



## UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO

### EMERGENCY INCIDENT INTERNAL REVIEW REPORT

MEMORANDUM TO: University of Idaho President Chuck Staben  
University of Idaho Vice President of Infrastructure, Dan Ewart

FROM: University of Idaho Ad Hoc Internal Review Task Force

SUBJECT: Moscow Campus Rocket Fuel Explosion of April 13, 2017

DATE: May 19, 2017

#### **Executive Summary:**

At approximately 9:50 p.m. on April 13, 2017, members of a university recognized student club were conducting a rocket fuel experiment in a parking lot adjacent to the University Steam Plant on Sixth Street. The experiment resulted in an unintended explosion that injured and hospitalized four university students.

Following the explosion, UI Division of Infrastructure Vice President Dan Ewart directed the University Office of Public Safety & Security (OPSS) to form an ad hoc internal task force to conduct an internal review of the incident and to produce a report of findings.

The purpose of this report is to provide task force observations and recommendations regarding the incident in the interest of enhancing and improving University safety and emergency response practices and policies and closing identified gaps. The university investigated the details of what occurred on the night of April 13 in order to understand the incident and to make observations and recommendations into the relevant university policies, procedures and practices on campus.

Task Force sub-teams were charged to review the incident *and* relevant university policies and practices, and then make observations and ***recommendations regarding university policies and practices*** in the interest of identifying areas for possible improvement. The table below summarizes the key recommendations and office of primary responsibility for implementation and recommended date of implementation.

**NOTE:** Student Affairs is planning a more in-depth review of the student club recognition process, the role of student club advisors and the associated policies and practices. Student Affairs intends to complete their in-depth review during summer break with a goal of implementing recommendations no later than the start of the fall semester.

**Key Task Force Recommendations\***

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Office of Primary Responsibility</b>	<b>Recommended Implementation Date</b>
<b>RM 1:</b> Revise/improve ASUI Handbook to incorporate an enhanced risk assessment process	Student Affairs with Risk Management support	No later than Fall 2017
<b>RM 2:</b> Mandatory RM training for advisors of clubs that conduct potentially dangerous activities	Student Affairs with Risk Management support	No later than Fall 2017
<b>RM 3:</b> Student Engagement should maintain copies of all student club required waivers	Student Affairs	No later than Fall 2017
<b>S 1:</b> Mandate Office of Public Safety & Security (OPSS) consult for clubs that conduct potentially dangerous activities	Student Affairs with OPSS support	No later than Fall 2017
<b>S 2:</b> Formal revision of club advisor role to include RM and safety functions	Student Affairs with OPSS support	No later than Fall 2017
<b>EM 1:</b> Revise EM framework consistent with the federal incident command system	Emergency Management	No later than July 2017
<b>EM 2:</b> Incorporate “failsafe” process for broadcasting immediate alerts	Emergency Management	No later than June 2017
<b>EM 3:</b> Implement process to increase mobile device enrollment in Vandal Alert	Emergency Management	No later than Fall 2017
<b>EM 4:</b> Ensure Vandal Alerts have essential information by creating templates in the web application	Emergency Management	ASAP (complete)

<b>CC 1:</b> Update Crisis Communication Team roster to ensure positive contact	University Communications and Marketing	ASAP (complete)
<b>CC 2:</b> Improve alignment between UCM Crisis Communication Plan and the Emergency Response framework	University Communications and Marketing with support from Emergency Management	June 1, 2017
<b>SA 1:</b> Conduct in-depth incident review and gather data from student club NORE	Student Affairs	August 1, 2017
<b>SA 2:</b> Identify all Student Organizations at UI	Student Affairs	August 1, 2017
<b>SA 3:</b> Include Safety/Risk Management process, roles and responsibilities into Student Club Handbook	Student Affairs with support from Public Safety & Security	August 1, 2017

*\*Additional recommendation details are available in the body of the report*

**Legend:**

- RM: Risk Management
- S: Safety
- EM: Emergency Management
- CC: Crisis Communication
- SA: Student Affairs

**Task Force Framework:**

On April 15, 2017, the University Office of Public Safety & Security in collaboration with other campus stakeholders developed the post incident internal review framework. Task Force members were selected because their university positions aligned with the elements of the review framework. The Task Force held its first meeting on Thursday, April 20, and agreed to a sub-team review approach, general review objectives and established a review timeline.

