



**SAN MATEO COUNTY  
COMMUNITY  
COLLEGE DISTRICT**

## Meeting Agenda

**2016 Public Safety Services Study Committee**

Date:	Start:	End:	Next Meeting	Next Time
April 16, 2018	1pm	2pm	May 7, 2018	1pm

Purpose:	Location:
Monthly Meeting to review best practices for Public Safety at all 3 Colleges	District Office, Executive Conference Room

Attendees:			
X	Kathy Blackwood, SMCCCD Executive Vice Chancellor	X	Alfredo Olguin, Jr., BOT Student Trustee
X	Mitchell Bailey, SMCCCD Chief of Staff	X	Zach Bruno, SKY Faculty (via phone)
X	José D. Nuñez, SMCCCD Facilities & Public Safety	X	Michelle Schneider, CSM Staff (CSEA) (via phone)
X	Michelle Marquez, CAN VP Admin Services (via phone)	X	Bill Woods, SMCCCD Chief/Director of Public Safety
X	Jan Roecks, CSM VP Admin Services (via phone)	X	Rob Dean, CSM Public Safety Captain
X	Eloisa Briones, SKY VP Admin Services	X	Carina Warne, SMCCCD Facilities & Public Safety

Item	Description	Action by	First Noted	OPN/CLO
------	-------------	-----------	-------------	---------

NEW BUSINESS										
<b>13.0</b>	<p><b>Feedback from Forums</b> Staff briefed the stakeholder groups on the four preliminary recommendations previously discussed by the Board:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Clarifying the Mission and Role of the Department of Public Safety.</li> <li>2. Rejecting the Margolis Healy recommendation to create a Sworn and Armed Police Department.</li> <li>3. Implementing, as directed by the Board of Trustees, the remaining (71) recommendations of the Margolis Healy Study.</li> <li>4. Exploring alternatives to enhance local Law Enforcement services on or near the District's campuses.</li> </ol> <p>Throughout the feedback process, more than 400 faculty, staff and students participated in briefings and forums.</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">Board of Trustees</td> <td style="text-align: right;">November 8, 2017</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Chancellor's Cabinet/Council</td> <td style="text-align: right;">November 8, 2017</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Districtwide Participatory Governance Council</td> <td style="text-align: right;">December 4, 2017</td> </tr> </table>	Board of Trustees	November 8, 2017	Chancellor's Cabinet/Council	November 8, 2017	Districtwide Participatory Governance Council	December 4, 2017	<b>MB</b>	<b>4/16/18</b>	<b>OPN</b>
Board of Trustees	November 8, 2017									
Chancellor's Cabinet/Council	November 8, 2017									
Districtwide Participatory Governance Council	December 4, 2017									

