June 30, 2021

MICHAEL DRAKE, PRESIDENT
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Re: Presidential Campus Safety Plan

Dear President Drake,

As requested, I distributed for systemwide Senate review the draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan. Nine Academic Senate divisions and two systemwide committees (UCFW and UCAADE) submitted comments. These comments were discussed at Academic Council’s June 23 meeting and are attached for your reference.

We understand that the Plan is intended to “lay a foundation for transforming UC’s culture, policies, and practices to achieve a vision of safety in which all members of the community feel equally welcomed, respected and protected from harm.” Part I of the Plan establishes four Guidelines as overarching themes for UC public safety: (1) community and service-driven safety; (2) a holistic and tiered response model for safety services; (3) transparency and continuous improvement through data; and (4) accountability and independent oversight. Part II outlines a series of specific actions to support implementation of each Guideline, with target completion dates for each.

First, a major concern across divisions was the extraordinarily brief timeline for review of the Campus Safety Plan. It was a significant challenge for campuses to convene faculty at the end of the term to review a policy of this magnitude in less than four weeks. The Senate supports your desire for rapid change, but faculty need adequate time to review the next iterations of the Plan. We ask the University to engage the Senate in continued review of the Plan after Senate committees reconvene in the fall.

The Council has been consistent in its recommendations about policing and campus safety. Council’s June 2020 letter¹ and its May 2021 review of the Gold Book² both encouraged the University to substantially reduce the presence of campus police and redistribute policing resources to the development and implementation of alternative modes of campus safety. Council asked the University to create policies that focus on de-escalation and demilitarization,

¹ https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/_files/reports/kkb-jn-recommendations-uc-policing.pdf
alternative strategies to deadly force, training in implicit bias and cultural competency, and mental health training and partnerships with mental health professionals. Council also recommended banning firearms as standard equipment for campus police.

Senate reviewers consider the Campus Safety Plan to be a positive, though tentative and incomplete, step forward in defining broad principles and actions that address the Council recommendations, support the transformation of UC policing and public safety, and reflect a commitment to data collection, transparency, accountability, and public engagement. Senate reviewers also identified numerous examples of vague or confusing language as well as several significant areas of disagreement about the role of campus police envisioned in the Plan that may be counterproductive and reinforce the status quo. I summarize several of these below, but we ask you to read all comments carefully as you develop the Plan further. We also recognize that the Plan is one step in a longer-term process and will be expanded and augmented with more detail in the coming months.

➢ The introductory text foregrounding the Campus Safety Plan notes that the police are a source of distrust and fear. We agree but think the language should do more to explicitly acknowledge the long history of racial profiling and police violence behind that distrust and fear.

➢ The recommendation for a “Holistic, Inclusive and Tiered Response Model for Safety Services” reflects calls for shifting resources to a community safety model that relies less on police. However, the wording of the proposed actions was unclear, and important details are missing, in particular how this inter-disciplinary group will work together and to whom they will report. For some reviewers it appeared that campus police may be integrated into additional community safety roles and services on campus, including mental health, wellness, basic needs, sexual harassment prevention, and bias/hate response. Other reviewers assume that staff will be reassigned or deputized to these roles and responsibilities. Many at Council expressed the goal to reduce police presence on campus, but whether this plan will accomplish it is uncertain in the proposal. Also, the reliance on additional roles for staff raises labor, organizational, and resource questions that will need to be addressed.

➢ The Plan does not yet include a clear or adequate response to the persistent calls from the Senate and others to ban firearms as standard equipment for campus police. The Plan should be bolder about embracing a campus safety model where police have access to firearms in specific circumstances, but not as standard equipment in routine campus patrols.

➢ The next iteration of the Plan should include more detail about oversight and accountability, particularly concerning the role of Police Accountability Boards (PABs). Reviewers support the recommendation for independent PABs on each campus, but want clarifications about their authority, oversight, and reporting lines.

➢ Senate reviewers are unsure how the Plan intersects with, or perhaps overrides, the Gold Book revisions reviewed by the Senate earlier this spring. Given the significant differences between the policies and procedures outlined in Gold Book and the Guidelines proposed for the new Campus Safety Plan, it will be important to clarify which set of policies will be operative in the fall. Also, as you know, the Senate and others in the University community reacted very negatively to the Gold Book. The Senate would appreciate a statement or other
communication from the Administration about the status of the Gold Book in response to that commentary.

President Drake, we support your ongoing efforts to engage the UC community and promote positive change on the issue of campus safety, including through the symposia you sponsored this winter and spring. We assume that continuous review and evaluation of the Campus Safety Plan will be needed as part of a multi-year roll out. The Senate looks forward to discussing next steps for this Plan and other policies that make our campus communities safer, more respectful, and more welcoming. Let us know where we can be helpful, and please do not hesitate to contact me if you have additional questions.

Sincerely,

Mary Gauvain, Chair
Academic Council

cc: Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer Nava
    Chief of Staff Kao
    Chief Policy Advisor McAuliffe
    Academic Council
    Senate Directors
    Executive Director Baxter

Encl.
June 22, 2021

Mary Gauvain
Chair, Academic Council

RE: Draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan

Dear Mary,

Given the short time frame for consultation, the draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan was forwarded for review only to the Executive Council of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate.

Executive Council views the draft plan as a positive step forward for keeping our campus communities safe. Members noted several sections that should be clarified and strengthened:

- **Action 1.10:** It states that “the University will not hire officers or any campus safety personnel with any sustained findings of misconduct related to moral turpitude, sexual harassment, bias, discrimination...or who resigned while under investigation.” The phrase “sustained findings” is unclear—no one with any proven history of these types of misconduct should be hired as a campus police officer. At the very least, “sustained finding” should be more specifically defined. Action 1.10 should also specifically mention “excessive use of force in a previous position” as a criteria for exclusion from hiring.

- **Action 1.13:** The description is vague regarding armaments and use of force, an issue that campus community members are rightfully concerned about given recent events in the country. Although the plan says that a workgroup is being formed to “recommend uniform, armament, and vehicle standards for every tier in the safety model,” the wording should be stronger; the workgroup should be charged with establishing strict guidelines (or prohibitions) regarding the purchase of military surplus supplies, use of harmful “non-lethal weapons” on campuses, and use of restraint tactics that restrict oxygen or blood flow to the head or neck.

- **Action 2.5:** The language should be more specific about how police forces will respond to protests that threaten to turn violent and/or involve property damage. What will be the process for escalation or de-escalation of police response in developing situations? Specific guidelines for minimizing either over or under reaction would be welcome.

The Davis Division appreciates the opportunity to comment.
Sincerely,

Richard P. Tucker, Ph.D.
Chair, Davis Division of the Academic Senate
University of California, Davis

c: Hilary Baxter, Executive Director, Systemwide Academic Senate
   Michael LaBriola, Assistant Director, Systemwide Academic Senate
   Edwin M. Arevalo, Executive Director, Davis Division of the Academic Senate
June 16, 2021

Mary Gauvain, Chair
Academic Council

Re: Systemwide Review of Presidential Plan for Campus Safety

Dear Chair Gauvain,

The Irvine Division Senate Cabinet discussed the draft Presidential Plan for Campus Safety at its June 15, 2021 meeting. The plan was also reviewed by the Council on Faculty Welfare, Diversity, and Academic Freedom, the Council on Teaching, Learning, and Student Experience, and the Council on Equity and Inclusion. Cabinet members agreed with the observations made by these Councils, and their memos are enclosed here for your review. Also included is a memo from Dr. Carroll Seron, the former Chair of the UCI Public Safety Advisory Committee.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Barrett, Chair
Academic Senate, Irvine Division

Encl: CFW, CTLSE, CEI, & Seron memos

Cc: Joanna Ho, Chair Elect-Secretary
Kate Brigman, Executive Director
Gina Anzivino, Associate Director
JEFFREY BARRETT, CHAIR  
ACADEMIC SENATE – IRVINE DIVISION

Re: Draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan

Systemwide Academic Senate Chair Gauvain has forwarded a draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan for review and comment. This plan lays a foundation for transforming UC’s culture, policies and practices to achieve a vision of safety in which all members of the community feel equally welcomed, respected and protected from harm. This draft plan was developed based on extensive input from diverse groups of University of California stakeholders, including Campus Safety Task Force members, participants in the campus safety symposia held earlier this spring, and numerous conversations with students, faculty, staff and administrators.

The Council on Faculty Welfare, Diversity, and Academic Freedom (CFW) discussed this issue at its meeting on June 8, 2021, and would like to submit the following comments and questions:

1. By many accounts, police unions have been an immovable barrier in all other US reform efforts—how (if at all) will the UC fare any differently?

2. What are the documented best practices with respect to the so-called “tiering” of safety-related community services? Tiering sounds positive, but what is it like in practice?

3. This document strongly urges accreditation by International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators (IACLEA). Which two UCs have achieved accreditation and what is the evidence of its value?

4. The data reporting is to include Complaints (consistent with California Department of Justice requirement). It’s not clear if this is simply counts or information what/who/when and so on. Counts are not going to be very useful.

5. “In consultation with Campus Counsel and Student Affairs, campuses will consider addressing the harm created by the traditional criminal justice system through adjudication of nonviolent and low-level crimes using community-based solutions, such as restorative justice programs or neighborhood courts.” How could this be incorporated or measured? It’s not the police who decide whether an individual is ultimately charged, it’s the DA’s office.
6. How will additional trainings be funded, and which Systemwide entities will be providing funding?

7. The concepts of advisory roles versus oversight roles were unclear. Who would have access to collected data? Would that data be collected, evaluated, and publicly posted?

8. Who would oversee the makeup of the commissions/committees? Representatives should be elected to these positions, not appointed by administration.

9. Which mechanisms would be needed to implement community-led policing?

10. Members were encouraged to contact the UCI Public Safety Advisory Committee (PSAC) representatives for any further comments or questions.

11. Overall, members agreed that this plan appears to be a vague and aspirational reframing of campus public safety.

Sincerely,

Terry Dalton, Chair
Council on Faculty Welfare, Diversity, and Academic Freedom

C: Kate Brigman, Executive Director
   Academic Senate

   Gina Anzivino, Associate Director
   Academic Senate
JEFFREY BARRETT, CHAIR
ACADEMIC SENATE – IRVINE DIVISION

Re: Draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan

Systemwide Academic Senate Chair Gauvain has forwarded a draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan for review and comment. This plan lays a foundation for transforming UC’s culture, policies and practices to achieve a vision of safety in which all members of the community feel equally welcomed, respected and protected from harm. This draft plan was developed based on extensive input from diverse groups of University of California stakeholders, including Campus Safety Task Force members, participants in the campus safety symposia held earlier this spring, and numerous conversations with students, faculty, staff and administrators.

