Meeting called to order at 7:06 p.m.

**Agenda**

**Item 1. Open Forum**

a. Students from WesDivest: We want to send out a survey to students asking about how they rank the importance of divesting from fossil fuels.

b. Grant: I would be open to including questions like that in our Winter Survey during the Winter Election.

**Item 2. Director Rohde**

a. Director Rohde: Experience has been very good so far. Meeting with a lot of groups on campus to discuss how they all relate. I have been out 2 times so far at night and been patrolling. I have met with the supervisors at public safety. I want to grow the program internally and bring nutrients from the entire population back to the department. There are many diverse opinions within the public safety department. The biggest question I have for people who want to work in Public Safety is why they want to work on a college campus, because it is an institution that works 24 hours a day. We want to reassemble an advisory committee. We’ve already developed a framework for this group. Communication has not always been efficient, and that creates problems for the department image. We want to become better communicators and listeners. We want to work with students, faculty, and other departments such as CAPS. We still have to have an organizational meeting. I want to meet 3 times per semester, 90 minutes per meeting. We will keep records of the meetings. Crimes of opportunity make up a lot of the incidents on or near campus, especially theft. Concerning sexual assault, I think Wesleyan is doing a great job addressing and dealing with sexual assault. I think that education is an important factor in this. If we can get people to think about how to handle extreme situations that may occur on a campus, I believe we can mitigate loss of life and minimize the chaos. Internal surveys done on how crime is reported. We want to consolidate headings of incidents to make them more meaningful and easier to understand.

b. Bruno: One of my goals is to get a synthesis of how people feel, especially in terms of concrete goals or ideas: 1) Initial reactions 2) Positive reviews 3) Student concerns 4) Potential Solutions

c. Key: Two questions: 1) Can you talk about your role as a psafe director here and the difference between your old one? 2) The spaces on campus and how psafe can continue to promote the parties and social life on campus?

d. Director Rohde: The biggest difference is that all of them (officers at previous job) were police officers. They had to take legal action without discretion. There was no SJB or points system. The good news is that we did work as best as we could with students and created diversion programs. After completion, the citation was dropped. The student only had to pay the fee for the program. The main difference is the enforcement level. Not something that can be addressed or dealt with in a week or two. Main problem as I understand is the woodframe house and the occupation limit. We have to be aware of the legal fire codes.
e. Carter: Regarding background checks: Are you going to be conducting full background checks on
the new applicants?
f. Director Rohde: Yes. I believe that has already been in process.
g. Bryan: What is the biggest source of misconception/misunderstanding about Psafe?
h. Director Rohde: I haven’t seen a repeating theme. It usually has been pretty trivial stuff. People
don’t know how extensive the psafe officers’ training is.
i. Sadasia: Positive review: I like that Psafe sends out reports. However, I believe they are very
reactionary. I would love Psafe to form stronger relationships with students, such as through
getting meals with students.
j. Director Rohde: I agree with you. We want to remind people to be safe because of something
that has happened, but we also don’t want to send so many messages and alerts out that students
either feel desensitized to them or feel anxious about the level of safety on campus. I also really
want to see a lot more of positive Psafe-student interactions, similar to the Psafe-sponsored 3-on-3
basketball games.
k. Grant: 1) How do we balance the priority of P-Safe in enforcing the code of non academic conduct
and protecting students from muggings, assaults, robberies, etc… 2) Can you delineate P-Safe’s
policies when approaching a situation like a noise complaint or other scenarios. Also, it might be
helpful to release these policies to the student body.
l. Director Rohde: There are titles in the program that deal with specific incidents, but they make us
seem like antagonists. We hope that people comply voluntarily (This is the vast majority of the
outcomes). When it is repetitive, threat assessment is run and the size of the risk is assessed. Risk
is too high, then the party is disbursed. In regards to the first question, it all depends on the details.
We want communication between Psafe and students, but there are external actors that have to
be taken into account. A visible presence of Psafe around the area is a pretty effective deterrent.
We don’t want to profile specific people, but we have to be aware that college students are often
targets, and act proactively.
m. Nicole: You mentioned the memorandum of understanding earlier, can you speak about the
policies and any changes psafe is making in regards to sexual assault?

n. Director Rohde: We want to emphasize transparency and the sharing of information. The memo of
understanding helps identify roadblocks and work with the state attorney’s office. We also want
to understand what the Middletown Police need to form a substantial case. This will be carried
through joint training, both on our end and their end as well. The training helps us sync up our
policies.

o. Izzy: A lot of students are concerned that Psafe is a strong force in social situations, but assaults
keep happening.

p. Director Rohde: We can’t have staff on every street all the time, so we have to best allocate the
resources that we do have. We’re trying to look for patterns to carry this out in the most efficient
way possible. Always gonna ere on the side of a person’s safety. Patterns are diminishing and are
different each semester, so it’s difficult. We try to inform students of this through alerts. I think
the more that we publicize that we want to partner with students, the better it will be.

q. Lizzie: Thank you again. Can you talk about what you see as being the relationship between
reslife and the greater middletown community.

r. Director Rohde: As we acquire new staff, I want to build several liaison relationships, especially
with Middletown Police. I think we have a solid commitment for support in emergency cases.
Follow-ups are harder to obtain. I want to share statistics with them as well to better judge what
might be happening on campus in relation to what happens off campus. In regards to ResLife, I
want more of a consistent view of when to call Psafe. I think this is more of a training issue, but
could be assisted through a stronger liaison relationship.
s. Jared: 1) I have heard that fire code applies to back yards as well, can you comment? 2) Also I saw a psafe officer driving in an unmarked car, is that a new policy? 3) What is the judicial consequences of non-compliance?

