

Portland State University

PDXScholar

Office of the President Publications and
Presentation

Office of the President

1-2022

The Reimagine Campus Safety Committee Final Report to President Stephen Percy and the Greater PSU Community

Jose Coll

Portland State University, coll@pdx.edu

Vicki Reitenauer

Portland State University, vicr@pdx.edu

Ed Washington

Portland State University, washington@pdx.edu

Zachary Mettler

Portland State University

Charlie Evans

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/president_pubs



Part of the [Social Justice Commons](#), and the [Social Welfare Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

See next page for additional authors

Citation Details

Coll, Jose; Reitenauer, Vicki; Washington, Ed; Mettler, Zachary; Evans, Charlie; Tenty, Crystal Renee; Mayo Kelley, Deborah; Barsamian Kahn, Kimberly; Hunt, Marcy; Gunderson, Molly; Valentin, Roberto; Merriman, Scott; Wahab, Stéphanie; and Labissiere, Yves, "The Reimagine Campus Safety Committee Final Report to President Stephen Percy and the Greater PSU Community" (2022). *Office of the President Publications and Presentation*. 6.

https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/president_pubs/6

This Report is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Office of the President Publications and Presentation by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

Authors

Jose Coll, Vicki Reitenauer, Ed Washington, Zachary Mettler, Charlie Evans, Crystal Renee Tenty, Deborah Mayo Kelley, Kimberly Barsamian Kahn, Marcy Hunt, Molly Gunderson, Roberto Valentin, Scott Merriman, Stéphanie Wahab, and Yves Labissiere

The Reimagine Campus Safety Committee
Final Report to President Stephen Percy
and the Greater PSU Community

Prepared by Steering Team and Committee Members, representing the hundreds of community members and leaders we worked alongside over the past year and a half

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
RCSC Approach	4
Timeline of Activities	5
Overview of the Collaborative Process	7
Guiding Principles	9
Task Group Areas	10
Consensus Recommendations Introduction and Overarching Topics	11
Creating Spaces of Belonging & Removing Barriers to Entry	12
Creating Alternative Models of Support	13
Creating a Shared Ownership of Safety, Information, and Decisions	14
Specific CPSO Departmental Recommendations	17
Ensuring Respectful & Meaningful Community Engagement	20
Former and Current RCSC Participants and NPCC Facilitation Team	23
Appendix References	24
Recommendations Specifically by Task Group with Preambles and Vote Results	24
General Recommendations	25
Community Engagement	27
Physical Environments	35
Welcoming & Belonging	37
Responding to Individuals in Crisis	38
Frameworks for Campus Safety	41

Executive Summary

On August 13, 2020, Portland State University President Stephen Percy announced two key changes in the University's approach to campus public safety: first, Campus Public Safety officers would begin to patrol the campus without firearms and, second, a new Reimagine Campus Safety Committee (RCSC) would convene during the 2020-21 academic year to make a comprehensive set of recommendations for additional changes to the University's approach to campus safety, security, welcoming, and belonging. In that announcement, President Percy introduced a four-person Steering Committee for the RCSC (Jose Coll, dean of the School of Social Work; Vicki Reitenauer, faculty member in Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies and Faculty Senate presiding officer elect; Ed Washington, director of Outreach and Community Engagement in the Office of Global Diversity and Inclusion; and Motutama Sipelii, president of the Associated Students of Portland State University) to help guide the work of the RCSC. Zachary Mettler, a graduate student in the Urban and Regional Planning Program, joined the Steering Team in June 2021.

As set forth in its Charter, the members of the RCSC engaged in a collaborative process to understand the array of safety needs of the campus community and to reimagine an approach to meeting those needs that reflects PSU's commitment to racial justice and human dignity. The RCSC existed to develop recommendations not only for new functional approaches to campus safety and security, but cultural shifts that will call forth a new vision of a welcoming campus that promotes well-being and creates the conditions for genuine belonging for all members of the PSU community.

The full RCSC met 20 times between January and December 2021. Working through task groups and full RCSC forums, the RCSC concluded its effort with full consensus on a series of specific recommendations, outlined in the Consensus Recommendations section below.

RCSC Approach

To catalyze change on both functional and cultural levels, the members of the Steering Team designed an intentional process for productive engagement across differences. In establishing the foundation for the RCSC's work, the Steering Team affirmed a number of key principles, grounded in a commitment to anti-racism in practice and intended outcome and informed by [Showing Up for Racial Justice](#) and [The Characteristics of White Supremacy Culture](#) by Tema Okun (2021/2007):

- Inclusion of individuals from diverse social locations and institutional positionalities, as well as ideological perspectives
- Self-nomination as the basis for participation
- Fundamental commitment of participants to engaging in this work as a learning process
- Relationship-building as the foundation for every aspect of the RCSC's work
- Consensus process for group decision-making

Timeline of Activities

August & September 2020

- President Percy announces the formation of the Steering Team for the RCSC.
- The Steering Team begins building relationships, drafting the framing document for the Committee's work, and developing a self-nomination process and form.

Fall 2020

- The Steering Team releases to the campus community the framing information and self-nomination form for the RCSC.
- The Steering Team accepts President Percy's offer to contract with the National Policy Consensus Center (NPCC) for RCSC facilitation and project management.
- The Steering Team reviews self-nominations, schedules 1:1 conversations with potential participants, and invites members to join the RCSC.

Winter 2021

- The RCSC convenes. Participants build relationships across weekly 2-hour meetings, explore themes related to the RCSC's purpose and charge, and develop [guiding principles](#) for its work.
- Five task groups are formed to carry out the work of researching approaches across several key areas: Community Engagement, Frameworks for Campus Safety, Physical Environment, Responding to Individuals in Crisis, and Welcoming & Belonging.
- The task groups are constituted from the remaining self-nominators and additional invitees.
- The RCSC Steering Team and members of the University Public Safety (UPSOC) begin meeting for shared understanding and mutual support of each group's charge.

Timeline of Activities (cont.)

Spring 2021:

- Task groups convene, form relationships and begin data gathering and research.
- Through the President's Office, the Steering Team begins distributing honoraria to participants.

Summer 2021

- The Community Engagement Task Group begins informal engagement activities.
- Task groups continue data gathering and research, and begin to draft recommendations.

Fall 2021

- The Community Engagement Task Group conducts formal engagement processes with campus constituents and neighbors.
- Task groups finalize recommendations.
- Recommendations come to RCSC for test consensus checks.
- Task Groups interpret Community Engagement feedback relative to various recommendations and revise recommendations accordingly.
- RCSC engages a consensus process to finalize recommendations.
- Recommendations made public for the University community and sent to President Percy for consideration.

Overview of the Collaborative Process

The RCSC process rolled out in a series of steps consistent with a deliberate collaborative process. An initial convening phase began with the RCSC Steering Team inviting participants representing a spectrum of perspectives and positionalities across the University. Concurrently, Steering Team members accepted President Percy's offer to contract with the National Policy Consensus Center (NPCC) for RCSC facilitation and project management support. During this phase, NPCC completed a brief assessment, interviewing Steering Team members to help inform how the process could best be structured and initiated. Also during this phase, a draft Charter for the RSCC was developed for consideration and adoption at the first two full meetings of the RCSC, as well as a set of guiding principles that the RCSC came to consensus on in February 2021.

The RSCC held its kickoff meeting with NPCC in January 2021, and continued meeting approximately every month (or more frequently as needed) through December 2021. The RCSC began building a relational foundation for its work by engaging in a series of facilitated exercises and dialogues. One such example was a mind mapping exercise that helped to build individual and collective understandings of the term 'campus safety' through intellectual, physical, emotional, experiential, and conceptual lenses. This exercise helped form the initial areas of subcommittee work, direction, and general scopes of work to help guide the information gathering and analysis phase.

The information gathering and analysis phase (Spring 2021 – Summer 2021) focused on envisioning possibilities for a future systemic approach to safety, security, welcoming and belonging, and on identifying and researching alternative or desired elements of this new vision. To accomplish its work, the RCSC created five subcommittees, centered on Community Engagement, Welcoming & Belonging, Frameworks for Campus Safety, Responding to Individuals in Crisis, and Physical Environments. Subcommittees were organized as a way to efficiently move through the information gathering and analysis phase of this project. To aid RCSC members in the significant lift of subcommittee work, the Steering Team recruited additional participation (outside of the RCSC member make-up) of members on campus who could lend subject matter expertise or perspective. Subcommittees worked over the spring and fall to conduct research, deliberate, and develop a set of draft recommendations for further discussion by the RCSC and final consensus seeking at RCSC meetings.

Overview of the Collaborative Process (cont.)

As a component of the information gathering phase, community engagement efforts occurred through the RCSC and its Community Engagement subcommittee, which included online consultation and in-person listening sessions to gather input.

As the information gathering and analysis phase continued, the RCSC initiated its deliberation and agreement seeking phase (October - December 2021) with the intent of developing a set of recommendations for President Percy to consider through a consensus-seeking process. The RCSC focused their agreement-seeking effort around collectively building recommendations for reimagining campus safety, security, welcoming, and belonging, as originally charged by the President.

The following section articulates the areas of consensus recommendations, as well as recommendations that were considered but ultimately not passed by consensus. Additionally, in the appendix section of Recommendations, the number of votes between 1-5 given to each recommendation is recorded, to make transparent the level of agreement RCSC members showed for each recommendation.

Guiding Principles

Each principle is a reflection of input synthesized from previous discussions and homework assignments. This draft list is intended to provide the RCSC with an overarching lens through which recommendations can be viewed and developed.

These guiding principles recognize the intersectional nature of all aspects of campus welcome, safety, and belonging, and intend to advance equity and inclusion regarding campus safety through developing recommendations that:

- Take into account the historical and current contexts in which we operate
- Build connections on campus through collaboration, partnership, and community
- Foster shared responsibility for a welcoming and safe campus
- Make possible conditions where people who study at, work at, and/or visit PSU experience a sense of belonging
- Recognize the interconnectedness of physical and emotional aspects of safety
- Draw from both qualitative and quantitative data that is disaggregated whenever possible, recognizing that no individual experience can represent an entire group's or community's experience
- Address barriers, especially for persons who disproportionately experience multiple forms of harm
- Consider the impact of safety interventions on persons experiencing crises in mental, emotional, and/or physical health on campus
- Focus on addressing behaviors, not problematizing or pathologizing individuals
- Include mechanisms for accountability, including approaches for promoting healing around historical and contemporary harms

Task Group Areas

→ Frameworks for Campus Safety

- A task group will examine existing and alternative models and/or strategies for campus safety, including the consideration of addressing scenarios of a threat to safety.

→ Responding to Individuals in Crisis

- A task group will explore and make recommendations for identifying and assisting students, faculty, staff, and visitors to campus who are experiencing mental or physical distress, houselessness, and other forms of crisis.

→ Physical Environment

- A task group will explore concerns and experiences related to the physical and spatial impacts of safety on campus, considering the combination of spaces, infrastructure and subjective experiences.

→ Community Engagement

- A task group will solicit input to understand the lived experiences of members of the campus community relative to campus safety, security, and well-being to help inform the RCSC's decision-making and development of recommendations.

→ Welcoming and Belonging

- A task group will seek to understand how welcoming and belonging are fostered on campus and intersect with, and impact, safety and security. The task group will also engage with potential relationships and partnerships on campus to investigate opportunities around collaboration.

Consensus Recommendations

Recommendations are organized below by general themes instead of by the respective task groups that developed them. After each recommendation, a bolded abbreviation notes from which task group the Recommendation came. The recommendations will be listed by their respective task group in the appendix. We wish to organize the recommendations in both ways to give the reader different ways to associate and interpret recommendations.

- General Recommendation: GE
- Community Engagement: CE
- Frameworks for Campus Safety: FW
- Physical Environments: PE
- Responding to Individuals in Crisis: RIC
- Welcoming & Belonging: W&B

Note: For the sake of consistency across recommendations, some have been slightly edited. The original versions, as written by its associated task group, appear in the Appendix starting on page 22.

Recommendations by Overarching Theme	Number of Recommendations
Creating Spaces of Belonging & Removing Barriers to Entry	6
Creating Alternative Models of Support	3
Creating a Shared Ownership of Safety, Information, and Decisions	8
Specific CPSO Departmental Recommendations	8
Ensuring Respectful & Meaningful Community Engagement	6

Creating Spaces of Belonging & Removing Barriers of Entry

1. The University should conduct an assessment of potential barriers to gatherings and engagement on campus. **(CE)**
2. The University should develop a campus community organizing and engagement cohort composed of a multi-racial, multi-lingual, multi-ethnic group of students who are interested in learning more about community engagement and community organizing. Those students would learn about best practices, develop relationships with PSU community members, and participate in campus-wide and other community engagement efforts. The students could potentially be drawn from existing classes or programs, and they should receive credit and/or a stipend for their work. Oregon's Kitchen Table or some other coordinating entity could help create a collaborative partnership to create and sustain the program. **(CE)**
3. In recognition that culturally appropriate food is central to gathering and a sense of belonging, the University should eliminate any contracts or policies requiring campus gatherings to use PSU food service. **(CE)**
 - a. The current food service contracts and/or other policies require that students and other on-campus groups use University food service for gatherings. The food provided is sometimes either prohibitively expensive and/or not culturally and/or religiously appropriate.
4. Some campus spaces have become too expensive for students and other on-campus groups to use for gathering, forcing some members of the community to meet either in less than optimal spaces or off-campus entirely. The University should ensure that spaces on campus are affordable for members of the campus community to easily gather, particularly in spaces that are culturally significant for particular groups. **(CE)**
5. The University should invest in physical additions to campus buildings and digital upgrades to create a coherent visual identity, as recommended in the [report](#) completed for the Students First Student Research Initiative, in the form of banners affixed to PSU-related buildings, accessible directories (including an accessible digital campus map), murals, and the creative use of public space. **(W&B)**

Creating Spaces of Belonging & Removing Barriers to Entry

6. The University should create flexible gathering spaces, including covered outdoor seating spaces, where people can gather and meet in small groups. **(CE)**
7. It is important that all community members feel they can easily and fluently engage in community conversations. The University should investigate which language PSU community members feel most comfortable communicating in and create policies to meet those language needs (e.g., translations, interpreters, relevant departments or community organizer cohorts, per Recommendation 30). **(CE)**

Creating Alternative Models of Support

8. The University should reinstate the Ombuds Office, in accordance with the principles set forth by the International [Ombuds Association](#) and the [Ombuds Office Final Report](#) completed by Dr. Shirley Jackson, in service to the PSU Community.¹ **(W&B)**
 9. The University should bring back an ombudsman role on campus to allow a safe and confidential environment for students to discuss issues with CPSO or campus safety prior to filing a formal complaint. **(FW)**
 10. The University should create an office dedicated to offering the PSU community alternate models of dispute resolution, in the case of conflicts that one or more parties chooses to report to the institution in expectation of remedy. The further development and establishment of this office will involve the collaboration of key units across the University, in alignment with collective bargaining agreements. **(W&B)**
1. Footnote from parallel Frameworks for Campus Safety recommendation: Bring back an ombudsman role on campus to allow a safe and confidential environment for students to discuss issues with CPSO or campus safety prior to filing a formal complaint.

