
The University of British Columbia

**Campus Security Department Review
Vancouver and Okanagan campuses**

Report of the Review Committee

April - May 2016

Fred Fotis, Director of Residence Life, University of Wisconsin, USA
Stan Gilmour, Superintendent, Reading Police, Berkshire, UK
Pat Patton, Director, Security and Operations, University of Regina, Saskatchewan

With assistance from Ann Campbell, former Director, Office of VPRI, UBC

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 3
- INTRODUCTION 8
- AREAS OF FOCUS 10
 - 1. Clarity of role..... 10
 - 2. Clarity of purpose 13
 - 3. Leadership..... 16
 - 4. Reporting structure 17
 - 5. Resources..... 18
 - 6. Myths and legends 20
 - 7. Staff engagement and visibility..... 21
 - 8. Access services, including electronic security, risk, and planning 25
 - 9. Incident management 26
- APPENDIX I 27
- APPENDIX II 29

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of the external review of Campus Security on the Vancouver and Okanagan campuses is to evaluate current operations and provide feedback and suggestions to enhance those operations in the near and longer term. As noted in the review's terms of reference, although the Campus Security departments on each campus operate independently, there is a desire to ensure that the operating philosophies and practices of the two departments are in alignment.

Over the five-day-long review, the committee met many dedicated and thoughtful students, staff and faculty who were committed to improving both the quality of life on, and safety of, each campus. The committee members were struck by how quickly they found a series of like comments and opinion, as well as "myths and legends", particularly on the Vancouver campus.

Dissonance best describes what the committee found on the Vancouver campus. There was a lack of clarity concerning the importance of safety on the campus, who was undertaking the security function and how it was being undertaken, what role the Campus Security department was fulfilling (investigation or service or both or neither), what role the RCMP was and should be fulfilling, who owned the blue phones, and many other issues. In contrast, on the Okanagan campus the reviewers found clarity concerning Campus Security's mission, role, and values. Resolving the dissonance in Vancouver is crucial to identifying a plan for that campus.

The committee's final report shares findings and recommendations in nine areas. All recommendations are intended for both campuses, unless otherwise stated.

Regarding clarity of role:

Recommendation 1: Establish clear roles and responsibilities for the Campus Security department on the Vancouver campus. Charge the department with responsibility for all safety and security on the entire Vancouver campus (both the academic center and all market properties). End the use of the artificial boundaries that confuse and fragment security. Use best practices from the Okanagan campus as one model.

Recommendation 2: Provide adequate funding for the Campus Security departments, along with clear direction and strong leadership and support from above. Provide the resources and tools required to match what the departments should offer with what they should provide. For the Vancouver department, ensure some financial consistency in the years ahead in order to foster a new vision and a new work style.

Recommendation 3: Working with the RCMP in Vancouver (Richmond Detachment) and Okanagan (Kelowna Detachment), enter into a formal memorandum of understanding so that each partner is clearly aware of their responsibilities. The MOU process and regular conversation should take place between senior UBC administrators and senior RCMP officers as well as, in Vancouver, the detachment's staff sergeant.

Recommendation 4: With advising by the RCMP, ensure Campus Security staff has proper training in areas of investigation to ensure that there are common standards and understanding of when is the appropriate time to turn a criminal action over to the RCMP.

Recommendation 5: Develop a communications/education program on the Vancouver campus to make clear to the community the roles of the RCMP and Campus Security.

Recommendation 6: Review the University Bylaws on the Vancouver campus and clarify enforcement roles and responsibilities, in particular regarding the RCMP and Campus Security. Explore the best model for that enforcement. Give consideration to whether Campus Security should be given authority under that bylaw. Seek out the tolerance level of the University and a full understanding of why particular bylaws may be used.

Recommendation 7: Immediately bag all non-working blue phones on the Vancouver campus. Implement a plan to repair or replace the non-working blue phones quickly and on an on-going basis. Ensure that safety items such as the blue phones receive a high priority in the maintenance hierarchy. Assign one unit the responsibility and resources to manage the blue phones.

Regarding clarity of purpose:

Recommendation 8: Establish a strong and clear value statement on community safety for both campuses—created at the Board level, addressed strategically by the President and the Executive and operationalized by the specific unit.

Recommendation 9: As part of a broader safety commitment, develop a coordinated effort with strong education, policies, language, support services and awareness to address issues around sexual violence. Seek the willing collaboration of many units to share resources and services to create an effective response.

Recommendation 10: Further incorporate the philosophies of community based policing into UBC Campus Security on the Vancouver campus. This involves community involvement/interaction, community consultation, and a proactive, problem-solving-oriented approach to security on campus. Develop a system in which security staff can become familiar with their constituents. Undertake this change in approach in consultation and partnership with the RCMP.

Recommendation 11: In the establishment of a community based policing model on the Vancouver campus, develop staff skills and understanding to encourage a more interactive relationship with the community. This includes looking for opportunity to have staff work in zone locations that allow them to develop a relationship with those in their area. This could be in the form of an officer liaison program or general foot patrol assignments.

Regarding leadership:

Recommendation 12: As soon as is practicable, recruit a Head of Profession for Community Safety as a senior post holder.

Recommendation 13: Identify UBC assets working in broadly defined community safety roles and how they link into wider social services. Charge the Head of Profession with bringing together and leveraging the resources and goodwill of stakeholders in all matters related to community safety and security.

Regarding reporting structure:

Recommendation 14: Consider linking the Vancouver and Okanagan Campus Security teams in a new Community Safety Directorate, under the Head of Profession and with a broader skill base and a wider focus on linking campus and community assets in community safety activities.

Recommendation 15: Identify geographic 'neighbourhoods' within the Vancouver campus to enable more localism in the delivery of differentiated campus community safety activities.

Regarding resources:

Recommendation 16: Adopt a priority based budgeting model to link finances to risk and level of service. Make and articulate a clear link between risk and resource allocation.

Recommendation 17: Prioritize and conduct a diversity review on both campuses to ensure the Campus Security departments understand the needs and assets available to support greater inclusion.

Recommendation 18: Expect the Head of Profession to be a strong, vocal advocate for the funding necessary to meet the University's goals and expectations.

Regarding myths and legends:

Recommendation 19: In line with the development of a security mandate for UBC, work with Communications professionals to clarify and share the key messages at the forefront of the Campus Security departments' safety and security mission.

Recommendation 20: Ensure the revised Campus Security 'offer' and key messages on the Vancouver campus are clearly linked in web and social media communications, with simple, easily accessible safety information and online reporting processes available.

Regarding staff engagement:

Recommendation 21: Campus Security leadership engage with staff in providing them with a clear mission and vision and thereafter seeking to involve them and their representatives in improving services.

Recommendation 22: Campus Security leadership seek to leverage staff assets across broad community safety partnerships to build engagement and lift the performance of Campus Security staff and their collaborators.