<p>Cañada Planning and Budget Council January 1, 2018  Cañada President’s Cabinet/Extended Leadership Team January 31, 2018  Skyline President’s Cabinet/Extended Leadership Team February 8, 2018  Cañada Associated Students February 22, 2018  CSM President’s Cabinet/Extended Leadership Team February 26, 2018  CSM Classified Senate February 27, 2018  Skyline Classified Senate March 1, 2018  Skyline Associated Students March 6, 2018  CSM Math and Science Division March 9, 2018  CSM Associated Students March 12, 2018  CSM Academic Senate March 13, 2018  AFT March 14, 2018  Skyline Academic Senate March 15, 2018  Cañada Classified Senate March 19, 2018  AFSCME March 21, 2018  Cañada Academic Senate March 22, 2018  CSEA April 3, 2018  CSM Creative Arts and Social Sciences Division April 4, 2018  CSM Business and Technology Division April 5, 2018</p>																								
<p>District staff also held seven (7) open forums at differing times for faculty, staff and students across the three campuses and District office.</p>																								
<table border="0"> <tr> <td>College of San Mateo</td> <td>April 3, 2018</td> <td>5:30 p.m.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>District Office</td> <td>April 9, 2018</td> <td>11:30 a.m.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Skyline College</td> <td>April 9, 2018</td> <td>2:00 p.m.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cañada College</td> <td>April 10, 2018</td> <td>5:00 p.m.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>College of San Mateo</td> <td>April 11, 2018</td> <td>1:00 p.m.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cañada College</td> <td>April 11, 2018</td> <td>2:30 p.m.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Skyline College</td> <td>April 12, 2018</td> <td>5:30 p.m.</td> </tr> </table>	College of San Mateo	April 3, 2018	5:30 p.m.	District Office	April 9, 2018	11:30 a.m.	Skyline College	April 9, 2018	2:00 p.m.	Cañada College	April 10, 2018	5:00 p.m.	College of San Mateo	April 11, 2018	1:00 p.m.	Cañada College	April 11, 2018	2:30 p.m.	Skyline College	April 12, 2018	5:30 p.m.			
College of San Mateo	April 3, 2018	5:30 p.m.																						
District Office	April 9, 2018	11:30 a.m.																						
Skyline College	April 9, 2018	2:00 p.m.																						
Cañada College	April 10, 2018	5:00 p.m.																						
College of San Mateo	April 11, 2018	1:00 p.m.																						
Cañada College	April 11, 2018	2:30 p.m.																						
Skyline College	April 12, 2018	5:30 p.m.																						
<p><i>*Trustees (and staff) in attendance as observers but not included in participant totals.</i></p>																								
<p>As a result of these discussions, several major themes emerged in the feedback from participants:</p>																								
<p>1. There was agreement with staff’s preliminary recommendations, and overwhelming support to reject the Margolis Healy recommendation regarding moving to sworn and armed police force. Faculty, staff and students alike all expressed their approval of not creating a police department and commented that doing so would isolate members of the campus communities and create an atmosphere that is counter to the desired approach to have the Department of Public Safety be more engaging and approachable.</p>																								

	<p>2. As was expressed in the pre-report forums in 2016, faculty, staff and students again reinforced a desire to have the officers of the Public Safety Department be more engaged in the campus community, to develop and implement an outreach strategy and to develop and foster relationships with faculty, staff and students.</p> <p>3. All groups expressed a desire to be more aware of public safety practices/protocols/ measures, to have more opportunities for training on incident scenarios (natural disaster, assailants, incidents, etc.) and to have more drills and exercises. The general consensus was that the best way to prevent or respond to an incident or issue was to be informed, prepared, aware and engaged.</p> <p>During several of the discussions, two additional items were raised, but not as consistently or as adamantly as themes 1 – 3:</p> <p>4. In some areas of the campuses, there are locations where alarms and audible notifications can't be heard. While the District utilizes overlapping notification systems (speaker announcements, alarms, emails, AlertU, etc.), it appears that not all systems reach all members of the campus communities.</p> <p><i>Staff Note: The District is working to remedy the issue and will have a full assessment of the scope and cost of the issue by the end of the semester.</i></p> <p>5. While the overwhelming consensus from stakeholders was to reject the Margolis Healy recommendation regarding creating a District Police Department, there were questions</p> <p>BOARD REPORT NO. 18-4-2C 4 regarding the response times from local law enforcement partners and those respective agencies' familiarity with the campuses.</p> <p>Nearly all feedback supported the preliminary staff recommendations. However, there was a small minority (less than 10 of the 400+) who did not agree with the staff recommendation regarding rejecting the concept of creating a police department. Those individuals expressed concern for their safety and the safety of others on the campuses, the response time of local law enforcement, and found the District's rationale for not agreeing with Margolis Healy's recommendation to be insufficient.</p>			
13.1	<p><b>Discuss Alternatives</b> Margolis Healy offered one overarching recommendation in their report: to create a sworn and armed police department. The reasoning for their recommendation was plausible and their rationale was sound. However, the District staff believe that Margolis Healy's recommendation does not appropriately take into consideration the operating and environmental context of the District community and the cultures of its campuses.</p>	MB	4/16/18	OPN

