

---

# The University Senate

FACULTY • STUDENT • P&A • CIVIL SERVICE

---

## UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

### Campus Safety Committee (CSC)

Monday, October 2, 2023

### Minutes of the Meeting

*These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate; none of the comments, conclusions or actions reported in these minutes reflect the views of, nor are they binding on, the senate, the administration, or the Board of Regents.*

[**In these minutes:** Welcome and Introductions; Campus Safety Committee Chair and Succession Planning Options; Access to University Buildings; Definition of Culture of Safety Discussion]

**PRESENT:** Edgar Arriaga (chair), Joseph Alf, Lamija Alisic, Austin Chanen, Jessica Larson, Soyun Lee, Adam Negri, Terry Niebeling, Rebecca Sedivy, Ashok Singh, Julie Thompson, liz thomson, Ian Tonks

**REGRETS:** Jovany Betancourt, Clara Hanson, Barry Standorf

**ABSENT:** Joshua Ichen, Christine Swartout, Andrew Whitman

**GUESTS:** Jeffrey Lessard, director, Public Safety Emergency Communication Center

### 1. Welcome and Introductions

Professor Edgar Arriaga, chair, began the meeting by sharing a safety moment, and inviting introductions from committee members and guests. Throughout the meeting, Arriaga referred to information in this [slide deck](#). Arriga took a moment to thank former Campus Safety Committee (CSC) member Jabra Kawas who has accepted a position outside the University of Minnesota.

### 2. Campus Safety Committee Chair and Succession Planning Options

Arriaga asked committee members to consider options for succession planning and determining a new chair for the Campus Safety Committee (CSC) for the 2024-25 academic year, as this will be his last year as chair of the committee. The following points were shared:

- Consider having a chair-elect or vice chair who would “shadow” the current chair.
- The person who will serve as chair does **not** have to be a current member of the committee.
- The committee could informally situate a chair-elect or vice chair and would need to coordinate its efforts with the Senate Committee on Committees as it considers its work of seating and appointing members and chairs of committees.
- If the committee wanted to change its bylaws to more formally add the position of a chair-elect or vice-chair to the committee, a University Senate Bylaws change would be

required.

- Arriaga will work with Senate Office staff to send out a form for committee members to express interest in serving as chair. Members can self nominate or nominate others as long as they have permission from the person they would be nominating. The intention is to have the names of interested parties to share at the October 30, 2023, Campus Safety Committee meeting.

### **3. Access to University Buildings**

Jeff Lessard, director, Public Safety Emergency Communication Center (PSEC), shared with the committee information about changes in access to buildings on campus. Lessard described the three types of building hours/restrictions:

- Public Hours - building is accessible to the general public (libraries, museums, buildings with restaurants, and buildings that have some kind of community engagement profile).
- University Hours - building is accessible using a U card for anyone affiliated with the building
- Restricted Hours - building is accessible only to those who need to access the building (dormitories, labs, specific classrooms that hold classes during even hours, etc.) Open to those who have to respond to incidents.
- FSSO Clearance (faculty/student/staff only) - clearance profile that is initiated when a person becomes associated with the University and is automatically removed when they depart the University.
- The process of restricting building access has been in progress since 2014, when an extensive project was undertaken to add card access entry points to many buildings.
- The changes have resulted in fewer incidents of theft and suspicious persons, especially in the Health Sciences buildings, where public entrances have been reduced from over 20 to three.
- In 2021 the University began applying the card access to more buildings on campus. Out of roughly 172 buildings, 95 are not using University Hours and the remainder have public hours.

Lessard invited questions from committee members. In response to a question regarding access to buildings on Twin Cities campuses by University members from the Crookston, Duluth, Morris, and Rochester campuses, Lessard said that PSEC is looking at additional technology to allow such visitors building access. Currently, such visitors still need to make arrangements with the person/people they are meeting to allow them into the building. DPS is reviewing what is needed and evaluating FSSO clearance to allow University members to have access to buildings across the entire system.

In response to a question regarding how success (reduced number of incidents) is being determined, Lessard said the information being reviewed takes into account the uniqueness of each building. Some buildings may have very few calls and a reduction in incidents would be difficult to notice.