Creating a Shared Ownership of Safety, Information, and Decisions

11. The University should utilize a decision-making framework, which identifies specific stakeholders to be engaged and process for community input, to consider broad policy changes intending to impact campus safety, welcoming and belonging:
 - a. The University will take into account identified data points, weigh tradeoffs of decision outcomes, and mitigate negative impact(s) of decision. This includes drawing from both qualitative and quantitative data that is disaggregated whenever possible, recognizing that no individual experience can represent an entire group's or community's experience.
 - i. Data points include, but are not limited to, the following:
 1. Educational needs (student and instructor priorities)
 2. Business needs (office service models)
 3. Accessibility standards
 4. Impact on marginalized groups
 5. Workplace needs
 - b. The University should seek to understand what effects policy changes will have, or necessitate, within the current campus safety system including, but not limited to: budget, campus community partnerships, partnership with Portland Police Bureau, unions, internal and external communications, connections to other related activities already happening on campus, etc. **(GE)**
12. The University should establish an RCSC "Ways and Means" Committee to ensure that the necessary labor and resources are allocated and an oversight framework is created in order to complete implementation of the recommendations in a timely manner.
 - a. The RCSC "Ways and Means" Committee, in consultation with, but not limited to Finance & Administration, Facilities, and the President's Office, should create an operating budget to ensure that the recommendations are adequately resourced. **(GE)**

Creating a Shared Ownership of Safety, Information, and Decisions

13. The University should report back both on the results of engagement efforts so that members of the community can interpret and make meaning out of the results and on how the input informed any decisions made by University leadership. **(CE)**
14. The University, through a designated implementing body, should follow up on the work of RCSC during the 2022-23 academic year. In addition to traditional evaluation practices, the University should engage the whole campus community to determine whether the plan adopted based on the work of RCSC has been implemented and whether campus community members feel a greater sense of safety, security, welcoming, and belonging as a result. Input from the community should be utilized to evaluate current policy and help determine future policy. **(CE)**
15. The University should establish a new implementation group to follow up on RCSC recommendations once RCSC completes its work. **(FW)**
16. The University should educate and train the campus community on alternative response (to armed responses) options to an individual in crisis. These alternatives could include building individual and collective skills in compassionate care, de-escalation, bystander intervention, mental health first aid, overdose response workshops and other programs. **(RIC)**
17. The costs of safety infrastructure at PSU should be centralized, and not assessed to individual offices or departments. Urgent departmental requests regarding safety should be given priority **(FW)**
18. Students and student organizations should have input into contracting and fee structures for the use of campus facilities. **(CE)**

Creating a Shared Ownership of Safety, Information, and Decisions

19. The University should review, track, and evaluate the new CPSO changes in policy to unarmed patrols and their impact on PPB's involvement on the PSU campus. After twelve months and at annual intervals, UPSOC or a newly appointed committee will revisit data and review CPSO policy for the impact on violent incidents on campus, PPB's involvement on campus (e.g., presence on campus, response time), the number of times PPB is called, and the impact on perceptions of safety from the campus community. The University should initiate review of policies in light of any critical incidents on campus. The committee will create a plan to revise PSU's relationship with PPB, if needed. **(FW)**

20. UPSOC or a newly appointed committee will:
 - a. Establish an annual data collection focused on campus safety metrics and community perceptions of safety on campus.
 - b. Annually survey the campus on safety outcomes and perceptions of campus safety and attitudes toward/experiences with CPSO.
 - c. Prioritize responses from all aspects of the campus community. Consider both raw safety data and survey results within each year's review.
 - d. Keep standardized questions to track changes across time.
 - e. Improve CPSO data tracking system to monitor safety data (e.g., data beyond Clery reporting).
 - f. Establish a set review of data, recommendations, and implementation actions that is communicated back to the PSU community.
 - g. Review all CPSO armed responses (e.g. any time a CPSO officer accesses their firearm in response to an incident) on a quarterly basis, to include the reason for the level of response with the ability to request more information, as needed.
 - h. Make data available to the PSU community. **(FW)**

Specific CPSO Departmental Recommendations

21. Prioritize unarmed responses to individuals in crisis as demonstrated by a reduction in armed responses to individuals in crisis that will be tracked through CPSO and UPSOC data. **(RIC)**
22. Support the continued development and neighborhood expansion of Portland Street Response (PSR) through an intentional partnership between PSR and Portland State University.
 - a. Should a partnership with PSR become untenable and/or not be able to meet the campus needs, PSU will consider alternative response models for individuals in crisis that align with RCSC Guiding Principles. **(RIC)**
23. Guiding Principles of PSU Campus Safety
 - a. CPSO should prioritize a community-based, relationship-oriented policing approach to campus security and policing, in which public safety is cocreated and shared by CPSO and the PSU community. This includes key tenets of shared responsibility for public safety, valuing community engagement, relationship building between CPSO and the PSU community, involving the PSU community in safety measures, allowing for the community to have a voice on public safety issues, and enhancing CPSO transparency and accountability. Decision making, safety policies, and policing strategies should be viewed in light of community-based policing goals. (FW)
 - b. The PSU community should have voice and input into major CPSO policy changes and the future vision of the department. Efforts should be made to hear from diverse parts of the PSU community prior to instituting major changes and for strategic planning.
 - c. CPSO should prioritize unarmed responses and create alternative responses to low threat level calls on campus. This includes developing alternative responses besides CPSO to calls involving individuals in crisis.

Specific CPSO Departmental Recommendations

25. The University should improve access by providing regular communication channels and opportunities between the Chief, CPSO, and the PSU community (students, faculty, staff). Suggestions include open, regularly scheduled office hours; coffee with PSU community groups; enhanced interactive social media; a regularly monitored and responded to email address, and/or an interactive PSU campus safety app (e.g., an accessible reporting mechanism, not having to call to report low-level issues, request walk escort). **(FW)**
26. The University should increase training to facilitate non-violent and equitable interactions across campus:
 - a. For CPSO: training on procedural justice, implicit bias, de-escalation techniques, resolving conflict with individuals in crisis. Facilitate CPSO's familiarity with topical experts on campus, including faculty and staff.
 - b. Training for campus community: As a community engagement activity, CPSO could offer/sponsor, in conjunction with other relevant organizations, trainings like first aid, CPR, self-defense workshops, and relevant safety classes to the campus community. **(FW)**
27. The University should improve the process for the submission of complaints and commendations regarding public safety and the work of the CPSO, and enhance civilian oversight and review of incidents, complaints, and commendations.
 - a. Provide full information on the process for filing a complaint or commendation, together with an online submission form, on the main page of the UPSOC website, and clearly link to it from the CPSO website.
 - b. Enhance the authority and responsibility of an appropriate Civilian Oversight Agency (COA)—which may be either the UPSOC or some committee or office yet to be created—to receive and investigate in the first instance both complaints and commendations regarding the CPSO, except where complaints fall within the jurisdiction of the Office of Global Diversity and Inclusion (GDI).

Specific CPSO Departmental Recommendations

- c. Grant the appropriate COA the authority to compel employee testimony in its review of incidents and investigation of complaints.
 - d. Hire trained staff support for the appropriate COA to better enable it to fulfill its investigative role.
 - e. For the sake of transparency in civilian oversight, publish the full text of the current CPSO Policy Manual on the CPSO website. For the sake of transparency in civilian oversight, publish the CPSO's Annual Campus Security Reports and Annual Fire Safety Reports covering at least the most recent three years on the CPSO website. **(FW)**
28. The University should increase connections and communication between CPSO and positions on campus which often contact CPSO (e.g. community and student facing positions such as resident hall staff, RAs, SHAC, Library staff). Provide additional support and resources for these campus safety-related positions as needed. Continue enhancing existing campus partnerships and develop new partnerships where needed. Formalize this group, promote connections between the group and CPSO, and meet regularly with CPSO to discuss issues and needs. **(FW)**
29. The University should expand and promote the PSU safety escort service program, which provides a safety escort when for individuals walking on campus. Following best practices at other universities, potentially train and involve students as safety escorts (providing an option other than CPSO officers to respond). Consider providing golf carts or other measures to promote program visibility and enhance public safety. **(FW)**

Ensuring Respectful & Meaningful Community Engagement

30. Future engagement efforts should be guided by the values and best practices developed and adopted by the RCSC:
 - a. Engagement and outreach activities prioritize respect and authenticity.
 - b. Recognize that the topics of safety and belonging are potentially triggering for some members of our community and should be approached with intentionality and care.
 - c. Use a trauma-informed approach to ensure that communities that are particularly impacted by issues of safety and violence are invited to participate actively, authentically, and in the ways that make the most sense for them.
 - d. Recognize that communities themselves know how to best communicate and deliberate within their communities.
 - e. Recognize that authentic engagement is based in relationships that take time to develop and sustain.
 - f. Outreach and engagement activities should be co-created with communities.
 - g. Think creatively about engagement. Engage and conduct outreach in targeted and intentional ways that may vary and will not look completely uniform.
 - h. Engagement on this topic should be ongoing and any framework should include periodic check-ins with community members.
 - i. Decision makers should commit to keeping members of the community informed and aware of how their input is being used.
 - j. Recognize that members of the PSU community hold multiple and concurrent axes of identity and belong to different groups and communities.

(continued on next page)

Ensuring Respectful & Meaningful Community Engagement

30 (cont'd). The University should include these practices to conduct future engagement efforts:

- k. Focus engagement on members of the PSU community (e.g. students, faculty, staff, alumni) and surrounding neighbors (e.g. businesses on /next to PSU campus, regular visitors to campus, adjacent schools, churches, institutions, and community-based organizations).
- l. Stakeholders should be brought in as partners as early as possible to help co-create the questions and design the engagement process.
- m. Utilize an equity, justice, and human rights lens in the engagement process to ensure that PSU's BIPOC communities and other disenfranchised communities (e.g. individuals experiencing homelessness and/or mental illness) that have been and are least engaged and most disparately impacted by traditional policing tactics are both engaged effectively in the process and have meaningful input in the outcomes of the RCSC's work and recommendations.
- n. Focus on co-creating engagement and outreach activities and provide ample time to build those relationships and partnerships.
- o. Provide a spectrum of engagement activities that ask for different levels of vulnerability and involvement (from a brief, anonymous online survey on one end, to storytelling and story exchanges on the other end of the engagement spectrum).
- p. Develop a privacy policy and protocol that is utilized across different engagement activities to ensure anonymity in what community members share.
- q. Create a variety of types of outreach and engagement activities and allow for space for approaches that emerge during the process.
- r. Create ways for RCSC and PSU leadership to "share back" with the community what they have heard through engagement and intentions to respond. **(CE)**

Ensuring Respectful & Meaningful Community Engagement

31. The University should engage the community every year around questions of safety, security, welcoming, and belonging. That engagement should have a special focus on those disproportionately affected by policing. Future community engagement efforts can and should be combined with efforts related to other University priorities. **(CE)**
32. It is important for the implementing body to plan to engage with people living on the street on and near campus. As part of that effort, the implementing body should work in conjunction with Street Roots to participate in their Civic Circles conversations about safety, security, welcoming, and belonging. In the spring of 2022. Oregon's Kitchen Table is willing to provide support to ensure that those conversations take place.. **(CE)**
33. In future engagements, the implementing body and the University more broadly should use Fall term as a period of preparation and relationship building and should engage the campus community in Winter and/or Spring term. **(CE)**
34. The University should create a standing fund to provide resources to organizations and individuals on campus who host community engagement efforts or assist with engagement efforts in other ways. **(CE)**
35. When the University wishes to hear from the whole campus community about significant policy decisions and issues, it is important to mobilize the University's communication resources in multiple forms and at multiple points throughout the community engagement period. Doing so underscores how much people's voices matter to the University and ensures that people who may receive one form of communication but not another form of communication will be more likely to see the opportunity to share what they think. We recommend repeating communications at least three times throughout the engagement period across multiple communications platforms. These include:
 - Direct single-subject emails from the lead decision-maker inviting and encouraging participation;
 - Postings in regular newsletters;
 - Social media postings across platforms;
 - Requests to the various university colleges, departments and units to communicate through their channels. **(CE)**

Former and Current RCSC Participants and NPCC Members

Steering Team

Ed Washington
Jose Coll
Vicki Reitenauer
Zachary Mettler
Motutama Sipelii

NPCC Facilitation Team

Amy Delahanty
Jennah Stillman
Manuel Padilla

Community Engagement

Damon Isiah Turner, *Know Agenda*
Janet Cowal
Michaela Loggins
Mika Sakia, *NPCC*
Molly Gunderson
Nujhat Ahmed, *NPCC*
Roberto Valentin
Sarah Giles, *NPCC*
Wendy Willis, *NPCC*
Yves Labissiere
Zachary Mettler, *Chair*

Frameworks for Campus Safety

Becca Love
Charlie Evans
Jose Coll
Kim Kahn, *Chair*
Lisa Rupp
Scott Merriman
Thomas Lockett

Responding to Individuals in Crisis

Amy Ruff
Debra Mayo Kelley
Denae Murphy
Marcy Hunt, *Chair*
Stéphanie Wahab
Toni Lewis
Vicki Reitenauer
Zachary Mettler

Physical Environments

Ed Washington
Julian Steele
Michael McNerney
Molly Gunderson, *Chair*
Sarah Kinney
Scott Merriman

Welcoming & Belonging

Alyssa Reget
Brian Janssen
Crystal Tenty, *Chair*
Harold McNaron
Michaela Loggins
Rachel Dietz
Vicki Reitenauer

Appendix

Support Network of Documents, Links, and Community Engagement Results

RCSC General Materials

- Main RCSC Website, Office of the President
 - ◆ <https://www.pdx.edu/president/reimagining-campus-public-safety>
- RCSC 2021 Meeting Agendas and Meeting Summaries
 - ◆ <https://www.pdx.edu/president/rcsc-agendas-meeting-materials>

Consensus Check Guiding Principles

Our Committee used a ranking system of 1-5 when voting on each individual recommendation. Ultimately, through group deliberations, one-on-one discussions, and reworking of specific language, the RCSC passed all our recommendations through consensus with 1s through 3s, with 1 meaning “Strongly Agree,” 2 meaning “Agree,” and 3 meaning “I can see pluses and minuses, but am willing to go along with the group.”