The Task Force created sub-teams to review practices and policies in five broad areas:

- a. Risk Management
- b. Safety
- c. Emergency Management
- d. Crisis Communications
- e. Student Affairs

**Specific Focus Areas for Sub-Teams:**

1. Inception and formation of student club – Northwest Organization of Rocket Engineers (NORE)
  - a. Club activity/educational objective risk control review
  - b. Club oversight/advising

2. Incident occurrence review (up to and including explosion)
3. Incident response review (post incident activities – all)
  - a. Immediate notification
  - b. Vandal Alert system (used to communicate with the UI community by email, text messaging and voicemail)
4. Crisis communication
  - a. External communication
  - b. Internal communication
  - c. Executive communication
  - d. Media relations
5. Incident response team and roles
6. Student care

**Task Force Members:**

Matt Dorschel, Public Safety & Security – Task Force Chair  
 Stefany Bales, Communications & Marketing  
 Blaine Eckles, Dean of Students  
 Joe Law, College of Engineering  
 Penny Martinez, Campus Security  
 Kent Nelson, General Counsel  
 Lisa Ormond, Communications & Marketing  
 Todd Perry, Emergency Management  
 Samir Shahat, Environmental Health & Safety  
 Nancy Spink, Risk Management  
 Ray von Wandruszka, College of Science  
 Jodi Walker, Communications & Marketing

**Task Force Timeline:**

April 15, 2017 – Ad Hoc Internal Review Task Force formed  
 April 20, 2017 – Task Force meets and establishes review process and objectives  
 May 1, 2017 – Sub-team observations and recommendations due to Task Force Chair  
 May 5, 2017 – Draft report sent to Task Force members for final review and input  
 May 8, 2017 – Task Force meets and finalizes report  
 May 19, 2017 – Final report submitted to university leadership

**Assumptions:**

Task Force Sub-Teams were provided the following incident assumptions as a basis for their review to provide additional context when formulating observations and recommendations.

1. *Student Club – Northwest Organization of Rocket Engineers (NORE)*
  - a. Formed under the process established by Associated Students University of Idaho (ASUI).
  - b. Recognized as eligible to receive ASUI funds allocated to student clubs.
  - c. The club was formed in January 2017.
2. *Advisors*
  - a. Two faculty advisors are assigned to the club.

- b. These faculty advisors actively engage with the club.

### *3. Club Function and Purpose*

- a. The Northwest Organization of Rocket Engineers is an organization of faculty and students who design, build and test rockets to develop engineering expertise and actualize extraordinary visions.
- b. The club does what the above description says, part of which is design and creation of rocket fuel such as the fuel used in the incident of April 13, 2017.
- c. The club has engaged in this activity (rocket fuel development) since inception.

### *4. Incident (additional details available in police reports from the night of the incident)*

- a. The purpose of the fuel test was to measure the force of the fuel by igniting it in the testing apparatus which was intended to allow the ignited fuel to escape through the top of the apparatus, using an instrument underneath the apparatus to measure force. There was no intention to launch the test apparatus and no intention to create an explosion.
- b. Club members designed and prepared the fuel mix that resulted in the explosion.
- c. The fuel mix was prepared in a university facility using materials obtained by the club.
- d. Club members designed and constructed the testing apparatus using materials obtained by the club.
- e. Club members conducted the fuel test at approximately 9:50 p.m. on April 13, 2017, in the university parking lot to the east of the University Steam Plant on Sixth Street.
- f. One club faculty advisor was on scene and present for the fuel test.
- g. The explosion which occurred injured four UI students seriously, requiring hospitalization. These four students included club members who were conducting the fuel test and at least one non-member UI student who was only observing.
- h. Police, Fire and Emergency Medical Services (EMS) were dispatched to the scene. These responders administered first aid, transported the injured to Moscow's Gritman Medical Center and secured the incident scene.
- i. The university issued two Vandal Alert system messages in conjunction with this incident. The first Vandal Alert was broadcast at 10:43 p.m.
- j. Moscow Police Department, in conjunction with federal law enforcement, conducted a scene investigation, including removal of the remaining fuel mix from a university lab.
- k. Upon removal of the remaining fuel mix, the incident was concluded.