The Council on Teaching, Learning, and Student Experience (CTLSE) discussed this issue at its meeting on June 7, 2021, and would like to submit the following comments:

1. Members expressed concern regarding Action #4 of the draft, particularly regarding who will establish oversight and how the oversight body would be populated. It was suggested that, for Action #4.1.a, an advisory body should be independent, have its own resource allocations outside of any particular administrative umbrellas, and members should be elected, not appointed.

2. It was suggested that guidance on trauma-informed approaches should be included.

3. Phrases referencing “community-based solutions” and “restorative practices” need to be more clearly defined.

4. Members expressed concern that any prospect of abolishing campus police or other alternatives was not included.

5. It was suggested that the particular expertise of faculty be included by way of a provision for consulting.

6. The definition of who will be “stakeholders” and “response teams” should be clarified, and faculty should be consulted for such roles.

7. Members questioned how this plan will move forward and how further comments would be solicited. It was suggested that a strategy for contributions and an outline for workgroups should be included.

Sincerely,

Andrea Henderson, Chair
Council on Teaching, Learning, and Student Experience
June 11, 2021

JEFF BARRETT, CHAIR
ACADEMIC SENATE, IRVINE DIVISION

RE: Draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan

The Council on Equity and Inclusion discussed the draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan at its meeting on June 7, 2021. The plan lays a foundation for transforming UC’s culture, policies and practices to achieve a vision of safety in which all members of the community feel equally welcomed, respected, and protected from harm. Locally at UCI, the draft plan aligns with efforts of the Public Safety Advisory Committee. While members recognize this as a general plan, they noted several areas where more specificity would be helpful:

- The introduction states, “…systems charged with providing protection have become a source of great distrust and fear.” Members felt the document should explicitly acknowledge that distrust and fear is rooted in a culture of real and ongoing racial profiling and police violence.
- It was unclear to whom “non-sworn” security personnel would report, e.g. the chief of police or someone else. Members felt that the chain of command for these personnel should be clarified for accountability purposes.
- Action 1.10: history of domestic violence should be added to the list of reasons the University will not hire officers as part of its standard background check.
- For actions, 3.1 and 3.2, members would like to see data posted by race and ethnicity when applicable (e.g. stops and complaints).
- Members felt the plan should include an explicit commitment to avoiding use of force, particularly use of deadly force.
- The training component should expand beyond officer training and include “know your rights” modules for students and members of the University community.

The Council on Equity and Inclusion appreciates the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Louis DeSipio, Chair
Council on Equity and Inclusion

C: Joanna Ho, Chair Elect
Kate Brigman, Executive Director
Gina Anzivino, CEI Analyst and Associate Director
Brandon Haskey-Valerius, Cabinet Analyst
Dear President Drake and Regent Perez:

As you may recall, I was one of the speakers at the February 2022 Public Safety Symposium. I have just read through the proposed steps for re-imaging public safety across the University of California. Overall, the steps proposed seem reasonable to me and very much in accordance with the work we have already begun at UC Irvine. What I find lacking in the proposal, however, is a process for sustaining a public safety framework that remains open to change and responsive to developments that we cannot anticipate at this time.

Coincidentally, I just finished reading *Tangled Up in Blue* by Rosa Brooks, a law professor at Georgetown. Brooks’ book is an ethnography of her experience of going through a volunteer program sponsored by the DC Metropolitan Police Department (MDP) that begins with the same training that all recruits receive and then allows volunteers to work with officers on various beats around the city. As a result of this experience, Brooks and colleagues at Georgetown Law developed a fellowship program for young officers beginning their careers in DC MDP. The focus on young recruits is deliberate because the program is designed to capture officers’ imagination and commitment while they are both idealistic and yet vulnerable to becoming cynical. The website describes the Police for Tomorrow Fellowship program; [https://www.law.georgetown.edu/innovative-policing-program/police-for-tomorrow-fellowship/](https://www.law.georgetown.edu/innovative-policing-program/police-for-tomorrow-fellowship/).

I should also note that Professor Kristy Lopez, one of the leads on the project, is a graduate of UC Riverside (and Yale Law School; also, Kristy put me in touch with Michael Davis, Chief of Police at Northeastern, who has worked with us at UC Irvine).

I suggest that UC take steps to think through developing a similar program for UCPD’s new recruits. This might be envisioned as a system-wide initiative, drawing on the strengths of the expertise of faculty across UC’s multiple law schools, social science and humanities faculty. In the case of new recruits to UCPD, the fellowship might be a condition of employment. Should UC decide to go forward with an initiative such as the one I propose here, I would welcome the opportunity to work with others on design and implementation.

Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Carroll Seron
Professor, Emerita
University of California, Irvine
Department of Criminology, Law & Society
seron@uci.edu
June 10, 2021

To: Shane White, Chair
    Academic Senate

Re: Systemwide Review: Draft Campus Safety Plan

Dear Chair White,

We appreciate the expression of broad principles and goals articulated in the draft Campus Safety Plan, which identifies crucial issues regarding the pressing challenge of policing in the University of California. We look forward to the presentation of more detailed policy proposals that elaborate on local implementation to which CODEI might respond more fully.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at yarborou@humnet.ucla.edu or the Interim Committee on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Analyst, Taylor Lane Daymude at tlanedaymude@senate.ucla.edu.

Sincerely,

Professor Richard Yarborough, Chair
Committee on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion
June 22, 2021

To: Mary Gauvain, Chair, Academic Council

Re: Presidential Campus Safety Plan Draft

The proposed Presidential Campus Safety Plan draft was distributed for comment to the Merced Division Senate Committees and the School Executive Committees. The following committees offered several comments for consideration. Their comments are appended to this memo.

- Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA)
- Committee for Diversity and Equity (D&E)
- Committee on Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom (FWAF)

CAPRA noted that from a resource standpoint, many of the proposed changes in the plan are likely to require a significant infusion of money, and perhaps an even greater infusion of personnel time. In terms of monetary resources, not only will the new non-sworn force need to be hired with crisis intervention teams available 24/7, but the plan also includes significant data gathering, a new complaint process, and eight campuses will need to be accredited by the International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators. In terms of time, the Plan calls for multiple task forces, surveys, and a “community-led process that involves faculty….to define and advise on specific strategies…” CAPRA does not intend to imply opposition to the plan, but is simply pointing out that this draft plan will require both money and the time of many people, and therefore requests that UCOP provide the resources needed rather than asking the campuses to carry out this large body of work from existing resources.

D&E found the draft plan inadequate to address the very problems it identifies. The draft observes that for many in the campus community, “the same systems charged with providing protection have become a source of great distrust and fear.” This is a real and pressing problem with deep roots in policing as it exists in the United States and on UC campuses. D&E pointed out that this draft fails to name the sources of that distrust and fear – namely the long history of racism and anti-Blackness that are embedded within our contemporary model of policing – nor does it offer concrete solutions to address them. D&E stated that the plan’s first main recommendation, “Community and Service-Driven Safety,” is on the surface a laudable goal but it contains neither meaningful analysis nor concrete policies to achieve its stated aims. The second recommendation, “A Holistic, Inclusive and Tiered Response Model for Safety Services,” appears to have been influenced by the national call to “defund the police” and move resources away from traditional policing towards models of community safety that
rely less on sworn officers. This section, however, evades the hard questions about resources and power that are central to any meaningful change in how policing – and its alternatives – operate in practice. This recommendation does not address the underlying questions of resources or respond to community concerns about police firearms, and may actually lead to increased police involvement and presence on campus. D&E finds that the third recommendation, “Transparency and Continuous Improvement Through Data” is a narrow, technocratic response that largely repeats policies already suggested by the 2019 Presidential Task Force on University Policing (most notably recommendations 22-27 of that report). The fourth and final recommendation, “Accountability and Independent Oversight,” also builds on the recommendations of the 2019 task force convened by President Napolitano. This new recommendation suggests that rather than advisory boards (which have no powers beyond that of making policy recommendations) that campuses establish accountability boards that will have more meaningful ability to formally investigate complaints against UCPD. This change represents a small forward step but one that fails to address the fundamental underlying concerns over policing at the UC and nationwide.

FWAF believes the proposed plan is a step in the right direction. The committee endorses the plan’s goals and the means so far proposed to accomplish them. But while FWAF applauds the plan’s stated commitment to using background checks for those applying to be police officers and to holding candidates to a high standard, the committee hopes that the University has worked out a way to obtain the needed information, given that records of officer misconduct are confidential in the State of California and that national databases such as the National Decertification Index are incomplete.

Divisional Council reviewed the committees’ comments via email and supports their various points and suggestions.

The Merced Division thanks you for the opportunity to comment on this proposed policy.

Sincerely,

 Robin DeLugan
 Chair, Divisional Council
 UC Merced

CC: Divisional Council
 Hilary Baxter, Executive Director, Systemwide Academic Senate
 Michael LaBriola, Assistant Director, Systemwide Academic Senate
 Senate Office
June 11, 2021

To: Robin DeLugan, Chair, Division Council

From: Patricia LiWang, Chair, Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA)

Re: Presidential Campus Safety Plan

The draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan proposes many changes to policing on UC campuses, with the goal that all members of the UC campus should feel “valued, welcomed, and free from any threat of physical, psychological or emotional harm”. In particular, the plan calls for better training of all security personnel and for a tiered response, with non-sworn security personnel providing services such as patrolling dormitories and providing security for campus events. The plan also calls for more oversight from the campus and community, asking campuses to “develop a campus safety ‘whole systems’ infrastructure which integrates campus policing more deliberately with mental health, wellness, basic needs, sexual harassment prevention, bias/hate response, and so forth”.

From a resource standpoint, many of the proposed changes are likely to require a significant infusion of money, and perhaps an even greater infusion of personnel time. In terms of monetary resources, not only will the new non-sworn force need to be hired with crisis intervention teams available 24/7, but the plan also includes significant data gathering, a new complaint process, and eight campuses will need to be accredited by the International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators. In terms of time, the Plan calls for multiple task forces, surveys, and a “community-led process that involves faculty....to define and advise on specific strategies...”

