

## **CONCERNS FROM ASSOCIATED STUDENTS REGARDING BP 7600: CAMPUS SAFETY OFFICERS**

---

Overarching Concerns: The language in this document is being changed to address liability, and does not take into account the safety, comfort, or well-being of students on campus. While it is being presented as DEIA work, it is not, and the changes to BP 7600 will negatively affect those students across the Fullerton College campus in need of positive DEIA initiatives.

It is important that the training of campus safety officers be reviewed along with the development of this board policy, as we must guarantee that the officers conduct deescalation tactics above all others. Additionally, we must train officers, so they do not interpret the ambiguous language of this document in a manner that negatively impacts students.

---

Overarching Questions: How many people have been involved in this? How many people of diverse backgrounds? People with background and experiences with campus safety officers?

---

### **CONCERNS FROM ASSOCIATED STUDENTS SEPARATED BY CORRESPONDING SECTION OF BP 7600: CAMPUS SAFETY OFFICERS**

#### **1.3 “Objectively reasonable” means that officers shall evaluate each situation requiring the use of force in light of the known circumstances...**

- Writers in this section use “objectively reasonable” to define “objectively reasonable.
- It is difficult to determine under which or whose standards something would be considered “objectively reasonable.” Language pushes policies that have created the level of incarceration we have today.

#### **1.4 “Probable cause” – Probable cause for an arrest exists when facts and circumstances...**

- It is difficult to define “a reasonable officer,” leading us to wonder what that means and who would make the determination that an officer was indeed reasonable.

#### **1.5 “Reasonable suspicion” – Is the basis for detention when specific facts would lead any reasonable person to believe criminal activity has taken place...**

- Question: Is there a reason that “reasonable person” is used in this instance and “reasonable officer” used in section 1.4?

## **2.1 The Campus Safety Departments will apply community-oriented safety principles, problem-solving techniques and other appropriate methods...**

- This section advocates for welcoming and visible campus safety officers to promote an inclusive educational environment. However, this section seems flawed and pointless, as we wonder in what ways campus safety officers could make education more inclusive at Fullerton College.

### **3.1.1 - Campus Safety Officers are non-sworn and unarmed...**

- Question(s): Why was it necessary to add “deterrence” to the primary role of campus safety officers? In what ways might campus officers deter students?
- It is concerning that deterrence is a necessary addition to this document, taking into account the more mundane “prevention, observation, and reporting” language that was present before this addition.

### **3.1.6 - Campus Safety Officers uphold campus safety standards throughout the student conduct and discipline process...**

- Question: How is campus safety involved in the student conduct and discipline process outside the role of Dr. Nick Arman?

### **3.2.1 - Campus Safety Officers may question, request identification, and/or detain any person on District property when reasonable suspicion to do so exists...**

- The document mentioned in section 1.5 that “Reasonable Suspicion is not sufficient for an arrest.” This has prompted us to wonder what difference the district has found between “arrest” and “detain.”
- Question: What do campus safety officers define as reasonable suspicion?

### **3.2.2 Campus Safety Officers may detain an individual on campus for reasonable suspicion of involvement in criminal activity but short of probable cause to arrest...**

- This section characterizes the length of allowed detainment as “a short period of time.” This explanation is highly ambiguous, leaving too much to the interpretation of any given campus safety officer. This concern is also present for section 3.3.2 under “reasonable time.”

- This section explains that detainment of students allows a campus safety officer to determine “if there are facts that a crime occurred.” Evidence that any crime has occurred at all should be verified before beginning to detain students.

### **3.2.3 Campus Safety Officers have the authority to question and request identification of students when necessary...**

- This element of the board policy is especially concerning for students who do not feel safe around safety or police officers due to immigration status, race, etc. We wonder why it is necessary to add a section permitting officers to generally question and/or identify students outside the realm of detainment or arrest.

### **3.4.2 Campus Safety Officers will use other reasonable means to gain compliance before resorting to force including: verbal commands, critical decision-making...**

- Question: What is tactile deployment and critical decision-making?

#### **3.4.3.1 Low force is calculated to gain compliant behavior with no expectation of injury and includes the physical presence of the officer...other similar measures.**

- This section again uses vague terminology that could be interpreted a variety of ways by campus safety officers in the form of “other similar measures.” It would be more beneficial to the well-being of students to avoid this level of ambiguity.

#### **3.4.3.3 Pepper spray or similar products authorized by the District will not be used at any time except as a defense measure when there is a threat of personal injury...**

- Pepper Spray is a high level of force that is permitted under “threat of personal injury.” The definition of this type of threat is ambiguous, leaving us to wonder if campus safety officers use pepper spray on students must they only say they felt threatened? The cause of such a substance’s use on students should be more clear.
  - Question: Why does “threat of personal injury” no longer include the use of the word “immediate” as it used to in section 2.4.4.?
- We also wonder what the necessity of pepper spray on campus safety officers is, and if it is truly in the best interest of students for officers to have it on them.

### **3.5.3 Campus Safety Officers may pat-down the outer garment of an individual subject to arrest...**

- The document mentioned in section 3.5.2 that “Campus Safety Officers are authorized to conduct...a limited and reasonable search for weapons, only if the officer has probable

cause to believe that the person arrested is in possession of a weapon.” Section 3.5.3. clarifies the use of pat-downs, stating a pat-down is used “when there are articulable facts that would indicate the individual(s) detained may have weapons.” These two sections appear remarkably similar in purpose, and prompt us to wonder why a section on “pat-downs” specifically was deemed a necessary addition.

- Question: Have campus safety officers been the subject of complaints due to “pat-downs”? Is that why this section has been added?

### **3.6.2 Campus Safety Officers are authorized but not required to engage in foot or bicycle pursuits on District property to detain or arrest for criminal activity...**

- The use of the term “imminent capture” seems ambiguous, and if left to the interpretation of campus safety officers may lead to unnecessary pursuits and chases off-campus.

### **3.6.3 Campus Safety Officers are authorized to follow an individual who has committed a crime for the purpose of updating law enforcement as to the location of the individual.**

- We feel it is important to clarify restrictions on how and why campus safety officers may follow people off-campus if this section is to be added to BP 7600. If not, there is no reason why officers could not follow individuals off-campus for unethical purposes and just tell others later they were doing it to update law enforcement.

### **5.4 Campus Safety Officers shall immediately report any accident to their immediate management supervisor...**

- Question: Are accidents that occur on campus not to be reported to the police? The wording of this section implies this, as it only clarifies a police department’s involvement when the accident occurs on a public road.

### **5.0 Personal Bearing: It is essential that safety personnel be sensitive to the higher education environment. Safety officers shall at all times be courteous and civil...**

- This seems like common courtesy in any environment and the way that the officer speaks is indicative of the way he sees the group. We’re curious why it has been stricken from the Board Policy, as that action implies that these actions are no longer requirements of a campus safety officer.