## **Task Force Sub-Team Observations and Recommendations:**

### **1. Risk Management**

#### Risk Management Sub-Team:

- Nancy Spink, Risk Manager
- Kent Nelson, General Counsel
- Blaine Eckles, Dean of Students

#### Observations:

**O 1:** There is a handbook for ASUI Sport Clubs that is available online. ASUI documents (Constitution, By-laws, Rules and Regulations) contain only one reference to safety or risk. There is an ASUI cabinet member designated as “Director of Safety & Violence.” ASUI representatives do not appear to participate in the University Safety and Loss Committee.

**O 2:** UI Risk Management has been told by UI Student Involvement that Student Involvement is working on a revised clubs’ handbook. Student Involvement intends to include revised sections on risk, based on training UI Risk Management provided Student Involvement this year.

**O 3:** Faculty Staff Handbook contains only one searchable reference to student club advisors. Service as a student club advisor is one of the elements considered in faculty performance. Successful service is described in the UI Faculty Staff Handbook (FSH) Chapter One: 1565, Section C-(1) policy. <http://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/fsh/1565.html>.

- a. UI Risk Management consults with student club advisors who contact them by phone or email.
- b. UI Risk Management provides consultations on risk planning, risk assessment, insurance, vehicle procedures, and protection of minors. UI Risk Management will refer clubs to other resources, including but not limited to Environmental Health and Safety (EHS) and Office of Public Safety and Security. During consultations, UI Risk Management teaches risk assessment methodology that takes a proactive approach to risk.
- c. The UI Northwest Organization of Rocket Engineers Club consulted with UI Risk Management in January 2017. UI Risk Management assisted with preparation of a waiver for group members. Waivers for three injured parties have not been recovered.

#### **Key Risk Management (RM) Recommendations:**

**RM 1:** Revise the ASUI Handbook to incorporate enhanced RM process.

**RM 2:** Mandatory Risk Management training for faculty advisors of clubs that conduct potentially dangerous activities.

**RM 3:** Student Involvement should keep signed club waivers on file electronically for two years from date of signature. Clubs can be required to get the Waivers from Risk, and send an electronic upload as often as necessary to Student Involvement. (Not all clubs require a Waiver).

## Additional Recommendations:

RM 4: A current ASUI Registered Clubs Handbook should be posted online and kept current.

RM 5: Basic risk management guidelines for student club advisors should be included in the UI Student Involvement's proposed new handbook.

- a. UI Risk Management can collaborate with UI Student Involvement on the risk-related sections of this guideline.
- b. Successful student club advisors should be encouraged to add to the guidelines.
- c. Student club advisors should be encouraged to seek out UI resources such as Student Affairs, EHS, UI Risk Management, and General Counsel.

## **2. Safety**

### Safety Sub-Team:

-Samir Shahat, Director, Environmental Health & Safety

-Ray von Wandruszka, College of Science

The Safety Sub-Team focused on policies and regulatory requirements, and student club activities related to explosives and energetic material, materials that are toxic or yield toxic products, and activities that produce hazardous wastes.

### Observations:

**O 1:** The Office of Public Safety and Security (OPSS) does not appear to be involved in assessing the risk of certain student club activities.