<p>Since Margolis Healy did not provide any alternatives to their recommendation, District staff are outlining review several alternatives which might be of interest to the Board when evaluating options. The District believes that regardless of the implementation of any alternative operating scenario, the Department of Public Safety should take appropriate steps to become fully staffed (per positions that have already been approved), update needed technologies, engage and invest in training around community engagement practices, de-escalation, crime prevention, and unconscious bias. This approach maintains the status-quo operating model of the Department, but will increase the Department’s expenses by \$1.2 million annually.</p> <p>In addition to the status-quo operating model, the following alternatives are worthy of evaluation:</p> <p><b>1. Contracted Policing (~\$2 million - \$2.5 million)</b></p> <p>Local policing jurisdictions can provide the full range of policing services including armed police officers on campuses during typical instructional days/times. These officers are assigned based on their respective jurisdiction’s processes and it is possible that there will be various officers who rotate through the campus. Contracting for police services includes costs for support services such as records clerks, property clerks, investigators, supervisors. Additionally, the District would be required to pay for the officer’s wages (plus benefits) and all equipment used by the personnel, including vehicles, body cameras, uniforms, computers and radios.</p> <p><b>2. School Resource Officer (SRO) (~\$600,000 – \$800,000)</b></p> <p>The SRO model is one currently utilized across the nation, typically in high schools (and some middle schools), whereby a sworn and armed police officer from a local jurisdiction is permanently assigned to a school(s) and has no other “beat.” The SRO becomes part of the campus community and participates in meetings, trainings and activities with faculty, staff and students and develops relationships and responds to incidents and issues on the campus(es). The SRO would work at the direction of the campus Public Safety Captain and typically would not undertake additional policing activities (i.e. traffic stops, drug and alcohol violations, etc.). With this model, the District would continue to implement a community focused, community engaged public safety approach. Under this model, the SRO would also become a member of the campus CARES team (soon to be constituted as a Threat Assessment Team).</p> <p>BOARD REPORT NO. 18-4-2C 11</p> <p><b>3. Non-Sworn Officers who are Permitted to Carry Firearms (~\$800,000 – \$900,000)</b></p> <p>Federal law permits retired police officers to carry concealed weapons on their person in any state in the nation (with certain conditions). Under this alternative, the Department of Public Safety would maintain its status as a non-sworn entity, but the District would, under very limited parameters, sanction certain retired officers who are current members of the</p>			
---	--	--	--

	<p>Department of Public Safety to act during situations of active assailants on campuses. In theory, under this model, there would be one to two such designated individuals on each campus. Any such sanctioned officer would require extensive training and certification, licensing from the California Bureau of Security and Investigative Services (BSIS), along with an extensive background, psychological testing, medical testing and polygraph examinations.</p> <p>There are two options in which to implement this alternative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Option A: Allow sanctioned officers to carry their firearms exposed (e.g. openly carry on their person), and</li> <li>• Option B: Allow sanctioned officers to carry their firearms in a concealed manner.</li> </ul> <p><i>Note: Public Safety officers who are not honorably retired police officers would only be able to carry a concealed weapon with a concealed weapons permit issued from the San Mateo County Sheriff and would not be sanctioned by the District to act on its behalf (with a firearm).</i></p> <p><b>4. Contracted Armed Security (~\$1 million)</b></p> <p>There are armed security forces that are available for hire and various organizations utilize these services. Armed security guards are not police officers. Under this alternative, the contracted, armed security services would supplement the Department of Public Safety operations and service all of the District properties during instructional days/hours. Often the armed guards employed by the security companies have less training than the District’s public safety officers and may not be consistently scheduled.</p>			
<b>13.2</b>	<p><b>Final Recommendations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Information Report will be presented to the BOT on 4/25/18</li> <li>- BOT will make final recommendations</li> </ul>	<b>MB</b>	<b>4/16/18</b>	<b>OPN</b>
<b>OLD BUSINESS</b>				
	<b>Roundtable</b>			