarios to confirm its efficacy before training its officers on it. Deputy Chief Kula suggested that PSU do the same. As he did with all of these issues, Kula indicated his enthusiasm for sharing this training with PSU in the future.
Employee Assistance Programs for officers after a use of force incident: OHSU does not currently have anything besides the EAP to offer officers after a use of force incident. Kula hopes to remedy this deficit in the near future using an approach similar to the one OHSU used for implicit bias training. That is, identify internal experts and collaborate with them to create a program. Then run the program in-house.

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

**Research Task:** Speak to the U of O’s training Lieutenant about the following:

- Implicit Bias Training
- Lessons Learned after two years as a sworn and armed force

**Interviewed:**

Lt. Andrew Bechdolt  
Police Lieutenant - Professional Standards and Training  
Phone: 541-346-5040  
bechdolt@uoregon.edu

**Implicit bias training:** The U of O PD\(^2\) provides this important training after their officers have completed their DPSST training. The training is done by U of O Chief of Police Carolyn McDermed\(^3\) in collaboration with Eugene Police Captain Samuel Kamkar.\(^4\) This training is offered every other year.

U of O PD officers also receive post DPSST supplemental training for working with community members experiencing mental illness and homelessness. This weeklong training occurs during the summer. This summer’s program is under development now and the curriculum will be delivered on campus by appropriate U of O faculty. The curriculum will take a “crisis intervention” approach and emphasize resources that are currently available both on and off campus.

**Lessons Learned:** Lt. Bechdolt mentioned several lessons learned that may be of interest to the appropriate IAC Topic Teams; they are:

- Sexual Assault training resources - The U of O PD provides their officers with post DPSST training on the nuances of the Cleary Act and Title IX as they apply to sexual assaults on campus. This training is provided during a week-long class that is offered on campus and in-service. There

\(^{2}\) University of Oregon Police Department: [http://police.uoregon.edu/](http://police.uoregon.edu/)  
\(^{3}\) Carolyn McDermed - Phone: 541-346-4127 -mcdermed@uoregon.edu  
\(^{4}\) Learn more about Captain Kamkar: [https://www.eugene-or.gov/CivicAlerts.aspx?AID=1280](https://www.eugene-or.gov/CivicAlerts.aspx?AID=1280)
may be opportunities for PSU Police to attend this training. Lt. Bechdolt can provide more particulars about the training and its availability.

- Evidence and Property storage - Now that the U of O PD has felony arrest capability, they are finding their capacity for the proper management and storage of evidence and property is inadequate. So far they have been able to limp along by repurposing existing space they control to provide secure lockers and storage. However, they acknowledge they will need additional space for this function in the future. Note: U of O PD is particularly sensitive to this issue after an audit done of Eugene PD’s evidence lockups found property and evidence to be missing.

- Management of evidence and property - Similar to the previous issue, the U of O PD has learned the need to properly track and retain evidence and property has grown exponentially since they converted to a sworn unit. In fact, this element of their work has become so complex and time consuming that they anticipate having to hire a full time coordinator for this function in the near future.

- Preferred sidearm: U of O PD uses a Glock 45 caliber sidearm in a level 2 retention holster. This weapon takes a magazine of 13 rounds as opposed to the more commonly used Glock 9 mm, which takes 16. The second level holster requires officers to make two manipulations before their weapons can be un-holstered.

Research Task: Speak to Portland Police Chief in charge of training about supplemental training on Implicit Bias and Community Policing with a focus on homelessness, mental illness and de-escalation.

Interviewed:

Assistant Chief of Police Mike Crebs
Phone: 503-823-0990
michael.crebs@portlandpolicebureau.com

Background: I interviewed Commander Crebs at the 5/5 meeting of the City of Portland’s Public Involvement Advisory Committee, on which I serve. We discussed the training of PPB officers on the subjects of Implicit Bias and Community Policing with a focus on homelessness, mental illness and de-escalation.