**O 2:** The roles of faculty advisors in student club activities are not well defined.

**O 3:** Current UI safety policies addressing potential explosives and energetic materials on campus:

- APM 35.34 part A-1, e: "Explosives. Except in the case of law enforcement officers engaged in official duties, explosive substances are prohibited on university premises unless the university safety officer approves their use."
- APM 35.35 part H-2, a and b: "a. Explosives include but are not limited to any chemical compound, mixture, or device, the primary or common purpose of which is to function by explosion. The term includes, but is not limited to, dynamite and other high explosives, black powder, pellet powder, initiating explosives, detonators, safety fuses, squibs, detonating cord, igniter cord, and igniters.  
b. Except in the case of law enforcement officers engaged in official duties, explosive substances are prohibited on university premises unless the Executive Director of the Office of Public Safety and Security (OPSS) approves their use."
- APM 35.35 part H-3: "Violations of the Weapons and Explosives Policy. Anyone who has concerns about possible violations of this policy should notify the Executive Director of OPSS at (208) 885-7209."

- a. Employees who violate this policy are subject to disciplinary action, up to and including dismissal.
- b. Students who violate this policy are subject to disciplinary action, up to and including expulsion, as outlined in the Student Code of Conduct.”

### **Key Safety (S) Recommendations:**

**S 1:** OPSS should be included in the evaluation of the risk associated with potentially dangerous student club activities and should provide an assessment and evaluation to Student Affairs.

**S 2:** More clearly define the role of a student club advisor to incorporate risk assessment, risk planning, and safety planning and require more complete coordination of potentially dangerous club activities. A student club intending to engage in any activities involving items listed in the observations should seek the advice of one or more faculty members who will assume a supervisory role in the project in question.

### **Additional Recommendations:**

S 3: It is incumbent upon the faculty advisor to assess whether he/she has the expertise and the opportunity to discharge their duties in a manner that will ensure the safety of all involved in the activities. If this assessment is negative, the faculty advisor is obliged to remedy this by involving additional supervisors in the project.

S 4: Faculty role in potentially dangerous student club activities should be conducted in person, and for the entire duration of the activity. It is also implied that student club members planning potentially dangerous activities in a club project must obtain clearance from the faculty advisor.

S 5: It is incumbent on faculty advisors and student club members who plan to undertake a project involving items listed in the observations to thoroughly familiarize themselves with, and follow rules set forth in, existing UI safety policies, Idaho State requirements, and Federal regulations. Guidance will be provided by OPSS.

## **3. Emergency Management**

### **Emergency Management Sub-Team:**

- Todd Perry, Emergency Manager
- Matt Dorschel, Executive Director, Public Safety & Security
- Penny Martinez, Director of Campus Security

### **Observations:**

#### **O 1: Emergency Management Plan/Response Framework**

The current Emergency Management Plan was developed and promulgated in 2013. Since then, the university has undergone many staff changes which are not reflected in the plan. The plan does not include a detailed response framework that adequately outlines roles of emergency management team members.

#### **O 2: Notifications**

Several members of The President’s Cabinet and the Emergency Management Team were not notified about the incident in a timely manner. The responsibilities for notification and recall of personnel is not clearly defined in the current emergency management plan.



### **O 3: Vandal Alert System**

The Vandal Alert is an institution-wide, multi-modal (email, voice, text message, Twitter, Facebook) emergency notification system. All university employees and students are enrolled automatically through employee and student database modules. Students and employees are encouraged to update their Vandal Alert contact information through the Vandal Web application. Members of the greater Moscow community may also be enrolled in Vandal Alert.

- a. The initial Vandal Alert message was significantly delayed (approximately 50 minutes after incident).
- b. The first Vandal Alert did not include adequate information. It said the following: *“Explosion occurred on Moscow Campus. Responders on scene. Avoid Area. More information will follow”*.
- c. Only 17% of registered Vandal Alert members have a mobile device registered, as a result, only 2745 of approximately 15,000 registrants received a text from the Vandal Alert system during this incident.

