

This document includes all recommendations approved by the Campus Safety Community Advisory Board for Academic Year 2020-21.

Table of Contents

Finalized Recommendations	2
Parking Enforcement should be moved out of UCSC PD to a non-police unit.	2
UCSC Leadership should issue an Apology	3
Experience with Policing Digital Art Project	4
CAB Review of the Annual Survey on Experiences with Policing and Campus Safety	5
Hear and Engage with Student Organizers	6
Recommendation on Crisis Response Team Proposal	9
Prioritize Prevention Over Policing	11
Employ Trauma-Informed Training and Practices Across Campus	12
Institute an External Complaint Mechanism	14
Establish a Low-Level Crime Self-Report Portal	15
Establish an Ambulance Fund for Medical Transport Rather Than Relying on PD Transport (reflected in CRT response)	16
Develop Community Safety Strategies and Agreements Toolkit	17

Finalized Recommendations

Parking Enforcement should be moved out of UCSC PD to a non-police unit.

We recommend that Parking Enforcement and its full budget and FTE move out of UCSC PD elsewhere, perhaps to TAPS or another appropriate, non-police, administrative unit as determined after evaluation and analysis. Parking Enforcement staff should be trained in conflict de-escalation and trauma-informed response. Their job descriptions should be reviewed and revised for their role as campus ambassadors and safety resources.

Administration should work with Staff HR to review job descriptions and any potential changes within scope of work to accommodate this recommendation in compliance with applicable collective bargaining agreements. Vehicles and uniforms should be modified to unlink the association of this unit with the police. Though campus parking enforcement personnel do not currently carry weapons, we wish to affirm that **parking enforcement should never be conducted by armed individuals.**

Parking Enforcement should create an annual Community Engagement Plan that centers a culture of care in the execution of their duties and addresses their role in creating a safer campus climate. This plan should be reviewed by the CAB every year.

Benefit to campus and shared values: This recommendation benefits the campus by limiting unnecessary and potentially intimidating encounters with police and intentional or unintentional profiling. By reframing parking enforcement & tickets within an administrative framework and not a policing framework, we reduce the likelihood of these kinds of encounters, which disproportionately affect community members, faculty, staff, and students of color. This recommendation reflects our shared value that wherever and whenever possible, we should not use police if they are not explicitly needed.

Notes for implementation of this recommendation: The CAB discussed possible barriers to implementation, related primarily to employment contract rights. Members of the CAB recognize that sworn officers have authority to issue parking citations and enforce parking regulations, but recommend these activities be deprioritized by UCSC PD. We affirm that parking enforcement should not be conducted by armed individuals.

We recommend that you consult with the following units on campus: TAPS, Parking Enforcement, UCPD, ELR, Risk and Safety Services, UCSC Legal Counsel. We also recommend consultation with the CHES CSO program. We anticipate this recommendation may have implications for the Parking Enforcement budget; require updated identity for unit materials, vehicles, uniforms, etc.; and necessitate an analysis to find the best administrative home for the unit.

UCSC Leadership should issue an Apology

We recommend that **UCSC leadership should apologize** for the way that UCSC administration, UCPD, and outside police forces **treated student protesters during the strike in 2020, which had an outsize effect on marginalized students.**

Benefit to campus and shared values: This apology would be a meaningful gesture toward repairing the relationship, rebuilding trust and creating dialogue with people affected by the police actions. This recommendation reflects our shared value of Restorative Justice as a lived practice of community accountability.

Notes for implementation of this recommendation: The CAB discussed possible barriers to implementation, related to how an institutional apology can be meaningful and reparative and not symbolic or performative. Members of the CAB recognize that an apology while possible litigation and union negotiations are ongoing may be challenging but acknowledging the lived experience of student protesters and committing to substantive change in future institutional response to student protest would be meaningful.

We recommend review of the Senate Resolution passed on the floor and approved through referendum in Feb 2020 and that you consider consultation with Mia Mingus re: adaptation of [“how to give a good apology”](#) for community accountability by institutions.

Experience with Policing Digital Art Project

We recommend that the CAB website should include a feature that brings together people's experiences of policing and data about policing in a way that we can more fully engage with it. This should be a digital arts project, possibly supporting a graduate student and/or faculty member in a program like Digital Arts and New Media, supported by the GSR for the CS CAB, and possibly offered as a class for students interested in campus safety to learn how to conduct this research and develop such features.