Rather than listing more of the possible resources the plan needs, we simply refer to the 3.5 pages of action items that are proposed to all be completed by the end of 2021.

CAPRA does not intend to imply opposition to the plan, but is simply pointing out that this draft plan will require both money and the time of many people, and therefore we would request that UCOP provide the resources needed rather than asking the campuses to carry out this large body of work from existing resources.

CAPRA appreciates the opportunity to opine.

cc: Senate Office
To: Robin DeLugan, Senate Chair

From: Committee for Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI)

Re: Draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan

The Committee for Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) reviewed the Draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan released on June 1, 2021, which is the result of an important process of discussion and debate over the nature of policing within the context of the University of California. EDI found the draft in its current form, however, inadequate to address the very problems it identifies. The draft observes that for many in the campus community, “the same systems charged with providing protection have become a source of great distrust and fear.” This is a real and pressing problem with deep roots in policing as it exists in the United States and on UC campuses. This draft, however, fails to name the sources of that distrust and fear – namely the long history of racism and anti-Blackness that are embedded within our contemporary model of policing – nor does it offer concrete solutions to address them.

This report is centered around four main recommendations. The first, “Community and Service-Driven Safety,” is on the surface a laudable goal but it contains neither meaningful analysis nor concrete policies to achieve its stated aims. No one could object to the notion that “All members of the UC community should feel valued, welcomed and free from any threat of physical, psychological or emotional harm” or that “The campus safety system will provide high-quality service in a courteous and accessible manner that allows our community to feel safe and respected in every interaction.” But if this sentiment is so widely shared by our community, then why does it need to be repeated here? The fact is, as acknowledge in the preface to this very draft and expressed at the two Presidential Symposia, that many in our university community feel more unsafe as a result of UCPD presences on our campuses. Any meaningful public safety plan must acknowledge that sense of unsafety and forthrightly address it rather than simply repeat well-intentioned aspirational goals. There is ample scholarship and numerous personal testimonies from UC students that explicitly links policing with racism, and specifically anti-Blackness. The failure to even mention these well-documented issues hamstrings this draft from even beginning to address the core issues that led the President to initiate this process in the first place.

The second recommendation, “A Holistic, Inclusive and Tiered Response Model for Safety Services,” appears to have been influenced by the national call to “defund the police” and move resources away from traditional policing towards models of community safety that rely less on sworn officers. This section, however, evades the hard questions about resources and power that are central to any meaningful change in how policing – and its alternatives – operate in practice. Rather than addressing the central demand of the “defund the police” movement, that our limited resources be shifted away from policing to better fund alternative community services, this draft rather seeks to tie policing more closely to those services: “This holistic approach will deliberately integrate campus policing with mental health, wellness, basic needs, bias/hate response and other services through inter-
departmental partnerships and cross-trainings.” As UCR Professor Dylan Rodríguez recently observed, “The history of modern police reforms indicates that such proposals expand the bureaucratic, ideological, cultural, and institutional capacity of policing and police violence in their various forms, from surveillance and harassment to crowd control, involuntary hospitalization, and bodily (sexual) assault.” Nor does this section address a persistent demand heard at the Presidential Symposia to remove firearms from the standard equipment carried by UCPD. In short, this recommendation does not address the underlying questions of resources or respond to community concerns about police firearms, and may actually lead to increased police involvement and presence on campus.

The third recommendation, “Transparency and Continuous Improvement Through Data” is a narrow, technocratic response that largely repeats policies already suggested by the 2019 Presidential Task Force on University Policing (most notably recommendations 22-27 of that report). Like the other recommendations in this draft, there is nothing inherently objectionable about creating a “systemwide dashboard with campus-level detail. . . . to assess campus safety practices, generate recommendations for best practices, and hold the institution accountable.” But in the context of the national debate that was reignited by the police murder of George Floyd, the deep body of critical scholarly writing on policing (much of it generated by UC researchers), and the numerous personal testimonies offered by members of the UC community about their negative experiences, to have this already thin set of recommendations padded out with yet another call for “dashboards” and more data is inadequate and disappointing.

The fourth and final recommendation, “Accountability and Independent Oversight,” also builds on the recommendations of the 2019 task force convened by President Napolitano. That report called for every campus to establish independent police advisory boards. This new recommendation suggests that rather than advisory boards (which have no powers beyond that of making policy recommendations) that campuses establish accountability boards that will have more meaningful ability to formally investigate complaints against UCPD. As with the previous recommendations, this change represents a small forward step but one that fails to address the fundamental underlying concerns over policing at the UC and nationwide. By their nature, accountability boards can only address incidents after the fact, rather than prevent them. Moreover, both this recommendation and the preceding recommendation on data gathering are hampered by the fact that the groups most frequently subject to police misconduct and violence are also the least likely to report it given their well-justified mistrust of institutions that have historically mistreated them. Such boards have existed since the 1950s in some U.S. cities but have failed to notably address the concerns about racialized police misconduct and violence that continue into the 21st century.

In summary, the recommendations contained in this draft are inadequate to address both our current moment and the long history of racialized policing in the United States and at the UC. The UC can – and must – be more bold and forward thinking about community safety. In doing so, we need to forthrightly name and address the reasons why many in our community fear and mistrust the police and link that to what we know about the long history of racism and anti-Blackness in law enforcement. Narrow technocratic solutions such as those proposed here neither acknowledge nor address that history in any meaningful way.

The Committee for Equity, Diversity and Inclusion appreciates the opportunity to opine.

cc: EDI Members
Fatima Paul, Executive Director, Senate Office
Senate Office
To: Robin DeLugan, Chair, Divisional Council

From: Carolin Frank, Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom (FWAF)

Re: Draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan

The Draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan aims to lay a "foundation for transforming the UC's culture, policies and practices to achieve a vision of safety in which all members of the community feel welcomed, respected, and protected by harm." Reaching this goal will involve fundamental reflection on the "needs and values of our diverse community" and how the campus' safety infrastructure can meet those needs and serve those values.

If implemented, the proposed plan is, in FWAF’s view, certainly a step in the right direction. Importantly, it acknowledges that

1. policing must be integrated with "mental health, wellness, basic needs, bias/hate response and other services;"
2. all "safety personnel must receive high-quality training in de-escalation and non-violent crisis intervention, lawful use of force, cultural competency and diversity, anti-racism, the potential for biased policing, and response to certain offenses such as domestic violence, sexual violence, and hate crimes;"
3. a "standardized and robust complaint and investigation process" are "essential mechanisms for the community to report misconduct and ensure officers are acting consistently with rules, policies, and law;"
4. and that other approaches to campus safety will need to be given due consideration, "including maintaining, defunding or abolishing the police departments".

FWAF endorses the plan's goals and the means so far proposed to accomplish them. Of course, the plan is just the beginning, and everyone's efforts will be required to see it through.

While FWAF applauds the plan's stated commitment to using background checks for those applying to be police officers and to holding candidates to a high standard, we hope that the University has worked out a way to obtain the needed information, given that records of officer misconduct are confidential in the State of California and that national databases such as the National Decertification Index are incomplete.

FWAF appreciates the opportunity to opine on this matter.

cc: Senate office
June 22, 2021

Mary Gauvain, Chair, Academic Council
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607-5200

RE: (Systemwide Senate Review) Draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan

Dear Mary,

The Riverside Division looks forward to continued conversation and consultation regarding this incredibly important topic and trusts that subsequent reviews of this proposal - and those similar - allow for a longer review and comment period. I urge the Academic Council and President Drake to read carefully the thoughtful responses attached from Divisional standing committees and faculty executive committees in response to the draft plan.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ Jason Stajich
Professor of Bioinformatics and Chair of the Riverside Division

CC: Hilary Baxter, Executive Director of the Academic Senate
Cherysa Cortez, Executive Director of UCR Academic Senate Office
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

June 10, 2021

To: Jason Stajich, Chair
Riverside Division

From: Stefano Vidussi, Chair
Committee on Educational Policy

RE: Draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan

The Committee on Educational Policy reviewed the draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan at their June 4, 2021 meeting. The Committee recommends that the proposed plan be updated to include options to have the campus police force not carry firearms unless facing comparable weaponry. Concern was noted by members that the proposed plan does not fully address the safety of students and faculty on campus, especially during the evening hours, and recommends that the plan be updated to address this issue.
June 21, 2021

TO: Jason Stajich, Chair
Riverside Division of the Faculty Senate

FROM: Lucille Chia, Chair
CHASS Executive Committee

RE: Draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan

The CHASS Executive Committee has the following comments after reviewing the draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan. First, the EC wishes to thank all those who worked on this plan. Second, as EVP/COO Rachael Nava wrote in the note introducing this draft, it is meant to lay “a foundation for transforming UC’s culture, policies and practices to achieve a vision of safety in which all members of the community feel equally welcomed, respected and protected from harm.”

1. The current political and social climate of the country makes the enactment of an adequate plan by the University of California as a whole and by each UC campus an urgent matter. The question remains, however, of how exactly it will be implemented and what an endorsement of a plan like this would mean on the ground for the university.

   --One member of the CHASS EC noted that it seems the clearest of the four suggestions proposed was the “Transparency and Continuous Improvement Through Data” (p. 1, and Guideline 3 on p. 2, p. 5-6 of draft). These recommendations have a clear follow-up, objective, and implementation. But the Guideline 2 “Holistic, Inclusive and Tiered Response Services” (p. 2, 5), though commendable, raises questions of how it will be implemented. In particular, Point 2.4 (p. 5) is unclear on how a “campus safety ‘whole systems’ infrastructure” will integrate existing units such as the Title IX office and existing CARE services. For example, will there be “buy-in” from CARE and the Title IX office? How does that work with issues of confidentiality?

   --The issue of accountability seems critical. Are there models for how “to establish a campus police accountability body and procedures to review investigation reports regarding public complaints against UCPD”?

2. We also have concerns about Point 1.10 (p. 5) of the “Community-Centered Safety” Actions:

   1.10 As part of its standard background check, the University will not hire officers or any campus safety personnel with any sustained findings of misconduct related to moral turpitude, sexual harassment, bias, discrimination, or any other finding determined to be
inconsistent with the University's principles and values, or who resigned while under investigation.