Recommendations Specifically by Task Group with Preambles and Vote Results

General Recommendations - Page 25

Community Engagement - Page 27

Physical Environments - Page 35

Welcoming & Belonging - Page 37

Responding to Individuals in Crisis - Page 38

Frameworks for Campus Safety - Page 41

Oregon’s Kitchen Table Community Engagement Report - Page 47

Task Group Recommendations and Preamble: General Recommendations

- A. Utilize a decision-making framework, which identifies specific stakeholders to be engaged and process for community input, to consider broad policy changes intending to impact campus safety, welcoming and belonging:
- a. The University will take into account identified data points, weigh tradeoffs of decision outcomes, and mitigate negative impact(s) of decision. This includes drawing from both qualitative and quantitative data that is disaggregated whenever possible, recognizing that no individual experience can represent an entire group's or community's experience.
 - i. Data points include, but are not limited to, the following:
 1. Educational needs (student and instructor priorities)
 2. Business needs (office service models)
 3. Accessibility standards
 4. Impact on marginalized groups
 5. Workplace needs
 - b. Seek to understand what effects policy changes will have, or necessitate, within the current campus safety system including, but not limited to: budget, campus community partnerships, partnership with Portland Police Bureau, unions, internal and external communications, connections to other related activities already happening on campus, etc.

Consensus response: all 1s and 2s

Task Group Recommendations and Preamble: General Recommendations

- B. Establish a RCSC “Ways and Means” Committee to ensure that the necessary labor and resources are allocated and an oversight framework is created in order to complete implementation of the recommendations in a timely manner.
 - a. The RCSC “Ways and Means” Committee, in consultation with, but not limited to Finance & Administration, Facilities, and the President’s Office, should create an operating budget to ensure that the recommendations are adequately resourced.

Consensus response: all 1s and one 2

Task Group Recommendations and Preamble: Community Engagement

The Reimagine Campus Safety Committee (RCSC) recognizes that community engagement around safety, welcoming, and belonging is an ongoing process. PSU is a dynamic community and the factors that affect safety, welcoming, and belonging are often changing and developing. In fact, a sense of safety includes the ability to gather and community engagement itself is an important means by which to foster a sense of belonging on campus.

We approach this work with optimism that this process can create a template for equitable, just, and robust engagement in the future. It is in that spirit that the Community Engagement Task Group offers the following recommendations:

Ongoing Engagement:

- A. The university, through a designated implementing body, should follow up on the work of RCSC during the 2022-23 academic year. In addition to traditional evaluation practices, the university should engage the whole campus community to determine whether the plan adopted based on the work of RCSC has been implemented and whether campus community members feel a greater sense of safety, welcoming, and belonging as a result. Input from the community should be utilized to evaluate current policy and help determine future policy.

Consensus response: all 1s and one 2

- B. The university should engage the community every year around questions of safety, welcoming, and belonging. That engagement should have a special focus on those disproportionately affected by policing. Future, community engagement efforts can and should be combined with efforts related to other university priorities.

Consensus response: all 1s and 2s

Task Group Recommendations and Preamble: Community Engagement

Values and Best Practices:

- C. The university should report back both on the results of engagement efforts so that members of the community can interpret and make meaning out of the results and on how the input informed any decisions made by university leadership.

Consensus response: all 1s, 2s, and one 3

- D. It is important for the implementing body to plan to engage with people living on the street on and near campus. As part of that effort, the implementing body should work in conjunction with Street Roots to participate in their Civic Circles conversations about safety, welcoming, and belonging, in the Spring of 2022. Oregon's Kitchen Table is willing to provide support to ensure that those conversations take place.

Consensus response: all 1s and 2s

- E. In future engagements, the implementing body and the university more broadly should use fall term as a period of preparation and relationship building and should engage the campus community in winter and/or spring term.

Consensus response: all 1s and 2s

Task Group Recommendations and Preamble: Community Engagement

Values and Best Practices:

- F. Future engagement efforts should be guided by the values and best practices developed and adopted by the RCSC:
- a. Engagement and outreach activities prioritize respect and authenticity
 - b. Recognize that the topics of safety and belonging are potentially triggering for some members of our community and should be approached with intentionality and care.
 - c. Use a trauma-informed approach to ensure that communities that are particularly impacted by issues of safety and violence are invited to participate actively, authentically, and in the ways that make the most sense for them.
 - d. Recognize that communities themselves know how to best communicate and deliberate within their communities.
 - e. Recognize that authentic engagement is based in relationships that take time to develop and sustain.
 - f. Outreach and engagement activities should be co-created with communities.
 - g. Think creatively about engagement. Engage and conduct outreach in targeted and intentional ways that may vary and will not look completely uniform.
 - h. Engagement on this topic should be ongoing and any framework should include periodic check-ins with community members.
 - i. Decision makers should commit to keeping members of the community informed and aware of how their input is being used.
 - j. Recognize that members of the PSU community hold multiple and concurrent axes of identity and belong to different groups and communities.

(continued on next page)

Task Group Recommendations and Preamble: Community Engagement**Values and Best Practices:**

- F. (cont.) The university should include these practices to conduct future engagement efforts:
- a. Focus engagement on members of the PSU community (e.g. students, faculty, staff, alumni) and surrounding neighbors (e.g. businesses on / next to PSU campus, regular visitors to campus, adjacent schools, churches, institutions, and community-based organizations).
 - b. Stakeholders should be brought in as partners as early as possible to help co-create the questions and design the engagement process.
 - c. Utilize an equity, justice, and human rights lens in the engagement process to ensure that PSU's BIPOC communities and other disenfranchised communities (e.g. individuals experiencing homelessness and / or mental illness) that have been and are least engaged and most disparately impacted by traditional policing tactics are both engaged effectively in the process and have meaningful input in the outcomes of the RCSC's work and recommendations.
 - d. Focus on co-creating engagement and outreach activities and provide ample time to build those relationships and partnerships.
 - e. Provide a spectrum of engagement activities that ask for different levels of vulnerability and involvement (from a brief, anonymous online survey on one end, to storytelling and story exchanges on the other end of the engagement spectrum).
 - f. Develop a privacy policy and protocol that is utilized across different engagement activities to ensure anonymity in what community members share.
 - g. Create a variety of types of outreach and engagement activities and allow for space for approaches that emerge during the process.
 - h. Create ways for RCSC and PSU leadership to "share back" with the community what they have heard through engagement and intentions to respond.

Consensus response: all 1s and one 2

Task Group Recommendations and Preamble: Community Engagement

Build and Sustain Community Engagement Infrastructure

- G. The university should create a standing fund to provide resources to organizations and individuals on campus who host community engagement efforts or assist with engagement efforts in other ways.

Consensus response: all 1s and 2s

- H. When the university wishes to hear from the whole campus community about significant policy decisions and issues, it is important to mobilize the university's communication's resources in multiple forms and at multiple points throughout the community engagement period. Doing so underscores how much people's voices matter to the university and it ensures that people who may receive one form of communication but not another form of communication, are more likely to see the opportunity to share what they think. We recommend repeating communications at least three times throughout the engagement period across multiple communications platforms.

These include:

- a. Direct single-subject emails from the lead decision-maker inviting and encouraging participation;
- b. Postings in regular newsletters;
- c. Social media postings across platforms;
- d. Requests to the various university colleges, departments and units to communicate through their channels.

Consensus response: all 1s and 2s

Task Group Recommendations and Preamble: Community Engagement

Build and Sustain Community Engagement Infrastructure

- I. Develop a campus community organizing and engagement cohort composed of a multi-racial, multi-lingual, multi-ethnic group of students who are interested in learning more about community engagement and community organizing. Those students would learn about best practices, develop relationships with PSU community members, and participate in campus-wide and other community engagement efforts. The students could potentially be drawn from existing classes or programs, and they should receive credit and/or a stipend for their work. Oregon's Kitchen Table or some other coordinating entity could help create a collaborative partnership to create and sustain the program.

Consensus response: all 1s, 2s and one 3

Task Group Recommendations and Preamble: Community Engagement

Eliminate Barriers to Gathering

- J. The university should conduct an assessment of potential barriers to gatherings and engagement on campus.

Consensus response: all 1s and one 2

- K. The current food service contract and/or other policies require that student and other on-campus groups use university food service for gatherings. The food provided is sometimes either prohibitively expensive and/or not culturally and religiously appropriate. In recognition that culturally appropriate food is central to gathering and a sense of belonging, the university should eliminate any contracts or policies requiring campus gatherings to use PSU food service.

Consensus response: all 1s, 2s, and one 3

- L. Some campus spaces have become too expensive for student and other on-campus groups to use for gathering, forcing some members of the community to meet either in less than optimal spaces or off-campus entirely. The university should ensure that spaces on campus are affordable for members of the campus community to easily gather, particularly in spaces that are culturally significant for particular groups..

Consensus response: all 1s and 2s

- M. Students and student organizations should have input into contracting and fee structures for the use of campus facilities.

Consensus response: all 1s and 2s

Task Group Recommendations and Preamble: Community Engagement

Eliminate Barriers to Gathering

- N. The university should create flexible gathering spaces, including covered outdoor seating spaces, where people can gather and meet in small groups.

Consensus response: all 1s and 2s

- O. It is important that all community members feel they can easily and fluently engage in community conversations. The university should investigate which PSU community members feel most comfortable communicating in. The university should create policies to meet those language needs. (translations, interpreters, relevant departments or community organizer cohorts per Recommendation E).

Consensus response: all 1s and 2s

Task Group Recommendations and Preamble: Physical Environments

Holistic Approach to Campus Design and Ownership

- A. Designate funds for Campus Security Programming allowing for a considered, campus-wide approach and standardization which reduces cost of ownership.
 - a. Current process places the burden for security costs on departments and allows better funded departments to provide themselves with extensive security measures while less well funded departments must always defer security concerns.¹

Consensus response: all 1s, 2s, and one 3

- B. Continue to prioritize universal design across the campus.
 - a. Recognizing that all construction and planning involves balancing competing priorities, we advocate for a continued, well resourced commitment to increasing physical accessibility including the utilization of universal design consultants on all major construction projects
 - b. Assess existing infrastructure from a universal design lens. Identify opportunities for improvement and suggest solutions at different levels of expenditure (“steps”). Estimate the impact that each “step” of a solution would have on accessibility.

Consensus response: all 1s

1. Footnote from Frameworks recommendation: The costs of safety infrastructure at PSU should be centralized, and not assessed to individual offices or departments. Urgent departmental requests regarding safety should be given priority.

Task Group Recommendations and Preamble: Physical Environments

Holistic Approach to Campus Design and Ownership

- C. Expand processes to ensure spaces on campus are well maintained and well-lit.
- a. Currently, FPM, EHS, and CPSO perform a “light walk” twice a year to identify areas of concern. Each walk usually covers roughly half of campus, meaning the entire campus is covered *at most* once a year.
 - i. Schedule longer walks that include the entire campus or more frequent walks
 - ii. Broaden the invitation to include input and/or participation from more stakeholders, including all students, faculty and employees who wish to participate.
 - iii. Ensure that walks occur at least once per term, with a goal of complete campus-wide coverage at least twice per year.
 - b. Ensure processes empower community members to facilitate this work.
 - i. Improve communication around the work order system to remind people (anyone) that they can place work orders - communication that you can also use work order system for bigger issues like lighting needed.
 - ii. Add the work order system to the MyPSU portal
 - iii. Engage people on campus and let them know that it’s everyone's responsibility to put in work orders
 - iv. Create feedback loop for issues that go beyond the scope of a basic work order request (i.e. lighting or cameras needed in a certain area)

Consensus response: all 1s and 2s

Task Group Recommendations and Preamble: Welcoming and Belonging

- A. Reinstatement of the Ombuds Office, in accordance with the principles set forth by the International [Ombuds Association](#) and the [Ombuds Office Final Report](#) completed by Dr. Shirley Jackson, in service to the PSU Community.¹

Consensus response: all 1s, 2s, and one 3

- B. Create an office dedicated to offering the PSU community alternate models of dispute resolution, in the case of conflicts that one or more parties chooses to report to the institution in expectation of remedy. The further development and establishment of this office will involve the collaboration of key units across the University, in alignment with collective bargaining agreements.

Consensus response: all 1s and 2s

- C. Invest in physical additions to campus buildings and digital upgrades to create a coherent visual identity, as recommended in the [report](#) completed for the Students First Student Research Initiative, in the form of banners affixed to PSU-related buildings, accessible directories (including an accessible digital campus map), murals, and the creative use of public space.