### **O 4: Vandal Security**

Community Emergency responders (Moscow Police Department and Moscow Fire Department) noted the excellent work of University of Idaho Campus Security. They were available to identify and take down names of potential witnesses to be interviewed by the police later. UI Campus Security also were available to assist with crowd and traffic control.

### **O 5: UI Response Team**

The Vice President of Infrastructure, Dean of Students, Associate Dean of Students and Director of Communications responded to the scene and then established an operations center on campus at the Bruce M. Pitman Center. Other emergency management team members participated via telephone. The team managed all response activities very well though their efforts were not aided by having a written response framework in advance.

### **O 6: External Response**

Over 30 emergency responders were on scene within 11 minutes of the incident. This response included four ambulances and EMT's that treated and transported all of the injured students to Gritman Regional Medical Center in less than 30 minutes. The quick, thorough, and well-coordinated response demonstrated the outstanding capability of City of Moscow responding agencies **and** very likely saved lives that evening.

## **Key Emergency Management (EM) Recommendations:**

**EM 1:** Develop an Emergency Response Framework (ERF) that documents the processes required for a successful response and recovery from an emergency incident at the University of Idaho.

- a. The ERF should be consistent with applicable provisions of the National Response Framework (NRF) and the National Incident Management System (NIMS).
- b. The ERF should serve as a tool to improve coordination and strengthen relationships between the University and local, State, and Federal entities which operate under the NRF and NIMS provisions.
- c. Incorporate a notification scheme into the ERF that ensures positive contact with members of the University leadership team (Policy Group) and the required Emergency Management Team.

**EM 2:** Develop and incorporate a “fail safe” methodology to broadcast immediate Vandal Alerts to the university community more quickly.

**EM 3:** Develop and implement a plan to increase mobile device enrollment in the Vandal Alert system to ensure maximum notification.

**EM 4:** Use templates to ensure Vandal Alerts contain the necessary elements of immediate alerts. For example: “Explosion occurred on Moscow Campus in the vicinity of Sixth and Line Streets. Responders on scene. Avoid the area. More information will follow.”

#### **4. Crisis Communication**

Crisis Communication Sub-Team:

-Stefany Bales, Executive Director, University Communications and Marketing

-Jodi Walker, Director of Communications

-Blaine Eckles, Dean of Students

Observations:

A serious emergency, if not handled correctly, can destroy a good organization’s reputation. Serious incidents present the most difficult media relations and communications problems. How an organization manages publicity properly during a crisis will be remembered by the media and other stakeholders long after the emergency is forgotten.

The University of Idaho’s Crisis Communication Plan provides a framework for timely and accurate communication in crisis situations. The goal is to communicate accurately as soon as is possible about the incident to ensure UI’s stakeholders know the university is working as a team to resolve the situation.

University Communications and Marketing (UCM) deployed the Crisis Communication Plan in response to an explosion that occurred on campus the evening of April 13, 2017.

**O 1: Initial Crisis Communication Response**

Using the Crisis Communication Plan as a guide, immediate executive and decision maker notification of the April 13, 2017 explosion was executed effectively and within plan guidelines. The decision to initiate the Crisis Communication Plan and schedule a crisis communication call was made and appropriate UI decision makers were notified of the call within 15 minutes of the initial report of the incident. The call was scheduled for 10:45 p.m. Crisis Communication Team members were notified about the incident very quickly. Team members were briefed and ready to perform their specific responsibilities by 10:27 p.m., 23 minutes after initial incident notification.

- a. Table 1 below captures the steps to follow in the event of a crisis or emergency situation as outlined in the UI Crisis Communication Plan (first column), which team member completed each step (second column), and when each step was completed (third column).
- b. Table 2 below outlines when each member of the UCM Crisis Communication Team was notified of the incident.