We feel that even a single serious abuse of authority should preclude hiring (how many inappropriate uses of force does it take to become “sustained” and therefore preclusive of hiring under the standard as drafted. Moreover, the standard should explicitly reference use of force issues—the wording of the current draft seems to mean that a police officer cannot be hired for having engaged in bias, but an arbitrary use of unjustified violence is permissible (especially if not “sustained” in a demonstrable pattern of past behavior).

3. The draft plan mentions financial concerns twice, but there are no specific hints of how much such a budget would be and where funding would come from. This is an important concern, particularly at a time when UC is meeting serious budget challenges. For example, since this plan requires the creation of several new positions on each campus and system-wide, including “a full-time position in service to the campuses, to coordinate campus safety, ensure continuous improvement through best practices and monitor the implementation of the Presidential Campus Safety Plan.”

In sum, endorsing this draft plan is easy. The work of implementation and finding the resources to do so will be much harder.
COMMITTEE ON DIVERSITY, EQUITY, & INCLUSION

June 9, 2021

To: Jason Stajich, Chair
Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Xuan Liu, Chair
Committee on Diversity, Equity, & Inclusion

Re: [Systemwide Review] Draft Plan: Draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan

The Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (CoDEI) reviewed the Draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan. CoDEI is supportive of the plan and has no additional comments to make.
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE

June 21, 2021

To: Jason Stajich
Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Patricia Morton, Chair
Committee on Faculty Welfare

Re: [Systemwide Review] Draft Plan: Draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan

The Committee on Faculty Welfare met on June 15, 2021 to consider the Draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan. The Committee noted that the plan seems to be more of a preliminary framework than a concrete plan, and further detail is crucial for understanding how the plan would operate on campuses. CFW felt it would be helpful if the document stated the issues to which the plan responds and would help solve, in addition to describing the steps for implementation. Some members of the committee felt the plan should include a more substantive response to recent calls within the University for structural changes to UCPD and campus safety.
GRADUATE COUNCIL

June 22, 2021

To: Jason Stajich, Chair
   Riverside Division

From: Amanda Lucia, Chair
       Graduate Council

Re: Proposed Presidential Campus Safety Plan

Graduate Council (GC) reviewed the proposed Presidential Campus Safety Plan at their June 10, 2021 meeting. The proposal, while focused on reform, has a large emphasis on expanding the complaint procedure process as opposed to creating structural changes to campus safety or policing tactics. It appears that police officers will be surveyed more with little fundamental change to what police actually do to protect UCR community members. There is minimal attention to anti-bias and anti-racism training for example, and to means and ways to measure efficacy of current and future trainings in that area. In Spring 2021, GSA informed GC that they have been in collective discussion about the ways in which police presence on campus negatively impacts students, particularly non-white students and neurodivergent students. These discussions included, but were not limited to, a refusal to return to campus in Fall 2021. Graduate students are often on campus late at night and on weekends, so more needs to be done to create a vital campus that feels safe during off hours. UCR in particular needs more emergency call stations and all day/night escort services for students. An expanded campus life program would help bring activities to campus on weekends and evenings so that the campus feels like a place in which students want to live, not just study.
June 18, 2021

To: Jason Stajich, Chair  
Riverside Division

From: Alejandra Dubcovsky, Chair  
Committee on Library and Information Technology

RE: Draft Plan: Draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan

The committee did not get to discuss in detail but wanted to note a concern regarding why item 1.10 (Copied below) was not a standard practice from the beginning.

1.10 As part of its standard background check, the University will not hire officers or any campus safety personnel with any sustained findings of misconduct related to moral turpitude, sexual harassment, bias, discrimination, or any other finding determined to be inconsistent with the University’s principles and values, or who resigned while under investigation. 9/30/21
PLANNING & BUDGET

June 18, 2021

To: Jason Stajich, Chair
    Riverside Division

From: Katherine Kinney, Chair
    Committee on Planning and Budget


Planning & Budget (P&B) reviewed the draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan at their June 8, 2021 meeting. P&B notes the very difficult timing requested review of this important question—a short turn around at the end of a very difficult school year. Committee members raised concerns about whether the holistic model’s proposal to integrate policing with mental health and wellness services represents an expansion of policing functions on campus. In the absence of information about budget and organization there is real risk that the new unit would be reduced to having a “zero sum game” approach and so would have policing at the expense of mental health capacities or vice versa.

In the time the committee had to discuss the proposal these questions came to the fore: Are all the initiatives defined here to be organized under a Campus Safety unit? Who would have authority over it? How will implementation be designed and overseen?
June 18, 2021

To: Jason Stajich, Chair
   Riverside Division

From: Ben Bishin, Chair
   Committee on Physical Resources Planning

Re: Systemwide Review: Draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan

The Committee on Physical Resources Planning has reviewed the Draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan and believe it will almost certainly have impacts on campus physical planning (and space allocation). At this point it largely seems sufficiently preliminary that it is difficult to identify specific changes to campus and concerns that seem likely to arise once the plan begins to be implemented.
June 18, 2021

To: Jason Stajich, Chair of the Riverside Division

From: Declan McCole, Ph.D., Chair, Faculty Executive Committee, and UCR School of

Subject: Medicine SOM FEC Response to Draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan

During a special e-meeting, SOM Executive Committee reviewed the Draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan. The SOM FEC we approve of the plan and have no additional comments.

Yours sincerely,

Declan F. McCole, Ph.D.
Chair, Faculty Executive Committee
School of Medicine
TO: Jason Stajich, Chair  
Riverside Division

FR: Richard M. Carpiano, Chair  
Executive Committee, School of Public Policy


Date: June 18, 2021

The Executive Committee of the School of Public Policy reviewed the document “[Systemwide Review] Draft Plan: Draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan.” We appreciate the attention paid to this important matter, the soliciting of extensive input from multiple UC stakeholders, and the fact that multiple proposals are offered.

Regarding comments on the document, we recommend providing greater clarification about how the proposed tiered-incident responses can/will be truly “inter-departmental partnerships” (as described) and not simply consolidation with—or expansion of—existing UCPD policing services/duties, which is a fundamental concern with existing policing throughout the US and what underlies calls for reform (defined broadly) and restructuring, including the need for a new approach to UC campus safety.

Sincerely,

Richard M. Carpiano, Ph.D., M.P.H.  
Professor of Public Policy and Sociology
22 June 2021

To: Jason Stajich, Chair
   Riverside Division

From: Theodore Garland, Jr., Chair, Executive Committee
       College of Natural and Agricultural Science

Re: Systemwide Review: Draft Plan: Draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan

These issues were raised:

Coordination, cross training and communication between campus-present law enforcement and those offices that serve campus community health, well-being and safety is a good idea. However, merging those functions or offices is NOT the right approach.

As the Riverside Faculty Association recently pointed out in a letter to our Chancellor about our campus plan, "converging an office organized for policing and criminalization with offices that serve our most vulnerable students, many of whom have had negative and violent experiences with policing, is inadvisable and will undermine campus safety and well-being."

Repurposing law enforcement officers to other roles in support of social services for which they were not trained would be a bad idea. The same people who need resources for safety, survival, and access are disproportionately targeted for criminalization and have disproportionately negative and violent experiences with police and other systems of criminalization (for example, people experiencing mental health crises, people of color, people, especially women and LGBTQ people, who are victims of sexual assault).

Cheers,  

[Signature]
June 22, 2021

To: Mary Gauvain, Chair
   Academic Senate

From: Susannah Scott, Chair
   Santa Barbara Division

Re: Systemwide Review of the Draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan

The Santa Barbara Division distributed the proposed revised policy to the Council on Faculty Welfare, Academic Freedom, and Awards (CFW), the Undergraduate Council (UgC), Graduate Council (GC), Council on Planning and Budget (CPB), Committee on Diversity and Equity (CDE), Committee on International Education (CIE), and the Faculty Executive Committees (FECs) of the College of Letters and Science (L&S), College of Engineering (ENGR), College of Creative Studies (CCS), Gevitz Graduate School of Education (EDUC), and the Bren School of Environmental Science and Management (BREN). CIE and the L&S, ENGR, CCS, and BREN FECs were unable to or opted not to opine. The individual responses are attached for your review.

While the Santa Barbara Division acknowledges the need to shift UC’s culture, policies, and practices, the time granted for Systemwide Review was inadequate given the lateness of the request and unusual workload being borne by Senate agencies in response to the pandemic. Most reviewing groups were not able to hold thoughtful discussions of the proposed plan, and some were not able to consider it at all, which is distressing considering the import of the issues. The Division echoes CFW’s comments, which recommends more appropriate review periods such that the faculty’s “role in shared governance is meaningful and not merely performativ.”

Another unusual aspect of this review is its occurrence prior to the Office of the President’s response to the Academic Council on the proposed Gold Book revisions. Several groups express confusion about how the Campus Safety Plan will correspond with the Gold Book, particularly given the incongruencies between the two documents. Moreover, the reviewing groups find the Plan to be quite vague, and raise a number of questions that range from general to detailed. These inquiries included partnerships with other campus entities, research on the effectiveness of civilian police oversight boards, training, accreditation, resource requirements, and data collection. Reviewing groups also identified the need for a broader context to inform these proposals, and suggest an overall examination of policing at UC.
Overall, the Santa Barbara division finds the continued strongly police-centered approach to campus safety troubling, and the short timeline for consultation and implementation inconsistent with the stated desire for a community-based approach.

We thank you for the opportunity to comment.
June 11, 2021

To: Susannah Scott, Divisional Chair, Academic Senate

From: Lisa Parks, Chair
    Council on Faculty Welfare, Academic Freedom, and Awards

Re: Presidential Campus Safety Plan

The Council on Faculty Welfare, Academic Freedom, and Awards received the draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan on the day of its final meeting of the year, June 2, 2021. The document was reviewed electronically but there was not time for significant in-person discussion. The Council advocates that more notice and time be given to reviews in order that their role in shared governance is meaningful and not merely performative.

The Council is unclear how to regard this draft plan in the absence of a presidential response to comments on the Gold Book and policing policy reviewed earlier this year. Many of the proposed revisions to the policing policy seem to utterly contradict the tone and aspirations of the Presidential Safety Plan. The Council reiterates its firm opposition to the Gold Book policy revisions and the militaristic environment it represents for our campuses.