Recommendation 23: Upgrade the Campus Security uniform to a more visible, recognizable style. Consider a common colour and standard while allowing that different styles and accessories may be needed for the different environments in which individual officers will work.

Recommendation 24: On the Vancouver campus and in concert with the union executive, review the job description of the Shift Supervisor role, including the responsibilities and training required. Once complete, ensure that all staff are clear on their roles (supervisory and not) and what the successful undertaking of each role looks like on a day-to-day basis. Provide appropriate training to address gaps and provide feedback towards constructive behavior.

Recommendation 25: Develop competency and flexibility among the Vancouver management team to allow for flex scheduling and the ability to work more closely with Shift Supervisors on supervision of staff. Work with the staff and union management to clearly define and articulate professional expectations for shift workers and their supervisors.

Recommendation 26: Review the present practice followed for hiring staff into the Vancouver department. Look for ways to provide new staff with consistent employment (ideally full-time) which could result in a higher quality pool of applicants.

Recommendation 27: Review the job description and classification of general Campus Security staff in order to attract a higher level of candidate with university education and experience. Seek security experience gained in a similar post-secondary or professional environment. Require this level of staff to demonstrate a proactive, problem-solving mindset and interact at a higher level with staff, students and faculty.

Regarding access services:

Recommendation 28: University and unit leaders articulate clear ownership rules for space use, based on risk. Apply those rules, with any exceptions escalated for Executive decision making.

Recommendation 29: Take a program perspective in future, including planning for additional services, consulting widely before agreeing on single-line ownership.

Recommendation 30: Conduct a careful risk assessment of the entire Vancouver campus, and create a safety certification for all parts of campus, similar to LEED-building certification.

Regarding incident management:

Recommendation 31: Senior managers in Risk Management Services and Campus Security plan and exercise responses for the full range of major incidents. Involve senior managers from across UBC and the RCMP.

Recommendation 32: Draw up plans and processes to identify cumulative levels of critical incidents. All managers must be made aware of their roles and responsibilities in regard to these, specifically the roles of governance and communications.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the external review of UBC Campus Security on the Vancouver and Okanagan campuses is to evaluate current operations and provide feedback and suggestions to enhance those operations in the near and longer term. As noted in the review's terms of reference, although the Campus Security departments on each campus operate independently, there is a desire to ensure that the operating philosophies and practices of the two departments are in alignment.

In order to carry out the review, the UBC Campus Safety and Security Steering Committee recruited three external review committee members:

- Fred Fotis, Director of Residence Life, University of Wisconsin;
- Stan Gilmour, Superintendent, Reading Police, Berkshire, UK; and
- Pat Patton, Director of Security and Operations, University of Regina, Saskatchewan.

The reviewers brought to their committee work experience in both police and security matters and in campus life, and were assisted greatly by clear Terms of Reference (see Appendix A), a carefully thought out interview process that drew in varied constituencies on both campuses, and an assistant who had current knowledge of UBC.

The review committee spent four days on the Vancouver campus and one day in Kelowna on the Okanagan campus. The reviewers met with a broad representation of Campus Security leadership and staff, academic units and administrative departments, and external agencies including the RCMP. Appendix 2 contains the names and affiliations of all participants who met with the committee.

The five-day schedule, with the Okanagan visit at its midpoint, allowed time for the review committee to review the Campus Security departments and prepare to comment broadly on the concept of campus safety. Stepping away from Vancouver for a day to visit the Okanagan was important as it allowed the reviewers to see a different University situation that provided direction in their thinking about the broad charge.

Over the week the review committee met many dedicated and thoughtful students, staff and faculty who were committed to improving both the quality of life on, and safety of, each campus. The committee members were struck by how quickly they found a series of like comments and opinion, as well as "myths and legends", particularly on the Vancouver campus.

Dissonance best describes what the committee found during many of its interviews on the Vancouver campus. There was a lack of clarity concerning the importance of safety on the campus, who was undertaking the security function and how it was being undertaken, what role the Campus Security department was fulfilling (investigation or service or both or neither), what role the RCMP was and should be fulfilling, who owned the blue phones, and many other

issues. In contrast, on the Okanagan campus the reviewers found clarity concerning Campus Security's mission, role, and values. Resolving the dissonance in Vancouver is crucial to identifying a plan for that campus.

The external review committee wishes to emphasize strongly that the difference between the campuses should not be attributed simply to size. Although there are advantages to being able to build a unit from scratch as was the case in the Okanagan, what impressed the reviewers was the level of professionalism, engagement in the campus, and positive attitude that was present there. In every Okanagan campus meeting, participants described the Campus Security department as a partner and a subject matter expert. Further, the department has a very positive relationship with the local RCMP detachment and that relationship is with a senior officer.

It is noteworthy that as the campus developed, leaders on the Okanagan campus committed to using security cameras in all buildings and that this provides an important technological tool in maintaining campus safety. The Central Dispatch office is central to the campus and open and staffed 24 hours a day. The reviewers learned that there are concerns on the Vancouver campus about the use of closed circuit television (CCTV), but the operation in the Okanagan is a good example of its successful application.

The review team also notes that the two campuses have different representing unions. There are some challenges to address regarding work place issues in Vancouver, and the reviewers heard a willingness on the part of the CUPE 116 leadership to address some of the issues.

Both campuses share unique challenges that must be managed as they grow—into a “university city” in the case of the Vancouver campus, and as part of a rapidly growing area with new accessibility in the case of the Okanagan campus. While each campus is different, the positive note is that some best practices exist on the Okanagan campus that are easy to access and consider for the Vancouver campus.

AREAS OF FOCUS

1. Clarity of role

Who does security at UBC?

On the Okanagan campus, the committee found a shared understanding of the role of the Campus Security department, its contracted security personnel and the local detachment of the RCMP.

On the Vancouver campus, no such shared understanding was found. The answer to the question “who does security?” depended largely on who was asked. AMS students and staff focused on AMS Security. The response of UBC staff members was sometimes Campus Security, sometimes RCMP. The University Neighbourhood Association members spoke of either the RCMP or private security staff hired to attend to their neighborhoods. In many cases, the Campus Security department was confused with AMS Security, other external security providers and the RCMP. There was little understanding of the different roles and responsibilities of the RCMP versus Campus Security, even within those ranks.

When questioned specifically about the Campus Security department, students (and many staff) on the Vancouver campus were not clear as to their role. In general, UBC staff understood aspects of the department’s role (for example, in providing after-hours access to buildings or additional security at certain, potentially raucous events). In the situations where Campus Security gave specific service (for example, providing support to Ceremonies functions) they were highly regarded and valued partners. Individual staff members were singled out for praise. It appeared that when the customer was able to get what they needed, it was a good relationship.