Findings: As the PPB’s Assistant Chief of Services, Commander Crebs oversees the Training Division, Personnel, the Office Professional Standards, Fiscal Services Division, Statistical Support Division and the Records Division. He is the executive who is most familiar with the training available to PPB officers and spoke to me about national trainings he had participated in, as well as new trainings programs being developed by the PPB to address our subjects of interest.
**Recommendations:** According to Commander Crebs, the most impactful training he has experienced in terms of appreciating Implicit Bias is the *White Men as Full Diversity Partners* training produced by Proudman and Whelp.

He also recommended a diversity issues training program he provides his officers. It was developed by Dr. Caprice Hollins in collaboration with the Seattle police department.

Finally, the PPD has hired a new Equity and Diversity Manager, Elle Weatheroy (elle.weatheroy@portlandpolicebureau.com). Ms. Weatheroy will be responsible for “making sure the bureau's recruiting, hiring and promotional practices serve all people fairly.” Commander Crebs suggested Phil contact him and Ms. Weatheroy if he wishes to learn more about PPD training opportunities and he seemed sincere in his interest in collaborative training.

He also told me he would consider including PSU in the PPB’s ongoing supplemental trainings. Since they train 700 officers at a time, our 10 would not burden the trainers.

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

**Research Task:** Contact the Police Chiefs of the Urban 21 Universities and find out what supplemental trainings and trainers they use; particularly in regards to Implicit Bias and Community Policing with a focus on homelessness, mental illness and de-escalation.

**Process:** All 21 Chiefs were contacted between the end of April and first week of May by phone or email. A follow up email was sent May 5th.

**Findings:** Four Chiefs responded to my request for information. Their contact information and responses follows.

1. Congrats on the change of status. I did the externship for my master’s degree in Portland and have been on your campus. I’m glad to see you making the transition.

   For training, Jyl Shaffer, our Title IX Coordinator and I team teach a good program on Bias Management. We also do a victim centered process class as well as a police / Title IX concurrent investigations class. We would be happy to deliver any or all of those topics free of charge if you can cover our expenses. I have copied Jyl on this email if you have any questions for us.

   Thanks and good luck!

   C. Jason Goodrich
   Director of Public Safety & Chief of Police
2. I would suggest contacting the Fair and Impartial Policing program (http://www.fairimpartialpolicing.com/) for implicit bias training for your officers. If you contact them please let them know I directed you to them. This training has been deployed in Ferguson and is the best that is out there

    Best
    John

John Venuti
Chief of Police
VCU Police Department
938 West Grace Street
Richmond, Virginia 23284

(804) 690-8868 Cell
(804) 828-1210 Office
(804) 828-1199 Fax

3. Response to my telephone interview of 5/7/15 with:

Lt. David Scott
Director of Community Policing, Crime Prevention, Safety Awareness
ab3559@wayne.edu
313-577-6064

Q. Can you recommend an effective implicit bias training program?
A. Wayne State sends its officers to our local Police Academy where this subject (Michigan calls it "sensitivity" training) is covered. Wayne State is not allowed to provide supplemental trainings on any subject unless the training is vetted and approved by the Michigan Commission on Law Enforcement Standards (MCLOSES). Consequently, we do all our training -- including inservice, advanced and refresher -- through the academy.
Q. What advice do you have for a newly sworn force?
A. Wayne State has been sworn and armed since 1967 so we are not "newbies" however based on my 39 years of campus experience, here are a couple of issues I suggest you consider:

- When you are fully sworn and armed you can anticipate a change in how the community perceives your force. Not just the concerns they may have about having armed cops on campus, but also the shift in how you are perceived by people and businesses located near the campus. Wayne State is located in the middle of Detroit and has permeable boundaries. We often get calls inside (and on the outskirts) of our geographical jurisdiction that in the past would have gone to the Detroit PD. However, locals know that our service response times are faster and our officers are better trained and more sensitive to local conditions...so they call us first.
- After Virginia Tech, Wayne State invested in training and equipment to prepare for active shooters. Part of the training was running simulations involving the whole campus. While debriefing one such experience, we heard from students who participated that it was clear the campus police were being prepared to deal with such a situation...but what about students. At that time there was no training for students on how to respond in an active shooter situation, so we developed a program of our own. This program has now been picked up and adapted by other campuses. Lt. Scott still does this training and would be happy to discuss with Chief Zerzan if there is interest at PSU.