Consensus response: all 1s and 2s

1. Footnote from Frameworks rec: Bring back an ombudsman role on campus to allow a safe and confidential environment for students to discuss issues with CPSO or campus safety prior to filing a formal complaint.

Task Group Recommendations and Preamble: Responding to Individuals in Crisis

The Responding to Individuals in Crisis task group of the Reimagine Campus Safety Committee is providing recommendations on how and with what partners PSU responds to individuals in crisis. When we say **an individual**, we mean anyone who may be within, on, or immediately adjacent to PSU property. This includes students, faculty, staff, employees of businesses, and other non-PSU affiliated community members passing through campus. We broadly define **crisis** as a disruption to an individual's baseline functioning which can happen when the individual's usual coping and problem solving strategies are insufficient, resulting in distress. The crisis could be in relation to mental health concerns, substance use concerns, basic need concerns, or acute or chronic health needs. A call for crisis help is often initiated not by the individual in crisis, but by a member of the public experiencing safety concerns for that individual.

The Responding to Individuals in Crisis task group cares about who responds to calls concerning individuals in crisis. We believe it is in the best interest of the PSU community to build a system of care for individuals in crisis that does not rely on law enforcement as first responders, be they armed or unarmed. Given PSU's integral role downtown and in the city as a whole, the Responding to Individuals in Crisis task group recommends that PSU use its leverage to engage with, advocate for, and directly invest in unarmed crisis response programs like Portland Street Response.

Law enforcement in Portland, specifically the Portland Police Bureau, has a history of using excessive force on individuals experiencing mental health crises.¹ This history, which has yet to be fully reconciled or reformed in current practice, is brought to bear every time a law enforcement officer in Portland responds to an individual in crisis.^{2,3}

(continued on next page)

1. US Department of Justice - Civil Right Division (2012). *Re: Investigation of the Portland Police Bureau*. Office of the Assistant Attorney General, Washington DC.
<https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/justice-department-and-city-portland-ore-reach-preliminary-agreement-reforms-regarding>
2. US Department of Justice - Civil Rights Division (2015). *Re: Periodic Compliance Status Assessment Report for the Settlement Agreement in United States v. City of Portland, No. 3:12-cv-02265-SI*. JCP: LLC:RJG:BDB:ALB. Special Litigation Section - PHB, Washington DC.
<https://www.justice.gov/usao-or/file/771166/download>
3. US Department of Justice - Civil Rights Division (2021). *Re: United States v. City of Portland, 3:12-cv-02265-SI Notice pursuant to Amended Settlement Paragraph 178*. SHR:LLC:RJG:JDH. Special Litigation Section - PHB, Washington DC.
https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/20588531-ppb_notice_letter_4-2-21-1

Task Group Recommendations and Preamble: Responding to Individuals in Crisis

The outcome of Portland police officers acting as first responders to people with actual or perceived mental illness continues to result in civilian casualties.^{4,5,6,7,8} While we recognize that PSU's Campus Public Safety Officers are not part of the Portland Police Bureau, it is unreasonable to expect the PSU community, especially those experiencing an active mental health crisis or other crisis of concern, to disentangle their own experiences and expectations of a Portland Police officer from a Campus Police officer. Our task group commends Campus Public Safety Officers' move towards disarmament. We believe that having alternative first response teams, such as Portland Street Response, to individuals in crisis on campus is an important next step for Portland State University.

4. Levinson, J. (2021, June 28). Man killed by Portland police called 911 himself, seeking mental health care. *OPB*.
<https://www.opb.org/article/2021/06/28/man-killed-by-portland-police-called-911-himself-seeking-mental-health-care/>
5. Wilson, J. (2021, April 24). Portland police killed a homeless man. Now the city faces tough questions: The killing of Robert Douglas Delgado last week came after months of protests against police violence in the city. *The Guardian*.
<https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2021/apr/24/portland-police-killing-homeless-man-robert-delgado>
6. Cruz Guevarra, E. (2019, January 8). Portland Police Shot Man Who Struggled With Mental Illness, Family Says. *OPB*.
<https://www.opb.org/news/article/andre-gladen-mental-illness-portland-police/>
7. Cruz Guevarra, E. and VanderHart, D. (2018, May 24). Man Shot at Portland Homeless Shelter Moved Towards Officers With Knife, Video Shows. *OPB*.
<https://www.opb.org/news/article/john-elifritz-investigation-mental-health-crisis-portland-shelter-shooting/>
8. Bernstein, M. (2021, July 21). City Council approves \$600,000 to settle suit in Portland police officer's fatal shooting of Terrell Johnson. *Oregon Live: The Oregonian*.
<https://www.oregonlive.com/crime/2021/07/city-council-approves-600000-to-settle-suit-in-portland-police-officers-fatal-shooting-of-terrell-johnson.html>

Task Group Recommendations and Preamble: Responding to Individuals in Crisis

- A. Prioritize unarmed responses to individuals in crisis as demonstrated by a reduction in armed responses to individuals in crisis.¹

Consensus response: all 1s, 2s, and one 3

- B. Support the continued development and neighborhood expansion of Portland Street Response (PSR) through an intentional partnership between PSR and Portland State University.
- a. Should a partnership with PSR become untenable and/or not be able to meet the campus needs, PSU will consider alternative response models for individuals in crisis that align with RCSC Guiding Principles.

Consensus response: all 1s and one 3

- C. Educate and train the campus community on alternative response (to armed responses) options to an individual in crisis. These alternatives could include building our individual and collective skills in compassionate care, de-escalation, bystander intervention, mental health first aid, overdose response workshops and other programs.

Consensus response: all 1s

1. Before the consensus check, one RCSC member offered some concerns related to the recommendations proposed by the Individuals in Crisis task group. Those concerns generally included, but were not limited to: the definition of stakeholders in ‘individuals in crisis’ was inclusive of houseless individuals (they had hoped it was to solely include students, faculty, staff, and visitors to campus); anticipated challenges to implement and support these new policies with such a broad scope and limited resources at the outset; concerns that the wording for ‘reduction in armed responses’ might have a negative impact by encouraging CPSO to not respond to an incident if they happen to have a firearm on them, in order to achieve a metric of unarmed responses; and an observation that the Portland Street Response unit is not yet-set up.

Task Group Recommendations and Preamble: Frameworks for Campus Safety**Holistic Campus Safety Principles****A. Guiding Principles of PSU Campus Safety**

- a. CPSO should prioritize a community-based, relationship-oriented policing approach to campus security and policing, in which public safety is co-created and shared by CPSO and the PSU community. This includes key tenets of shared responsibility for public safety, valuing community engagement, relationship building between CPSO and the PSU community, involving the PSU community in safety measures, allowing for the community to have a voice on public safety issues, and enhancing CPSO transparency and accountability. Decision making, safety policies, and policing strategies should be viewed in light of community-based policing goals.
- b. The PSU community should have voice and input into major CPSO policy changes and the future vision of the department. Efforts should be made to hear from diverse parts of the PSU community prior to instituting major changes and for strategic planning.
- c. CPSO should prioritize unarmed responses and create alternative responses to low threat level calls on campus. This includes developing alternative responses besides CPSO to calls involving individuals in crisis.

Consensus response: all 1s and 2s

- B. Improve access by providing regular communication channels and opportunities between the Chief, CPSO, and the PSU community (students, faculty, staff). Suggestions include open regularly scheduled office hours, coffee with PSU community groups, enhanced interactive social media, a regularly and responded to monitored email address, and/or an interactive PSU campus safety app (accessible reporting mechanism, not having to call to report low level issues, request walk escort).

Consensus response: all 1s

Task Group Recommendations and Preamble: Frameworks for Campus Safety**Holistic Campus Safety Principles**

- C. Improve the process for the submission of complaints and commendations regarding public safety and the work of the CPSO, and enhance civilian oversight and review of incidents, complaints, and commendations.
- a. Provide full information on the process for filing a complaint or commendation, together with an online submission form, on the main page of the UPSOC website, and clearly link to it from the CPSO website.
 - b. Enhance the authority and responsibility of an appropriate Civilian Oversight Agency (COA)—which may be either the UPSOC or some committee or office yet to be created—to receive and investigate in the first instance both complaints and commendations regarding the CPSO, except where complaints fall within the jurisdiction of the Office of Global Diversity and Inclusion (GDI).
 - c. Grant the appropriate COA the authority to compel employee testimony in its review of incidents and investigation of complaints.
 - d. Hire trained staff support for the appropriate COA to better enable it to fulfill its investigative role.
 - e. For the sake of transparency in civilian oversight, publish the full text of the current CPSO Policy Manual on the CPSO website.
 - f. For the sake of transparency in civilian oversight, publish the CPSO's Annual Campus Security Reports and Annual Fire Safety Reports covering at least the most recent three years on the CPSO website.

Consensus response: all 1s and 2s

Task Group Recommendations and Preamble: Frameworks for Campus Safety**Holistic Campus Safety Principles**

- D. Increased training to facilitate non-violent and equitable interactions across campus:
- a. For CPSO: training on procedural justice, implicit bias, de-escalation techniques, resolving conflict with individuals in crisis. Facilitate CPSO's familiarity with topical experts on campus, including faculty and staff.
 - b. Training for campus community: As a community engagement activity, CPSO could offer/sponsor, in conjunction with other relevant organizations, trainings like first aid, CPR, self-defense workshops, and relevant safety classes to the campus community.

Consensus response: all 1s and 2s

- E. Reflecting a community-oriented policing model, further involve students in aspects of safety on campus in partnership with CPSO. Provide additional opportunities for students to dialogue with CPSO, provide input, have a voice regarding campus safety issues, and feel shared ownership of campus safety. This might include the creation of new student advisory groups, safety liaisons, and/or student internships.

Consensus response: all 1s and 2s

- F. Increase connections and communication between CPSO and positions on campus who often contact CPSO (e.g. community and student facing positions such as resident hall staff, RAs, SHAC, library staff). Provide additional support and resources for these campus safety-related positions as needed. Continue enhancing existing campus partnerships and develop new partnerships where needed. Formalize this group, promote connections between the group and CPSO, and meet regularly with CPSO to discuss issues and needs.

Consensus response: all 1s

Task Group Recommendations and Preamble: Frameworks for Campus Safety**Holistic Campus Safety Principles**

- F. Expand and promote the PSU safety escort service program, which provides a safety escort when walking on campus. Following best practices at other universities, potentially train and involve students as safety escorts (providing an option other than CPSO officers to respond). Consider providing golf carts or other measures to promote program visibility and enhance public safety.

Consensus response: all 1s

- G. Review, track, and evaluate the new CPSO changes in policy to unarmed patrols and their impact on PPB's involvement on PSU campus. After twelve months and at annual intervals, UPSOC or a newly appointed committee will revisit data and review CPSO policy for the impact on violent incidents on campus, PPB's involvement on campus (e.g., presence on campus, response time), the number of times PPB is called, and the impact on perceptions of safety from the campus community. Initiate review of policies in light of any critical incidents on campus. The committee will create a plan to revise PSU's relationship with PPB, if needed.

Consensus response: all 1s and 2s

Task Group Recommendations and Preamble: Frameworks for Campus Safety**Holistic Campus Safety Principles**

- H. UPSOC or a newly appointed committee will:
- a. Establish an annual data collection focused on campus safety metrics and community perceptions of safety on campus.
 - b. Annually survey the campus on safety outcomes and perceptions of campus safety and attitudes toward/experiences with CPSO.
 - c. Prioritize responses from all aspects of the campus community.
 - d. Consider both raw safety data and survey results within each year's review.
 - e. Keep standardized questions to track changes across time.
 - f. Improve CPSO data tracking system to monitor safety data (e.g., data beyond Clery reporting).
 - g. Establish a set review of data, recommendations, and implementation actions that is communicated back to the PSU community.
 - h. Review all CPSO armed responses (e.g. any time a CPSO officer accesses their firearm in response to an incident) on a quarterly basis, to include the reason for the level of response with the ability to request more information, as needed.
 - i. Make data available to the PSU community.

Consensus response: all 1s and 2s

Closing Notes

Words cannot accurately describe the experience each member of the RCSC felt throughout this process. This report is the culmination of so much passion, courage, heart, awareness, fear, frustration, and pride surrounding the way PSU relates to campus safety.

Like much of the work done at PSU, this was done by individuals with a myriad of backgrounds, experiences, and goals. One of the hallmarks of this work was our ability to work together and ultimately pass every single recommendation with consensus.

Additionally, the members of the RCSC would like to note the unique relationships and perspectives built through this process of consensus and collaboration over majority rule. Many meetings, whether virtually or in-person, often culminated in heavy hearts and running imaginations of the scope of this work. The final months of this work were heavy with concerns of stalling out, of not finalizing recommendations, of clearing the mud and figuring out how to create a cohesive list of recommendations in a final report.

Using consensus over majority rule allowed us to more critically discuss recommendations, down to the word and phrase, discussing intent versus probable outcome, and listening to contrasting opinions and goals. Consensus allowed us to reach out continuously to ensure we were all a part of this process and not felt intentionally left out.

This work is heavy, and it impacts different groups and individuals disproportionately and in unique ways. This work is not complete. This is only the next step in addressing PSU's history of campus safety, security, welcoming, and belonging. We look forward to furthering the relationships made in this process, both within our own committee and with community partners and leaders across Portland State University, in the next stage of delegation and implementation of our recommendations to President Percy.

Thank you for taking the time to read this report.

Be safe, be well

The Reimagine Campus Safety Committee

Oregon's Kitchen Table Community Engagement Report

This page is meant to denote the transition from the RCSC Final Report to the Oregon's Kitchen Table Community Engagement Report, which was done in conjunction with the RCSC and its Community Engagement Task Group. It's main sections are listed below.