It was also the case that if a unit or building had the financial resources to put to security, they could get all the security they wanted. Entities such as the Ike K. Barber Learning Center, the Sauder School of Business, and the Faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences were able to pay for additional and specific security to their buildings. Units such as the Museum of Anthropology and Life Sciences Institute were provided augmented security through central University funding. While this arrangement seemed to more or less meet the self-determined needs of the individual units, the question remains if this a *à la carte* approach (with security levels determined by the entities, not by Campus Security after a proper risk assessment) offers value to the institution. The committee found that it added to the dissonance on the Vancouver campus.

The Campus Security staff members on the Vancouver campus were very unclear as what their role was: Were they investigators or ambassadors or static security guards? Some staff members were very customer-oriented and, as such, praised by many for their willingness to

drop what they were doing and assist when asked. While admirable, the committee questions whether staff has a clear sense of the department's priority activities that should not be compromised when requests for lower priority services are received.

Overall, the reviewers found that many different offices or units work separately on issues around safety and security. As a result, no one seems able to define what the service or task actually is for each, and for Campus Security specifically. Additionally, there are artificially imposed boundaries between the academic campus and market housing in Vancouver that add to confusion and a lack of ownership.

Recommendation 1: Establish clear roles and responsibilities for the Campus Security department on the Vancouver campus. Charge the department with responsibility for all safety and security on the entire Vancouver campus (both the academic center and all market properties). End the use of the artificial boundaries that confuse and fragment security. Use best practices from the Okanagan campus as one model.

Recommendation 2: Provide adequate funding for the Campus Security departments, along with clear direction and strong leadership and support from above. Provide the resources and tools required to match what the departments should offer with what they should provide. For the Vancouver department, ensure some financial consistency in the years ahead in order to foster a new vision and a new work style.

Regarding the relationship between the RCMP and Campus Security on the Vancouver campus, the RCMP staff sergeant who met with the committee was adamant that it was the role of the RCMP to address all crime on campus. He believed that his detachment should be called for all crime, and that the RCMP's non-emergency number should be distributed to students, staff and faculty, not the Campus Security number. At the same time, the officer was concerned about his own funding, and shared the fact that his group did not respond to issues at the fraternity complex located next door to the detachment.

In a large community such as UBC's Vancouver campus, there is clearly a role for both Campus Security and the RCMP. While it is important to note that the RCMP are the Law Enforcement agency of record, Campus Security needs to play a role in safety and security for the Vancouver campus. While improving, there is still much more work to be done with the relationship on the Vancouver campus.

On the Okanagan campus, although there is no formal memorandum of understanding, a very amicable relationship has been forged through good communication between the Campus Security and the RCMP. It would be wise for the campus to formalize the relationship so that future leadership changes do not impact the shared understanding of roles and responsibilities.

Building on Recommendation 1, further clarity should be sought in the role of Campus Security to maintain the safety of campus versus the need of police to do policing. The Law Enforcement

agency of record must be used to deal with any criminal cases on campus but there can also be a role for Campus Security to assist in making the policing easier.

Campus Security has a role in addressing issues of non-academic misconduct and the proactive response to crimes on the campus. It is very important that they respond on behalf of the University. They should have the ability to gather basic information in support of the case for the University and be good stewards of the community while supporting the RCMP. They must be continually considering proper response to criminal action. This partnership should extend to where Campus Security works with partners both inside and outside of the University community to maximize security and put preventative action in place as deemed fit. Campus Security should be the liaison to all parties and should be coordinating that proactive piece on campus. As stewards of the University property, Campus Security should also be able to work with others to determine action when the University is deemed the victim of a crime (mischief, theft of University property, etc.)

In the Okanagan, a Campus Security staff member works with the student affairs unit to review and resolve cases of student misconduct. This is one way the unit in Kelowna partners with a broad university issue. As well, the RCMP Inspector stated Campus Security helps them by dealing with the issues that are “low hanging fruit” so the RCMP can focus on pure policing matters. That may also be the case on the Vancouver campus, however that relationship and trust needs to be rebuilt.

Recommendation 3: Working with the RCMP in Vancouver (Richmond Detachment) and Okanagan (Kelowna Detachment), enter into a formal memorandum of understanding so that each partner is clearly aware of their responsibilities. The MOU process and regular conversation should take place between senior UBC administrators and senior RCMP officers as well as, in Vancouver, the detachment’s staff sergeant.

There is a strong likelihood that Campus Security will come across crimes or may be able to respond faster to an emergency call due to their intimate knowledge of campus. As a result, Campus Security staff should be properly trained as to what the RCMP would like to see in terms of securing a crime scene and maintaining the integrity of that scene, witnesses and victims. That partnership will bode well for both parties and allow all to look after their individual interests and that of the community.

Recommendation 4: With advising by the RCMP, ensure Campus Security staff has proper training in areas of investigation to ensure that there are common standards and understanding of when is the appropriate time to turn a criminal action over to the RCMP.

It is very important that the community sees a team approach to communications and education regarding campus security. A coordinated approach will assist individuals to feel comfortable approaching various areas in a time of need and to have comfort that they will be assisted and supported.

Recommendation 5: Develop a communications/education program on the Vancouver campus to make clear to the community the roles of the RCMP and Campus Security.

There appeared to be confusion on the role of the RCMP in the enforcement of UBC Bylaws on the Vancouver campus. The example provided was regarding the RCMP's perceived inability to enforce Noise Bylaws. It appears that in the University Bylaws there is clear acceptance of the role of the RCMP as enforcement officers, however this does not seem to have been clarified. This could be a point where finding the ability for that enforcement and a shared vision of when that would be used could benefit both parties. As much as anything, the discussion and subsequent work to achieve the end result would be a worthwhile, relationship-building exercise.

Recommendation 6: Review the University Bylaws on the Vancouver campus and clarify enforcement roles and responsibilities, in particular regarding the RCMP and Campus Security. Explore the best model for that enforcement. Give consideration to whether Campus Security should be given authority under that bylaw. Seek out the tolerance level of the University and a full understanding of why particular bylaws may be used.

Role confusion that led to a lack of ownership regarding campus safety was evident in the condition of the blue phones in Vancouver. During meetings with Campus Security and Building Operations it was unclear who was responsible for the on-going maintenance of the phones. Some non-operational phones simply had "not working" signs tacked to them, but from afar one might think it was an operating phone. This places the institution in a serious situation where its offer of service does not match what it can deliver.

The committee understands that, after the review meetings, a Service Level Agreement (SLA) is now being drafted for the maintenance and upkeep of all Campus Blue Phones. The SLA will identify each of the UBC Departments involved, their responsibilities and service response times offered to restore the unit to full operation.

Recommendation 7: Immediately bag all non-working blue phones on the Vancouver campus. Implement a plan to repair or replace the non-working blue phones quickly and on an on-going basis. Ensure that safety items such as the blue phones receive a high priority in the maintenance hierarchy. Assign one unit the responsibility and resources to manage the blue phones.