Table 1

Crisis Communication Plan Steps	Action	Time
Initial Contact receives report	Matt Dorschel receives call from MPD	9:57 p.m.
Initial Contact informs unit lead	Dorschel calls Dan Ewart	10:02 p.m.
If situation is eminent threat, OPSS will issue Vandal Alert	OPSS issued Vandal Alert #1 via text and email; Vandal Alert #2 email only	10:43 p.m. and 12:03 a.m.
Senior Unit Lead consults with primary contacts	Ewart heads to scene, reports to primary contacts via text	Immediately heads to scene, sends initial texts at 10:19 p.m.
Senior Lead contacts Crisis Comm Team Lead and discusses expansion of notification	Ewart calls Stefany Bales	10:04 p.m.
Senior Lead contacts Executive Leaders	Ewart calls President Staben, John Wiencek, Brenda Helbling	10:06 p.m.
Notification from Senior Lead and Crisis Comm Team Lead to executives	Bales calls: John Wiencek, Lodi Price	10:14 p.m.
Senior Unit Lead and Crisis Comm Team Lead decide if Crisis Comm Call needed	Ewart and Bales decide to initiate crisis call	Crisis Comm Call invite emailed at 10:14 p.m., set for 10:45 p.m.
Crisis Comm Call initiated	Attendees: Staben, Wiencek, Bales, Ewart, Eckles, Dorschel, Larry Stauffer, Jodi Walker, Rob Patton	10:45 p.m.

Table 2

Crisis Communication Team (UCM)	Initial Contact Timing
Stefany Bales	Contacted by Ewart at 10:04 p.m.
Jodi Walker	Contacted by Bales at 10:06 p.m.
Brad Gary	Contacted by Walker at 10:25 p.m.
Savannah Tranchell	Contacted by Walker at 10:25 p.m.
Rob Patton	Contacted by Walker at 10:27 p.m.

## O 2: Internal and External Stakeholder Notification

The UI Crisis Communication Plan includes guidelines for notifying internal and external stakeholders in the event of a crisis or emergency. The tables below list internal and external audiences and the timeframe in which each was notified by UI. UI employee, student and family notification of the explosion occurred within the timeframe outlined in the Crisis Communication Plan. Notifying the State Board of Education (SBOE) did not happen within the guidelines outlined in the table below. This was due in part to the nature of the incident which did not require immediate SBOE notification.

Internal Audience	Who Made Contact	Method	Plan Guideline	April 13, 2017
SBOE Public Affairs	Staben	Call	0-1 hour	12:30 a.m.
SBOE Members	Staben	Call	As determined	12:30 a.m.
Employees/Students	DSS	Vandal Alert	0-2 hours	10:44 p.m.
Families	DSS	Vandal Alert	0-2 hours	10:44 p.m.

External Audience	Who Made Contact	Method	April 13, 2017
Fire/EMS	911		9:52 p.m.
Law enforcement	911		9:52 p.m.
Media	UCM	Press Releases	11:55 p.m. and 2 a.m. 4/14
Media	UCM	Individual calls	First call at 10:33 p.m., continued through 4/14, responded in real time
Partners, neighbors	UCM	Facebook and Twitter	11:03 p.m.
Partner institutions, donors, alumni	UCM	Memo from President	10:10 a.m., April 14
Elected officials	City	n/a	n/a
Public	UCM	Facebook and Twitter	11:23 p.m.

**O 3: Incident Messaging**

The messaging included in UI communications (press conferences, news releases, social media posts, memos, interviews) about the incident was consistent, accurate and timely (except for the Vandal Alerts which could have been sent sooner and included more thorough information). Media reports of the incident were accurate and required no corrections.

Audience	Communication Method
Faculty, staff and students	Vandal Alert 1
Community/Vandal Family	Facebook and Twitter
Media	Press Release 1
Faculty, staff and students	Vandal Alert 2
Media	Press Conference 1
Media	Press Release 2
Media	Press Conference 2
Faculty, staff and students	Internal memo
Faculty, staff, alumni, stakeholders	External memo

**Key Crisis Communication (CC) Recommendations:**

**CC 1:** Attempts to reach legal counsel by phone and email in the initial hours of the incident were ineffective. Contact preferences for legal team members have been reviewed and contact lists are now updated with appropriate contact numbers.