4. Mark, Captain Greg Butler is the chief training supervisor for the Indiana University Police Academy that is one of seven certified training academies in the Indiana with the specific purpose of training university police officers (undergrad IU student sworn police). Below is his preliminary response however his email address is included below should you have additional questions.

Thank you

Jerry

---

Jerry L. Minger
Indiana University PSIA
Superintendent of Public Safety
812-855-4296
812-856-5480 (fax)
jminger@iu.edu
protect.iu.edu/jminger

From: Butler, John G jobutler@indiana.edu
Sent: Thursday, May 7, 2015 1:33 PM
To: Minger, Jerry L.
Subject: RE: Portland State University - Request for Training Information

In response to your inquiry the following information is presented:

Implicit bias is not taught at the IU Police Academy. The closest subject matter taught we label Racial Profiling. Federal guideline on Racial Profiling are taught to our officers from the USDOJ fact sheet of 2003 and the new US Federal Law Enforcement profiling ban, other materials are used as appropriate.

Community Policing is taught by the Public Safety Director and Assistant to the President at Butler University, Benjamin Hunter. Ben Hunter is a former Indianapolis Police Sgt. and Indianapolis City Councilman. His instruction is based on the SARA model (scanning-analysis-response-assessment) and his experience conducting Community Policing programs in Indianapolis.

Mental Illness – This subject matter is covered in a 3-5 day course coordinated by the National Alliance of Mental Illness. It teaches the basics to Police Officers on the different types of mental illness and how to recognize individuals who may be displaying symptoms of mental illness. This training also allows for visits to facilities that would handle mental illness patients. In the academy the subject matter is presented by IU ADA office with second session regarding individuals with intellectual disabilities.

De-escalation – What we present in the academy is Verbal Judo as designed by George Thompson. It is basically referred to the professional use of language or tactical communication to “Generate Voluntary Compliance”. Taught on the principles that:

All people want-
  -to be treated with respect
  -to be asked rather than told what to do
  -to know why they are asked or told to do something
  -to have options rather than threats
  -a second chance to make it right
EXHIBIT 2-C
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IAC - Public Comment for the Recruitment and Training Topic Team

Note: Public Comment was gathered via two different online forms: a general comment form hosted by FADM that was active before the Implementation Advisory Committee (IAC) formed; and a second, IAC managed form. Additional comments were provided at IAC produced “listening” sessions that took place across campus during April and May of 2015. Forty four unique comments pertaining to Recruitment and Training were generated using these forums.

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

Listening Session Feedback: (16 comments)

3 Students could be assets in police trainings, helping officers and staffers understand the views and perspectives of students.

4 When will the conversion from a non-sworn/armed campus safety force to a fully sworn/armed force be completed and implemented? For example, will there be sworn/armed PSU officers on campus this fall?

5 RAs are particularly concerned about issues that arise when students display suicidal tendencies and want the new force to be well trained in PSU’s mental health policies.

6 How will the conversion to a PSU police force change how RAs do their job? For example, will there be new RA trainings to better understand the changes in CPSO policies?

7 RAs felt the emphasis of community policing should be on training that integrates (rather than segregates) officers into the community.

8 Recruits should be screened for bias as part of their psychological evaluation. There was particular concern that there is currently only one psychologist in Oregon who does these screenings.

9 All agreed that PSU has to expand its outreach to potential officer candidates and advertise in more diverse communities.

10 Given the large number of Veterans on campus, should new hires be given specialized training in how to respond to students suffering from PTSD?

11 There was concern that LGBTQ community members are considered “deviant” by the police and thus are assumed to be “trouble-makers.” What training will PSU officers get to address this concern?

12 Will officers receive age-group specific, emerging mental health issues, and working with the homeless-specific training?

13 Will dispatch also be part of the training? For example, folks wanted to know if they will have the option to ask for an armed or unarmed officer when initiating a request for service.