2. Clarity of purpose

How safe should the campuses be?

This is a challenging question for UBC to answer, but a necessary one. The review committee found no broad statement about the value of campus safety that could drive the idea and operationalizing of safety and security.

As a consequence, on the Vancouver campus, staff and individual events seem to both define and drive the issue. The Campus Security department has been lead by nine directors over 27 years, with each director setting the department direction according to his own, different idea. The Vancouver campus has grown into a large, diverse community, a “university city,” yet the reviewers were not able to find this major change—and its implications on safety and security--acknowledged in any values statement. As noted earlier, there are artificially imposed boundaries between the academic campus and market housing that add to questions and confusion over who provides that service. The budget of the Campus Security department has been cut over the last two years, surprising for a campus that is concerned about its reputation around safety. Finally, the operating model of the Vancouver department does not lend itself to providing leadership to the campus in both safety and security. Without a clear and strong institutional statement addressing this question, the University is left with dissonance. A safety and security unit director will not succeed without knowing clearly the institutional values around safety and security.

The creation of a clear high-level values statement about security at UBC is the first step in making it clear that the safety of the campus is a priority. Such a statement is a reputation enhancer. If from this follows a well-resourced, effective unit charged with maintaining safety on campus in active partnership with the RCMP, the University’s reputation will be further strengthened. At times of crises, a clear values statement and an effective unit are the critical supports a communications staff needs in order to craft an appropriate communications’ response. The review committee notes that addressing issues around the institution’s reputation are separate from creating the strategic items required. At the same time, because of the impact security issues have on the UBC reputation, Campus Security should have a staff member who is trained to deal with media inquiries, or the campus communications unit should always provide the primary response to media.

Recommendation 8: Establish a strong and clear value statement on community safety for both campuses—created at the Board level, addressed strategically by the President and the Executive and operationalized by the specific unit.

As it is for all universities, sexual violence is an issue for UBC and has a chilling effect on the learning climate. It impacts all members of the University community, and requires strong policies, active education around all the issues around sexual violence, and the ability for a response by the University that is safe and caring for the victim and makes a strong statement about safety to the community.

Both UBC campuses are working on policies and programs that will address the issue of sexual violence. While this is a *part* of safety on campus, it is not *all* of what campus safety is about. Addressing the issue of safety at UBC will include an approach to sexual violence as part of the greater whole; it does not and should not define the issue of safety and security. The review team observed that since 2012 there has been a rush to tactics around sexual violence and safety on the Vancouver campus that has resulted in incremental and not strategic decisions

and planning. Having the policies in place and clearly communicating them to the campus will help all parties move beyond 2012.

The committee acknowledges that UBC has a health and safety policy (Policy 7) but feels that this policy does not adequately or specifically address the University's commitment to community safety in a comprehensive way. A new policy would reflect a commitment to community safety within the academic campus and beyond to the larger neighbourhood.

Recommendation 9: As part of a broader safety commitment, develop a coordinated effort with strong education, policies, language, support services and awareness to address issues around sexual violence. Seek the willing collaboration of many units to share resources and services to create an effective response.

How should Campus Security "look" and "feel?" The review team sees an opportunity for the Vancouver campus to consider the model of community based policing. While "policing" is referenced, this model can be used as a campus security model as well. Rather than a traditional reactionary "night watchman" model, community based policing involves a more community-oriented approach to security. This approach will better integrate Vancouver's Campus Security department into the UBC community, with a particular emphasis on student involvement. This appears to be happening on the Okanagan campus already with great success.

Recommendation 10: Further incorporate the philosophies of community based policing into UBC Campus Security on the Vancouver campus. This involves community involvement/interaction, community consultation, and a proactive, problem-solving oriented approach to security on campus. Develop a system in which security staff can become familiar with their constituents. Undertake this change in approach in consultation and partnership with the RCMP.

Part of the community-based model of Campus Security involves a high level of visibility. Research shows that people feel safer with a more visible level of police/security. That visibility also involves a face-to-face component in which citizens become more familiar with security personnel serving in that area. As mentioned previously, the Okanagan campus department has developed a robust network of relationships that help them in the pursuit of being the eyes and ears on campus and engaging the community to assist them. The challenge for the Vancouver campus is developing strategic relationships that will provide the same friendly neighbourhood feel.

Recommendation 11: In the establishment of a community based policing model on the Vancouver campus, develop staff skills and understanding to encourage a more interactive relationship with the community. This includes looking for opportunity to have staff work in zone locations that allow them to develop a relationship with those in their area. This could be in the form of an officer liaison program or general foot patrol assignments.

3. Leadership

Strong leadership is required, at all levels, to deliver campus security and the strongest leadership needs to come from the top of the organization. This is most especially true when there is a need to bring forth change; the most difficult changes are always those aimed at moving organizational culture.

The reviewers found a lack of knowledge and experience at senior levels in UBC across broad security and community safety matters. On the Vancouver campus, this has led to a culture of upwards management and general low levels of trust and confidence, often expressed as insecurity, amongst many stakeholders.

The Vancouver campus “city”, the Okanagan campus “community” and both their environs have a broad range of stakeholders, with varied interests in the safety and security of its citizens as well as its physical and intellectual assets. It cannot, of course, be forgotten that UBC is also an institution with an international reputation to maintain and protect.

Many senior leaders in UBC departments are skilled and able to contribute to broad safety and security aims. On the Vancouver campus there is a lack of leadership in bringing those skills and abilities together for the common good of community safety. Steps have been made in the right direction through the formation of the security review committee but this approach needs to be part of core business—and this requires professional vision and leadership.

There also appears to be a policing deficit on the Vancouver campus, with a small detachment of RCMP officers expected to support a population that has exponentially outgrown the small number of officers (and police services) available to it. There appears to be little recognition of the impact of this deficit (especially as it impacts on diversity) or the leadership role needed to bring balance and stability across the wide policing and community safety remit.

UBC requires a Head of Profession who must work with the UBC executive and governors to negotiate a reduction in this deficit at senior police/political levels. Bearing in mind that the RCMP is not the only solution to the problem, the Head of Profession should also be able to articulate the problem in detail and present the University Executive with high-level options.

These challenges require an authoritative voice with a broad skills base, well versed in managing complex relationships even in times of crisis. This challenge would best be served by an acknowledged Head of Profession who will take the lead on all community safety matters across UBC, the Vancouver and Okanagan campuses inclusive. They would have direct line management of staff in their department and professional oversight of others engaged in community safety activities (e.g. non-academic misconduct, survivor care, communications).

The Head of Profession would be responsible for creating and managing relationships with stakeholders, and take personal responsibility for managing the University’s relationship with senior stakeholders, in all matters related to community safety (this includes wider social

services that may impact on UBC staff and students). The Head of Profession would identify and bring together collaborators to leverage the experience and goodwill of staff and volunteers across the UBC community.

