

MassArt Board of Trustees  
**Executive Committee**  
January 25, 2019  
11:15 am to 12:45 pm, Alumni Room

**MINUTES**

Trustee members present: Pamela Parisi (Chair), Elisa Hamilton, David Lee, Peter Nessen, Jan Saragoni, Linda Snyder, David Nelson (Ex Officio). Other trustees present: Karen Keane. Members absent: none  
Also participating: Ellen Carr, Dwayne Farley, Maureen Keefe, Dave Morrow, Lyssa Palu-ay, Kymberly Pinder, Gina Yarbrough, and Susana Segat (Board Secretary)

Call to order

Chair Parisi called the meeting to order at 11:20am and reviewed the agenda.

Approval of the minutes

On a motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

**VOTED: To approve the minutes of the November 16, 2018 committee meeting.**

Items requiring a vote

President Nelson asked for the approval of appointing Robert Perry to the Vice President for Administration position. Trustees congratulated VP Perry.

On a motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

**VOTED: To approve the appointment of Robert Perry as Vice President for Administration and Finance, effective February 5, 2019.**

Regarding the proposed motion to appoint Susana Segat as Vice President for External Affairs/Chief of Staff, President Nelson said that he and Chief Segat were rethinking the scope of the position as related to the strategic plan so we were not prepared to recommend the submitted motion at this time. Trustees expressed their appreciation for Chief Segat's work.

Items for discussion: consideration of revising MassArt's policy on arming CPO's

Chair Parisi opened the discussion on campus safety. She asked trustees to consider what needs to be done to have a safe campus and to then decide what to recommend to the full board for their February 5, 2019 meeting. President Nelson distributed an "If/Then/Regardless" chart, data on the tenure of officers, a list of courses already completed, and a community policing report.

Trustees asked to receive the budget implications for supporting officers through the academy and any other costs associated with developing public safety officers through the ranks. They discussed whether it would be possible to create a new model or to re-think the Public Safety Department: its goals, responsibilities, staffing, types of uniforms, availability of non-lethal weapons, and training. Trustees discussed the issue of institutional liability; whether installing metal detectors would be effective; the status of arming policies at Emerson and Suffolk Universities and Roxbury Community College; and the sample size of MassArt community survey feedback. They discussed whether staff tenure would be a factor in increasing de-escalation skills; how MassArt's turnover might compare with other Boston institutions and our peer set; and whether tenure might be brief because staff might not feel equipped to do their jobs well. Chief Farley introduced Lieutenant David Morrow, who discussed the legal authority expectations for sworn officers. Trustees discussed the futility of searching for an ideal model and agreed that if MassArt CPO's were to be asked to carry arms, then this new policy could not be implemented until in-depth training had been completed. They agreed on the dual goal of having our campus *be* safe and as well as making it *feel* safe (including that students might feel less safe with arms and CPO's might feel less safe unarmed) and considered whether implementing both the "current" and "regardless" columns of the chart provided would be enough. Trustees discussed who would have permission to carry arms on campus if CPO's were not allowed to carry weapons; the commitment of the Boston Police Department and their potential response time; and the complexity of having open, public, building access regardless of arming.

Trustees agreed that they would need to know the specific implementation timeline, training, budget, and sequence of events if the board voted to arm CPO's. Chief Farley listed his proposed training plan, which he said is already being implemented, regardless of the arming issue. In response to questions about what the department would need to do to alleviate community fears, Chief Farley discussed the hiring of a Community Resource Officer, the monthly themes presented to engage public safety with the student body, and the opportunity for his staff to enroll in student courses. He introduced his assistant Julie Simons, who spoke of creative ideas for projects involving both artists and police officers. On

questions of what would happen if trustees did not vote to arm CPO's, Chief Farley explained that his officers were waiting for this vote before deciding whether to stay at MassArt: some might leave. Trustees discussed the ability to hire and retain well-qualified public safety staff and the pros and cons of arming as an incentive to work at MassArt.

Trustees discussed the goal of being a campus where people thrive. They noted that the upcoming campus health presentation to the board would present data on food insecurity and other big factors affecting student well-being; there are many more issues leading to campus safety than just the issue of arming CPO's. Trustees agreed that a comprehensive communications plan must be created, regardless of the vote, to discuss the vote and manage expectations and feelings of safety. President Nelson added that the new safety committee would be helpful in this endeavor. Trustees discussed how to proceed with these deliberations; whether there would be any new information that might make a difference; and how best to handle the expectations on how the community perceives the board's considerations.

At 12:18pm, the chair called for a brief recess for lunch. At 12:51pm, the meeting resumed.

Chair Parisi re-focused the conversation to "where do we go from here." Trustees agreed on the need to continue to make improvements to the physical plant; that if CPO's were to be armed, this would only happen after training; and that the community would need to be engaged in developing a vision for the trainings. Chair Parisi asked for a sense of the body, assuming that all of the prerequisites have been implemented prior to arming: Trustees Saragoni, Lee, and Parisi said they were leaning toward arming and Trustees Hamilton, Snyder, and Nessen said they were leaning toward maintaining our current policy. Trustees discussed how to monitor and assess incidents and how their split vote is conditioned by the culture and climate of the campus. President Nelson suggested that trustees think about what they might be bringing forward to the board and to consider what level of confidence they might require him to provide from trainings. He asked trustees how they would adjudicate conditions and deliberate over the serious indefinable questions about trainings and philosophical assumptions. There was discussion about defining conditions. President Nelson noted that he would like to have more confidence on how best to implement a new policy and asked trustees to weigh the probabilities of protection versus day-to-day security. He said that he would need to be convinced and to be given a high level of confidence about the field or the level of training. Chair Parisi noted that we could not determine success until we arm, and that we would not be able to arm until the trainings have been completed. Chief Farley noted that these concerns have been discussed for three years and that there has been internal agreement that training would be mandated, regardless. He added that even though training seems to now be an issue, the actual training never stops.

Trustees discussed the possibility of not having unanimity as a board. The chair noted that all of the trustees had been given the opportunity to attend the committee's discussion on this issue, so that not much more briefing would be necessary. Chair Parisi questioned the wisdom of approving a new policy where the vote is too split and where the administration does not want it to happen. She said that she would now be more likely to lean toward not changing the policy. Trustees discussed how the recommendation to the board should be phrased so that their intent would be clear. The proposed framework was that from a split committee vote, the Executive Committee would recommend to the full board that MassArt maintain its current practices of not arming CPO's, including the continued implementation of physical safety enhancements; that MassArt continue to strive to be a safe and welcoming community for all members, including CPO's.

On a motion duly made and seconded, the motion was approved by a showing of 4 hands raised in the affirmative and 2 hands raised in the negative:

**VOTED:** To forward the following recommendation to the full board of trustees for their deliberation: **To greatly enhance our efforts to increase the wellbeing and safety of our community through strategies presented in the "If/Then document columns 1 and 3" and to continue the status quo with respect to arming at MassArt (e.g. that CPO's are not armed). Furthermore, to express deep appreciation to MassArt's public safety staff.**

#### Other business

President Nelson provided a brief report on collective bargaining issues with the MSCA union. He said that the administration at MassArt has a good relationship with the faculty and that everyone is eager to complete the contract this year. There is an issue about language negotiated over equivalencies that would cost the college over \$1m. He also distributed a page from the Chronicle of Higher Education that included MassArt as one of the top thirty *less-selective 4-year public institutions/colleges with the highest retention rate*.

#### Adjournment

On a motion duly made and seconded at 2:15pm, it was unanimously

**VOTED: to adjourn**