

Campus Life and Safety and Security Task Force
MINUTES

Tuesday, September 25, 2007, 9 a.m.

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS: Chancellor Glen D. Johnson welcomed the attendees and began introductions. Also in attendance were: Phil Berkenbile, Oklahoma Department of Career and Technology Education; Tom McKeon, Tulsa Community College; Kerry Pettingill, Oklahoma Department of Homeland Security; Joe Harroz, University of Oklahoma; Terri White and Steven Buck, Oklahoma Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services; Lee Bird, Oklahoma State University; Doug Major, Pioneer Technology Center; Bill Pennington, Murray State College; Kay Martin, Francis Tuttle Technology Center; Tom McDaniel, Oklahoma City University; Jeanette Nance and Joel Gavin, Office of Gov. Brad Henry; Linda Mason, Kurt Snodgrass, Pam Boatright, Debra Herlihy, Erin Taylor Weathers, Amber Coulter, Jim Purcell, Amanda Paliotta, Donna Combs, Kermit McMurry, Bob Anthony, Ben Hardcastle and Rebecca Richardson, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education; Olaf Standley, OSRHE Student Advisory Board; Bruce Lochner, University of Central Oklahoma; and Susan Simpson, The Oklahoman.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM AUGUST 30 MEETING: Johnson asked task force members to review the minutes of the Aug. 30, 2007, meeting. The minutes were approved by a voice vote.

OPENING REMARKS: Johnson referred members to copies of news articles about the recent shooting incident at Delaware State University and noted the ongoing importance of the task force's work.

Johnson reminded members that the next task force meeting was scheduled for Dec. 13, during which the final report would be presented. He said that the subcommittees were continuing work on their reports but added that not all of the counseling and self-assessment surveys had been received from the campuses. He said that Ben Hardcastle was working with those institutions, and Hardcastle said he expected to have all the surveys in the next couple of days. Phil Berkenbile said he would work with any career technology campuses that had not submitted surveys.

Berkenbile said that he had been looking into SchoolReach, a messaging system that can be used with text and voice messages and e-mail for emergencies, weather notification and more. He said he would forward an e-mail with more information.

STATUS OF SURVEYS SENT TO INSTITUTIONS: Jim Purcell provided a general progress report on the counseling and self-assessment surveys. He said that 66 surveys had been received so far and that results would be distributed to the subcommittees after late surveys were received and processed. Although preliminary, he noted that several trends were already emerging.

Counseling Survey: Twelve percent of campuses have limits on how many times a student can visit a counselor on campus.

Rural institutions were more likely to indicate they were less prepared than urban campuses in responding to behavior or incidents "regarding threats (terroristic or personal) against others at the campus" and for dealing with "suicide ideation, gestures and attempts."

Rural institutions also indicated a greater interest than urban institutions in training on "working effectively with police and other first responders" and in "crisis management."

Self-Assessment Survey: Career technology centers were less likely to have a plan to address pandemic flu but were more likely to have:

- Training for students, staff and faculty.
- Emergency drills.
- First aid capabilities.
- Security plan for building access.
- Badges for guests.
- Capability to notify faculty and lock down classrooms in an emergency.

Community colleges were less likely to have:

- A plan for hazardous materials.
- A crisis management team in place.
- An employee roster on file, including emergency contact numbers.
- Redundant backup of communication capabilities.
- A fireproof safe/storage area for records.

Universities were more likely to have:

- A crisis hotline.
- Aerial photographs of campus.
- Emergency generators on campus.

Purcell added that all data could be sent to subcommittee chairs as soon as the remaining surveys were received and processed. He asked when to move forward without the missing surveys, and Hardcastle suggested the end of the week. Purcell said that would make it possible for him to send information to the chairs by Oct. 2.

SUBCOMMITTEE PROGRESS REPORTS:

Notification: Subcommittee co-chair Doug Major reported that the subcommittee had identified five key considerations for its report.

1. **Diversity of campus environments and populations served:** Campuses vary in size, environment and populations served, and no one process will fit all campuses.
2. **Variety of notification technologies and their benefits and limitations:** Many options exist, from basic to high-tech, and all have advantages and limitations. Campuses should evaluate the available options and choose what allows them to provide the quickest notification of the most people possible.
3. **Linkages with key law enforcement, emergency, public agencies and other potentially impacted organizations:** Campuses should explore areas of collaboration to leverage local resources, including the development of Memorandums of Understanding.

4. **Awareness, education and training:** For even the best plan to be successful, campuses must provide faculty, staff and students with materials and exercises that familiarize them with the policies and procedures in place.
5. **Testing and evaluation:** Plans must be tested regularly for the systems to work properly.

Co-chair Tom McKeon commended the members of the subcommittee for their work and said the report was close to the final draft stage.

Response: Subcommittee chair Kerry Pettingill said the subcommittee was awaiting the full results of the self-assessment surveys so that it could determine best practices and recommendations to include in its report.

Counseling: Subcommittee co-chair Lee Bird reported that the subcommittee had engaged in productive conversations about the needs not only on campuses but in the communities as well. For example, she noted the lack of psychiatric beds in Stillwater and how that would affect Oklahoma State University students seeking treatment so that they could return to classes. She noted that funding was a major issue and asked that Johnson delay the funding report until the other reports are completed and needs are assessed and dollar figures placed on them.