→ **Executive Summary - Page 1**

- About Oregon's Kitchen Table
- Outreach and Engagement
- Findings

→ **Section 1: Project Goals and Design - Page 3**

- Engagement Goals
- Design
- Participation / Outreach

→ **Section 2: Themes & Perspectives in Each of the RCSC Topic Areas - Page 6**

- Perspectives on Welcoming and Belonging on Campus
- Common Themes and Perspectives on...
 - Physical Environment - Page 8
 - Campus Safety - Page 9
 - Responding to Individuals in Crisis - Page 12

→ **Section 4: Recommendations For Future Engagement - Page 14**

→ **Section 5: Conclusion - Page 14**

→ **Appendix - Page 15**



Oregon's Kitchen Table – PSU's Reimagine Campus Safety

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In winter 2021, Portland State University President Steve Percy convened the Reimagine Campus Safety Committee (RCSC) – made up of students, faculty, and staff – to understand the safety, welcoming, and belonging needs of the campus community and to reimagine an approach to meeting those needs. The RCSC organized itself into five task groups:

- community engagement;
- frameworks for campus safety;
- the physical environment;
- responding to individuals in crisis; and
- welcoming and belonging

As part of that work, Oregon's Kitchen Table staff provided support to the Community Engagement Task Group. In spring 2021 the task group developed a set of values and practices to guide community engagement, which the RCSC adopted, and then conducted a series of initial interviews with individuals and small groups to develop a community engagement and outreach plan. In October 2021 task group members and Oregon's Kitchen Table supported community conversations on campus safety and belonging and hosted an online survey.

The executive summary provides an overview of the engagement process as well as high level findings. The attached report contains the following sections:

- A description of the project's goals and design;
- Themes and commonly shared perspectives related to the RCSC topic areas noted above
- Recommendations for future engagement efforts on this topic
- A brief conclusion; and

- Appendices, including annotated survey results.

ABOUT OREGON'S KITCHEN TABLE

Oregon's Kitchen Table is a program of the National Policy Consensus Center in the College of Urban and Public Affairs at Portland State University, and was created by a group of non-partisan, non-profit community organizations dedicated to helping Oregonians have a voice in public decision-making. Oregon's Kitchen Table creates public consultations to allow Oregonians to weigh in on policy questions posed by elected officials and public managers. OKT has been used at the state, local and regional levels to gather feedback from a wide variety of Oregonians using both our online surveying tool to solicit input from thousands of participants and in-person community gatherings of various sizes and formats. The online surveying tool is not intended to be a scientific study; rather it is one way to allow the public to share ideas, beliefs, and values with decision-makers.

We are committed to engaging community members from all walks of life – particularly communities that typically have not been represented or engaged in public processes - to achieve deep engagement. Using culturally specific and targeted outreach, Oregon's Kitchen Table has a particular focus on hearing from Oregonians who have been left out of traditional engagement processes. We work with organizers, translators, and interpreters so materials and online and in-person consultations are available for Oregonians who speak a wide variety of languages and learn in a variety of ways. We recognize that people bring all different levels of knowledge and familiarity regarding issues / policies. We use approaches to ensure those who may not have as in-depth knowledge can still respond and share what they believe and have experienced.

OUTREACH AND ENGAGEMENT

The purpose of this was to hear from members of the PSU community about what is most important to them about campus safety and feeling welcomed on campus. RCSC members also were interested in hearing people's priorities related to potential recommendations and understanding more about people's experiences on campus. The interviews and outreach we conducted over the spring and summer focused on learning what might be the best ways to reach and engage different people on campus and helped to inform the task group's design approach (the protocol for these interviews is attached as Appendix A). We focused time, energy, and resources on working with community groups on campus to host community gatherings where people could share their stories and hear from one another. OKT and the task group supported those conversation through providing a discussion guide, professional facilitation in person or over Zoom when requested, and funds for food or room rentals. We also offered an online survey as an option should people prefer that method, particularly with many COVID restrictions still in place.

FINDINGS

The following commonly held perspectives emerged across various discussions, PSU community groups, and the responses through the online survey:

- Most people think about safety on campus to some degree. Of those who responded to the online survey, 48% said they think about safety “a lot” while 44% responded “a little bit.” In many of the community conversations and interviews, we heard that safety and belonging on campus were important issues for people.
- People often pointed to feeling a sense of belonging on campus related to specific groups they are a part of, whether that was a person’s own department, academic cohort, cultural or ethnic affinity group, identity-specific resource center, or employee union.

The results of this engagement provide a sense of the values and beliefs held by those who participated at this particular time. The engagement process also coincided with PSU’s reopening campus for in-person learning after many months of exclusively on-line learning as well as the start of a new school year. Many people were still working remotely or attending classes remotely during this time. Additionally, the PSU Campus Safety Office also announced a shift from armed to unarmed patrols in September 2021, which many people had very little to no time to experience prior to this engagement process. In general, the impacts from COVID, particularly the spread of the Delta variant at this time, continued to be front and foremost for people and naturally required a considerable amount of time, energy and resources, leaving little to no capacity for other activities. COVID restrictions still in place also limited both people’s experiences with or on campus as well as their ability to gather in conversation with one another.

SECTION 1: PROJECT GOALS AND DESIGN

ENGAGEMENT GOALS

The purpose of this Oregon’s Kitchen Table project was to hear from people in different roles and communities within the PSU campus community about their experiences, values, and priorities for campus safety and belonging.

The Community Engagement Task Group developed a set of values and best practices that were adopted by the RCSC in May 2021 to guide engagement efforts. These values and best practices are attached as Appendix D. As part of those practices, the RCSC focused its engagement efforts for the fall of 2021 on members of the PSU community (e.g. students, faculty, staff, alumni) and surrounding neighbors (e.g. businesses on / next to PSU campus, regular visitors to campus, adjacent schools, churches, institutions, and community-based organizations).

Key values that guided the engagement effort included:

- Utilize an equity, justice, and human rights lens in the engagement process to ensure that PSU’s BIPOC communities and other disenfranchised communities (e.g.

individuals experiencing homelessness and / or mental illness) that have been and are least engaged and most disparately impacted by traditional policing tactics are both engaged effectively in the process and have meaningful input in the outcomes of the RCSC's work and recommendations.

- Recognize that communities themselves know how to best communicate and deliberate within their communities.
- Recognize that authentic engagement is based in relationships that take time to develop and sustain.
- Outreach and engagement activities should be co-created with communities.

With these four values guiding the engagement effort, the Task Group and other RCSC members reached out to a variety of campus community groups and leaders to plan outreach and engagement activities, including:

- Faculty, staff and student affinity groups and employee resource groups
- Cultural resource centers
- Faculty and staff employee unions, including PSU American Federation of Teachers (PSUFA-AFT), Portland State Chapter American Association of University Professors (AAUP), Service Employees International Union (SEIU) Local 503, OPEU
- Colleges and schools
- Student activities and leadership programs
- Students and staff living and working in residence halls on campus
- People who operate businesses, such as food carts, on PSU property or adjacent property

DESIGN

In order to reach a wide variety of historically and currently underserved communities throughout Oregon, Oregon's Kitchen Table developed a multi-faceted set of engagement activities. OKT and the task group conducted one-on-one and small group interviews, group listening sessions, and presentations and discussions at standing / existing community meetings. The task group had originally envisioned in-person activities for fall 2021 that would provide the space for people to both share their own experiences as well as gain a better understanding of what their fellow campus community members experience on campus. By August 2021, as the Delta variant took hold in Oregon, it became clear that while PSU was re-opening for in-person learning, many people were opting to remain remote in their work and learning and many in-person activities were still restricted. In discussions and interviews late in the summer, we heard from many people that at this time, an online survey would be the most effective way to reach community members.

There were, however, still a small number of groups who wanted to be able to bring their group together in-person – some for the first time in over 18 months - and saw an in-person discussion on this topic as a critical issue to gather around. The task group focused, then, on offering resources to help people gather – either in person or virtually – as they chose. For some groups, this meant a socially distanced meal in-person. For others, this meant a lunch time facilitated discussion over Zoom. The task group

developed a discussion guide and offered facilitators as well as resources to pay for meals, room rentals, childcare or other elements needed to support people coming together on this topic.

Through this combination of activities, we aimed to hear from a wide variety of the campus community on two key strands:

- A. The RCSC had an interest in making sure that there was an opportunity for people to share their own experiences and to understand experiences across different and intersecting identities for campus community members. In listening sessions, interviews, and the online survey, people shared both their own stories as well as stories from their friends, families, neighbors, co-workers and classmates. These stories help to create a deeper understanding of how people view and experience safety and welcoming on campus.
- B. As the RCSC considered potential recommendations on campus safety and belonging to present to President Percy, they sought a sense of what people thought of potential options and recommendations. Each of the task groups (community engagement; frameworks for campus safety; the physical environment; responding to individuals in crisis; and welcoming and belonging) developed a few questions for both discussions and the online survey to better understand what people thought of potential options in those different areas.

PARTICIPATION / OUTREACH

OKT and the task group contacted over 30 individuals and organizations to introduce the project and set up small group or individual interviews. OKT conducted a combined total of 20 interviews by email, Zoom, or phone to plan outreach and engagement activities for fall 2021. This initial set of outreach activities took place from June 2021 to September 2021. A total of 811 campus community members responded to the online survey on Oregon's Kitchen Table's platform. Some of the community gatherings held in fall 2021 were voluntarily self-organized by RCSC members, people or groups who OKT and the task group contacted, or were arranged and facilitated by task group members. Approximately 10 community conversations, with over 70 people participating. These activities were conducted between October 1 and October 31, 2021.

Outreach for the community conversations and online survey was mainly conducted through individual emails and telephone calls as well as time on the agenda for OKT at some existing / standing meetings. Outreach also included an email to Oregon's Kitchen Table email list, social media posts, and distribution by individual networks. Many of the individuals and groups who we contacted in the initial spring / summer outreach also shared the survey through their own listservs, newsletters, and networks. President Percy also sent out an email to the entire campus community inviting people to participate.

SECTION 2: THEMES & PERSPECTIVES IN EACH OF THE RCSC TOPIC AREAS

Throughout the various forms of engagement, OKT and task group members asked questions intended to help the RCSC better understand what people thought about the topic areas that RCSC members and task groups were working on. Each task group provided a set of questions to the Community Engagement group to use in developing the content and questions for the online survey and discussion packets. Some of these questions sought to learn more about people's experiences on campus while others sought to understand where people's priorities were regarding potential recommendations. The discussion packet for community gatherings is included as Appendix B. Appendix C, the annotated survey results, includes the questions posed in the online survey.

PERSPECTIVES ON WELCOMING AND BELONGING ON CAMPUS

People often pointed to feeling a sense of belonging on campus related to specific groups they are a part of, whether that was a person's own department, academic cohort, cultural or ethnic affinity group, identity-specific resource center, or employee union. In these groups, people shared that they often feel in community, accepted, and recognized.

Some responses mentioned that they had felt belonging in specific places on campus, such as the Library, the Park Blocks, SHAC, or particular academic buildings / spaces tied to a department. Many people also noted that campus or community-specific events on campus and opportunities to share food and a meal were very important in creating a sense of belonging and welcomeness on campus. We often heard that spaces geared around eating (Victor's, for instance) were safe, welcoming spaces.

Quotes on places or situations where people have felt a sense of belonging on campus:

"I felt most engaged with the community when we came together in the same space. Those feeling are not regular and that should occur more often."

"As a Black-Latinx staff member on campus, I really haven't really felt a sense of belonging on campus to be honest, on a physical sense. On an emotional level, my sense of belonging has really been through the affinity staff groups on campus. Those connections have made me feel seen and share/hear stories from other BIPOC folx on campus about their experiences."

"Rallies where PSU's multiple labor unions are supporting each other-- I felt everyone had a common goal of excellence in caring for students' and employees' needs. There is also often an element of hospitality, which I have also felt at events at the Native Center and Smith."

Quotes on places or situations where people have felt a sense of belonging on campus (cont.):

"I feel safe going to the Multicultural center, it is welcoming, and the people are kind."

"My first meeting with the Pacific Islander club made me feel the most welcomed. I feel the most sense of belonging when I'm with my fellow AA and PI friends."

"A time I felt like I had a sense of belonging on the campus was when student start coming up to me to join in their discord server or their clubs. I thoughts its was nice that y had confident to come up to a stranger and make easy conversation rather than my old college where the student mainly focus on the study and not the community."

While some people responded that they felt like they "always" belonged or belonged "everywhere" on campus, other people stated "never" or "nowhere."

People also shared stories of interactions with fellow PSU community members that, because of their identity or personal views, contributed to feeling like they didn't belong on campus. Some people also said that they thought that aspects of their identities – whether racial or ethnic identity, status as a transfer or older student, position as staff or adjunct faculty, or gender identity or sexual orientation – also played a role in how they felt about belonging on campus. One person who identified as "older than most and in the minority" said, "I don't remember anyone specifically being rude. I just had natural feelings of being different than most."

Quotes about times when people didn't feel a sense of belonging:

What does sense of belonging mean?? Belonging to what? I have my own family and friends. This is a place of work where I commit to doing the best job I can. All I want from my place of employment is fairness and ability to do my job well."

"As a long-time adjunct instructor, I am aware of feeling expendable and less valuable as a campus community member. I am excluded from most opportunities for advancement, and while I know that my director is invested in maintaining my level of employment, I also know that I can be unemployed or underemployed with little notice, in any and every term. I am aware of feeling like I will never be secure in my employment or fully vested in or valued by the larger institution."

Quotes about times when people didn't feel a sense of belonging (cont.):

“This is a complex question. It's not so much that I don't feel a sense of belonging when I am not among my Asian American colleagues. When I am in spaces (meetings, classes, etc.) and am the only Asian American in the room, I notice. It doesn't always feel uncomfortable but it is something I notice. I think there is untapped potential at PSU; when people feel a strong sense of belonging, they feel more connected to the university and when they feel more connected, they are more invested.”

“I don't really feel like I fit anywhere. I'm a transfer student, but I don't feel like I fit with the TSRC. I have accommodations, but I don't feel like I fit with the DRC. I just don't feel like I belong generally speaking.”

There was not clear, strong support for any one particular type of initiatives under consideration that could increase people's sense of belonging at PSU (the largest percentage, 27%, of responses selected “other initiative not listed”). The initiative that had the highest amount of support was “A faculty and staff that reflects my background and life experiences” (16%). The initiative with the lowest amount of support was, “A more central events calendar to share and learn about upcoming cultural events, celebrations and educational experiences” (8%).