The Council lauds the broad representation and emphasis on social services and mental health that the Presidential Safety Plan seeks to inculcate. However there remain questions about the vague language of the plan. We are concerned that this policy may ultimately represent an expansion, rather than reduction, of policing on campus. For instance, Guideline 2 calls for minimizing police presence at “peaceful protests” yet calls for “diffusing unsafe behavior,” but does not make clear the difference between them. Guideline 4 calls for a new UCOP staff position to coordinate efforts among the campuses and moves towards expanded accreditation for all 10 campuses from the International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators (IACLEA) – are these expenses necessary? A cursory review indicates this accreditation costs $3,000 per campus per year.

We also have questions about the plan from a labor and organizational perspective. As it purports to involve and integrate existing personnel and offices on UC campuses in “campus safety,” the plan runs the risk of deputizing these staff and offices by charging them with a host of policing-related tasks and responsibilities. Many of these staff and offices (Student Affairs, Student Health Centers, Title IX offices, CARE advocates, DEI offices as identified in guideline 2.4) are already overworked and underfunded. Since the document provides no details regarding additional funding, we are concerned that this plan may burden UC staff while further embedding policing within the UC under more euphemistic spin (“holistic” “campus safety”). The plan only identifies the appointment of one additional full-time staff position (under guideline 4.6), as mentioned above.

The three pillars of the University of California are Education, Research, and Service; we are dismayed that this document repeatedly emphasizes that nothing is more important than security, at a time when
there is a robust “defund the police” movement within the UC, including on our campus, and nationwide. The Council calls on the Office of the President to issue a response regarding the campuses’ collective rejection of the revised Gold Book policies, and to initiate a comprehensive and inclusive conversation regarding the concept of a safe campus during the 2021-2022 school year.

CC: Shasta Delp, Executive Director, Academic Senate
June 7, 2021

To: Susannah Scott, Chair  
   Academic Senate

From: Mary Betsy Brenner, Chair  
   Undergraduate Council

Re: Draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan

Undergraduate Council has reviewed the draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan and would like to share the following questions and comments:

1. Will the Campus Safety Plan guidelines extend to UC campus adjacent neighborhoods (i.e. Isla Vista)? How will these guidelines be shared and implemented with other policing agencies that also serve neighborhoods such as Isla Vista?

2. How are these guidelines going to be reconciled relative to the UC Police Policies and Administrative Procedures document UgC reviewed earlier this year?

3. UgC expressed concern about the 9/30/21 deadlines and wonders how it will be possible for a proposal currently in draft form to be implemented in such a short period of time with broad community input as called for in items 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3, among others. Given the timing of this proposal, during the last week of the quarter, many of the constituencies mentioned are relatively unavailable over the summer.

4. UgC strongly supports the “whole systems” approach laid out in Guideline 2 and action 2.4.

CC: Shasta Delp, Executive Director, Academic Senate
June 16, 2021

To: Susannah Scott, Divisional Chair  
   Academic Senate

From: Tamara Afifi, Chair  
   Graduate Council

Re: Draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan

At its meeting of June 7, 2021, Graduate Council (GC) reviewed the draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan. While the Council was very pleased to see proposed changes that would deal with the current climate around policing, members found it very late in the year to have a substantive discussion. The plan seems well-intentioned, but many aspects are vague. What are actual problems that the UC is facing with its current police force? How does each campus perceive its issues with policing? A report with data about campus incidents and questionable police actions should be provided.

Some members found language in Action Item 1.10 in Part II: Implementation Framework to be “puritanical and prejudicial,” particularly the term “moral turpitude”. Everyone is capable of transgressions, and this language excludes persons actively working on improving themselves. The consequences for reprimands should be made more transparent, with details about what happens to an officer and exactly what transpired in a given situation. This plan pushes the decision to potentially defund or abolish police forces down to the campus level, and will require large amounts of resources that many campuses likely do not have. The Council would appreciate details about where the additional resources and funding will be coming from.

CC: Shasta Delp, Executive Director, Academic Senate
To: Susannah Scott, Divisional Chair  
UCSB Academic Senate  

From: Douglas Steigerwald, Chair  
Council on Planning & Budget  

Re: Presidential Campus Safety Plan  

The Council on Planning & Budget was given a short timeline at a hectic point in the academic year for reviewing the draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan, as were all Senate bodies. This abridged timeline is unfortunate given the scope of structural changes the new Campus Safety Plan proposes: to lay “a foundation for transforming UC’s culture, policies and practices to achieve a vision of safety in which all members of the community feel equally welcomed, respected, and protected from harm.” Even a brief look at those changes reveals that implementing them would involve many areas of the university and its personnel, the state and federal governments, the Regents, the Governor's office, and represented labor, including the police union.

However, the Academic Council and Senate committees on all ten campuses recently addressed many of the daunting issues raised in the draft Campus Safety Plan when they responded to proposed changes to a review of systemwide policing and administrative policies referred to as the Gold Book. Senate committees overwhelmingly rejected those changes because UCOP proposed them outside of the context of a UC-wide and national movement to reimagine public safety. There is no doubt that the language of the Presidential Campus Safety Plan will sound good to those who have insistently called for dramatically reimagining public safety. Its key elements are:

- Community and Service-Driven Safety  
- A Holistic, Inclusive and Tiered Response Model for Safety Services  
- Transparency and Continuous Improvement Through Data  
- Accountability and Independent Oversight

But never has the devil been more in the details, especially given the abstract level of discussion in the draft document. To take one example, “A Holistic, Inclusive and Tiered Response Model for Safety Services” calls for campuses to integrate policing with mental health, wellness, basic needs, and bias/hate response through interdepartmental partnerships and cross-training. Most campus members would likely welcome the news that behavioral health crises, for example, would be handled by mental health professionals and social workers instead of armed police. But the new plan conceives of those professionals as working in concert with and directed by the police. Thus, what might look like an improvement (and it would undoubtedly save lives) could also represent an extension of police power through the work of more benign-appearing professionals.
To take another example of devilish details, the Plan would realize “Accountability and Independent Oversight” through establishing police accountability boards on every campus. We now have a great deal of research, including that of UC scholars, on the ineffectiveness of civilian police review boards with a merely advisory role and limited powers of investigation.

The final paragraph of the Plan’s cover letter acknowledges the recent call to review the Gold Book’s policing and administrative policies (and implicitly the outrage it stirred). “It is important to note the review process does not preclude the University from making significant, long-term changes through the Presidential Campus Safety Plan.” The Plan promises to somehow reconcile the Gold Book’s policing status quo with the fundamental changes called for by the Academic Council, Associated Students, the Cops Off Campus campaign, and now UCOP itself. It would be helpful if President Drake would clarify his position by first responding to the Senate faculty’s rejection of the Gold Book revisions because those policies starkly contrast with the spirit if not the letter of the new Campus Safety Plan.

Because of the Plan’s abstraction, even with what looks like a robust multi-stage timeline for implementation, CPB cannot offer at this time any concrete or substantive responses to its planning and budget components. President Drake says he will offer a final plan later in the summer after hearing from the “stakeholders,” including Academic Senate committees and the Council. CPB believes he could advance that discussion by not only adding details but also addressing stakeholder perceptions of the contradictions between the Gold Book and the new Plan. CPB welcomes the wide-ranging discussion needed to achieve the profound structural changes touted by the Plan, which would position UC as a national leader in reimagining public safety.

cc: Shasta Delp, Academic Senate Executive Director
June 16, 2021

To: Susannah Scott, Divisional Chair  
   Academic Senate

From: Melissa L. Morgan, Chair  
   Committee on Diversity and Equity

Re: Draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan

The Committee on Diversity and Equity (CDE) received the draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan too late to include on the agenda for its final meeting of the year. Members received the draft plan electronically, and some provided comments and questions, included below.

- More information is needed as to what informs this particular configuration of the safety plan, as well as more details about oversight and accountability to prevent potential abuses of response services, particularly as they concern more vulnerable members of our campus.

- How does this proposed plan reflect what has been or has not been done at UC? What is the broader context?

- The proposal does include some language about "the history" of policing, but it does not go far enough. Providing a historical perspective, such as a transparent timeline, on previous and current practices at UC will provide insight into the significance of this proposal. If we have a history of prior and current practices, we will be able to evaluate more thoroughly how these new procedures enhance (or not) our campuses. What has been tried? What hasn't worked? What has worked and how can we expand on that practice?

CC: Shasta Delp, Executive Director, Academic Senate
June 7, 2021

To: Susannah Scott, Chair
    Academic Senate

From: Carolyn Sattin-Bajaj, Vice Chair
    Faculty Executive Committee, GGSE

Re: Draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan

The Faculty Executive Committee of the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education supports the President’s draft campus safety plan. However, the FEC would like to ensure that trainings address neurodivergence and provide information about appropriate ways to engage with and support people living with disabilities as well as include anti-bias training. We also request that UCPD collects data that are disaggregated by key demographic characteristics (race/ethnicity, gender, etc...) and publicly release these statistics.
June 22, 2021

Mary Gauvain, Chair
Academic Council

Re: Draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan

Dear Mary,

The Santa Cruz Division has reviewed the Presidential Campus Safety Plan draft. Our Committees on Graduate Council (GC) and Planning and Budget (CPB) responded. The Santa Cruz Division notes that this draft plan is the beginning of a larger plan to “re-envision safety at the University of California” and is a response to national events and conversations about police, policing, and public safety. Reviewing committees noted that the plan contains some good proposals including greater transparency, the representation of diverse constituencies, and the possible use of a restorative justice program, and acknowledges that “the same systems charged with providing protection have become a source of great distrust and fear” for some. Although many details of the proposed plan still need to be figured out, the committee responses expressed areas of support, noted areas where greater clarity is needed, raised some concerns, and provided recommendations for improvements. The responses are enclosed due to their level of detail and are summarized below.