The Head of Profession would be the face and the voice of community safety for UBC and as such should report directly to the Executive (in the present structure this would be the Vice President Students). In order to reflect the importance of the mission, the Head of Profession would need to be senior within UBC, perhaps at the Managing Director/Associate Vice President level.

Recommendation 12: As soon as is practicable, recruit a Head of Profession for Community Safety as a senior post holder.

Recommendation 13: Identify UBC assets working in broadly defined community safety roles and how they link into wider social services. Charge the Head of Profession with bringing together and leveraging the resources and goodwill of stakeholders in all matters related to community safety and security.

4. Reporting structure

The reporting structure currently sees the Director of Campus Security on the Vancouver campus reporting to the Managing Director, University Community Services whose portfolio also includes the Bookstore on both campuses, Parking and Access Control Services, UBCcard and Campus Mail. This seems an odd fit, one that defines security as a service rather than an approach and does not prioritise the importance of the role that the Campus Security department should play in broader community safety.

On the Okanagan campus, Campus Security reports into Risk Management Services, which seems more apt for their needs at this time. There is, however, a clear line between the impending construction of transport infrastructure and more local housing development with the need to think about future strategic requirements for the Okanagan campus, and consistency across UBC.

Amongst the lessons to be learned from the expanding Vancouver campus “city” is that the community’s needs and assets—along with changes in their scale and complexity—must be taken into account. This includes policing, safety and security activities. Leadership in broad community-safety terms should reflect the importance of the mission and the level and depth of leadership should reflect that importance across both campuses. This does not preclude an opportunity to flatten the organization under a more senior leader; and there would be nothing wrong in using the existing senior roles in Campus Security on both campuses in a strong operational context, linked by the Head of Profession as discussed above, in a new directorate for Community Safety.

There is a noticeable difference between cultures and levels of staff engagement between both sites, with Okanagan Campus Security much more embedded in campus life. Vancouver

Campus Security staff members talk about how they gather ‘intelligence,’ whereas Okanagan staff see themselves as the ‘eyes and ears’ of their campus. This use of less security and more pastoral language is an indicator of the different cultures. There is a need for both approaches, depending on the nature of the threat and risks at hand, and bringing both campuses under common control would add to the overall cultural mix and give flexibility in designing solutions to broad community safety problems.

Recommendation 14: Consider linking the Vancouver and Okanagan Campus Security teams in a new Community Safety Directorate, under the Head of Profession and with a broader skill base and a wider focus on linking campus and community assets in community safety activities.

The Okanagan campus is much smaller than Vancouver and benefits from this smaller scale in many ways. However, there is nothing to stop Campus Security on the Vancouver campus from creating smaller geographic ‘neighbourhoods’ across its territory to obtain the same benefits. Discussions with Campus Security staff suggest that six Vancouver ‘neighbourhoods’ would be optimum.

Consider options under the broad banner of organizational design and development to bring both security teams under common oversight and develop a smaller ‘community’ feel to their activities and approach on the Vancouver campus.

Recommendation 15: Identify geographic ‘neighbourhoods’ within the Vancouver campus to enable more localism in the delivery of differentiated campus community safety activities.

5. Resources

UBC is a dynamic organization with an annual budget of \$2.3 billion and a global reputation for excellence. If the University is to live up to its promise to provide world-class opportunities it must provide adequate resources to ensure the safety (including dealing with feelings of insecurity) of its students, staff, neighbours and sponsors. The review committee acknowledges that meeting the needs of all strands of diversity will introduce additional costs, but this is an important part of the University’s promise and should be adequately resourced.

It is clear that the Campus Security department on the Vancouver campus over promises and under delivers with its current resource model. The committee was advised that, despite staffing minimums intended to ensure adequate coverage of the campus, there are times when only two patrol staff are circulating on campus; as such they can have little real impact on community safety and certainly very little on ‘keeping students safe’ or adding to the overall feeling of safety on campus.

There is a general lack of clarity with regard to the resources available to the Vancouver campus department. This lack of clarity extended into how the resources available should be allocated and prioritised. While the committee was advised by Campus Security leadership that the

charge out rate for Campus Security services is \$45 per hour, the various static sites reported being charged differently and a variety of charge out rates were noted.

In Vancouver, there appeared to be little evidence of a link between risk assessment (and very little evidence of that assessment actually being done) and resource allocation. As noted earlier, the reviewers learned about a number of buildings and faculties that pay for static security. Buildings should have security if it is needed and not just if it can be afforded. It appears that somehow a 'concierge' type service is being offered for those with the cash to spend, whilst other building with perhaps greater need are being ignored. In short, if security is needed then provide it. If not needed then don't provide it. If a department disagrees with the risk assessment and wants to 'buy' some form of security (e.g. concierge services) then ensure these are differentiated from other core security services.

As noted earlier, operational and organizational priorities were not evident in Vancouver and seemed to be ad hoc at best. Priority allocations (or lack thereof) did not bear scrutiny and certainly were not funded to the level necessary to meet the claims, or the rhetoric.

On the Vancouver campus, financial resources have been cut back over successive years and there was no evidence that consideration had been made as to how these cutbacks impacted on specific or generalised risks. The most recent staff cutbacks were to staff support roles, specifically the Com Op Supervisor and receptionist. It was apparent that there had been no attention paid to how the budget was split between functional areas of business and how cutbacks and other burdens had impacted on the affordability of current allocations (for example, between the needs of different static security clients). In short, there appears to have been little defence or advocacy for resources, with everyone simply resigned to their fate. The review team did not find the same level of concern over the availability of resources at the Okanagan campus.

Staff remuneration appears to be below average in Vancouver and, although there are other benefits that add value, the hourly rate in particular seems low. As the saying goes, you get what you pay for and some of the client requests (for example, for Campus Security staff in Vancouver to take a more proactive role, including through communications and education) would require a different—and more costly—staff profile.

This potential change in staff profile also aligns to the need for diversity and representation within Campus Security. Although diversity and representation can be leveraged by greater collaboration with other UBC assets (for example, AMS Student Services) it is clear that diversity costs money, and UBC needs to decide if they want to pay for it. The Head of Profession should be able to deliver a clear pathway and strong advocacy for this initiative.

On diversity, most interviewees reported that there was a lack of diversity within Campus Security on the Vancouver campus and cited the fact that there were few women. It should be noted that all strands of diversity appear underrepresented and, in order to meet the particular needs of the community, this diversity should extend to intellectual diversity. Those staff

members tasked with engagement priorities need an ‘equality of arms’ in intellectual horsepower with the UBC community. Campus Security needs to plan for how they will achieve this. Particular attention should be paid to building bridging capital with minorities and First Nations staff and students. As the interior of British Columbia is less diverse than Vancouver, the review team noted that an increase of all strands of diversity would be important on the Okanagan campus as well.