14 Will PSU Police be trained to be gender specific in their identifications? The LGBTQ group expressed the opinion that gender should in no way influence how officers respond to a community member during a service call.

15 The LGBTQ group wants to see the PSU Police spend the maximum amount of academy time possible - as well as pre and post training time - on learning non-lethal use of force techniques.
16 What will be the retraining/refreshment training cycles for PSU Police? The LGBTQ group would like to see this occur at least every two years.

17 Will officers receive “safe restraint” training for the mentally disabled?

18 The LGBTQ group would like to see “verbal” conflict resolution emphasized in any training PSU Police engage in.

**Online General Feedback Form - Pre IAC (8 comments - unedited)**

i. I approve of the actions the committee is making by improving the enforcement on campus. My one suggestion would be to implement body cams onto the officers that will benefit all parties involved. Thanks for making an effort to increase the security of the schools staff and students.

ii. I have two recommendations. First, I would like to encourage the implementation committee to work collaboratively with experts at PSU on culturally responsive practices and the Coalition of the Communities of Color to develop model culturally responsive training modules for sworn police officers. These modules could become models for other police departments. Next, I would like to encourage the implementation committee to develop a strong method of collecting and regularly analyzing data (disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, gender identification, national origin, and religion) on all aspects of the force’s work (stops, citations, arrests, use of diverse strategies such as handcuffing) to ensure there are no disparities between the populations represented on the PSU campus and the police actions. Should we find disparities by any individual sworn officer or units, we must require additional training and consider disciplinary actions up to and including dismissal if the actions are not in alignment with our commitment to equity and diversity. The analysis must be done often, possibly monthly; the findings must be made public; and the solutions to the disparities must be collaboratively identified by the community impacted by disparities, PSU representatives, and the force’s representatives. While the communities of PSU are not in agreement regarding the use of a sworn, armed police force, the decision provides PSU with the opportunity to lead the way locally and nationally with a culturally responsive police force that contributes to the human dignity of all our students, faculty, and community members.

iii. First I want to commend you on the open and transparent process you have engaged in. Second, I would like to suggest that - to the extent possible - we make an intentional effort to recruit a PSU Police that is representative of the ethnic distribution on campus.

iv. There are such things as rubber bullet that don’t kill people. I don’t believe deadly force should be an option for campus police.

v. To ensure the safety of all people affected by the implementation of an armed security force, firearms need to be regulated on a checkout system. For each day that a security officer wishes to carry a firearm, they should be required to file a request specifying the individual weapon, the quantity of ammunition, and the reason that checking out a firearm is necessary. Any discrepancy between reports and inventory must be grounds for immediate suspension and possible termination. Such a system would be a natural, regular
reminder that the use of guns is a last resort, and that every bullet matters. Additionally, I recommend that all security personnel be required to wear body-mounted cameras, set to record from the moment they are checked out to the moment they are returned. Video records protect both the students and the security staff by providing an unbiased account of all encounters. As with the firearms, any abnormality found in videos must be interpreted as a reflection of the camera-holder’s character. These regulations may seem like a burden, but so is implementing security in the first place. Keeping a close watch on all security personnel is a vital element of safety, particularly for at-risk populations such as people of color and people with disabilities, for whom armed security too often decreases safety rather than increasing it.

vi. It would be prudent for the committee to work with Randy Miller, Director of the Physical Education Program at PSU, to spread the word about the Self Defense PE Class offered at PSU. Any student can sign up to take this class for one credit! In addition, the campus police should be aware of the class and hand out flyers for concerned PSU students. It would be great to see a variety of departments to work together and create a safe campus community. Thanks.