Graduate Council noted that greater clarity is needed in the following areas:

- Guideline 1 – with respect to the “high standard of respect and fairness” that will be monitored
- Guideline 2 – with respect to the amount of effort and emphasis that will be placed on seeking non-urgent mutual aid before calling outside law enforcement agencies, and how the proposed practice using community-based solutions to adjudicate nonviolent and low-level crimes will be extended to students living off campus
- Guideline 3 – with regards to anonymity and surveillance systems
- Guideline 4 – with regards to accountability and outside law enforcement agencies, and accountability and transparency measures that will be incorporated into the complaint processing and investigation unit

The Committee on Planning and Budget response identifies three broad concerns that the committee suggests should guide the UC approach to campus safety. These concerns include the increase of police influence, the need for police accountability boards to be fully independent, and the need for police accountability boards to generate conditions for enforcement and not be limited to handling investigations and complaints. The committee additionally raised concerns that the proposal is silent on discussion of
weapons, guns, and use of force, and suggests that greater clarity is needed in Part II: Implementation Framework, Action 2.5 with regards to university and campus guidance on protest response.

The committee additionally strongly recommended that if campus safety protocols are to consider a variety of reviews and include broad representation of the UC community, that those who are involved in abolitionist thinking should also be included in the conversation. The committee strongly endorsed Part II: Implementation Framework, Action 2.1 of placing a pause on the hiring of non-essential campus safety personnel until the plan has been submitted. Additional recommendations may be found in the enclosed responses.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this UC wide initiative.

Sincerely,

Patty Gallagher, Vice Chair
Academic Senate
Santa Cruz Division

Enclosures: Neuman to Brundage, 6/14/21, Re: Systemwide Review: Draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan

Smith to Brundage, 6/15/21, Re: Draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan

cc: Donald Smith, Chair, Graduate Council
    Dard Neuman, Chair, Committee on Planning and Budget
    David Brundage, Chair, Academic Senate
Dear David,

During the week of June 7, 2021, the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) reviewed the Presidential Campus Safety Plan Draft. Given that this request was not received in time to include in CPB’s last meeting agenda, the committee reviewed and discussed this request online. This plan is represented as the beginning of a larger plan to “re-envision safety at the University of California.” This re-envisioning is responsive to national events and subsequent conversations about rethinking the role of police and policing in the larger system of public safety. As such, this plan “starts by acknowledging” that “the same systems charged with providing protection have become a source of great distrust and fear.” CPB agrees with the spirit of the shift in thinking as well as with the four overarching guidelines: community-driven safety; inclusive tiered responses; transparency; and accountability. CPB acknowledges that much work will need to be done to work-out the details of this plan, as well as its actual implementation. With that in mind, CPB raises several issues and provides some recommendations.

- Regarding a University of California (UC) safety structure at a high level:
  - There are still national and local conversations as to whether universities and colleges more broadly, and the UC more specifically, should even have campus police. Thus, regarding Guideline #1, CPB asserts that it is crucial that this process truly make space for the range of viewpoints including “defunding or abolishing” police departments, and that these viewpoints be seriously considered by campus leadership. As such, CPB gives enthusiastic support to:
    - Action 1.1, which declares that any “campus-based task forces or working groups focused on campus safety will include broad representation of the full UC community including historically marginalized communities”; and;
    - Action 1.3: which insists that campus leadership consider “The history of policing, and the variety of views including maintaining, defunding or abolishing police departments…”
  - If this revision of campus safety protocols is to be taken up rigorously with a “variety of views”, CPB also recommends inviting those who have worked to produce, and are deeply involved in, abolitionist thinking. Many faculty, staff and students have been working on community safety issues (some for almost three decades), and have already thought through safety structures and procedures that take seriously anti-social behavior. CPB strongly recommends that UC engage their expertise.

- Regarding a UC safety structure that might include police and policing:
  - CPB identifies three broad concerns that should guide any approach to transform campus safety:
    1. The holistic approach should not have the effect of internalizing more functions to the campus police. CPB is concerned about increasing the influence of those with police training and therefore the overall expansion of police influence.
    2. Police accountability boards should be fully independent and have control, rather than just serve an advisory role. UC should examine advisory board structures outside of the university that have more robust control. For example, many boards use the term “civilian” to ensure that the board is fully independent. UC should
also carefully consider the group that decides on membership for this board to ensure that it is widely representative and knowledgeable.

3. Police accountability boards should operate in a constructive and not just a reactive manner. Which is to say, a board should not operate only if harm by police has already occurred. CPB argues that for a board to be consequential and helpful, it should be in a position to generate conditions for enforcement, and not limited to handling investigations and complaints.

Thus, CPB endorses **Guideline #4**, if the guideline intends that various actions under “accountability” be conducted independently from the police department and if the concerns above are incorporated.

- CPB is also concerned that this document is silent on discussions of weapons, guns and use of force, especially given that the system wide review on the University Policing Policies (Gold Book) included a “use of force” policy that was, in CPB’s judgement, unresponsive to national conversations on police violence.
- Relatledly, CPB finds action 2.5 to be vague and potentially problematic. If campuses will merely “reinforce and communicate” existing “University and campus guidance on protest response, role of police, observers or monitors, and use of mutual aid,” that suggests an unwillingness on the part of UC to critically examine the way police (including non-UC police) have been used in protests. This raises issues of actual police violence, as well as the way armed uniformed police acting as “observers” serve to intimidate protesters and others coming to campus.
- CPB recommends the data collection process, elaborated in Part 3, include qualitative data and analysis: This would provide depth in narratives that, in conjunction with quantitative data, would be both contextualized and provide context.
- CPB strongly endorses action 1.9 which states that evaluations for hiring and promotional decisions “will include behaviors consistent with the University’s principles of community and their commitment to integrity, excellence, accountability, and respect.”

To that effect, CPB recommends that UC consider requiring a diversity statement in the hiring process to get an in-depth picture of a candidate’s commitment to diversity, equity and inclusion, and what a candidate understands such a commitment to entail.

- CPB also endorses Action 1.8, which stipulates that each campus “will develop and implement procedures and guidelines for the UC community, including students, faculty, and staff, to participate in the interview process of UC police department and other campus safety personnel.”

**Regarding UC actions and implementations in the interim:**

- CPB strongly endorses Guideline #2: Action 2.1: placing a pause on “hiring of non-essential campus safety personnel until the plan has been submitted.”
- However, CPB has questions about the dates of the Actions. For example,
  - Action 2.1 referred to above has an “expected completion date” of 12/31/21, which implies that hiring could continue for seven months until it is paused.
  - Similarly, CPB views Action 1.10 as extremely important: Not hiring officers or safety personnel with “any sustained findings of misconduct related to moral turpitude, sexual harassment, bias, discrimination…” However, CPB wonders why the “expected completion date” is the end of September, rather than immediately.

**Regarding the document itself,** CPB recommends a more contextualized introduction: who wrote the document(s), and in coordination/consultation with whom/what bodies?
CPB appreciates the opportunity to provide feedback on this important UC wide initiative.

Sincerely,

Dard Neuman, Chair
Committee on Planning and Budget

cc:   All Senate Committees
June 15, 2021

David Brundage, Chair
Academic Senate

RE: Draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan

Dear David,

Graduate Council reviewed the draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan at its June 10, 2021 meeting. Overall, Council sees the draft Plan as an important and productive step forward in revising safety and security guidelines and practices across the UC. The draft Plan contains some very excellent proposals, including greater transparency, the representation of diverse constituencies, and the possible use of a restorative justice program rather than the traditional carceral model. The draft Plan also recognizes that the institutional systems charged with safety and protection have become a source of distrust and fear for some constituents. The draft identifies four key areas:

**Guideline 1: Community and Service-Driven Safety** recognizes that safety policies and practices must reflect the needs and values of our diverse community. This includes input from diverse interests on police hiring practices and training.

**Guideline 2: Holistic, Inclusive and Tiered Response Services** proposes that policing shall be integrated with mental health, wellness, basic needs, and bias/hate response.

**Guideline 3: Transparency and Continuous Improvement Through Data** advocates the creation of a system-wide website for data collection and sharing across the UC.

**Guideline 4: Accountability and Independent Oversight** proposes creating accountability boards on each campus as a mechanism to report and evaluate the conduct or misconduct of campus safety personnel.

While it is not surprising that the draft is somewhat short on detail given the early stage of the process, Council believes there are areas where greater clarity are warranted. These are:

**Guideline 1**

1. The draft states that interactions with the campus safety system will be “held to a high standard of respect and fairness and will be monitored.”
   a. What is the mechanism for establishing those standards? Who sets them?
   b. How will they be monitored? By whom? What data will be collected, and where will it be stored and for how long? Who will have access to it? What is the mechanism for reviewing the data?

**Guideline 2:**

1. The University will reinforce existing guidelines to minimize police presence at peaceful protests, and to seek non-urgent mutual aid first from UC campuses before calling outside law enforcement agencies.
   a. The term “seek” should be clarified. How much effort and emphasis will be placed on seeking non-urgent mutual aid?

2. In consultation with Campus Counsel and Student Affairs, campuses will consider addressing the harm created by the traditional criminal justice system through adjudication of nonviolent and low-level crimes using community-based solutions, such as restorative justice programs or neighborhood courts.
a. This is a promising recommendation, but given that most graduate students (and many undergraduates) live off-campus, how might this practice extend to students living off-campus. In other words, will there be efforts to coordinate with local community law enforcement so that students living in the community may benefit from this as well?

Guideline 3:
1. What will be the criteria for naming names vs. anonymity?
2. What surveillance systems will be deployed? What data will be collected? Where will it be stored and for how long? Who will have access to it? What is the mechanism for reviewing the data?
3. 3.2a Membership in the “dashboard” working group should include individuals not just with technical expertise but individuals with theoretical and ethical expertise as well.

Guideline 4:
1. It appears that accountability pertains only to campus police and non-uniformed security personnel. But it should also explicitly extend to upper administration within the decision-making chain-of-command with respect to use of policing, and in particular, use of outside law enforcement agencies.
2. 4.1a. Regarding the campus police accountability body, who serves? How are they to be selected?
3. 4.2a. What accountability and transparency measures will be incorporated into the complaint processing and investigation unit?

Sincerely,

Donald Smith, Chair
Graduate Council

cc: All Senate Committees
June 21, 2021

Professor Mary Gauvain
Chair, Academic Senate
University of California
VIA EMAIL

Re: Divisional Review of Presidential Campus Safety Plan

Dear Professor Gauvain,

The Presidential Campus Safety Plan proposal was discussed at the June 14, 2021 Divisional Senate Council meeting. The timeline did not permit the standard distribution of the proposal to standing committees for review and comment. While additional time would have been preferred, Council appreciates the President’s desire to start to address campus safety sooner rather than later. Council endorses the attached response letter and comments from Professor Eric Watkins, who was asked to review the proposal and report to Senate Council.

