Monday, June 04, 2012

Dear Vice President Dougharty:

Thank you for the opportunity to conduct a review of the Campus Safety and Security (CSS) Department. I found the self-study and the Review Team’s visit helpful. Additionally, I was pleased with the level of campus response from faculty, staff and students who engaged in dialogue with the Review Team members regarding the Campus Safety and Security Department.

I am appreciative of the hard work and diligence of the Review Team Members and all others involved in this process. The effort extended enhances the Department’s ability to further improve toward becoming one of the best Campus Safety and Security Departments in the United States.

The commendations noted in the report reinforce that the Department is on the right track in a number of areas. These comments include but were not limited to “Grinnell College is fortunate to have a well-respected staff in the Campus Safety and Security Department” and “The Campus Safety and Security Department does a lot with the limited resources they are provided”.

Below are my comments relative to the recommendations made in the Review Team report.

**Recommendations/Responses**

a) **Review Staffing**

Recommendations made by the Review Team include hiring an additional Campus Safety Officer, filling a position lost to budgeting in 2009, and to allow two officers to cover the campus during non-business hours. I fully endorse these recommendations and believe implementation will enhance the Department’s ability to respond to campus related calls and emergencies.

Another staffing recommendation was to hire an additional full-time dispatcher (or make better use of the on-call dispatchers) to provide more professional dispatching during the evening and weekend hours. I feel that an evening/weekend full-time dispatcher could have a positive impact. This would allow for a more cohesive response in that a full-time dispatcher would
have consistent exposure to what is going on in the department. Currently, there are a number of on call dispatchers that work at various times when we need additional help. This limited exposure makes the department more prone to breakdowns in communication and training as each new shift change occurs. Due to the varying nature of the on-call dispatcher staffing, it is possible for on call dispatchers to forget some of their training due to the passage of time since he/she last worked. Therefore, I feel a full time dispatcher is the best staffing direction to go at this time.

b) Equipment

In order for the department to respond to campus calls and situations it is imperative that the department equipment is updated and in working order. We are aware that the federal government is updating two-way radio system communications and the department will need to switch over to this prescribed equipment. One of the recommendations in this area by the Review Team was to update/replace the radio system to comply with Federal Communications Commission (FCC) regulations concerning “narrow band” frequencies and develop a “patch” to allow communication with the Grinnell Police Department. We have already begun working on this process and are hopeful that with budgeting assistance from the college’s Facilities Management Office we will have a new FCC compliant radio system in place by summer of 2012. If for some reason this assistance does not materialize, we will need to seek campus funding to have the system in place by 2013.

c) New Security Vehicle

The Campus Safety and Security Department depends on our security vehicle for a wide variety of services provided for the campus. One of the recommendations was to replace the current Honda Ridgeline since it is now costing the department too much in maintenance. Just recently the odometer on the Honda Ridgeline turned over 100,000 miles. The maintenance on the vehicle is costly and not included in the budget. Replacement of the vehicle would help ensure the level of service that is provided to the campus while eliminating high maintenance costs.

d) Emergency Preparedness Command Center

Emergency preparedness is important for both cities and college campuses. Having a location where designated campus members can come together, work, monitor, and guide the campus constituencies through emergencies would allow for better coordination of services and potentially faster and more effective responses in dangerous situations. One of the Review Team’s recommendations was to work with colleagues across campus (e.g., President’s Office, Informational Technology Services) to identify the ideal location(s) for an Emergency Command Center. While it would be convenient to be housed within the CSS department, it could be in another campus building provided that it is outfitted properly (technology, network capability, charts, communications, etc.). I fully endorse this recommendation. Over the years we have
looked at locations such as the Old Glove Factory Pioneer Room, Facilities Management Conference Room, and Joe Rosenfield Center room 209 as potential sites for the creation of an Emergency Command Center. The Campus Safety and Security Department has served as a command center in the past in times of short span emergencies. The use of the current CSS facility, although not the best location, has served this function well. However, command center equipment has been lacking.

A centralized Emergency Command Center location should be able to have technological, computer network capability, charts, communications, video and on-screen observation of the campus. We endorse the recommendation to have a centralized Emergency Command Center and will continue to work with campus entities to create such a center.

e) Budget

The department budget has consistently been a concern in recent years. Emergencies and unforeseen incidents must be dealt with and they impact our overall budget. Additionally, special events such as the NCAA Division III Indoor Track Meet bring positive attention and revenue to the city, college and additionally helps local businesses. These events as others must be staffed at levels that I feel is necessary in order to provide safety and security for the campus and all involved.

