

Campus Life and Safety and Security Task Force

MINUTES

Tuesday, April 29, 2008, 2 p.m.

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS: Chancellor Glen D. Johnson welcomed the attendees, including new members Janet Cunningham, Northwestern Oklahoma State University, and Donnie Nero, Connors State College, and began introductions. Also in attendance were: Phil Berkenbile, Oklahoma Department of Career and Technology Education; Joe Harroz, University of Oklahoma; Kerry Pettingill and Gary Davis, Oklahoma Department of Homeland Security; Lee Bird, Oklahoma State University; Kay Martin, Francis Tuttle Technology Center; Michael Storm, Langston University; Roger Webb, University of Central Oklahoma; Tom McKeon, Tulsa Community College; Doug Major, Pioneer Technology Center; Terri White, Oklahoma Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services; Jeanette Nance, Governor's Office; Dustin Somers, Oklahoma Daily; Dale Dewalt, The Journal Record; and Pam Boatright, Amy Goddard, Kermit McMurry, Amanda Paliotta, Kurt Snodgrass, Ben Hardcastle and Rebecca Richardson, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM JANUARY 8 AND MARCH 31 MEETINGS: Johnson asked task force members to review the minutes of the Jan. 8 and March 31, 2008, meetings. The minutes were approved by a voice vote.

OPENING REMARKS: Johnson stated that there had been a positive reaction to the final report of the task force and a great deal of activity since then, including the extension of the taskforce by Gov. Henry, the task force's special meeting and resolution regarding the "guns on campus" legislation, the annual Campus Security Summit at the University of Oklahoma, and a campus violence seminar sponsored by the Council on Student Affairs and Oklahoma State University.

Johnson noted that there had been four major attempts to pass the "guns on campus" legislation and that higher education, law enforcement and other concerned parties built a very strong effort to defeat the measure. He added that more attempts to pass the legislation were likely during the next legislative session and that the task force would need to continue to be vigilant.

Phil Berkenbile complimented the UCO and OSU events and said that his staff had recommended a proactive instead of reactive approach to "guns on campus" issue by suggesting legislation from the anti-guns-on-campus side.

Lee Bird suggested that the task force could look into offering a compromise by identifying circumstances where it would make sense to allow certain students to carry firearms on campus, e.g., current police officers carrying identification.

UPDATE ON PROGRESS MADE ON CLASS RECOMMENDATIONS: Johnson asked subcommittee chairs to present any updates on progress toward the final report recommendations.

Kerry Pettingill reviewed new training opportunities provided by the Office of Homeland Security this year. He added that Gary Davis from OHS had started the process of formulating working groups to get campuses NIMS-compliant. Pettingill stated that NIMS compliance was one of the final report recommendations and that it would address 10 additional recommendations as well.

Pettingill said that a request had been made to the U.S. Department of Homeland Security to bring in experts to help develop a common emergency response plan that would cover all potential hazards. He said the template would be a national model that could be delivered to other entities. He added that the response survey indicated that all the campuses have a plan but not all plans cover every type of incident.

Bird suggested that the plan should be customized for each tier to allow for differences among the types of institutions. Pettingill said the template would help campuses strengthen their current plans and that it would be customizable.

Berkenbile suggested a joint meeting to look at the plan and determine which institutions have elements of the plan already in place. Pettingill said that would happen.

Gary Davis noted that training would be provided on implementing the template. Bird noted that staff besides risk management should attend such training because there would need to be buy-in from multiple groups for the plan to be successful. Johnson suggested executive training on NIMS compliance

DISCUSSION OF CLASS FINAL REPORT PRIORITIES: Ben Hardcastle presented a PowerPoint overview of the final report recommendations and asked for discussion about what recommendations the task force should focus on.

Notification: Tom McKeon suggested conducting another survey to determine which institutions have implemented notification systems and what those systems are.

Response: Pettingill noted that several recommendations were covered in the earlier discussion about the emergency response template. Bird suggested making training part of the template and including a list of resources. McKeon suggested including narrative on best practices and a calendar for training. Joe Harroz added that an overview of suggested training and a checklist for tracking purposes could prevent the template from becoming too complicated.

