

The Evergreen State College

June 7, 1985

To: Richard M. Schwartz, Vice President for Business
From: Gail Martin and the Security/Police DTF *Gail Martin*
Subject: Report on the Charge to the DTF to Study Security Department
versus a Police Department

Summary of our Recommendations: We recommend that

1. the campus continue its security department rather than becoming a police department.
2. campus officers remain unarmed.
3. security staffing be increased.
4. security staff receive more training.

In our study of the central issues, we found no compelling reasons to change the status of Evergreen's Security Department at this time. It is our conclusion that insufficient evidence was presented for converting Security to a Police Department and for arming security personnel -- a move that would be contrary to majority campus opinion. Our investigation also revealed the need for a clearer definition of Security's role on this campus and a general ignorance of what security personnel are expected to do. We found a devoted and professional security force composed of staff who wish to become excellent in every respect and who take their responsibility for campus security with utmost seriousness. They feel, and we agree, that they have been given the responsibility for excellence without a concomitant commitment from the College to provide sufficient staffing and adequate opportunities for training.

The Security/Police DTF did not have sufficient time to fully answer items 3 and 4 of the charge:

3. What are the primary responsibilities and functions which should be delegated to the department?
4. Given the responsibilities and functions which are identified, is the operation adequately staffed at current level?

We feel that a clarification of the administration's expectations of its security force and of the officer's commissions will pave the way for future decisions regarding its proper status and the role of its personnel. Therefore, we recommend that the administration, in consultation with the individuals listed below, study what is reasonable to expect our Security personnel to do given that they are not converting to a Police Department or bearing arms. We recommend that this clarification occur as soon as possible so that our Security personnel will work under less ambiguous and safer circumstances and so that the College does not ask them to perform duties beyond their commissions and their job descriptions. Perhaps this clarification could begin with a review of the Standing Operating Procedure Manual currently under development in Security. The DTF has recommendations on two other matters:

1. **Staffing Levels:** We are concerned for the personal safety of our Security Officers who too frequently end up on patrol alone at night. In this respect, we do not find that Security is adequately staffed and we recommend that staffing be increased or organized in such a way that no Security Officer is alone on duty. Community and DTF members were divided on whether this increase should be professional Security Officers and/or the employment of more student staff.
2. **Training:** We recommend that our Security Officers receive more training. We found that they could attend the Washington State Police Academy on a space available basis for \$1,500 per officer. Community sentiment was also expressed in favor of our officers receiving more training in conflict resolution and non-violent methods of intervening in conflict situations.

Our Process: Our investigation included consultation with individuals on and off campus. We held three public forums during which those in attendance shared opinions and asked questions. We were not pleased with the attendance -- 25 people attended the DTF forums and another 15 attended a student sponsored forum. We also conducted a campus poll on the issues and received 162 responses. We consulted with Ken Jacob, Gary Russell and Larry Savage, who shared information about the Security staff's perceptions of their positions. We contacted administrative staff and students at WWSU in an attempt to understand the effects of that University's transition from a security to an unarmed police force and contacted NACUBO for their perspective. We investigated security departments at other schools comparable to TESC. Thurston County Sheriff, Dan Montgomery, attended meetings and provided valuable information.

The original charge of the DTF did not mention a responsibility to consider the effects of becoming a fully commissioned police force on the budget. Nonetheless, the issue of what additional funding might be necessary for a functioning police department surfaced often in our discussions and we have not been able to determine both the obvious and hidden costs of such in our deliberations to this point.

Richard Schwartz
June 7, 1985

- 3 -

Accompanying this report are the documents, minutes, reports, and community observations that informed the conclusions of the DTF. We recommend your review of these supporting documents as you consider the findings of the DTF. Some people in the community feel on both sides of the issue that our deliberations were rushed and therefore that our recommendations are not adequately informed. While we did not fully answer all of the questions contained in the charge, we are confident in the recommendations we have made.

GM/ndg

cc: DTF Members
Joe Olander
Ken Jacob
Gary Russell

Recommended consultants for clarifying campus expectations of Security:

Dan Montgomery
Gary Russell
Karen Wynkoop
Gail Martin
Stone Thomas
Jeannie Chandler

Attorney
Student Representatives, e.g., S & A
Coordinators, Student Representative
to Board of Trustees