After many years the department had built its budget to a level that was able to sustain the department for basic operations, providing necessary services to the campus. In around 2009 the overall campus budget was reduced and the CSS department took budget reductions as many campus operations did. One of the recommendations of the Review Team is to return the Campus Safety and Security budget to pre-2009 level. I fully endorse this recommendation and feel that it would help the department to continue to provide a high level of service to the campus.

f) Convenience Shuttles

Currently the department allows the on-duty officers to escort students to the hospital, medical appointments, local establishments, campus offices, safety escorts and off-campus apartments as needed by students. Faculty or staff can also use this service. During times when there is a high demand for a security officer’s service on campus it makes it difficult to provide these escorts. The Review Team recommended employing students to perform “convenience shuttles” for students (i.e., prescriptions, Wal-Mart, doctors appointments) to keep Campus Safety and Security staff on campus. I endorse this concept, however, I also realize that there may be times when the Security Officers may need to perform an escort. Currently, the campus Harms Reduction Committee has been considering this convenience shuttle service during night time hours. This service could be run from the Safety and Security office which already employs student security workers in a variety of services. Funding for the service will have to be allocated and an escort van will need to be made available for the service. Training will be provided by the Campus Safety and Security Department fulltime staff.
g) Students of Concern Meetings/Student Conduct Results

The Review Team recommended that we “enhance communication between Residence Life/Student Affairs and Campus Safety officers regarding “students of concern” and results of student conduct”. Currently the Director of Safety and Security meets on a weekly basis with Residential Life, members of Student Affairs and others across the campus concerning students of concern. I endorse the Review Team’s recommendation and as the Director I will continue to meet with Residential Life/Student Affairs/others and then brief security staff members about specific student issues to the extent possible. Additionally, the Dean of Student Affairs speaks regularly with the Director of Campus Safety and Security concerning any student matters which should be addressed immediately. In regard to “student conduct” matters, the Dean of Students prepares a brief summary of student conduct proceedings and posts them on a campus website on an annual basis for members of the campus. I will direct the Safety and Security officers and staff to that website for further information regarding student conduct summaries.

h) ADA Compliant Building

The Review Team recommended that “the Campus Safety and Security Department should be relocated to an ADA compliant building and one that will allow them to be the “face of Grinnell College” for guests during non-business hours”. I support the Review Team’s recommendation realizing that for many campus visitors, the Campus Safety and Security Department is the first point of contact after college business hours and on weekends. I additionally support an upgrade of the current facility that would bring the building into ADA compliance and an aesthetic upgrade which would make the building a location the campus would be proud for visitors, students, faculty and staff to visit.

i) Disciplinary Referrals

One of the Review Team’s recommendations was to “review the practice of “self-governance” as it relates to the disclosure of “disciplinary referral” statistics as required by the Clery Act”. Currently, the Campus Safety and Security Department makes disciplinary referrals for violations to the Dean of Students for violations of law and student handbook violations. This practice will continue and the department will continue to work with the Dean of Students Office to make sure the college is in compliance with any regulations concerning disciplinary referrals.

j) Annual Fire Log

The Review Team recommended that we “revise the Annual Fire Log to include the number of “injuries related to the fire that resulted in treatment at a medical facility” as required”. Currently this information can be listed in the disposition area of our daily log. Although we were put in place, this recommendation will be implemented and we will add a location for recording this information on the Annual Log.
k) **Hate Crime Chart**

The Review Team recommended that we “create a Hate Crimes chart (15 total in 2010) in future Clery Act postings”. This is not a requirement, but rather a suggested enhancement. Currently we report information on the number of hate crimes as required. We feel the Review Team’s recommendation of the creation of a separate chart is a good idea and we will implement this for future hate crime statistics.

l) **Formatting Changes In Report**

The Review Team recommended that we “clean up formatting in Grinnell-in-London Report (i.e., text regarding Assurances and Students Accused)”. We will make this change for reports going forward.