r. Director Rohde: Yes, there are unmarked Psafe cars, which are mostly used for administrative or business purposes. They’re not used to try to catch students. For the first question, I need to talk to the staff about that to get a more definitive answer. I’ve heard it does, but I will clarify. In regards to the last question, Psafe officers do take notes to file a report, but it mainly depends on the type of complaint.

u. Dean Mike: It has to be taken into account whether or not these events are registered. Most of the time, however, it’s up to the Psafe department to make that discretion.

v. Henry: Has your department looked at other universities that are also located in areas of crime to see how they work with the local police department?

w. Director Rohde: It’s reciprocal as the town can have a similar view on the students. Police can be here as soon as we need them and they arrive very fast. Let’s promote working together in a positive way.

x. Rebecca: Students are unsure of the disciplinary role vs. protection role of Psafe. Potential solution: Immunity for students worried about safety? How can we best convey Psafe’s role?

y. Director Rohde: Bystander intervention is a very important tool. The first and foremost goal is to save that person’s life. We treat those as medical. This is the kind of stuff I think the advisory committee would be good at.

z. Anna: I really liked what you were talking about people using their discretion. Would this be part of the training for new staff so that they could potentially be trained to critically think about whether or not a student’s safety is truly at risk?

aa. Director Rohde: A lot of what people bring to the table is their own thoughts and experiences to the job. We want a few common trainings throughout the year, but also compartmentalized trainings as well.


c. Director Rohde: They are public, but we try not to use student names. We try to use discretion regarding those cases.

dd. Leah: When is it appropriate to call public safety?

ee. Director Rohde: We want you to always be able to contact public safety if you feel threatened or unsafe. It is discouraging to hear that someone hung up on you.

ff. Jenna: Just to let you know, people are no longer registering parties because we know Psafe will check up on parties. I just wanted to bring that to your attention because I’m not sure how to respond to that.

gg. Director Rohde: That whole registration process is part of deciding where we go from here on out.

hh. Bruno: I have a whole list of problems and solutions that I will continue bringing to committees. I would also like to do outreach to other students.

Item 3. Minutes & Committee Reports

Item 4. Resolution X.36: Supporting Transparency [VOTE]

a. Anna: Not many changes made. Wanted to make it more vague.

b. All in favor: 24 All opposed: 0 Abstaining: 2

c. Resolution Passed

Item 5. Resolution X.36: Supporting the Renewal of the Green Fund [INTRODUCTION]

a. Ellen: Reads Resolution

b. Bruno: Maybe get concessions or good changes?

c. Bryan: What has the Green Fund done?
d. Ellen: Because the board of trustees is the one who actually renews it we tend to present it to them. We want to create something to send to the campus.

e. Nicole: Why are you only looking to renew it for an additional 5 years?

f. Ellen: We just want to keep the Green Fund on its toes because $85,000 is a lot of money and we want to make sure we’re being responsible.

g. Madison: Students get money from both the SBC and the Green Fund. Where is the overlap or the distinction between the funds? What are the guidelines?

h. Ellen: We don’t have a written guideline, but it’s currently in the works. We hope to have a conversation with SBC soon. In essence, Green Fund funds sustainability-oriented projects. We will try to clear up the overlap with SBC soon.

i. Henry: What possible counterarguments are there of the Green Fund? Is the connection between energy savings and financial aid part of the Green Fund? Suggestion: encourage alumni donation to Green Fund?

j. Ellen: Counterarguments: Why doesn’t the school get rid of the fund and pour it into the sustainability fund? (Having students directly pay gives them control over the money). The alumni donation sounds like a great idea. The COE has helped with Green Fund projects as well.

k. Izzy: Is putting something like having a liaison between the SBC and the Green fund in the resolution something we can do?

l. Ellen: I guess I would be the liaison.

m. Madison: Does the Green Fund have anything to do with the WSA? Would there be any disadvantages of giving SBC more funds and give money to the Green Fund through the SBC?

n. Ellen: I think Green Fund works so well because everyone in the committee specializes in sustainability and has the background to be very effective. I think there’s something symbolic in having the distinction of giving money directly toward sustainability efforts on campus. Motion for straw poll.

o. Yes: 24 No: 0 Abstaining: 3

Item 6. New Business & Announcements:

a. Bruno: Late Night Planning Social Committee with Elisa Cardona on November 18. RSVP!

b. Sadasia: Compilation of Fire Safety guidelines, etc.

c. Ellen: Option to ride along with PSafe.

d. Owen: That’s actually a punishment from SJB.

e. Nicole: Introduction of new members.

f. Rebecca: Bryan will introduce a proposal for work study and academic credit.

g. Jared: Work study students as event staff. It’s not working.

h. Anna: It’s not very clear what jobs are work study and what aren’t.

i. Henry: What work study jobs would be in consideration for academic credit?

j. Rebecca: Still in progress.

k. Serene: Work study isn’t mandatory, right? What is the purpose of work study?

l. Rebecca: Work study is part of how you pay for your Wesleyan tuition.

m. Nila: The Student Health Advisory Committee

n. Madison: I eventually want to have a discussion about what groups should get funding, depending on what they can bring back to campus.

o. Sadasia: I’ll send out an email asking who’s interested in helping me out.

p. Lizzie: Suggestion: Directory for committees at this school?

Meeting Adjourned: 9:30 pm
Respectfully Submitted,
Alice Lee ‘17
Madison Moore ‘16

Whilst every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of the information, statements and decisions recorded in these minutes, they are not intended to be a verbatim or complete accounting of the meeting.