COMMON THEMES AND PERSPECTIVES ON PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

In both community conversations and the online survey, there was some agreement about how people viewed the physical environment and safety on campus. Many people pointed to the Park Blocks or parking garages as areas of campus where they had safety concerns. Parking garages and stairways were selected as the top places where people felt unsafe (27% selected parking garages and 17% selected stairways) in responses to the online survey. In both the survey and community conversation, some people shared that the Library and SHAC were spaces where they felt most safe on campus. There was, however, a wide range of responses on specific buildings, parts of buildings, and areas of campus.

We also heard that time and condition played an important role in how safe people felt within a space. Many people said that a feeling of a lack of safety was due to the time of day rather than a specific physical space. Evening or night time on campus was often a key component in making people feel unsafe. As one person said in a community conversation, “I might feel both safe and unsafe in a space but it depends on what time of day it is.” Some people shared that the reason they felt unsafe in particular spaces was due to the conditions of those spaces and / or the presence of trash or bodily fluids. Several people shared that the presence of people in tents or encampments on campus contributed to feeling unsafe.

Quotes related to the physical environment on campus and safety

"I do feel safe on campus when the sun is out. Walking with friends contributes to my feeling safe on campus. I would feel safer if I saw security around me."

"What would make me feel safer would be more blue lights, because the distribution for them isn't the best in my opinion."

"As somebody with a small daughter attending Helen Gordon, I would like to see more attention given to that part of campus. There are encampments and people with clear mental health issues that we have to navigate almost daily."

"The building I work in has a lot of hidden spaces and tight corners and I am constantly aware of the entrances and exits in my area. I don't feel comfortable in my area when working alone in a building and I communicate to my colleagues if I am leaving them alone."

I am fairly concerned with the MAX/Bus Mall along SW 6th Ave. Many of the negative interactions I have seen and/or hear where PSU community members feel uncomfortable (or physically and verbally assaulted) takes place here. Additionally, I feel unsafe in areas like parking structures and waste corrals. I consistently see illegal/obscene activities such as drug use/dirty needles, defecating/urinating, and trash/litter a strew."

When asked about the spaces on campus where people think there should be key card access, many people thought at least one or some spaces should require key card access. 2% of responses selected "I don't think any of these places should require key card access." Residence halls (34%) and buildings with academic spaces (26%) were the top two places that people thought should require key card access. During community conversations, however, while people said they thought that requiring key card access did make them feel safer, people didn't think it was used consistently or as intended.

COMMON THEMES AND PERSPECTIVES ON CAMPUS SAFETY OFFICE

Participants were asked a set of questions regarding both how they were currently feeling about public safety responses on campus as well as what their hopes were for the future regarding a campus public safety office. We heard a mix of responses about how people perceived campus police, how safe people thought with the newly established unarmed patrols and potential incident responses by the Portland Police Bureau, and what kind of campus public safety office they would like to have. In community conversations, some people expressed feeling safer now that campus patrols are unarmed while others expressed feeling less safe. Still others said they weren't sure, either because the shift to unarmed patrols was so recent or because they still felt like the campus safety officers presented as a police force with uniforms and access to weapons on campus. Some of the discussions

focused on feeling like there was a lack of connection or trust with PSU's CPSO and some members of the PSU community, either because a police presence made them feel unsafe or because they felt like their own safety concerns weren't taken seriously. Other people said that the presence of campus security officers made them feel safer while others said they felt like they never saw safety patrols on campus.

In the online survey, 35% of responses said they felt "safer than before" with the change to unarmed patrols. 29% felt the same as before and slightly less (23%) felt less safe than before.

When asked how people felt about having the Portland Police Bureau responding to situations on campus regarding their safety, responses were split (32% each) between "same as before" and "less safe than before." 22% said they weren't sure and 13% said "safer than before."

There was also disagreement in what kind of campus public safety office people would like to see in the future, with 36% selecting "Campus police force, patrolling unarmed with access to firearms at a secure location on campus" and slightly fewer (34%) selecting "Fully disarmed campus safety office (not a police force), using the Portland Police Bureau for policing."

People also were divided in how they felt at this time about the current Campus Public Safety Office and its role on campus now. The largest group of responses (26%) said "neither positive nor negative." "Very Positive" and "Very Negative" both received 10% of responses.

When people were asked why they felt the way they did about CPSO, common responses included:

- Uncertainty about how well people can respond to question about how they feel about CPSO now since many people haven't been on campus since the changes were put in place
- Some people shared that they don't have any sense of CPSO, either because they haven't interacted with them in the past or because they weren't aware of them to begin with
- Some people are not optimistic about CPOS's new role on campus, either because they are concerned about PPB's ability to respond when called or because they are concerned about what the new role really means. Some see it not as disarming and would like full disarmament. Others are confused about what the new role is and are also concerned that CPSO also doesn't have a grasp on what the new role is.
- Some people shared that they wanted to see emphasis and resources go to non-CPSO approaches to safety as the primary focus.
- Some people shared that they felt CPSO was doing the best they could, given their role and limited resources.

- Some people said that while they supported disarming CPSO, they would rather have a campus security office respond to incidents on campus than PPB. Some people felt that way because they distrusted PPB even more. Others felt that way because they thought PPB was not able to adequately respond in time.
- Some people said that besides disarming CPSO, they did not want to see any presence of a uniformed police force on campus.
- Other people said they felt like PSU was moving in the right direction and wanted to see more training in non-violent responses for CPSO.

Quotes on a campus office of public safety and patrols

“I think the current chief would like to build out a different structure to create community and safety for all AND I think there has been a lack of transparency in that PSU has not truly disarmed as they had previously stated, which ultimately makes our campus less safe.”

“One dead person. Much higher costs. The City has an armed police force, why do we need one? Duplication of efforts and costs? We are an urban campus, deeply enmeshed into the city. The city police should be in charge of security in an urban campus.”

“I'd much rather have campus police responding than PPB. PPS has shown us this past year how little they care about people in Portland. I am particularly concerned for students and faculty of color, along with houseless folks in and near campus, who should be treated as humans who deserve dignity and respect. PPB has a history of violence and disproportionate response. While I have concerns about armed police, I'd much rather we have a smaller force that's diverse and trained in de-escalation and to work with our campus population. I've had some good interactions with CPSO.”

“Campus police should act like a police department, and people making decisions about public safety should be actual trained public safety personnel and not just random people who have never been in a conflict or had to deal with a person high on PCP.”

“Haven't been on campus with any regularity the past 19 or so months so difficult to say. Need to experience being back for a longer period of time before I can more adequately answer that question”

“The circumstances surrounding the death of Jason Washington is why I do not believe PSU campus safety officers should be armed. However, I will say that I have personally only had positive interactions with PSU campus safety.”

COMMON THEMES AND PERSPECTIVES ON RESPONDING TO INDIVIDUALS IN CRISIS

In both community conversations and the online survey, participants were generally supportive of PSU creating a partnership with community-based organizations that provide support and stabilization to individuals in crisis (such as Portland Street Response). Even when not asked this question directly during community conversations, people often raised the idea themselves. In the online survey, 70% of participants said they strongly supported such a partnership and an additional 17% somewhat supported it. Only 4% responded with either “somewhat oppose” or “strongly oppose.” Support for this potential partnership was evident across all racial and ethnic groups and roles on campus.

There was less agreement about the types of trainings that people would like to see offered on campus. Some people said that they didn’t think it was the role of students, faculty, adjunct faculty or staff on campus to be trained to respond to individuals in crisis. Other people felt like professionals with much more in-depth training and experience (such as social workers) were the appropriate people to respond to individuals in crisis versus people on campus who have had only some training. When asked on the online survey to rank potential types of training, “De-escalation training” received the highest rankings, with 41% ranking this first and 27% ranking it second. Next, “Bystander intervention” was ranked by 24% of respondents as their top choice and 25% as their second. While these two types of training were the top two choices across groups of adjunct faculty (38% and 31%), faculty (50% and 26%), staff (41% and 25%), and students (36% and 23%), there were stronger preferences for these trainings among faculty and staff for these trainings.

Of the types of trainings that some people said they would like also like to see offered, the following was suggested:

- Anti-racism, anti-homophobia, anti-transphobia, and other training on themes around equity
- Basic self-defense and specifically women’s self-defense
- Trainings related to bias and / or implicit bias
- CPR and basic medical skills
- Education around campus safety and policing grounded in racial equity
- Mental health training
- Suicide prevention training

Several people also said they would like either more information or understanding about the resources or contacts available instead of calling the police. Some people mentioned they simply wanted quick access with information (e.g. a small index card they could put in their pockets or bags) while others wanted to see training or education on such resources.

Quotes replated to responding to individuals in crisis

“I’ve seen many people on campus who aren’t part of campus that are clearly in distress and need help. I feel awful and I don’t know what to do. It doesn’t make me feel unsafe but they clearly feel unsafe and I don’t know what to do.”

“I would like to see students (or others) hired and trained in all of the above to be 'safety officers' (needs a better name). Training would also include getting backup from professional support as needed. They should be identifiable and enough of them that they have a felt presence. They should NOT look or act like police in any way and should be known as someone who can peacefully help. I would like to have much more of this and fewer police officers.”

“I would like widely available info on how to handle people in crisis that are not an immediate threat. Houselessness, addiction, and mental help seem like three separate issues that require their own response. None of the responses should involve campus police.”

COMMON THEMES AND PERSPECTIVES ON COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

We primarily learned about how PSU community members prefer to be engaged on important issues like campus safety and belonging through interviews conducted during summer 2021, which shaped some of the engagement approaches we used in this project. These were described in Section 1: Project Goals and Design. We also did hear more about people’s desires and preferences additional related to community engagement during community conversations and through one of the online survey questions.

Surveys (23%), email (20%), and “through my department or office” (15%) were the top three choices for the methods that people wanted to stay engaged on both this topic and future topics. We also heard that the following are important in creating spaces for people to engage:

- Hospitality: Food and events designed intentionally to be welcoming for people
- Human connections: Personalized approaches with clear communication channels and human beings that people on campus can recognize / know giving and responding to those communications
- Accountability: Decision makers acknowledge and respond to what the community shares as specifically as possible, in a timeline manner

Quotes related to community engagement / communications

“We know that there are people working on these things, but there’s no clear channel and when there is a channel, there’s never a feeling that you’ve connected with a human being who has understood the problem and then explained what they’re doing.”

“Tell us, ‘Here’s what we heard you saying, here is what we’re doing to address your concerns, ideas’ with specifics.”

“Creating events and opportunities to have open discussions. Lots of people are impacted by things but do not know who or where to bring concerns.”

“I felt most engaged with the community when we came together in the same space. Those feeling are not regular and that should occur more often.”

“Campus safety is not the most engaging thing. Tie it to something fun like games and in collaboration with student orgs.”

In addition to its work gathering people’s perspectives and beliefs on campus safety and belonging, the Community Engagement Task Force took these learning and developed a set of recommendations (attached as Appendix D) that were then adopted by consensus by the Reimagine Campus Safety Committee.

SECTION 4: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE ENGAGEMENT EFFORTS

As the RCSC moves forward with its recommendations and the university considers implementation, there will need to be ongoing engagement opportunities, particularly as people continue to return to campus and experience the changes CPSO has made in fall 2021. In addition, as PSU and other communities emerge from COVID, there will likely be different opportunities for engagement.

There are opportunities for further engagement, particularly with groups that have been and are disproportionately impacted by policing. Of note, members of the task group connected with and were able to interview the Street Roots ambassador program lead. While Street Roots was engaged in other community engagement projects in fall 2021 during the time of the RCSC engagement activities, there was interest in creating a space for a community gathering including PSU staff, faculty and students as well as people experiencing houselessness in the area. One forum for such a community conversation could be through Street Roots’ Ambassador Program’s Civic Circles.

No matter what recommendations the RCSC makes and the university then adopts, we encourage PSU leaders to return to the PSU community and share how their thoughts and ideas contributed to decisions about safety and belonging on campus. Even if university leaders make decisions that are different than what people shared through this engagement process, it will be critical to let the campus community know that they were heard and considered.

SECTION 5: CONCLUSION

The topics of safety, welcoming, and belonging on campus are of importance to many members of PSU's campus. In the midst of continued Covid precautions, the spread of the contagious Delta variant, the start of a new school year, and the re-opening of campus after 18 months of remote learning, teaching, and work for many PSU community members, over 800 people shared what they thought. The high levels of interest and passion are evident in the hundreds of comments and stories that people shared in both the online survey and community conversations. We hope these findings will help all of PSU, from the Reimagine Campus Safety Committee to PSU leadership to community members across campus, in considering what we want for campus safety and belonging.

RCSC Community Engagement Task Group Questions and Background Information for Spring 2021 Outreach

INTRODUCTION:

Please share the following background about RCSC's work:

Last fall, President Percy announced the creation of a new Reimagine Campus Safety Committee (RCSC). The RCSC is made up of students, staff, and faculty - and is set up to understand the array of safety needs of the campus community and to reimagine an approach to meeting those needs that reflects our commitment to racial justice and human dignity. The RCSC exists to develop recommendations for not only new functional approaches to campus safety and security, but cultural shifts that will call forth a new vision of a welcoming campus that promotes well-being and creates the conditions for genuine belonging for all members of the PSU community. RCSC is now working on developing a comprehensive set of recommendations for additional changes to the University's approach to campus safety and security. The RCSC has formed five task groups to carry out the work of researching approaches across several key areas: Community Engagement, Frameworks for Campus Safety, Physical Environment, Responding to Individuals in Crisis, Welcoming and Belonging.

Role: I am currently part of efforts to help engage our entire PSU community in the RCSC process as a member of the RCSC's task group on community engagement. While the RCSC examines different topics and thinks about potential recommendations related to safety and belonging at PSU, the community engagement group members are focused on connecting to members of the PSU community to both share about the effort and to learn about best ways to engage and connect with people when the time comes to get perspectives widely across campus. We know that we are often asked to share our views a lot over time, even around this topic, and we know that many of us have changed our views or had different experiences since the last time we were asked. I / We are spending my / our time now on this because we think that we have a chance to involve more people at this time and there is a lot of power in having all of us take part. We see this as a valuable opportunity to be in discussion with each other as members of the PSU community.