**CC 2:** Improve alignment between UCM Crisis Communication Plan and the Emergency Response framework.

Additional Recommendations:

**CC 3:** Crisis Communication call purpose and protocol should be reviewed for clarity among participants. This call is intended primarily to provide initial information about the incident to decision makers and communicators so the communications team can craft messaging for release as soon as possible. This is not an incident response call where details are worked out or strategies for response (outside communications) are discussed. A separate incident response call is the best place to have these critical discussions.

**CC 4:** Vandal Alerts did not go out quickly enough immediately following the incident. A review of Vandal Alert protocols between UCM and OPSS will result in clear protocols and

responsibilities to avoid delays in the future. Vandal Alerts will go out quicker and more efficiently in the future.

CC 5: The content in the first Vandal Alert issued the night of the incident should have included better information, specifically, the first Vandal Alert did not include the specific area on campus where the incident occurred so people would know which area to avoid.

CC 6: News release language was approved by senior executive leadership but was not reviewed by Legal Counsel.

## 5. Student Affairs

### Student Affairs Sub-Team:

- Blaine Eckles, Dean of Students
- Kent Nelson, General Counsel
- Joe Law, College of Engineering

### Observations:

**O 1:** Care and concern support for students was top priority after incident. This resulted in lack of critical information being obtained from students about club inception, goals, purpose, support, training, and education (especially as it pertains to risk management and safety practices).

**O 2:** There are a variety of types of student clubs on campus. Some are registered with Student Involvement while others are not. The time of this preliminary report did not allow for a full vetting of all the different clubs.

**O 3:** Student clubs registered with Student Involvement are provided a Registered Student Handbook, which outlines a variety of campus policies and procedures pertaining to student clubs.

**O 4:** The roles of a club advisor varies by each club. Some advisors are more involved with the regular workings of clubs than other advisors are.

**O 5:** Safety and risk management for student clubs can be strengthened to help address safety concerns for students, faculty, and staff.

### **Key Student Affairs (SA) Recommendations:**

**SA 1:** Gather critical data from students and faculty central to NORE club.

- a. Interview relevant individuals (including students) by July 1, 2017
- b. Establish a timeframe of events from Club Inception to April 13 incident
  - i. By August 1, 2017

**SA 2:** Identify all of the different clubs students can get involved with while attending the University of Idaho.

- a. By August 1, 2017

**SA 3:** Safety and Risk Management—include a section that speaks to this and clarifies the role of the students and advisors in risk management.

- a. Look at required safety and risk management practices and protocols for student organizations that answer “Yes” to the question of “Does your organization participate in events that can cause physical harm?”

- b. What is the risk identification and analysis process for student clubs?
- c. Who is the responsible party when risk is identified for a student club?
  - i. Review by July 1, 2017
  - ii. Changes to policies and procedures by August 1, 2017

**Additional Recommendations:**

SA 4: More in-depth review of Student Organization and Club Policies and Procedures should occur as it pertains to student safety and risk management. Changes should be made prior to start of Fall 2017.

- a. Determine what it means to be a “recognized” student club/organization at UI.
- b. Determine which offices/areas are authorized to recognize a student club.
- c. Clarify when a student organization may be denied recognition AND Clarify when a student org may be lose recognition for failure to follow appropriate policies/procedures. Should also entail a review of financial reimbursement practice and address the question of “When would reimbursement be denied”?
- d. By August 1, 2017

SA 5: A careful review of the role and responsibility for Student Club Advisors should occur with updated recommendations for how the roles should change (if at all) when it comes to safety and risk management of club activity.

- a. What is the role, scope, and limits of a faculty advisor?
- b. By August 1, 2017