Recommendation 16: Adopt a priority based budgeting model to link finances to risk and level of service. Make and articulate a clear link between risk and resource allocation.

Recommendation 17: Prioritize and conduct a diversity review on both campuses to ensure the Campus Security departments understand the needs and assets available to support greater inclusion.

Recommendation 18: Expect the Head of Profession to be a strong, vocal advocate for the funding necessary to meet the University’s goals and expectations.

6. Myths and legends

When repeated often enough, some points of information or opinion gain an apparent air of legitimacy that transports them above and beyond normal scrutiny.

Based on statistics and reporting provided by the Campus Security departments, the review team found both campuses to be safe places. Despite this, many interviewees spoke about the critical importance of safety and security, and not all believed that the Vancouver campus was a safe place. In over 90 per cent of scheduled meetings on the Vancouver campus, people made reference to the past sexual assaults and the current issues impacting the campus. For many it was the lens through which they saw the safety of their campus.

Many conversations on the Vancouver campus ended on a note of despair given that ‘UBC would never do that because...’, or ‘it will all be sorted when UBC finish doing...’. There was also apathy, ‘RCMP don’t care about...’ that was not reflected in face-to-face meetings with the recipients of the disparaging comments. These comments fell within enabling conversations (‘we do it because’) and disabling conversations (‘we don’t do it because’). As examples: ‘UBC have decided they are not going to have CCTV on campus.’ ‘The problems of sexual assault will be solved when UBC writes its sexual assault protocol.’ Clearly neither of these statements is true but they are tropes of the common knowledge around campus and both are ultimately disabling. They prevent progress being made against real issues.

Similarly, there was often a sense of impotence or lethargy on the Vancouver campus because people or institutions ‘don’t care’ about issues of importance. This was evident in many cases, for example, during discussions about student equity and, separately, in discussions about Campus Security’s relationships with RCMP. More worryingly, it was also present in discussions about inclusion.

These issues must be dealt with, and some grip and pace injected into positive messages and—most importantly—positive action.

The choice of the descriptive language used by UBC in media briefings and reporting raised the committee's concern, with terms such as 'proowler' and 'horror' coming to the fore. Describing campus as a place where 'certain people will be attracted'—translated by the media into 'fertile ground' for sex attack—is another example of concerning comment. UBC should be reporting in terms that present a calm and balanced perspective, not trying to 'up the ante'. The press are very good at scaring people; UBC should not be in that game.

A review of the Vancouver Campus Security web pages could also provide opportunities for positive messaging about community safety. It seems a shame, for example, that the only comment about sexual assault is from tabulated and contradictory 'crime' figures. Positive information concerning the broad range of services available from the wide UBC family and the RCMP, together with how these support majority and minority survivors, could prove valuable, especially if survivor groups were consulted in the design process. Safety and prevention advice and services could be linked to these as well as 'one-click' reporting. A review of the Okanagan campus security website will provide some ideas and guidance in this area.

Further the Okanagan campus has produced a safety app, which could be modified for use on the Vancouver campus. It contains many useful features and could be used to enhance community engagement.

Recommendation 19: In line with the development of a security mandate for UBC, work with Communications professionals to clarify and share the key messages at the forefront of the Campus Security departments' safety and security mission.

Recommendation 20: Ensure the revised Campus Security 'offer' and key messages on the Vancouver campus are clearly linked in web and social media communications, with simple, easily accessible safety information and online reporting processes available.

7. Staff engagement and visibility

Organizations need their staff to 'go the extra mile' in order to deliver a high quality service. This goodwill requires high levels of staff engagement and this has to be part of any organizational strategy; it rarely just 'happens'. Goodwill cannot be bought (although remuneration is a key building block), it is enabled by making staff feel vital and listened to and by giving them interesting and challenging work that is held in high esteem by its recipients. A motivated and agile workforce should be a planned goal, delivered by trusted and trusting leaders.

At the Okanagan campus, Campus Security staff showed a healthy level of engagement. They exhibited a clarity of purpose (to provide safety and security services in a professional and respectful manner), an understanding and appreciation of the value they provided to their campus, and a significant level of energy.

Campus Security staff on the Vancouver campus did not appear to have much sense of their role or purpose and could not clearly articulate the vision for their area of operations. This is not to say that they did not have lots of ideas, simply that they were uncoordinated. When guided, staff could clearly articulate their personal mission and displayed high levels of commitment to getting the job done.

All levels of the Vancouver staff seemed to despair at not being listened to or heard. They felt their role was being 'dumbed down' and specialist knowledge was not valued. Some officers felt they were being taken from specialist into general roles and that other areas were under-resourced (for example, analysis and information sharing). It appears that, as some of the longer-tenured officers age, they feel a lack of progression opportunities that prioritise their skills and knowledge over their physicality.

Many clients were, however, very complimentary of the service they received from some security personnel on both campuses and it is clear that, at an individual level, there is goodwill and experience that somehow is not captured in more general terms (this is most true of the Vancouver campus). There were clearly areas such as AMS student services (Safewalk, Sexual Assault Support Centre) where Vancouver Campus Security staff could add value, especially if they were able to work in closer partnerships.

The review committee sees a number of ways to engage staff, beginning with energizing them for change, encouraging innovation, and congratulating them when they do well. Conversations with staff associations revealed a willingness to work with managers to improve staff relations on the Vancouver campus. This offer should be seized upon. The voices of all stakeholders should be heard and communicated to demonstrate that they are being listened to.

Recommendation 21: Campus Security leadership engage with staff in providing them with a clear mission and vision and thereafter seeking to involve them and their representatives in improving services.

Recommendation 22: Campus Security leadership seek to leverage staff assets across broad community safety partnerships to build engagement and lift the performance of Campus Security staff and their collaborators.

It is important for UBC staff, students, faculty and the community to have confidence in the people who are serving them. While it seems superficial, people develop a first impression when they come across an individual. It is very important for Campus Security staff members to project an air of confidence to the community. Uniform is very much a part of that.

The review team observed that, with their present uniform, Campus Security staff seemed to blend in to the community on both campuses. Many of the uniforms appeared to be well worn and there did not seem to be a standard of uniform and accessories that was followed. This included hats, hair length, pants and accompanying undershirts and jackets.

Consider that one uniform may not fit all when it comes to Campus Security, but the “brand” should be consistent. Various static sites (for example, the Museum of Anthropology) may have a unique environment that is better suited to a more formal style of uniform while general security may require something that is more comfortable and suitable for a mobile environment. A more consistent and professional look may well aid with staff engagement, giving officers added confidence, pride and the ability to stand out in the community.

Recommendation 23: Upgrade the Campus Security uniform to a more visible, recognizable style. Consider a common colour and standard while allowing that different styles and accessories may be needed for the different environments in which individual officers will work.