The community engagement group has identified some core values in guiding how RCSC ensures that there is community engagement. Those values are:

- Engagement and outreach activities that prioritize respect and authenticity
- Recognize that the topics of safety and belonging are potentially triggering for some members of our community and should be approached with intentionality and care.
- Recognize that communities themselves know how to best communicate and deliberate within their communities.

We know that this takes time and relationships are critical, so we are spending time with our fellow members of the PSU community over these months to meet various campus communities where they are, rather than asking the community to come to us. It is also

important to us that we spend time and effort in making sure we are identifying the best ways of engaging with underserved communities.

QUESTIONS TO GUIDE THE DISCUSSION ON ENGAGEMENT

- How would you like to participate - logistically? What about other people in your community at PSU?
- What are the best ways to communicate (and ways to avoid - eg. modes that no one in your community will see or open)? Email / phone / face-to-face
- What does your community gather around? Food (preferences and things we should be aware of)? Activities?
- Are there any specific dates we should avoid planning around, if you are willing to be a part of the process? When do people in your community tend to NOT be available?
- What needs are you aware of that members of your community have in order to be able to participate? (childcare, food, setting, meeting set-up, materials, etc.)
- What are the best times to communicate (day / time of day / time of year)?
- Who should we be talking to who we might not have thought of? How might we reach them?
- Who might be the best person to ask you or your community to engage on this topic?
- What is the one thing you want us / the larger RCSC to know?
- Are there any questions we aren't asking around outreach / engagement that you think we should be asking?

Context around topic questions

Main Question: What are some of the things we should be aware of about safety / belonging for you and your community?

- How do you define safety and / security?
- What does safety on campus mean to you?
- Why is safety important to you?
- What are the factors that contribute to a lack of safety on campus?

- When have you felt the most welcomed on campus? When and where do you most feel a sense of belonging?
- What questions do you ask yourself about this topic?

THANK YOU FOR SHARING WITH US! Let them know what next steps are and thank them for their time, insight, and perspective. And we intend to build engagement activities and outreach efforts based on what they've shared in the coming months.

Reimagine Campus Safety Guidance for Community Gatherings / Discussions

Below is some guidance on how to structure a discussion about safety and belonging at PSU with your group. We hope it helps you! Please feel free to host your gathering in-person, on Zoom, or whatever platform you prefer.

WELCOME:

Please use whatever activity or welcome you and your group prefers.

INTRODUCTION:

Please share the following background with the group:

Last fall, President Percy announced the creation of the Reimagine Campus Safety Committee (RCSC) made up of students, staff, and faculty. The RCSC's role is to understand and analyze the safety needs of the campus community and to reimagine an approach to meeting those needs that reflects PSU's commitment to racial justice and human dignity. The RCSC will be giving recommendations to PSU leadership for new approaches to campus safety and security and a new vision of a welcoming campus that promotes well-being and genuine belonging for all members of the PSU community.

Oregon's Kitchen Table - a program at Portland State University that helps people in Oregon share their ideas, opinions, and beliefs about different issues - is helping the RCSC to engage the whole PSU community. As the RCSC drafts their recommendations, they want to hear from you about what is important to you!

We're engaging the PSU community in a number of ways: individual and small group interviews, community gatherings, and an online survey - <https://bit.ly/welcome-campus>. All responses will be collected by Oregon's Kitchen Table. OKT will provide a summary report to the RCSC.

Make sure to let people know that their responses will be confidential!

None of the responses will be tied to your name or anything else that identifies you.

QUESTIONS TO GUIDE THE DISCUSSION

Here are some questions for you to get the conversation started. We understand that a conversation will take its own course, but these questions are focused on some of the work that RCSC has undertaken.

- What's one word, phrase, or image that comes to mind when you think about safety, welcoming, or belonging on campus?
- The RCSC is also interested in learning about what makes people feel like they have a place at PSU. What are the situations or places on campus where you have or haven't felt belonging?

Follow up: What is it about those places or situations that have either made you feel like you belong or don't belong? What might increase your sense of belonging on campus?

- What are the places (buildings, spaces) on campus that are most safe and / or most unsafe for you?

Follow up: What is it about those places that make you feel safe or unsafe? What might make you feel more safe in the places where you don't feel safe?

- PSU's Campus Public Safety Office (CPSO) recently completed its transition to unarmed patrols on September 1st. That means that sometimes the Portland Police Bureau may be called to respond to a violent situation. In light of the new change, how are you feeling about Campus Public Safety Office (CPSO) right now?

Follow up: How would you like an office of campus safety to feel or look like in the future?

- If you were in crisis, how would you like to be responded to and supported? This could be in relation to mental health concerns, substance use concerns, basic need concerns, or acute or chronic health needs.

Follow up: What kinds of training about un-armed alternative responses when an individual is in crisis would you like to see offered on campus?

- What are the ways you or your community might want to continue to stay engaged about important policy issues on PSU's campus?

THANK YOU FOR SHARING WITH US! Your input will be combined with other input from community gatherings and survey responses in a report to the RCSC this fall. Invite your classmates, colleagues, and fellow PSU community members to host their own community discussion or contribute their thoughts through the online survey (<https://bit.ly/welcome-campus>). Oregon's Kitchen Table will share a summary report here <https://www.oregonskitchentable.org/results>.

Please include the following for your summary (You can email this or submit via this [Form](#)):

1. A description of the group, including:
 - a) ongoing function of the group (if any) or the host organization
 - b) how many people were present
 - c) general breakdown who was there (e.g. affiliation to PSU, age, gender, race) as observed. Please use a general description rather than personally identifying information.
2. A summary of responses to the questions you discussed. It does not need to be word for-word, rather a general sense of the responses and where there is agreement and disagreement.

3. Any area or topic where there seems to be confusion or strong conflict.
4. Any memorable quotes from participants
5. Send your meeting summary to Sarah at Oregon's Kitchen Table (sagiles@pdx.edu) or you can submit your summary via this [Google Form](#).

Reimagine Campus Safety FAQs for Community Gatherings / Discussions

1. Where and when should we hold a community gathering to discuss safety and belonging at PSU?

We have throughout October to share what we think with the Reimagine Campus Safety Committee. They will be giving their recommendations to PSU leadership at the end of fall term. Please hold your discussion and provide your summary by October 29th. Some groups might prefer to meet in-person over a shared meal while others might prefer to gather over Zoom or another online platform. How that happens is entirely up to you and what your group is comfortable with. You may already have regular check-ins or meetings set up for the month of October and choose to use that time to devote to focusing on safety and belonging at PSU for the month. You know your group best!

2. How can I help make people feel comfortable being part of a discussion on campus safety / belonging?

One key point to make early on is that you won't be sharing people's names or other personally identifiable information from the discussion. Instead, you can tell them that you're taking notes to summarize the points people are making. You can also let them know about Oregon's Kitchen Table, who you're sending the summaries to. Tell them OKT is a program at PSU that has been supporting people throughout Oregon to share their thoughts, values and beliefs about important topics and decisions for over a decade. You can point them to our past projects / reports so they can see how any information shared with us is presented / reported - <https://www.oregonskitchentable.org/results>.

3. What's the best way to start the discussion?

Often posing a warm up question in small groups or pairs can help people ease into the discussion. It might be as simple as "How often do you think about safety at PSU" or "What's one word or image that comes to mind when you think about safety at PSU?" We suggest starting with people's own experiences for a few questions before moving into some of the questions that ask people to think about the larger community and potential recommendations. You might even invite people to sit with the question for a minute or two, then write it down or draw a simple picture. Sometimes people aren't comfortable sharing their personal experiences or stories, especially about topics like safety and belonging. Asking them to write or draw rather than talk might be more comfortable.

4. If the conversation naturally flows into another question, can we move on in the agenda or do we need to go back and re-ask the question?

Feel free to let the conversation flow, as long as you're seeing that people are getting the opportunity to talk and that people are providing responses to some of the questions. You may want to say, "We've already talked some about this next question, but I want to make sure everyone gets a chance to weigh in, so I'll read it and give us a few minutes on it. If people feel like we've already discussed it, we can move on." If someone is jumping way ahead, you might want to stop them and say, "we'll be getting to that a bit later" if they're taking up a lot of talking time. But if it's short and flows naturally, let it flow! This is an opportunity for people to talk about what they are most interested in regarding safety and belonging on campus as well as to get important thoughts and opinions on specific questions that RCSC has.

4. What if someone shows up late?

If someone arrives late, welcome them and ask them to take a seat and say their name and give a very brief explanation of where you are in the agenda ("Thanks for joining us, Lilliana, we've been talking about times we've felt safe or unsafe on campus. Take a minute to settle in and we'll finish with Joe and Treasure who are both up next."). So, yes, bring them into the conversation! You might want to try to catch them at the end and say, "Lilliana, you joined us late, was there anything else on your mind you wanted to share, even as we've moved on in the agenda?"

5. What if someone comes in but then leaves?

There may be many reasons why someone decides not to stay. They may have a different idea of what a community meeting looks like; they may have expected a public hearing (and either prefer to sit in silence and listen or to have their 3 min at the microphone); they may have thought it was an open house where they could drop in on for 5 minutes. It may depend on the size of the group - some people might be intimidated by a smaller group (feel more pressure to talk) or by a larger group (too many voices). If someone gets up in distress at any time, one of the hosts or facilitators can go check on them and ask if they are all right or need assistance. If they seem hesitant to be there before the meeting has started, let them know that they're welcome and you'll be getting started soon, but also point them to other opportunities (online survey, for instance). You can ask them if they have any questions for you before you start (They may want to know what the meeting will "look" like - how long, what format, agenda), too, as that might help them feel more comfortable.

6. What if someone or a couple of people are really focused on a specific issue or initiative and want to only focus on that?

When you're kicking off the meeting, let people know that our goal for the meeting is to hear from everyone about what safety and belonging looks like for them or what hopes they have for PSU campus as a whole. You can also let them know that they can share in detail via the online survey - <https://bit.ly/welcome-campus>. We often see that people are going to talk about that one thing (whatever is "the thing" for the project / issue), whether they're asked to think more broadly or not, so we say, "People are going to talk about what they want to talk about." Be aware of whether that specific issue is dominating the conversation, though, and make sure to make room for others - either

other thoughts / ideas or other people. You can do this by saying, “Let’s open the discussion up to see if others want to share what they think about safety and belonging on PSU’s campus. What other thoughts do people have?” You can also say, “we’ve got a lot to cover that the RCSC wants to hear from us about. They’re also interested in how we all might better support each other if we are in crisis. Let’s move to those questions now.”

7. What if members of my group can’t attend our discussion? How else can they share? Anyone is welcome to respond to questions in an online survey. Oregon’s Kitchen Table will be collecting meeting summaries, responses to the online survey, and interviews and putting together a summary report for RCSC. Please share the link to people in your networks! And people who attend your discussion are also welcome to respond to the survey - and encouraged to invite their friends, colleagues, classmates to respond, too. Here is the link - <https://bit.ly/welcome-campus>. It will be live October 4th and we have through October 29th to share what we think.

8. How can I get assistance in hosting or facilitating a discussion with my group? OKT has some resources to support community groups who are hosting a discussion on this topic. This might be a student group or a staff affinity group or a club. We can help you with whatever needs (food, childcare, space) your particular group might have. Please contact us! We can also arrange for translations should you prefer to discuss in a language other than English, and if you need help facilitating the discussion, we have a packet with templates and sample language. We can also work with you to figure out who might be the right person to facilitate your discussion if you’re seeking outside facilitation help. You can contact either Zachary Mettler (mettler@pdx.edu) or Wendy Willis (wwillis@pdx.edu) to talk over what help you might be looking for.

9. How can I help if people might become upset during our discussion?

In many discussions around important issues and decisions, people can be passionate, frustrated, and uncertain. We’ve found [this resource from the Institute for Local Government](#) to have some helpful tips. Much of it is from the perspective of government officials and in the setting of a public hearing rather than a community gathering. But it’s important to acknowledge that people’s feelings are real and that members of your community may not be in agreement with each other. Here are 3 key tips:

- Have guidelines at the beginning of the gathering about how people can effectively make their views or concerns known.
- Acknowledge how people seem to be expressing their feelings. Ask clarifying questions, like “Can you share more about what you feel that way?”
- Asking about values and interests instead of focusing on positions can also help people to hear and understand each other. Here’s an example:
 - “I think children are vitally important to our community” (value);
 - “I want the health of our children protected” (interest);
 - “I want a legislated limit on the amount of mercury in our water supply” (position)

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Welcome!

Last fall, President Percy announced the creation of the Reimagine Campus Safety Committee (RCSC) to understand the safety, welcoming, and belonging needs of the campus community and to reimagine an approach to meeting those needs. You can read about more about the RCSC here - www.pdx.edu/president/reimagining-campus-public-safety.

Now the members of the RCSC would like to know what is important to you about safety and belonging on campus. Would you please fill out this survey to share your thoughts about that?

How can I help?

Please fill out this short survey if you are a member of the PSU community or immediate neighbor. You and others can fill it out until October 31, 2021. You can also host a community gathering to discuss these topics! Your input will help RCSC members as they draft their recommendations. Please ask your fellow students, friends, neighbors, and colleagues to take this survey or host a community gathering.

There are resources to support you in hosting a conversation such as a discussion guide, professional facilitation, and funds for food or room rental. Please contact Oregon's Kitchen Table at info@oregonskitchentable.org for support in hosting a discussion.

Will my answers on this survey be private?

Yes. All answers will be private (confidential). They will not be tied to your name or contact information, if you choose to share those. You can read about Oregon's Kitchen Table's privacy policy here - <https://www.oregonskitchentable.org/privacy-policy>. If you have any questions, please email Oregon's Kitchen Table at info@oregonskitchentable.org.