Council felt that the intentions behind the Plan were a step in the right direction. However, Council had reservations due to the lack of details in some areas and the compressed review timeline. The main concern was that in order to holistically evaluate campus security, with the goal to de-emphasize the use of campus police, the revisions to the Gold Book need to be revisited and finalized, and data related to the current situation of policing on campus needs to be provided. It would be beneficial for some of the proposed reforms to be implemented in the meantime while the Plan is being finalized, particularly the dashboard and proposed data in the “Transparency and Continuous Improvement through Data” section. Council would like to see a more thorough discussion of the Plan in the fall. Given that the implementation framework includes actions that extend through December 2023, there should be adequate time for a full Senate review of those actions that are planned for 2022 and 2023.

Sincerely,

Steven Constable
Chair
San Diego Divisional Academic Senate

Attachment

cc: Tara Javidi, Vice Chair, San Diego Divisional Academic Senate
    Ray Rodriguez, Director, San Diego Divisional Academic Senate
    Hilary Baxter, Executive Director, UC Systemwide Academic Senate
Dear Academic Senate,

I would like to take this opportunity to provide comments on the recently released Presidential Campus Safety Plan. As a faculty Senate member who is a member of the Community Safety and Security Advisory Committee, I know that this new plan is supposed to provide guidance on how policing and other security matters are to be handled on our campus. It is an important document.

My overall impression is that the intentions behind the presidential plan are good and to be commended. It is also true that trying to formulate a plan that could effectively guide ten rather different campuses represents a significant challenge. In the end, it is essential that shared governance on our campus attend carefully to how whatever guidelines are ultimately approved are then implemented. So whatever may happen with this document at the university-wide level, it behooves us to pay close attention to our own response and implementation. Indeed, my main recommendation is that the Academic Senate be proactive in how this process moves forward on our campus.

One general reservation that I have about the holistic, inclusive and tiered response element of the Presidential Campus Safety Plan is that, despite its good intentions, it is likely to increase rather than decrease police involvement throughout the campus, where such an increase is precisely the opposite of what many are calling for in response to current events. A similar point is relevant for the IACLEA accreditation element, since the requirements for accreditation will require more training for police and greater involvement of police on campus. To appreciate the significance of both of these points, it is important to keep the history of campus police firmly in mind. Attempts at police reform have been common for the last sixty years and the result of these repeated attempts is precisely the problem that we are now facing. It turns out, paradoxically, that reforms, which are certainly well-intentioned, are not only ineffective, but also counter-productive, because they invariably give police more resources rather than less. (Here’s a specific question: How much would it cost, UC-wide and at UC-San Diego, to acquire IACLEA accreditation? It would incur additional costs, since it is an additional responsibility. In fact, the plan explicitly states that UCOP will make additional funding available for this purpose.) In this context, it is worth noting that IACLEA has been extremely effective at professionalizing its campus police and increasing the size of campus police both at home (in the US) and abroad (internationally). But note that successful reform ought to decrease police presence and costs, not increase both. I fear that in the face of this kind of knowledge, it would be naïve to hope that current reform attempts will have a significantly different result from the long history of past attempts. As a result, instead of undertaking a holistic approach that would allow police greater access to a wider range of campus organizations (in the name of integration), we would be better off focusing on reducing the presence of police to those tasks for which they are demonstrably necessary. Thus, instead of additional training and reform, we should look to a more reduced police presence on campus. The only point in the presidential plan that might be used to address this issue is 2.2: To support a holistic tiered response model, campuses will launch its reconfiguration of campus safety roles and functions, including the repurposing of existing sworn officer positions to other safety, wellness or social service roles. But note that this does not actually say that police presence will be reduced, but rather that it will be “reconfigured”. At the very least, we should recommend that “reduction” language should be inserted in the
presidential plan. And regardless of our success in revising the text of the presidential plan, if our Faculty Senate pushes for that reconfiguration to amount to a reduction rather than an increase in the name of integration, we could make a genuine positive difference.

A second point concerns specific issues that were notably absent from the report. While students and faculty are invited to provide input on the hiring process of new officers, they are not similarly invited to give input on whether new officers should be hired at all. Nor is there any specific commitment to disarming officers and to preventing the funding of new weapons.

Let me also add some responses to much more specific points.
- The plan says that “[i]nteractions will be held to a high standard of respect and fairness and will be monitored.” But it is unclear how this will be monitored and by whom? (Is it enough if no formal complaint is lodged against a police officer?)

- The plan says that “[t]he University will prioritize deterrence and prevention of violent crimes over the enforcement of non-violent minor offenses, such as non-hazardous traffic violations.” Yet the plan is silent on how the university will prioritize deterrence. I suspect that they will not require that officers not make arrests.

- The plan says that “[t]his data will be used to assess campus safety practices, generate recommendations for best practices, and hold the institution accountable.” But what kind of data will be released on stops, complaints, and use of force?

- The plan says that “[a] standardized and robust complaint and investigation process will be implemented through police accountability boards.” But how will this interact with FUPOA? Will campus police still conduct their own investigations into officer behavior outside of public complaints brought to the board?

- The plan says that “[t]he history of policing, and the variety of views including maintaining, defunding or abolishing police departments, and making space for those ideas and solutions, will be shared and considered by campus leadership.” But this statement is extremely vague and is likely to be viewed as uttered in bad faith by those who have been ill-treated by our current security arrangements and by those who see that (as noted above) additional resources are being devoted to campus police.

In sum, despite the best of intentions, I fear that some of the recommendations will be meaningless – which is problematic insofar as we have a situation that needs a solution; the status quo is widely viewed as unacceptable – and that some of the recommendations will be counterproductive and harmful. It is hard to see this document, taken as a whole, as making a significant step in the right direction. It is lacking in specific initiatives that promise to make the situation better and is rife with generalities that campus police will have no trouble coopting, in all likelihood into more funding.

Sincerely,

Eric Watkins
June 21, 2021

Mary Gauvain, PhD
Chair, Academic Council
Systemwide Academic Senate
University of California Office of the President
1111 Franklin St., 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607-5200

Re: Presidential Campus Safety Plan

Dear Mary:

The San Francisco Division of the Academic Senate has reviewed the draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan. After considerable misgivings over the ‘Gold Book’ (especially around the use of force), a number of our standing committees were receptive to the proposed framework for policing, which envisions a “transforming UC’s culture, policies and practices to achieve a vision of safety in which all members of the community feel welcomed, respected and protected from harm.”

That said, our Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW), Equal Opportunity (EQOP), Graduate Council (GC), and Rules and Jurisdiction (R&J) all critically reviewed the draft campus plan. On the whole, the UCSF Division finds the Safety Plan to be a bold, but a rather vague and aspirational plan. Policies and procedures will need to be reviewed, revised, and implemented in line with the Safety Plan to improve policing at the University of California. It also goes without saying that the recent proposed changes to the Gold Book are not in line with the draft Safety Plan.

Our GC aptly observes that the focus of the “Safety” plan remains squarely on policing, which is only one tiny piece of the very large mosaic that is campus safety. For example, the “Holistic, Inclusive, and Tiered Response Services,” which should comprise the majority of any campus safety plan is underdeveloped and overemphasizes policing relative to other modes of providing and maintaining safety, which includes food security and affordable housing, among other elements.

In addition to the comments above, our Division would like to make the following specific suggestions for amendments and/or additions to certain parts of the Plan:

- **DEI:** CFW recommends that the proposed Safety Plan more explicitly address the importance of diversity, equity, and inclusion. Indeed, advancing diversity, equity, and inclusion should be one of the core guidelines of the plan.
- **Guideline 1: Community and Service-Driven Safety:** With respect to Accountability & Oversight, it will be important to have the UCOP staff who will serve in this role maintain transparent communication with the faculty (and perhaps the broader UC community). Faculty and other members of the UC community have been important stakeholders in safety discussions and should continue to play an active role. (EQOP)
- **Part II: Implementation Framework, Item 1.10 (hiring standards):** R&J recommends “excessive use of force” be added to the list of findings that would disqualify someone from serving as a university officer or as part of campus safety personnel.
- **Part II: Implementation Framework, Item 2.4:** The non-policing elements of Action 2.4, which proposes to integrate policing with services related to “mental health, wellness, basic needs, sexual harassment prevention, bias/hate response, and so forth,” are woefully underdeveloped. In this section, what is really covered by
the phrase “and so forth”? In our view this entire effort should be devoted to shifting our focus from policing to the world of alternatives represented by ‘and so forth’. We would like to see ‘and so forth’ cover plans to ensure food security and housing to our students, as they are essential elements of campus safety. (GC)

In closing, we emphasize and agree with Academic Council’s earlier review of the Gold Book, which found that, “many elements of the Gold Book policy revisions directly contradict the new model of public safety envisioned by many at the University, and they seem antithetical to UC values.” In that vein, we sincerely hope that UC will take this opportunity to not just revise existing policies that have proven inappropriate and harmful on UC campuses, but to completely rethink the meaning and mission of “Campus Safety.”

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on this review. If you have any questions, please let me know.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Sharmila Majumdar, PhD, 2019-21 Chair
UCSF Academic Senate

Enclosures (3)
Cc: Jill Hollenbach, UCSF Committee on Faculty Welfare Chair
    Errol Lobo, UCSF Equal Opportunity Chair
    Dyche Mullins, UCSF Graduate Council Chair
    Katherine Yang, UCSF Rules & Jurisdiction Chair
    Steven W. Cheung, UCSF Academic Senate Vice Chair
Committee on Faculty Welfare
Jill Hollenbach, PhD, MPH, Chair

June 16, 2021

Sharmila Majumdar, PhD, Division Chair, UCSF Academic Senate

Re: Proposed Presidential Campus Safety Plan

Dear Chair Majumdar:

The Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) reviewed the draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan at its June 9, 2021 meeting. The Safety Plan describes a new vision for policing at the University of California that is more holistic, trauma-informed, and anti-racist. CFW is hopeful that the vision will be realized, but it will be difficult to achieve sweeping systemic change until the University’s existing policies and procedures that guide policing undergo significant revisions.

CFW endorses the proposed Safety Plan and writes to offer comments about implementing and improving the plan. CFW found the Safety Plan to be bold but rather vague and aspirational. Policies and procedures will need to be reviewed, revised, and implemented in line with the Safety Plan to improve policing at the University of California. The recent proposed changes to The Gold Book are not in line with the draft Safety Plan.