m) **Locking/Unlocking Schedules**

The Review Team recommended that we “create a Campus Safety and Security Department email alias so locking/unlocking schedules and other important department information can be sent electronically and reach all members of the department”. Currently, the department receives reports from the Conference and Events Office concerning the locking and unlocking of areas on campus. This report is now shared electronically. A department committee will be established to review this process to look at how department staff can better receive these schedules, as well as how we can better disseminate any other important department information. Currently, important department information is relayed in policies, general orders and emails.

n) **Streamline Paper Use/Alarms**

The Review Team recommended that the department “streamline operations by using less paper (examples: receive daily reports for locking/unlocking doors electronically; have alarms write to an electronic file rather than a printer)”. The department has a printer that records all campus alarms that come in to the department. This printer can print out numerous alarms when there are multiple alarms across the campus. The alarms come in on the actual alarm system computer screen and on a paper print out. The print out is an actual backup copy to the information reviewed on the screen. We will convene a committee of members from within the department to further discuss this recommendation.

o) **Alarm Recording/Guidelines**

The Review Team recommended that the department should “communicate and coordinate with Facilities Management regarding recording alarms (is this a duplication of effort?) and create clearer guidelines on when to call in the Facilities on-call person”. As the Safety and Security Department monitors alarms outside of Facilities Management’s business hours, there is no duplication of effort. It is Safety and Security Department policy to record incoming alarms, as well as to record the disposition of the alarm. Department personnel are instructed to discard alarms (environmental) at certain times, and they are told when to contact the facilities on-call
Education is key when new officers and staff work with the campuswide alarm system. We will look at more internal education concerning the alarms and how to respond to those alarms and make contact with on call facilities management staff.

p) Traffic Vest
   While directing traffic security officers are expected to wear traffic vest when appropriate. The Review Team recommended that “for all traffic direction and control assignments, ensure that all personnel are wearing ANSI 207-2006 and Class II compliant safety vests”. I endorse the Review Team’s recommendation and we will check into whether our current reflective traffic vests meet this requirement.

q) Pioneer One Cards
   The Review Team recommended the college “require all students in their 3rd year to retake their Grinnell College Database picture to enhance efforts in the event of missing person incidents; consider issuing new Pioneer One cards to them at that time”. Although this is may be a good idea, the Grinnell College Database for pictures is handled by a different department. Additionally, to issue new cards would require an additional monetary commitment. We feel that the initiation of this recommendation is outside the parameters of the Campus Safety and Security Department.

r) NIMS Courses
   The Review Team recommended “all Campus Safety and Security Department personnel should complete NIMS IS100, IS200, IS700 and IS800 courses for emergency management”. Campus Safety and Security Officers have taken a number of these FEMA online free courses in the past. I agree with the Review Team’s recommendation and will ensure that each of the full-time officers complete any courses they have not already taken.

s) NIMS Courses/Other Campus Members
   It was the Review Team’s recommendation that “other campus members involved in emergency operations should also complete the appropriate NIMS certifications based on their role within emergency management”. In 2012, the Iowa Department of Homeland Security will be on campus at my request to evaluate the roles of different staff involved in our overall campus emergency plan. Both online and classroom training will be offered to members who participate in the emergency operations area mentioned above. Additionally, this training will be offered to members of the Campus Emergency Response Committee and the Campus Alert Network members.

t) Personal Safety
   One of the recommendations of the Review Team involved some of the officers “expressing concern about their personal safety, consider conducting a study to determine the benefits and
risks associated with weapons (handcuffs, collapsible batons, mace, etc.). The Review Team recommended looking at the use of the above items if the “department leadership feels this is warranted”.

In the past the department has stayed away from issuing officers handcuffs, collapsible batons, mace, etc. A number of campus security departments across the country have issued these items for the protection of the officers and the campus community members. The Grinnell College Campus Safety and Security Department is licensed by the state of Iowa Department of Public Safety. Under the Iowa Department of Public Safety guidelines campus safety and security officers can also carry weapons and firearms. Although it is unlikely that the administration of Grinnell College will move to issuing weapons to its security officers, it may be prudent for the Security Department’s leadership to explore this topic further. My consideration of this recommendation is due to the increasing number of hostile incidents occurring at other colleges and universities, some of them involving shooting situations.