Benefit to campus and shared values: This recommendation benefits the campus by creating a virtual space for the community to share experiences of policing, increase access to data about policing, and support research.

Notes for implementation of this recommendation: The CAB discussed possible barriers to implementation, related to resources for funding a GSR and possible course release to incentivise Faculty engagement and we recommend consultation with CP/EVC and the Arts Division to explore options for funding resources. Additionally, capacity building to host the Policing Digital Art Project on the CAB page would need to be facilitated and supported.

CAB Review of the Annual Survey on Experiences with Policing and Campus Safety

We recommend that the annual survey on experiences with policing and campus safety should be reviewed by the full Campus Safety Community Advisory Board (CAB); and before the survey is administered, the responsible parties administering the survey should review with the CAB changes that were made to the survey to reflect the input of the CAB. In addition, we recommend that the annual survey should not be the only method for gathering feedback about engagement with the police.

Benefit to campus and shared values: The implementation of the survey by the People Lab this year had the advantage of external implementation and the ability to gather comparable data across campuses. However, the disadvantages of not incorporating campus-specific feedback from the CAB, lack of transparent control over the incorporation of provided feedback, and the introduction of material that wasn't originally included (some that could cause emotional distress and should have been accompanied by a warning), outweighs those advantages. This recommendation benefits the campus by ensuring survey language and methodology that is consistent with campus values and trauma informed.

Notes for implementation of this recommendation: The CAB discussed possible barriers to implementation, related to possible conflicting requirements about survey implementation from the Office of the President. However, we affirm that the benefits from the model used for survey implementation are outweighed by the harmful campus impact shared with CAB this year. We recommend consultation with; IRAPS, BAS, PD, CAB and other relevant units to ensure relevant information related to staff time, analysis of best practices for moving forward with surveying, use of survey tool, and resources required for alternatives (e.g. focus groups, office hours, report creation, etc) are considered.

Hear and Engage with Student Organizers

The Campus Safety CAB created a mechanism for suggested recommendations from CAB members. This recommendation came from student members of the CAB, and we discussed it extensively in our meetings. The CAB ratified the following recommendation in its entirety and recommended that the shared working document be forwarded to you. We include it here, in the format in which it was submitted and considered by the CAB:

Area: Protest/Free Speech
Describe your recommendation. What kind of change do you recommend our campus make?
<p>Develop an effective mechanism to hear and engage with student organizers to preempt violent response to protest</p> <p>under the recognition that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) the administration would rather endanger its students with the presence of a militarized police force at demonstrations, than have conversations with students that may result in a request that the University concede something2) the militarized police force are less there to protect people and property than to be a sort of show of force/ counter protestors of sort representing administration resistance to the demands of protestors/ a intermediary and buffer between protestors and administrators3) The use of the police force as resistance assumes that the University can say no without actually having to defend why they say "no" to requests.<ul style="list-style-type: none">-It assumes that since they are the power in the situation, that they do not have to justify their positions with logic like protestors make an effort to. This results not in real conversations from the admin, but disrespectful, misguided, and inflammatory rhetoric when they are eventually forced to make a statement on the protests going on (see the many letters from the admin during the strike), that only make the situation worse. They do so In order to justify not only their "no" but more their response to the situation, rather than actually having to level with organizers to come up with a solution. They thus put all their energy into how to "manage" the situation and the response, which diverts the attention of everyone and makes policing the issue rather than the demands of the protestors. They can then hide their pathetic, rhetorical, and misleading responses to the logic of the demands as a mere footnote, hidden in the smoke of the scene they have brought about at the protest site by both their unwillingness to talk, and police response.4) And basically, the police at protests are a way for them to get away with saying no when they have no reason they should be able to. Other than institutional (and personal) greed. The police are the personification of the University's determination to remain a highly for profit-colonial- unequal white supremacist institution as opposed to a public University for the denizens of Santa Cruz, and the rest of our taxpayers. Because safety and property wouldn't have to be threatened if the administration were accountable, meaning the police would not have to be present at all, they are a safety net and a diversion (what they fall back on when

they don't want to concede but know it would be bad PR to just admit they are greedy)

5) that the most violent day of the COLA strikes at the hands of the police occurred alongside demands to speak with administration regarding the dire need of students, which were met instead with police violence