The proposed Safety Plan is not as detailed as the Gold Book, and CFW expects that the Gold Book will continue to guide day-to-day policing notwithstanding conflicts with the proposed Safety Plan. CFW finds it difficult to reconcile how the proposed Safety Plan and the revisions to the Gold Book came to this committee for review at the same time. If the proposed Safety Plan truly lays out the vision for policing at our University, the proposed changes to the Gold Book should have been set aside and a comprehensive review of the specific policies it describes should have been undertaken. CFW recommends that that review be undertaken now.

CFW also recommends that the proposed Safety Plan more explicitly address the importance of diversity, equity, and inclusion. Advancing diversity, equity, and inclusion should be one of the core guidelines of the plan.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan. Please reach out if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Jill Hollenbach, PhD, MPH
Committee on Faculty Welfare Chair
June 18, 2021

Sharmila Marjumdar, PhD
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate

Re: (Systemwide Senate Review) Presidential Campus Safety Plan

Dear Chair Marjumdar,

On behalf of the UCSF Graduate Council I am writing in response to the new Presidential Campus Safety Plan, which was recently circulated for comment and review. As (1) systemwide safety policies affect the entire UC community, including graduate students and postdoctoral fellows, and (2) the role of Graduate Council is to advise local and systemwide leadership regarding policies that affect both populations, we feel obliged to comment on this plan. Firstly, we wholeheartedly support efforts to change the culture around safety and policing on the UC campuses, and specific actions aimed at improving accountability and independent oversight of police and campus security services are particularly welcome.

We are, however, disappointed that the focus of this “Safety” plan remains squarely on policing, which is only one tiny piece of the very large mosaic that is campus safety. For example, the “Holistic, Inclusive, and Tiered Response Services,” which should comprise the majority of any campus safety plan is underdeveloped and overemphasizes policing relative to other modes of providing and maintaining safety. For example, the non-policing elements of Action 2.4, which proposes to integrate policing with services related to “mental health, wellness, basic needs, sexual harassment prevention, bias/hate response, and so forth,” are woefully underdeveloped. What is really covered by the phrase “and so forth”? In our view this entire effort should be devoted to shifting our focus from policing to the world of alternatives represented by ‘and so forth’. We would like to see ‘and so forth’ cover plans to ensure food security and housing to our students, as they are essential elements of campus safety.

In addition to the above concerns, we echo the concerns raised by UC Academic Council Chair, Mary Gauvin, in her recent letter to President Drake on this topic:

Specifically, we agree with Gauvin (and others) that, “many elements of the *Gold Book* policy revisions directly contradict the new model of public safety envisioned by many at the University, and they seem antithetical to UC values.”

We trust that UC will take this opportunity to not just revise existing policies that have proven inappropriate and harmful on UC campuses, but to completely rethink the meaning and mission of “Campus Safety.”

Thank you for your attention,

R. Dyche Mullins  
Chair, UCSF Graduate Council
Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction  
Katherine Yang, PharmD, Chair

June 16, 2021

Sharmila Majumdar, PhD  
Division Chair  
UCSF Academic Senate

Re: Proposed Presidential Safety Plan

Dear Chair Majumdar:

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction (R&J) writes to comment on the proposed Presidential Campus Safety Plan that R&J reviewed at its meeting on June 14, 2021. R&J supports the proposed Safety Plan but joins the Division in the concerns expressed at Executive Council on June 10, 2021.

The proposed Safety Plan is at odds with the recently revised Gold Book, which does not emphasize de-escalation or trauma-informed policing. If the proposed Safety Plan articulates U.C.’s vision for policing, then the policies and procedures that guide policing at our campuses should to be revised to be in accordance with that vision.

R&J also writes to recommend making a specific change to the proposed Safety Plan. In Part II: Implementation Framework, there is a list of community-centered safety actions, and item 1.10 provides,

As part of its standard background check, the University will not hire officers or any campus safety personnel with any sustained findings of misconduct related to moral turpitude, sexual harassment, bias, discrimination, or any other finding determined to be inconsistent with the University’s principles and values, or who resigned while under investigation.

R&J recommends “excessive use of force” be added to the list of findings that would disqualify someone from serving as a university officer or as part of campus safety personnel.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this important plan. Please reach out if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Katherine Yang

Katherine Yang, PharmD  
Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction, Chair
MARY GAUVAIN  
CHAIR, ACADEMIC COUNCIL  
RE: UCAADE RESPONSE TO PRESIDENTIAL CAMPUS SAFETY PLAN  

Dear Mary,  

I am writing on behalf of the University Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity, and Equity (UCAADE). UCAADE expressed serious concerns with the current state of policing at UC campuses and welcomes the new presidential campus safety plan.  

Attached please find a statement from UCAADE commenting on the proposed plan.  

Sincerely,  

Javier Arsuaga  
Chair, UCAADE  

cc. UCAADE
UCAADE reviewed the proposed presidential campus safety plan. The plan addresses key concerns raised by UCAADE in the past (see statement of UCAADE on changes to Gold Book): Safety measures should reflect the principles of community of UC campuses, policing should include a holistic approach to crises, transparency of management and accountability.

Overall UCAADE supports the guidelines proposed by the presidential campus safety plan but also has some suggestions:

Guideline 1: “The campus safety system will provide high-quality service in a courteous and accessible manner” While UCAADE appreciates the good intentions of this statement, it is also concerned that current policing is often presented as “high-quality service in a courteous and accessible manner”. This statement should be more specific marking differences with the current system of policing. This paragraph also says “Interactions… will be monitored”. Who will monitor these interactions? Police actions are currently monitored but with little or no consequences since the monitoring body is still the police department.

Guideline 2: The creation of multidisciplinary teams is welcomed but it has to ensure that the members of these teams are not members of the police force but instead professionals with adequate training in conflict de-escalation, mental health, etc… more clarity on the "non-sworn" personnel. Will they report to the police chief or will they have a separate reporting and accountability structure?

Guideline 3: The use of data can be dangerous if used improperly or can be used against the members of the community that these guidelines are trying to protect. The proposal should specify who should collect, analyze and interpret this data and who should decide on the response to the findings. Possibly a committee representing interested parties across campuses assisted by experts in data science should be formed.

Guideline 4: We are delighted to see that the office of the president will create a full-time position in service to the campuses, however this should be strengthened with representation from the academic senate, so decisions/recommendations are made jointly between the administration and the academic senate.

**Implementation**

UCAADE applauds the proposed schedule for implementing the guidelines, although some of the actions and their timelines are not clear to this committee

1.1 When will these working groups be formed? It seems to indicate that when they form they will include broad representations however there is no clear timeline for when these groups will be formed.
1.4 Should include “non-violent”
1.5 It seems that this action can be implemented right away.
1.7 What are going to be the consequences for police officers that are poorly evaluated?
1.10 should not only include future hires but current members of the police department. Current members should be evaluated, and decisions should be made as to whether they can still be part of the UC police.
1.13 The office of the president should consult with the academic senate on these decisions is important. Particularly removal of militarized vehicles and weapons should be addressed as soon as possible.

2.2 and 2.3 should be implemented simultaneously since 2.3 may be required before 2.2 in some of the recommendations. For instance, 2.3 requires the staffing step and 2.2 will require the reconfiguration step.

2.6 should not say “will consider addressing” but “will address”. There is no doubt that current practices are harmful and not only have created a distrust on police departments but has scarred communities. Action to heal these actions is needed and is urgent.

3.2a who will be part of this working group? Broad representation is required.

3.2b -3.2d. Who will be in charge of uploading all this data and how do we know the information will be reliable? Will the public have access to “raw data” to confirm the conclusions that are posted at UCOP? Oversight by independent units is important.

4. What will be the consequences for police officers that do not follow these guidelines?
MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

RE: Draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan

Dear Mary,

The University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) has reviewed the Draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan, and we have several comments. First, we wish to acknowledge the significant effort the Office of the President has made toward aligning the UC’s approach to campus safety with the needs and culture of the University community. We commend several aspects of the proposal, notably the commitments to data collection, transparency, accountability, and public engagement, as outlined in Guidelines 3 and 4. We generally support the implementation of a holistic and tiered response, as described under Guideline 2, with the caveats noted below. We also appreciate the ambitious time line proposed to implement sweeping changes throughout the system, although it remains unclear whether such a time line is realistic. UCFW appreciates the need to be responsive and act quickly, and we recognize that these principles represent a step toward a more community-centric safety posture, as articulated in Guideline 1.

Our primary concern is that the University’s position on campus safety remains uncertain as we move toward the new academic year. The Draft Presidential Plan presents a vision of policing at the University that is contradictory in tone and tenor to the recently circulated “Gold Book” revisions and many were left feeling unsure what to expect in 2021-22. Many in the UC community feel that radical changes are needed to the safety paradigm, and UCFW agrees that incremental steps are unlikely to yield meaningful change. We would like to have more clarity on the process of reform and on which policies are to be followed in the interim, before major changes become implemented. Will police practices on the campuses change before the official Gold Book is revised? If so, how will confusion among law enforcement, staff, faculty, and students be avoided?

Regarding proposed changes under Guideline 2 that would elevate a role for non-police staff to assist in campus safety, it will be imperative to ensure that protocols are clear and transparent, and that they protect the well-being of campus community members. The plan also raises questions from labor and organizational perspectives. It sets out to involve and integrate existing personnel and offices on UC campuses in campus safety and will likely charge them with a host of new policing-related tasks and responsibilities. Many of these staff and offices (Student Affairs, Student Health Centers, Title IX offices, CARE advocates, DEI offices as identified in guideline 2.4) are already overburdened and underfunded. The document provides no details regarding additional funding, and only identifies the appointment of one additional full-time staff position (under guideline 4.6). We are concerned about
the staff workload and organizational infrastructure that this proposal entails, and how the plan might alter or reorient the purpose and focus of these vital support services.

Because safety is critical to the entire University, we hope that, as details are developed, the drafting process, not just the consultation process, will also include stakeholder groups. Safety policies should not be issued, but be created commonly, and UCFW remains ready to assist in this process.

Sincerely,

Shelley Halpain, UCFW Chair

Copy: UCFW
     Hilary Baxter, Executive Director, Academic Senate
     Robert Horwitz, Academic Council Vice Chair