I recommend that Campus Safety and Security convene department personnel to learn more about the personal safety concerns of its officers. Additionally, a departmental committee could be established to evaluate both the benefits and risks associated with issuing weapons, handcuffs, collapsible batons, and mace. The findings of the committee should be presented to the Director of Campus Safety and Security who will share the findings with the Vice President of Student Affairs.

u) Keys Rings

The Review Team recommended that the department “review the policy that allows Campus Safety Officers to take campus key rings home with them”. Currently there is no written departmental policy on this topic; however, I studied this topic further with the officers and found that a number of officers do in fact take departmental keys home with them at the close of their shift. A written policy will be implemented where officers will now leave their keys on site at the Safety and Security Department in a locked location. As of this date only the key that allows the officers to gain access to the locked keys will be allowed to be taken home by the officer.

v) Campus Keys

The Review Team recommended that “Campus Safety should have keys to all facilities for emergency response purposes (for example, no key is available for the front door of the faculty house, however they have a back door key)”. It is important for the officers to have keys or have access to keys that will get them into the different facilities on campus in case of emergencies. It was mentioned that security did not have access to the front door of the faculty house, but had keys to the back door of the house. This has been changed and access can now be gained through the front or back door of the location.
w) **AED’s**
   The Review Team recommended that “all AEDs (automatic external defibrillators) should be inventoried and location information available to the Grinnell community”. I endorse this recommendation and will have a staff member of the department work on collecting this information from the campus. The location information of these devices will be placed on the Security Department website.

x) **Fire Alarm System/Procedures**
   The safety of campus personnel (students, faculty, staff, visitors) is important. Currently the Student Handbook lists fire alarm procedures and fire drills are conducted annually in the residence halls. The Review Team recommended that we “examine fire alarm system and procedures to reduce the number of alarms and work to enhance student’s cooperation with vacating halls during fire alarms (currently not all students evacuate buildings during fire alarms because there are too many and there are no perceived consequences for staying)”. We currently track all fire alarms for the campus. Many of these alarms are actual alarm situations where the alarm has been activated for a valid reason. At times we do experience a few false alarms due to mechanical failure and those are dealt with by maintenance. We experience very few “mischievous” alarms set off by students or others. Education is key in getting people to leave the residence halls in alarm situations. In 2012 we will increase our programming involving fire alarms and the evacuation of our buildings. Through increased education we hope to involve the students in the process and therefore increase responsible behavior when fire alarms sound in the residence halls.

y) **Programming**
   The Review Team recommended that we “provide more preventive and pro-active programming to complement the CSS “Know your rights and responsibilities” program in (e.g., have the Grinnell Fire Department conduct programs in the residence halls)”. I endorse more programming. Additionally, the City of Grinnell Fire Department has been on campus conducting fire extinguisher training. We will explore more programming in needed areas for the campus.

z) **Crime Report System**
   The Review Team recommended that we “upgrade hardware and software for the campus crime reporting system (Sleuth)”. We are currently behind in the upgrades to our system. It would be great if our system could have regular computer software updates handled by ITS when they come out. A number of offices on campus received regular computer software updated by the ITS Currently our new software and conversion will cost $5,000 and then the department will need new computers (5) to handle the software upgrades. The current system is an in-house system and it is not on the college network. ITS has talked with us about the system (server) going on the college network. I agree in pursuing this direction and endorse future software
upgrades being part of the overall campus software upgrade system used by our ITS department. The Safety and Security Office is paying “Sleuth” $1300 per year for a maintenance agreement which covers any software related problems that comes up and this should be continued. Sleuth is well known within the safety and security and law enforcement community. We recommend our continue use of this system.

aa) **Building Planning**

It was recommended by the Review Team that Campus Safety and Security be included in the planning stage when new buildings are being constructed for the campus. We have been given chances in the past to comment on security for new buildings on campus. We are delighted to give input when we are asked to either by members of the campus or the architects.

**Conclusion**

Campus Safety and Security at Grinnell College contributes to the Division of Student Affairs’ mission of promoting student learning and development by protecting people and the college’s property and programs, utilizing Grinnell’s philosophy of self-governance and personal responsibility. The Campus Safety and Security Department will continue to embrace its core values which involve broad collaboration and service to students, faculty, staff, visitors and the community. Furthermore, the department values “Proactive, preventative approaches, global citizenship and diversity, integrity and accountability and transparency and accessibility”. The observations, commendations and recommendations provided during this review process are examples of our mission and core values.

Sincerely,

Stephen A. Briscoe
Director of Campus Safety and Security