vii. Despite my wish that a police force would not be needed, I knew early on it was inevitable that PSU would hire police officers. My only hope now is that clear Pre-Planned Procedures are set in place so that police officers know exactly what to do in all kinds of scenarios. There are programs to help train officers via video games that help officers practice and drill. I’m sure the police force is aware of this but it doesn’t hurt to mention it. Secondly, it would put my mind at ease, as well as my peers with whom I spoken about this issue, if the police force would wear body cameras. Has this been looked into? I have not seen any info on the FAQ sheet. Lastly, I saw on the FAQ sheet that police would be trained in de-escalation techniques and multiculturalism which seems like a good idea. I also think a business class or communication class would be helpful. You may be asking yourself why? Well I have approached a CSSPO in the past and he was very rough and short in his demeanor when I first approached him about a campus safety issue. Once he realized there was a potential issue his demeanor changed and he gave me his card which was all very nice but I still felt rather uncomfortable because he had been quite rude initially. At another time I had called the dispatcher over other concerns and she was very dismissive at first. Customer service makes all the difference and if our police force was more approachable I don’t think there would be as much concern about hiring sworn officers. My experiences make me not want to bring up any issue so the last time I found a lady sleeping on the middle of the floor, I talked to someone who might have been a faculty member. I don’t think that’s acceptable and I am having a hard time imagining a positive outcome with sworn police officers. Despite going against student wishes, I hope PSU does keep their safety in mind and implements body cameras. I think it would help police officers do their jobs more easily. Thank you

viii. I applaud the Student Council for recognizing the need for safety and preparedness at PSU and welcome the open discussion and engagements to take place now and forward in ensuring the assimilation of this new police force. After reading over the information
given in favor of the proposal of adding 12 sworn officers and 1 police detective, I agree with
the necessitation of being well prepared in the extremity of an unfavourable event;
However, the Committee must accept the threat that a mere presence of an armed police
force is a threat to the public order. The positioning of these armed officers will be crucial to
maintaining the traditional "chill and relaxed" vibe of PSU's student life on campus rather
than having every new freshman feeling as if they are entering a state prison when they
walk the district. Focus the armed officers at key points of the most anticipated areas of
crime that spill from the city with a few reserves participating in LIGHT patrols and engaging
with students directly and openly, yet ready to respond in an emergengy. Training should
include: -Specific Training for Policing Forces in dealing with: -Rich varieties of ethnicities
-Marijuana and the social effects of Legalization -Developing Adults and Students

Online IAC Feedback Form: (20 comments - unedited)

i. I am disappointed about the CPS because I lost my backpack one time, last
month. After that, I realized the library is very unsafe when there is only two
cameras in the door and no camera in each floor. I only left my sheet for a
while but my backpack is disappeared. There is nearly no clue to find the stoler
and more importantly, it's very difficult for me to believe that CPS is doing
well in our campus.

ii. I recommend the same process other police depts in oregon do. Background
and history questionnaire, oral interview, background check, psychological
evaluation, medical examination. Veterans preference also. No waivers for
police academy unless the officer is a lateral. Complete police academy and
annual training consisting of use of force, weapons qualifications, shoot dont
shoot scenereos. Diversity and crisis intervention training. Ride alonga with
current police, and evaluated by current or former police Only. Pass physical
test yearly. Probationary period mandatory.

iii. Beyond the standard training that we want the officers to receive, they need
to know our campus and our student population. To help with that, I would
suggest that part of the training checklist needs to include meetings with the
resource centers for specific populations on campus. For example: Veterans
Resource Center, Queer Resource Center, Disability Resource Center,
Women's Resource Center, La Casa Latina, Resource Center for Students with
Children, etc. This will help officers understand the needs of specific
populations and provide them with an intro to people who can be a resource
for information.

iv. I hope you will keep as many current officers as possible during the transition.

v. As a faculty member and a member of a minority community, I think diversity
among the police force is very important, but also adequate training on how
to deal with people and in particular since the new force will be an armed
force, how to use, and when to use and when not to use deadly force. It
seems this is a major concern of many students who - looking to non-campus police forces use of deadly force in questionable situations fear that this might be an issue here. I have worked over 15 years at universities and all had armed police forces, but all had perhaps the best trained officers I have ever met who had adequate training in conflict resolution, nonviolent communication/arrest methods, and spent time getting to know the needs of students, faculty, and staff - in particular understanding the safety needs of on-campus and near-campus students. A model force is that at Princeton University where I worked on faculty: https://publicsafety.princeton.edu/about/sworn-officers

vi. This is more a question than a suggestion. I'm wondering about whether there might be any issues about recruiting veterans who have served in Iraq or Afghanistan. Would they have a better understanding of Muslim cultures and values than other recruits? Or might they have a darker concept of Muslims as 'the enemy'? We have a lot of students from the Gulf area....