Co-chair Terri White added that there is a need for campuses to partner with communities in areas like counseling and counselor training, since there are campuses that don't have either. She mentioned Norman as an example of having a good system already in place but said a way would have to be found to make that system work statewide.

Laws and Policies: Subcommittee co-chair Bill Pennington said the subcommittee had a good draft report in place, and co-chair Joe Harroz thanked Pennington for his leadership and Bob Anthony for his work with the subcommittee. Harroz said the report covers the following four areas:

1. Balancing the need of people to be able to be safe on campus, the rights of students who have mental health issues to get an education and maintain their privacy, and the need for faculty and staff to be able to share information in an effort to protect all on campus.
2. The major issues of (A) the perception that there are legal barriers to sharing information when the safety of people is at stake and (B) the lines of communication among people who have and need such information.
3. Recommendations that every campus establish a threat assessment taskforce; that campuses should actively communicate to faculty, staff and students the importance of reporting perceived threats; that training and emergency handbooks should be available to faculty, staff and students; and that campus police develop positive relationships with local law enforcement.
4. Review of existing laws, such as FERPA and HIPAA, that apply to campus safety and security.

Funding: Subcommittee co-chair Kay Martin said that co-chair Joe Wiley had a scheduling conflict and asked her to give the subcommittee's report. Martin said that, as Bird stated earlier, much of the subcommittee's report would be based on recommendations from the other subcommittees. She added that the subcommittee had identified four possible sources of funding for the recommendations:

1. **Grant clearinghouse:** Linda Mason will provide a list of grants to be posted on the CLASS Web site. Campuses can apply for such grants immediately and do not have to wait until the final report of the task force is released. Mason will also continue to expand that list to establish a grant clearinghouse and will work on developing a grant writing workshop focusing on campus safety and security.
2. **State funding:** A staff member from House Speaker Lance Cargill's office attended the last subcommittee meeting and suggested that gap funding requests, after all other funding sources were applied, would have the most support.
3. **Federal funding:** Robert Doak, the state fire marshal, attended the last subcommittee meeting and offered to contact officials in Washington D.C. about possible funding for the nation's colleges and universities. Congressman Tom Cole's office might also be able to provide some guidance on understanding how the issue fits in with other federal priorities.
4. **Institutional support:** As a "last resort," the subcommittee recommended the possibility of a student fee assessment to help meet the baseline need for campus security and/or counseling services.

Pettingill noted that Gov. Brad Henry had designated the Oklahoma Department of Homeland Security as the official federal funding applicant and that no other agency could apply for federal funds related to safety and security. He said the department would work with the subcommittee and institutions to maximize dollars and prevent redundancy and misspending.

Martin said the subcommittee would meet on Oct. 3 and asked that the subcommittees submit their recommendations/funding needs as soon as possible.

ROLLOUT PLAN FOR THE FINAL REPORT: Hardcastle said that he was continuing to work with Paul Sund in the governor's office regarding the specifics for the release of the final report. He added that the formal presentation was still scheduled for early January.

Hardcastle asked that the subcommittees submit their final reports in Microsoft Word format and added that the reports could be written as the subcommittees wished, but depending on length, some sections might not be printed in the final version but would be posted online.

As for the distribution of the final report, Hardcastle said copies would be mailed in January to the heads of the career tech and higher education governing boards and that he would be coordinating with the governor's office on presenting the report to the editorial boards of various media outlets. He added that there would also be an online component, possibly with streaming media. He also said that outreach packets would be provided in order to set up local presentations about the report.

Hardcastle suggested that the taskforce follow up with a progress report in 2009, possibly with a news release and/or press conference, in order to keep the issue on the “front burner.” He said the taskforce could discuss the possibility of providing a progress report on an annual basis.

Major suggested that the survey data be used as a benchmark and that another assessment be conducted in 18 months or on an annual basis.

Johnson said that Berkenbile had suggested an annual meeting or symposium on campus safety and security, and Johnson asked that recommendations for such events be included in the final report.

Pennington suggested that such a meeting could be piggybacked with another conference or held separately and styled like the recent enrollment management conference.

Hardcastle said he would provide updated information about the rollout plan at the December meeting.

OPEN DISCUSSION: Johnson noted the strong support for the task force that had been provided by OSRHE staff and thanked them for their work.

Tom McDaniel presented the issue of campus security vs. campus police and said that Oklahoma City University had recently transitioned from security to a police force. He said the decision should result in less turnover and better trained officers. He suggested that other campuses consider such a transition. Johnson asked how long the transition took, and McDaniel responded that OCU had started discussions 18 months ago. He noted that there were some initial costs incurred, which were covered by an increase in parking fees, but added that the campus should expect to experience an overall cost savings. Pennington stated that Murray State College has campus police but has problems getting CLEET-certified officers, so the campus also utilizes security as a backup.

Johnson announced that the next task force meeting would be held Thursday, Dec. 13 at 9 a.m. in the Symposium Room downstairs in the PHF Conference Center.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 9:55 a.m.