6) That campus police were empowered in response to, specifically, histories of BLACK student organizing, to protect the economic interests of the university/ political interests of the colonial settler state

I submit the following idea for a recommendation to be made to the chancellor regarding the policing and protest problem: The administration should instead of focusing all the worry on how police will conduct themselves when they are ultimately summoned to the scene of a demonstration, circumvent the assumption that a) the police are meant to respond to protests and b) that there will even BE demonstrations that have the potential of creating danger. Instead, the administration should work to prevent dangerous situations from occurring, by **IMPLEMENTING AN EXPLICIT AND SWIFT SYSTEM TO INTERFACE WITH STUDENT ORGANIZERS WHO ARE MADE TO BELIEVE THAT THE ONLY WAY TO MAKE HEARD THE ISSUES THAT ARE INCREDIBLY HIGH STAKES TO THEM**, is to hold a demonstration that endangers the monetary interests of the university and possibly individual safety. This mechanism should be open, transparent, and accessible to all students. If the university was willing to meet with student organizers in good faith, and actually operated from a commitment to the needs of their students and not their own pocketbooks, the very need for protest, and police presence, could be circumvented

This is a difficult change to make because it requires the University to actually act as a public university that is accountable to the needs and voices of its students and community, not to the benefits of top administrators and institutional interests. But if done it is possible to have conversations that PREVENT ALL KINDS OF VIOLENCE and preempt even the need for high amounts of protest activity, because you are meeting the needs of the student and community body.

How would your recommendation benefit the campus? What values or principles to improve safety does it support?

As stated above, it would help preempt the need for incendiary demonstration, and also response from police. This is one step that prioritizes the interests of students (being heard by the university) to the interests of the university (preserving the power of the police department to reinforce political/ economic interests). As things of course, should be at a public university. At this time, however, a separate recommendation should be put forth concerning the way that police response is directed when demonstrations do occur (in order to protect the safety of the students), because I do not anticipate the need for protest to be completely assuaged in the near future even if meetings between administration and student leaders do occur, or that the university will abolish their police police power to respond to demonstrations. This recommendation could save money by preventing a costly large-scale police response.

Please list any campus offices or campus members who might need to be involved in

evaluation and/or implementation of this recommendation. (optional)

The chancellor, vice chancellor, and all direct reports to the chancellor that interface with student interests. Students involved in campus protest should be involved in the development of this mechanism and compensated for their participation.

Are there resources that you think would be required for implementation of this recommendation? (optional)

--

Recommendation on Crisis Response Team Proposal

We were asked to provide feedback to a proposal in development from a number of campus units. This dovetailed with our work making recommendations. Though the proposal is not public information, we provide our recommendation here as a record of our thinking on the topic of a Crisis Response Team at UCSC.

The CAB is generally supportive of the philosophy of expanding UC Santa Cruz mental health resources and ensuring that those experiencing mental health crises in our community are engaged by those with mental health expertise rather than delegating this responsibility to the campus police. The benefits of a mental health first response for our community are partially identified in the proposal and include an increased willingness of community members to reach out in crisis.

The proposal makes clear that this is an early planning document and that comprehensive planning, implementation and project management details have not been worked through yet. We appreciate being engaged before the plans have been concretized and have a series of recommendations and questions.

1. The primary concern during our discussion was that a partner program with a police officer and a mental health professional would not actually create the positive results described in the introduction of the proposal. Many members of our board advocated for an alternative model that did not include a police officer for initial contact with a person experiencing a mental health crisis. We ask that the implications, costs, and benefits of a model that does not include the police be considered as a genuine alternative.
2. The proposal notes that in our current model, CAPS relies on UCPD to transport those experiencing mental health crises and subject to mental health holds. The proposal does not provide any alternatives. We recommend that the campus invest in non-PD transport options that destigmatize the experience of a mental health transport.
3. The proposal should be expanded to include coordinated response for Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault.
4. The proposal did not provide comparison with other UC and non-UC approaches to supporting community members in mental health crises. We recommend that before a proposal is formally accepted by the campus, comparative data is collected on other approaches and made available to those reviewing the plan.
5. The current proposal is extremely modest in its goals. The University of California is at a transformational moment and we recommend that UC Santa Cruz be at the leading edge of compassionate, community-focused mental health support that avoids medicalization or criminalization of mental health issues.