vii. I don't like the idea of armed police on campus but I agree that if they are going to be here they should have proven appropriate temperaments and multicultural training and additional training in handling college environments including students. Also considering the number of students attending PSU from countries torn by conflict and violence, often with the experience of abuse at the hands of police (frequently connected with the military and whoever rules or is attempting to rule the country) and students from places of poverty and intolerable experiences with police... Has there been any consideration of holding orientation style workshops with counselors and knowledgeable personnel to assist in addressing possible fears?

viii. As a tenured faculty member and Portland citizen, I am against the idea of campus police carrying firearms. US campuses are not their own countries. They should not be overseeing and judging sexual assault charges, nor arming themselves like a militia. If campus security is armed, I will feel markedly less safe.

ix. CPSO should not be armed. There is no reason to have guns on campus.

x. recruit people WITHOUT GUNS! keep all guns off campus! I as faculty I am greatly concerned by the militarization of our college campus. we have police officers downtown with guns. guns are designed to kill people-- keep them off our campus!

xi. It will be important for salaries, training, oversight and supervision to be equal to what Portland Police receive. All officers should be fully trained in working with individuals with mental illness and there should be rapid access to mental health support.

xii. How will PSU work to ensure that the police force reflects the diversity of the PSU student body, including international students, including students who are here learning English and who are from cultures where the role and
function of police forces is quite different from those here? (That is, while they may be of adult age, they are not fully linguistically or culturally competent.) What arrangements are currently or will be made to ensure that student will have access to interpreters who have both linguistic and cultural knowledge in such cases?

xiii. There are ample resources for reviewing precedent already set from other Universities and Supreme Court rulings. I would encourage the committee to review current best practices and not try and re-create already established protocol.

xiv. Working at a university requires an understanding of collegiate experiences. I would make a minimum requirement a BA/BS. I am not 100% on having a requirement of prior police experience. It should be able to be supplemented with demonstrated community/public/municipal involvement along with professional experience of some kind. Also, a written statement/supplemental submission on how police/CPSO can have positive impacts on a university community.

xv. I saw three men that I am assuming are new recruits today (or maybe two recruits and a trainer). What I saw were white men in uniform walking three abreast on various parts of the campus (I saw them twice). I would have felt better if there had been only two and one wore some indication that he was in training. I might also have felt better if they weren't all white men. This is an opportunity to show racial and gender diversity on campus. Please!

xvi. Please include recruitment components that will include scenarios and simulations before candidates move on to training.

xvii. I would suggest that CPSO recruit recent PSU graduates with experience in community outreach and conflict resolution, and to make Conflict Resolution courses available to sworn officers. Another suggestion is gender and racial equality in hiring, without giving preference to one specific non-white and non-hetero group.

xviii. Saw an email suggesting CPSO's may become armed in the future. I believe that is a horrible idea. The risk high density area and training involved is counter intuitive to the officers primary function as someone who observes, reports, and provides visual deterrence on campus. Much of the downtown security, as a former security officer, has unarmed security. In short, call emergency responders if there is an issue. It will save money, careers, and potentially lives.

xix. Sworn officers should reflect the diversity of the PSU Community, including an expansion of female and trans officers. There should be liaisons to every student group, every college and unit on PSU campus so trusting relationships can be built. Patrolling officers should not carry firearms, but rather be armed with their knowledge of and commitment to social justice. Trainings for every CPSO officer should be mandatory at least twice monthly
to review policies, to expand cultural sensitivity and competency, and to provide greater learning and awareness of all aspects of the PSU Community of which they are a part.

**xX.Cops are awful. Please, if it is decided that there has to be armed cops on campus train them in methods of de-escalating situations non-violently, teach them cultural competency (ie how not to be racist) and how to generally not be violent terrorists.**