As it is for other organizations with 24/7 staffing, supervision of shift workers is a potential challenge for Campus Security. The Okanagan appears to have dealt with this by giving the role of dispatcher to the person with supervisory responsibility, thus making it possible for them to allocate tasks freely.

On the Vancouver campus, supervision of shift workers has proven to be more of a challenge, particularly in the union environment. The reviewers note that the union executive who were interviewed were willing to listen and work towards positive change on a number of work place issues. In the short term, it is critical that those union members who are expected to supervise others are given clear responsibilities and expectations for their job. With that, they need to be held to account in their role as supervisors.

Recommendation 24: On the Vancouver campus and in concert with the union executive, review the job description of the Shift Supervisor role, including the responsibilities and training required. Once complete, ensure that all staff are clear on their roles (supervisory and not) and what the successful undertaking of each role looks like on a day-to-day basis. Provide appropriate training to address gaps and provide feedback towards constructive behavior.

The review committee was asked to consider shift length in order to assist with management of staff and retention. While 12-hour shifts have their downsides, they may in fact have a positive impact on staff management and retention. In fact, in the Okanagan, staff and management expressed support for the 12-hour shift.

Support was mixed on the Vancouver campus. With Greater Vancouver’s challenging real estate environment, existing and future staff face potentially longer commutes to work from outlying areas. They may find value in the 12-hour shifts as the commutes are at non-peak times and are undertaken for fewer days in a week as compared to typical 8-hour shift routines.

The 12-hour shifting may also support better opportunity for shift supervisors to develop a relationship with their team and to work with them over a longer period of time to achieve

goals. It is often more difficult to maintain a team environment with 8-hour shifts due to the rotations.

Certainly, shift work in any model has its challenges in terms of supervision and work/life balance but the reviewers did not find sufficient cause for it to be abandoned on the Vancouver campus. Developing a culture of positive work-life balance for shift workers and the unique challenges they face is important and may create a more positive environment for staff.

Recommendation 25: Develop competency and flexibility among the Vancouver management team to allow for flex scheduling and the ability to work more closely with Shift Supervisors on supervision of staff. Work with the staff and union management to clearly define and articulate professional expectations for shift workers and their supervisors.

Retention and recruiting of staff is another challenge for Campus Security on the Vancouver campus. The reviewers felt the present practice of hiring new staff into part-time roles may be more of a deterrent to recruitment than shift rotations. Coming into a role with only part-time possibilities and little structure (a casual approach) may be the largest barrier to attracting the best and most diverse pool of candidates.

Recommendation 26: Review the present practice followed for hiring staff into the Vancouver department. Look for ways to provide new staff with consistent employment (ideally full-time) which could result in a higher quality pool of applicants.

Campus Security on the Okanagan campus does not appear to have similar recruitment and retention issue. The model that works for them at present is a mix of in-house and contract staff. On-going review of this model is necessary as growth on and around the campus may change the present dynamic, requiring adjustment to the contract model.

In Vancouver, recruiting a team that better fits the demographics of the campus is important. That reflection of the community is not solely based in gender or culture but in intelligence as well. At a globally ranked university like UBC, it is important that Campus Security staff understand the academic environment within which they work. This requires them to be able to converse with staff, faculty and students at a higher level than might be required in, say, retail or construction security.

UBC is not trying to replicate a police department nor should it imitate a security guard unit at an airport. Campus Security should strive to develop a unique team with a specialized skill set that works in between those models in order to support a safe and comfortable living, learning and work environment. With a higher classification of staffing and possibly higher remuneration, recruitment and retention may better reflect the campus. This should also include acknowledgement for the unique challenges and sacrifices of shift workers in the form of an 'unsociable hours premium' to make shift work more palatable.

Recommendation 27: Review the job description and classification of general Campus Security staff in order to attract a higher level of candidate with university education and experience. Seek security experience gained in a similar post-secondary or professional environment. Require this level of staff to demonstrate a proactive, problem-solving mindset and interact at a higher level with staff, students and faculty.

There may remain the opportunity to employ staff with “security guard” mindsets at static sites but this new level of professionalism and expectation is likely a better fit for the general Campus Security role. It is important that these Campus Security staff be considered professionals with a unique skill set, rather than general security.

8. Access services, including electronic security, risk, and planning

Campus Security on the Okanagan campus seems to have made the important link between access services and community safety. On the Vancouver campus some legacy issues, many to do with the scale of operations, seems to prevent Campus Security from making the same link. There were many encouraging signs but, once more, there was a lack of leadership in joining the dots between those departments involved including, for example, Risk Management Services, Campus and Community Planning, and the Office of the University Counsel.

The reviewers observed once again a seemingly ad hoc approach to developmental practice with a lack of clarity in project and program ownership or risk. ‘Good ideas’ seemed to be considered risk free, when the contrary was usually the case e.g. the campus blue phones. Regarding the blue phones, the roll-out appeared to have been treated as a project rather than a program and, as such, contingencies were not thought through (for example, long term planning for maintenance was largely absent). Whole program ownership seemed vague at best with different departments acknowledging they were unsure where accountability fell for some problems. Again, the blue phones are a good example of uncertain ownership either of the physical assets or the risks associated with them.

Recommendation 28: University and unit leaders articulate clear ownership rules for space use, based on risk. Apply those rules, with any exceptions escalated for Executive decision making.

Recommendation 29: Take a program perspective in future, including planning for additional services, consulting widely before agreeing on single-line ownership.

The review team did not find evidence of a thorough risk assessment of the Vancouver campus and environs. Campus and Community Planning had done some of this planning but other departments (including Campus Security and Risk Management Services) did not appear adequately engaged. Maintenance and upkeep of safety equipment, particularly those used by the public, should be given high priority. It should be clear who has the responsibility for this role, and “operationalizing safety” should be a part of the risk assessment. Vancouver takes great pride in its green campus, with many environmental initiatives including LEED certified buildings. The same kind of focus and planning now given to environmental issues should be

given to safety and security issues. The results of the risk assessment should include a detailed plan to resolve deficiencies and meet the new institutional standards, a plan that is owned and managed by one unit.

Recommendation 30: Conduct a careful risk assessment of the entire Vancouver campus, and create a safety certification for all parts of campus, similar to LEED building certification.

9. Incident management

While both campuses have plans for some major incidents, there was an acknowledgement on both campuses that UBC was unprepared for some kinds of major incidents (for example, a firearms attack). While the Okanagan department is taking steps to address this deficit and will test their response plan in June, there was no clear leadership or link between both campuses that would drive forward a correction of this deficit for the University. UBC would be severely criticised for this in any post facto investigation and, although senior risk managers knew what they needed to do, there was no mechanism to prioritize this or acknowledge the risk of not having a plan in place. There was no understanding of the roles played by Campus Security in an expanding incident and, although the Okanagan campus was closer to this understanding, there were still clear gaps (and more will arise with any testing).