Committee members discussed appropriate and effective plans to communicate successes and changes in building security protocols. The following suggestions were offered:

- Since PSEC does not have sufficient resources to report on every single building across the system, safety personnel from each building (including primary building contacts and departmental facilities representatives, in conjunction with the resource responsibility

center) can be contacted for questions regarding a specific building and could be responsible for communications plans for the building.

- Problems in a building should be reported to the primary building contact for the building; they are the contact who is physically present in the building most often.

Arriaga clarified that the three types of building hours (Public, University and Restricted) is something that is University practice, but is currently not a policy. He suggested that the next time this practice is reviewed, perhaps the CSC could provide feedback if/when the practice were to become policy. Lessard said the review of these three types of hours is ongoing, and that the University is in discussions with its Big 10 partners regarding developing policy around the topic.

In the interest of time, Arriga thanked Lessard and moved to the next agenda item.

#### **4. Definition of Culture of Safety Discussion**

Arriaga summarized the work the committee had undertaken in the previous academic year toward developing a definition of “culture of safety” that could be proposed for use by the entire University community. The Culture of Safety workgroup has drafted [a statement](#), Arriaga said, and shared the proposed next steps with the committee:

- Review the document with the CSC, make necessary amendments, and vote to approve the statement
- Determine how to share the CSC-approved statement with the broader University community, receive and incorporate feedback
- Move the statement through the appropriate University Senate governance committees for consultation and adoption

Arriaga had provided the statement to committee members a week prior to the meeting, and asked them to comment on individual sections of the statement as laid out below:

- [Section 1: Mission and Vision](#)
- [Section 2: Structure](#)
- [Section 3: Graphics Options](#)
- [Section 4: Advancement = Assessment](#)
- [Section 5: Document History](#) (for information only; no comments or voting needed)

Committee members shared their thoughts, including the following:

- Appreciate that the very first part of the document is inclusive and that is one of the major tenets of safety; everyone must feel included in the process.
- What is the objective of including assessment at this stage in the process? Arriga said the working group felt it was important to recognize that safety is an involving process, and it is important to connect the aspirational overview of a culture of safety with efforts that are more from an administrative perspective and that include metrics for monitoring and organizing.
- So How are you going to measure it?
- What are the signs of a culture of safety?
- Initial feedback the workgroup received were recommendations for making the process accountable and transparent.

- Important to look at the items in Section two and be intentional about the nuances of what it presented. For example, it feels disingenuous to say, “We have safety alerts; therefore we are promoting a culture of safety.” There is more nuance that needs to be looked at with respect to how different populations feel about safety alerts.

Committee members discussed how best to address these types of concerns while keeping the document a digestible length. Arriaga noted that options include making the document longer to address more nuance; sending the document out for review knowing that parts of the statement may be considered controversial; and keeping the document as is and being aware that some nuances are going unaddressed. Adam Negri suggested if examples are going to be provided in the document, perhaps there could be fewer of them but they could be accompanied by context to tie the example back to the values promoted by the statement.

Jessica Larson recommended revising the value of using words such respected and emotional safety in the opening segment of the statement. Alf agreed that mentioning the idea of “respect or being respected” and yet not defining what that means in the statement. He recommended fine tuning the statement to better unite the aspirational nature of the beginning of the statement with the more qualitative/quantitative assessment portions of the statement.

Hearing no further comments, Arriaga recommend the following next steps:

- Revisit the statement, with the working group, and share the revised version with the whole committee.
- This may provide committee members additional time to review the statement and leave comments within the document.

Arriaga said follow up documents would be sent after the meeting to invite further reflection on the draft statement, along with an opportunity to vote on proposed graphics to accompany the statement. He asked committee members to also think about the following questions prior to the next CSC meeting on October 30, 2023:

- How should the CSC share the statement?
- With whom should it be shared?
- What sort of feedback do we expect to receive?

Last, Arriaga strongly urged committee members to take the time to review the list of 2023-24 CSC Engagement Opportunities, and fill out the [Engagement Opportunities Google form](#) to indicate the areas of most interest to them.

Hearing no further business, Arriaga thanked committee members and guests and adjourned the meeting.

Geanette Poole  
University Senate Office