Pettingill suggested creating a “compliant campus” model in which institutions would have to meet certain criteria to claim status. He said campuses could include evidence of their status on signage, marketing materials, grant applications and more.

Counseling: Terri White stated the need for more counselors on campuses and noted that it was an issue of funding.

Bird said institutions should be encouraged to include on their Web sites their compliance with the Drug Free School and Community Act, as well as online resources on DFSCA. She also suggested training on FERPA, HIPAA, etc. at the annual Legal Issues in Higher Education conference. She mentioned that Gene Deisinger, who spoke at UCO’s security summit, could perhaps be invited to make a presentation on threat assessment.

Laws and Policies: Bird suggested providing online resources about FERPA, HIPAA, etc. on the CLASS Web site.

Johnson suggested providing relevant training at the legal issues conference.

Funding: Bird suggested making training a priority for funding. Berkenbile said the task force should discuss possible efforts to pursue funding for CLASS during the next legislative session.

GRANT AND FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES: Amanda Paliotta provided a handout on a potential grant program for the task force. She said the purpose would be to provide non-recurring funds to campuses to help defray the cost of security measures and better meet campus security needs in the areas of notification, response and/or counseling. She said funding criteria would include demonstrable need, a detailed description of the project based on best practices, a detailed budget, existing and proposed collaborations with other groups, and leverages with other funding sources. She added that priority would be given to proposals in the areas of NIMS compliance, training, threat assessment resources and mutual assistance agreements.

Paliotta described the proposed grant process. She said grant applications would be accepted annually and would be reviewed by the Funding Subcommittee, who would make recommendations to the task force. She added that quarterly reports would have to be submitted for each grant and that those reports would be reviewed by the subcommittee and forwarded to the task force. In addition, a financial audit would be performed on each grant.

Bird stated that it was unrealistic to rely on grant funds unless the campus has a grant writer because the effort can be exhausting and often results in a small amount of money. She asked if a grant proposal template would be available, and Paliotta replied that one could be provided.

Janet Cunningham asked if OSRHE could pursue grant funding that would benefit multiple small institutions that may not have the resources to pursue grants. Hardcastle said that OSRHE provides grant workshops throughout the year but also has limited resources in that area.

Johnson suggested that the task force look more in-depth into the issue.

SUBCOMMITTEE STRUCTURE: Johnson provided an overview of the current subcommittee structure and asked if the task force wanted to maintain the current structure and participants. Harroz and Martin noted that their subcommittees needed co-chairs.

Bird suggested exploring the need for a training subcommittee that could focus on how to move forward, what training to offer and what the funding needs are. She also suggested that the task force keep a catalog or audit of what resources are being made available and a record of what is accomplished.

VENDOR PRESENTATIONS: Johnson said that campuses have received numerous solicitations from vendors for various security-related services and products. He asked for discussion on how those and future requests should be handled.

Johnson asked if subcommittees should prescreen vendor proposals and then invite approved vendors to make presentations to the full task force or if the task force would prefer to review all of the proposals. McKeon replied that it depended on the nature of the product or service and that if a subcommittee had expert knowledge on a particular proposal, then prescreening might be appropriate. Bird pointed out that vendors might want more interaction with the campuses and suggested scheduling back-to-back vendor presentations and creating an information clearinghouse for institutions. Pettingill, Davis and Hardcastle discussed coordinating a vendor fair for vendors to spotlight their products and services to campuses.

OPEN DISCUSSION: Hardcastle asked staff liaisons to contact their subcommittee chairs in the next couple of weeks to verify subcommittee priorities.

Johnson urged task force members to keep focused and not lose the momentum created in the past few months. He acknowledged that the funding picture was troubling but added that much could be accomplished just by working collaboratively. He noted that very few task forces are reauthorized, so the extension of CLASS was affirmation of its excellent work.

FUTURE MEETING DATES: Hardcastle suggested the next meeting occur in the next six to eight weeks and said he would e-mail the members some possible dates for feedback.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.