Despite a Disaster Response Plan for the Okanagan campus and an Emergency Management Plan for the Vancouver campus, staff on both campuses expressed confusion as to who would be 'in charge' during the phases of a major incident such as a lone shooter. Little thought seems to have been given to managing communications (similarly so for any critical incident – guidance is available but does not seem to have been sought out). Senior managers in all areas were unclear about the different types and scales of incident or their roles. The committee found a disconnect, particularly on the Vancouver campus, between Risk Management and Campus Security when considering violent acts.

A common theme developed in all discussions about incident management. Although certain incidents had become iconic in the community's shared experience, particularly on the Vancouver campus, there was little concerted effort to review the University's response and use lessons to build procedures for future incidents. Resources had not been put into areas of highest risk and procedures that do exist remain uncoordinated. The managing of sexual assault is one example.

Recommendation 31: Senior managers in Risk Management Services and Campus Security plan and exercise responses for the full range of major incidents. Involve senior managers from across UBC and the RCMP.

Recommendation 32: Draw up plans and processes to identify cumulative levels of critical incidents. All managers must be made aware of their roles and responsibilities in regard to these, specifically the roles of governance and communications.

APPENDIX I

Terms of Reference: Campus Security Department Review for the UBC Vancouver & Okanagan campuses

The purpose of the external review is to evaluate the current operation of the UBC Campus Security Department's on the UBC Vancouver and UBC Okanagan campuses against best practice and to provide feedback and suggestions to enhance each department's operations over the next 5 years.

The Security Departments on each campus operate independently but there is a desire to ensure that the operating philosophies and practices are in alignment.

The Review should address:

- the Department's alignment to the goals, vision and desired culture of the University
- the Department's administration & operational processes - including organizational structure, standard operating procedures, staff training and development, and funding model
- the Department's alignment with other operating units within the University community on the Vancouver campus including VP Students, AMS, GSS, SHHS, Risk Management Services, and the academic and administrative departments and on the Okanagan campus including AVP Students, Housing and Hospitality Services, Risk Management Services, University Relations, Facilities Management, Human Resources, Student Union Okanagan and Athletics.
- the Department's interaction with external agencies including the RCMP, BC Ambulance Services and Vancouver Fire and Rescue/Kelowna Fire Department and in the Okanagan the City of Kelowna and BC Transit.
- review the UBC Vancouver department's opportunities to share information with the UNA and UEL communities (suggestion and language to be confirmed)
- the Department's future direction, strategic planning and goals and challenges in achieving those.
- resourcing – including staffing levels, planning for purchase and replacement of equipment
- identify best practices in recruiting a diversified workforce

Review committee (Expertise focus):

Stan Gilmour, Superintendent Reading Police

Fred Fotis, Director, Residence Life, Univ. of Wisconsin

Pat Patton, Director of Security and Operations – Univ. of Regina

Process:

Review committee members will spend one week in British Columbia and they will have the opportunity to visit both campuses.

They will identify individuals and groups that they would like to meet with while on campus and a schedule will be set up ahead of their visit.

If the review team would like information from the broader campus community a survey could be developed prior to their visit.

At the end of the week they will present a high level overview of their findings to be followed by a written report.

Final Report from the Review Committee:

Review committee will provide a draft report to the respective Campus Security departments for fact checking before producing the final report.

Review committee's report will be presented on the Vancouver campus to the Campus Security Steering Committee and on the Okanagan Campus to the Direct Report Team (DRT).

APPENDIX II

Interview participants: Vancouver

- University Community Services, Campus Security – Debbie Harvie, Barry Eccleton
- AMS Safewalk—Ron Gorodetsky, Daniel Levangi ‘
- AMS Security – Alyona Martin
- Ceremonies – Eilis Courtney
- VP Students – Louise Cowin
- AMS – Jenna Omassi
- AMS Sexual Assault Support Centre – Ashley Bentley
- Student Housing and Hospitality Services – Andrew Parr, Janice Robinson
- Campus Security staff – Steve Bohnen, Rey Atienza, Glen McNeil, Syed Musavi, Kevin Mo, Rick Reinecke
- CUPE 116 – Dave Lance, Roger DePieri
- CUPE 2950 – Karen Ranalletta
- BCGEU – Kay Sinclair
- RCMP – S/Sgt Pat Reilly, Sgt Drew Grainger
- University Ombudsperson – Shirley Nakata
- Security Static site clients --
 - MOA: Moya Waters
 - Sauder: Linda Tommasini
 - Life Sciences: Pierre Tanguay, Maggie Zustovic
 - Pharmacy: Jamal Kurtu
 - Barber Library: Gordon Yusko
- Equity & Inclusion – Sara-Jane Finlay, Monica Kay
- Public Affairs – Susan Danard, Matt Ramsey
- Student Communications – Janeen Alliston
- Rick Management Services – Ron Holton, Bruce Anderson
- IT (Business Operations) – Michael LeBlanc, Kevin Lebadie, Calvin Lo
- Sexual assault survivor
- First Nations House of Learning – Linc Kesler, Debra Martel
- Board of Governors Secretary – Reny Kahlon
- Campus Security – John Molnar, Aarif Khan
- Campus Security – Ali Mojdehi, Sammy Lam
- Human Resources – Linda McKnight, Mike Vizsolyr, Sandra Blackmore
- UBC Legal – Hubert Lai, Mark Crosbie, Paul Hancock
- Athletics – Mike Tan, Kavie Toor, Doug Reimer
- Student Development and Services – Neil Guppy, Janet Mee, Cheryl Washburn
- Building Operations – Karyn Magnusson
- Pride UBC – Rachel Garrett
- Campus and Community Planning – Michael White
- Government Relations – Adriaan de Jager

Interview participants: Okanagan

- Risk Management Services, Campus Security -- Shelley Kayfish, Mike McGinty
- AVP Finance and Operations – Rob Einarson
- VP Research (designate), Manager, Biosciences Facility – Kim Hewitt
- Human Resources – Pauline Brandes
- University Relations – Bud Mortenson
- AVP Students – Ian Cull
- Athletics – Rob Johnson
- Aboriginal Services – Adrienne Vedan
- Student Development and Advising – Michelle Lowton
- Health and Wellness – Roger Wilson
- Campus Security team – Mike Gesi, Troy Campbell, Paul Hipsey
- Information Security, IT Services - Don Thompson
- Facilities Management – Roger Bizzotto
- Project Services
- IT Services – Steve Rosco
- Business Operations – Shannon Dunn
- Student Housing – Dan Smith/Alex Reid
- Conference Services/Central Booking – Suzanne Nazareno
- Parking Services/Food Services – Gary Hartung
- Bookstore – Ryan Hirowatari
- RCMP Kelowna: Inspector Brent Mundle, Operations Officer