We know these topics can be difficult to process, and we appreciate the time and effort you'll put into responding. You are a part of the PSU community and your input means so much. If you would like supports during or after responding to the survey, here are some resources:

- For PSU Students - Center for Student Health And Counseling - <https://www.pdx.edu/health-counseling/>
- For PSU employees - Employee Assistance Program - <https://www.pdx.edu/human-resources/employee-assistance-program-eap>
- For all members of the PSU community - Multnomah County Behavioral Health - <https://www.multco.us/behavioral-health/mental-health-crisis-intervention>

SURVEY QUESTIONS

Note: Some percentages may not be exactly 100% due to rounding.

1. How much do you think about safety on campus?

RESPONSE CATEGORY	N=804
A lot	48%
A little	44%
No at all	7%
I'm not sure / don't know	1%

2. Could you share with us a place or situation where you have felt a sense of belonging on campus?

Responses to Question 2 available in separate file

3. Could you share with us a place or situation where you haven't felt a sense of belonging on campus?

Responses to Question 3 available in separate file

4. Where on campus do you feel most safe? Please select all that apply.

RESPONSE CATEGORY	N=2645
Residence hall	4%
Academic or classroom buildings	20%
Spaces that host public events or services (such as Smith or Lincoln Hall)	12%
Library	16%
Stairways	3%
Elevators	4%
Restrooms	5%
Club spaces	5%
Recreational spaces	8%
Resource centers	10%
Parking garages	1%
Outdoor areas	9%
Other...	3%

5. Where on campus do you feel most unsafe? Please select all that apply.

RESPONSE CATEGORY	N=2089
Residence hall	2%
Academic or classroom buildings	3%
Spaces that host public events or services (such as Smith or Lincoln Hall)	4%
Library	2%
Stairways	17%
Elevators	11%
Restrooms	11%
Club spaces	1%
Recreational spaces	2%
Resource centers	1%
Parking garages	27%
Outdoor areas	16%
Other...	3%

6. Can you share with us what it is about those spaces that make you feel either safe or unsafe?

Responses to Question 6 available in separate file

7. Some people say they feel safer if some spaces require a key card for people to enter those buildings. Others say requiring key card access makes them feel less welcome. Below are some of the spaces where this issue has come up. Please select the spaces on campus where you think there should be key card access. Select all that apply.

RESPONSE CATEGORY	N=2026
Residence halls	34%
Buildings with academic / classroom spaces	26%
Spaces or buildings where public events are held or services are available to the public (examples: Smith, FMH, Lincoln Hall)	13%
Library	20%
I don't think any of these places should require key card access	2%
Other...	5%

8. There are a number of initiatives under consideration that could increase people's sense of belonging at PSU. Imagine you have \$100 to spend towards these initiatives. You can choose to use

all \$100 on one initiative. Or you can choose to spread it out in any way you want. Your total has to add up to \$100. Make sure you only use whole dollar amounts (for example, 10) and not numbers with decimals (for example, 10.5) and that the last box adds up to \$100.

RESPONSE CATEGORY	N= \$79,600
Ombuds Office (confidential conflict managers - https://bit.ly/ombuds-examples)	11%
Stronger support for cultural resource centers and events from academic departments (e.g. course credit for events, event outreach)	14%
Stronger peer mentorship services offered through cultural resource centers and other affinity spaces on campus.	12%
A faculty and staff that reflects my background and life experiences.	16%
Partnerships with PSU alumni for support, as well as networking and job searching.	12%
A more central events calendar to share and learn about upcoming cultural events, celebrations and educational experiences	8%
Enter your \$100 here if you would rather spend it on other initiatives not listed here.	27%

9. How does the change to unarmed patrols make you feel regarding your safety?

RESPONSE CATEGORY	N=806
Safer than before	35%
About the same	29%
Less safe than before	23%
I'm not sure / don't know yet	14%

10. How does having PPB responding to situations on campus make you feel regarding your safety?

RESPONSE CATEGORY	N=806
Safer than before	13%
About the same	32%
Less safe than before	32%
I'm not sure / don't know yet	22%

11. As people talk about the future of the Campus Public Safety Office, there are a range of options. Right now, what is your preference? Select the one that you most prefer.

RESPONSE CATEGORY	N=801
Fully disarmed campus safety office (not a police force), using the Portland Police Bureau for policing	34%
Campus police force, patrolling unarmed with access to firearms at a secure location on campus	36%
Fully armed sworn PSU police force	18%
Other...	12%

12. In general, how are you feeling about CPSO and its role on campus right now?

RESPONSE CATEGORY	N=802
Very positive	10%
Somewhat positive	20%
Neither positive nor negative	26%
Somewhat negative	15%
Very negative	10%
I'm not sure / don't know yet	20%

13. Can you share with us why you selected the response that you did for the question above?

Responses to Question 13 available in separate file

14. How do you feel about PSU creating a partnership with community-based organizations that provide support and stabilization to individuals in crisis (such as Portland Street Response)?

RESPONSE CATEGORY	N=784
Strongly support	70%
Somewhat support	17%
Neither support nor oppose	9%
Somewhat oppose	2%
Strongly oppose	2%

15. There is interest in establishing ways to educate and train the campus community on un-armed alternative responses when an individual is in crisis. Please rate which you would be most interested in learning about or being trained in as a member of the PSU community. Start with 1 being the one that you are most interested in out of all of these. Number all the way down to 5, with 5 being the one that is of least interest to you. Only use each number one time.

RESPONSE CATEGORY	1 N=758	2 N=752	3 N=747	4 N=741	5 N=743
Building our individual and collective skills in compassionate care (e.g., trauma informed care)	17%	17%	22%	23%	20%
De-escalation techniques (techniques to help calm a situation)	41%	27%	16%	10%	6%
Bystander intervention (recognizing a potentially harmful situation and choosing to respond in a way that could positively influence the outcome)	24%	25%	20%	18%	14%
Psychological First Aid (providing basic psychological care in the short-term aftermath of a traumatic event)	10%	20%	26%	29%	16%
Overdose response workshops (e.g., training in administering a medicine like Naloxone that quickly reverses an opioid overdose)	9%	12%	17%	20%	43%

Due to numbering error in programming, there was no question with the label 16.

17. Are there other types of trainings you would like to see offered to the campus community?

Responses to Question 17 available in separate file

18. What are the ways you or your community might want to continue to stay engaged about important policy issues on PSU’s campus? Please select all that apply.

RESPONSE CATEGORY	N=2425
-------------------	--------

Through surveys (online or paper)	23%
As part of community meetings that I or people in my community already attend	11%
Listening sessions set up specifically about a particular policy issue	13%
Exchanges on social media like Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, Tik Tok or Clubhouse	5%
Through my classes	8%
Through my department or office	15%
Through my residence hall or residential advisor (RA)	3%
Email	20%
Mailings to an address or PO Box	1%
Other...	1%

19. Is there anything else you would like to share about safety and / or belonging at PSU with the RCSC?

Responses to Questions 19 available in separate file

20. How do you identify as a member of the PSU campus? Please select all that apply.

RESPONSE CATEGORY	N=1067
Student	33%
Alumni	10%
Staff	27%
Faculty	15%
Adjunct Faculty	5%
Vendor or work for a business on or next to PSU campus	1%
I work for a school or organization next to PSU campus	1%
I live on or next to the PSU campus	6%
I am not currently a member of the PSU community	0%
Other...	2%

21. How long have you been affiliated with PSU?

RESPONSE CATEGORY	N=803
I am new to the PSU community	13%
Under two years	12%
2 - 5 years	27%
6 - 10 years	18%
11 - 15 years	11%
16 - 25 years	13%
More than 25 years	7%
Prefer not to answer	<1%

22. Which races and ethnicities do you consider yourself to be? Please mark all that apply.

RESPONSE CATEGORY	N=848
Asian/Pacific Islander	8%
Black/African American/African/Caribbean	5%
Hispanic / Latinx	10%
Native American/American Indian/Native Alaskan	4%
Middle Eastern/North African	2%
White/Caucasian	71%

23. Is there anything else you'd like to share about yourself that affects your experiences with safety at PSU?

Responses to Question 23 available in separate file

These Recommendations were presented to the full Reimagine Campus Safety Committee and adopted by consensus by the RCSC on November 19, 2021.

Ongoing Engagement

1. The university, through a designated implementing body, should follow up on the work of RCSC during the 2022-23 academic year. In addition to traditional evaluation practices, the university should engage the whole campus community to determine whether the plan adopted based on the work of RCSC has been implemented and whether campus community members feel a greater sense of safety, welcoming, and belonging as a result. Input from the community should be utilized to evaluate current policy and help determine future policy.
2. The university should engage the community every year around questions of safety, welcoming, and belonging. That engagement should have a special focus on those disproportionately affected by policing. Future, community engagement efforts can and should be combined with efforts related to other university priorities.
3. The university should report back both on the results of engagement efforts so that members of the community can interpret and make meaning out of the results and on how the input informed any decisions made by university leadership.
4. It is important for the implementing body to plan to engage with people living on the street on and near campus. As part of that effort, the implementing body should work in conjunction with Street Roots to participate in their Civic Circles conversations about safety, welcoming, and belonging, in the Spring of 2022. Oregon's Kitchen Table is willing to provide support to ensure that those conversations take place.
5. In future engagements, the implementing body and the university more broadly should use fall term as a period of preparation and relationship building and should engage the campus community in winter and/or spring term.

Values and Best Practices

6. Future engagement efforts should be guided by the values and best practices developed and adopted by the RCSC:
 - Engagement and outreach activities prioritize respect and authenticity
 - Recognize that the topics of safety and belonging are potentially triggering for some members of our community and should be approached with intentionality and care.
 - Use a trauma-informed approach to ensure that communities that are particularly impacted by issues of safety and violence are invited to participate actively, authentically, and in the ways that make the most sense for them.
 - Recognize that communities themselves know how to best communicate and deliberate within their communities.
 - Recognize that authentic engagement is based in relationships that take time to develop and sustain.
 - Outreach and engagement activities should be co-created *with* communities.
 - Think creatively about engagement. Engage and conduct outreach in targeted and intentional ways that may vary and will not look completely uniform.

- Engagement on this topic should be ongoing and any framework should include periodic check-ins with community members.
- Decision makers should commit to keeping members of the community informed and aware of how their input is being used.
- Recognize that members of the PSU community hold multiple and concurrent axes of identity and belong to different groups and communities.

The university should include these practices to conduct future engagement efforts:

- Focus engagement on members of the PSU community (e.g. students, faculty, staff, alumni) and surrounding neighbors (e.g. businesses on / next to PSU campus, regular visitors to campus, adjacent schools, churches, institutions, and community-based organizations).
- Stakeholders should be brought in as partners as early as possible to help co-create the questions and design the engagement process.
- Utilize an equity, justice, and human rights lens in the engagement process to ensure that PSU's BIPOC communities and other disenfranchised communities (e.g. individuals experiencing homelessness and / or mental illness) that have been and are least engaged and most disparately impacted by traditional policing tactics are both engaged effectively in the process and have meaningful input in the outcomes of the RCSC's work and recommendations.
- Focus on co-creating engagement and outreach activities and provide ample time to build those relationships and partnerships.
- Provide a spectrum of engagement activities that ask for different levels of vulnerability and involvement (from a brief, anonymous online survey on one end, to storytelling and story exchanges on the other end of the engagement spectrum).
- Develop a privacy policy and protocol that is utilized across different engagement activities to ensure anonymity in what community members share.
- Create a variety of types of outreach and engagement activities and allow for space for approaches that emerge during the process.
- Create ways for RCSC and PSU leadership to "share back" with the community what they have heard through engagement and intentions to respond.

Build and Sustain Community Engagement Infrastructure

7. The university should create a standing fund to provide resources to organizations and individuals on campus who host community engagement efforts or assist with engagement efforts in other ways.

8. When the university wishes to hear from the whole campus community about significant policy decisions and issues, it is important to mobilize the university's communication's resources in multiple forms and at multiple points throughout the community engagement period. Doing so underscores how much people's voices matter to the university and it ensures that people who may receive one form of communication but not another form of communication, are more likely to see the opportunity to share what they think. We recommend repeating communications at least three times throughout the engagement period across multiple communications platforms.

These include:

- Direct single-subject emails from the lead decision-maker inviting and encouraging participation;

- Postings in regular newsletters;
- Social media postings across platforms;
- Requests to the various university colleges, departments and units to communicate through their channels.

9. Develop a campus community organizing and engagement cohort composed of a multi-racial, multi-lingual, multi-ethnic group of students who are interested in learning more about community engagement and community organizing. Those students would learn about best practices, develop relationships with PSU community members, and participate in campus-wide and other community engagement efforts. The students could potentially be drawn from existing classes or programs, and they should receive credit and/or a stipend for their work. Oregon's Kitchen Table or some other coordinating entity could help create a collaborative partnership to create and sustain the program.

Eliminate Barriers to Gathering

10. The university should conduct an assessment of potential barriers to gatherings and engagement on campus.

11. The current food service contract and/or other policies require that student and other on-campus groups use university food service for gatherings. The food provided is sometimes either prohibitively expensive and/or not culturally and religiously appropriate. In recognition that culturally appropriate food is central to gathering and a sense of belonging, the university should eliminate any contracts or policies requiring campus gatherings to use PSU food service.

12. Some campus spaces have become too expensive for student and other on-campus groups to use for gathering, forcing some members of the community to meet either in less than optimal spaces or off-campus entirely. The university should ensure that spaces on campus are affordable for members of the campus community to easily gather, particularly in spaces that are culturally significant for particular groups.

13. Students and student organizations should have input into contracting and fee structures for the use of campus facilities.

14. The university should create flexible gathering spaces, including covered outdoor seating spaces, where people can gather and meet in small groups.

15. It is important that all community members feel they can easily and fluently engage in community conversations. The university should investigate which language PSU community members feel most comfortable communicating in. The university should create policies to meet those language needs. (translations, interpreters, relevant departments or community organizer cohorts per Recommendation #5).