

October 18, 2023

Meeting Notes

Welcome and Opening Comments

Review of Task Force Response Document – Steve Witmer

- 805.B - clarification on two separate teams, a Threat Assessment Team, and a violence prevention committee. One is policies, and the other is action/enforcement. **Can they be combined? Is that best practice?** They need to be two separate meetings, at least.
 - Suggested language- another statement “these should be two separate entities”, *Each violence prevention committee shall be separate from the Threat Assessment team...*
 - Campuses with similar issues – Chief Branch, smaller institutions
 - 805.B and 805.D have separated sections, different makeups of team members but some crossover. The membership of the two should not be completely congruent but can overlap.
 - Statement underneath the code: Part of best practices; a clarification of these statements would be helpful. Suggesting, without telling them how to alter code.
 - Chief Branch – a chief called and said they were in a Violence Prevention meeting, and they went into a Threat Assessment meeting. Confidentiality may be an issue. Steve Witmer said that seems to be an institutional issue, an operational issue. Meetings need to be clarified.
 - Donna – this document is not to suggest legislation, it is to clarify what is needed for Best Practice. Do we want to put something in this document to ask for clarification?
- 805. D
 - Title IX representative – conflict of interest, should not be on the Threat Assessment Team; Student Affairs needs to be. Keep it more general to allow campuses to add their own. This list is not exhaustive. Others can be added, but they won’t be privy to all information given in a Threat Assessment meeting.
 - Make clear in the document that language be included that allows universities to add others
 - **From Steve – 805.D should expressly authorize institutions to appoint additional members of the TA Team as necessary to meet intuitional needs.**
 - Should HR be included? Is this their area of expertise? Having an HR representative benefits employees if the situation falls under OSHA. Hesitate to exclude them.
 - Chief Branch mentioned a long discussion about when this legislation was created. There was a reason for the number of team members, but he couldn’t recall why.
 - Sometimes duplicates are “on the team,” but only one representative is asked to attend.
- 805.E
 - Check!
- 805.F
 - Change the word “obtain” to “request”. Teams may not be given information; clarify the mandate so sections are aware they need to release information to the TA team.
 - #2 - “Notify in writing” - archaic, can this be clarified? Certified mail is not 24 hours. Does email count as “writing”?

- Discussion on whether self-harm (eating disorder, cutting, etc.) is necessary to involve the Threat Assessment team.
- 805.G
 - Check
- 805.H
 - Check
- 805.I
 - Yes, we can offer a 2-hour yearly training by an outside entity, but it would have to be approved by DCJS. Let the Department approve the training. Teams would have to submit certification for approval. (Wouldn't that be PIC?) What do we do if someone doesn't take their training? Enforcement?
 - Returned to this after lunch – Donna pointed out that there hasn't been any money allocated to Campus Safety yet. More training might require a budget.
- 805.J
 -

Discussion of Draft Best Practices Document – Marc Dawkins, Steve Witmer

- Submitting Gene's Draft Model Policies and Guidelines, along with Identified Conflicts, with the statement that we are unable to finalize with the legislation as written.
- The financial aspect was brought up again

Final Steps

Public Comment and Wrap