While the CAB is very supportive of a mental health forward approach for responding to community members in crisis, there is a strong sense amongst the members that this proposal is not sufficiently distinct from our current practices or ambitious enough to help the campus realize a new horizon of safety and support for community members experiencing mental health crises. We welcome the opportunity to engage on this issue again in future.

Prioritize Prevention Over Policing

We recommend prioritizing funding for comprehensive prevention efforts so we can work towards decreasing harm and thereby the need for police involvement. For example, fund bystander intervention programming for all students which can address interpersonal violence, sexual violence, race-based harm, other crimes.

Benefit to campus and shared values: This recommendation shifts campus values from policing to harm prevention.

Notes for implementation of this recommendation: The CAB recognizes implementation would require resources for prevention programming and staffing.

We recommend that you consult with the following units on campus: CARE, CHES, WAS, and DSAS.

Area: Harm Reduction/Envisioning Community Safety
Describe your recommendation. What kind of change do you recommend our campus make?
Prioritize funding for comprehensive prevention efforts so we can work towards decreasing harm and thereby need for police involvement. For example, fund bystander intervention programming for all students which can address interpersonal violence, sexual violence, race based harm, other crimes.
How would your recommendation benefit the campus? What values or principles to improve safety does it support?
Shift values from policing to prevention
Please list any campus offices or campus members who might need to be involved in evaluation and/or implementation of this recommendation. (optional)
CARE, CHES (?), Orientation/ WAS (?), DSAS (?)
Are there resources that you think would be required for implementation of this recommendation? (optional)
Resources for prevention programming and staffing, buy in for broad implementation

Employ Trauma-Informed Training and Practices Across Campus

This recommendation was passed by the CAB with unanimous approval on June 21, 2021.

CAB recommends broad training and use of trauma-informed practices by all employees (student, staff, and faculty) in positions that are student-facing and especially where they have responsibility for incident response.

The campus should develop a list of all response programs, protocols, and policies (critical and otherwise). Each program, protocol, and policy should be reviewed:

- To identify individuals involved in response/implementation
- To review with an ABC and trauma-informed lens
- To determine how employees are supported and performance managed
- To recommend the use of best and promising practices that are trauma-informed and responsive to the lived experience of our community.
- With understanding of past/current training

CAB recommends ongoing review and accountability from involved units to ensure sufficient assessment for each principal officer by incorporating annual performance goals.

Benefit to campus and shared values: Trauma-informed practices are the best way to meet students where they are at and mitigates harm in daily interactions. It empowers the community through training to effectively respond and reduce harm.

Notes for implementation of this recommendation: The CAB recognizes the need for resources for implementation including stipends for Resource Directors, CARE to consult with principal officers in their program reviews, and Trauma-Informed Practices training resources.

We recommend that you consult with the following units on campus: Resource Directors, CARE, CAPS, ODEI, EEP, Chancellor, and principal officer/cabinet members.

Area: Harm Reduction/Envisioning Community Safety
Describe your recommendation. What kind of change do you recommend our campus make?
CAB should recommend broad training and use of trauma informed practices by all employees (student, staff and faculty) in positions that are student facing and especially where they have responsibility for incident response. Campus should develop a list of all response programs, protocols, and policies, critical and otherwise. Each program, protocol and policies should be reviewed: - to identify individuals involved in response/implementation - to review with an ABC and trauma informed lens - past/current training - how are employees supported and performance managed - recommend use of best and promising practices that are trauma informed and responsive to the

lived experience of our community.

CAB should recommend ongoing review and accountability for ensuring review for each principal officer by incorporating into annual performance goals.

CAB should recommend a certificate program and train-the-trainer model to ensure sustainable training resources on Trauma Informed Practices on campus with QTBIPOC lens.

How would your recommendation benefit the campus? What values or principles to improve safety does it support?

Being trauma informed is the best way to meet students where they are at and mitigates harm in daily interactions. Empowers community through training to effectively respond and reduce harm.

Please list any campus offices or campus members who might need to be involved in evaluation and/or implementation of this recommendation. (optional)

Resource Directors, CARE, CAPS, ODEI, EEP, Chancellor, principal officer/cabinet

Are there resources that you think would be required for implementation of this recommendation? (optional)

Stipends for Resource Directors, CARE to consult with principal officers in their program reviews. Trauma Informed Practices training resources.

Institute an External Complaint Mechanism

This recommendation was passed by the CAB with unanimous approval on June 21, 2021.

CAB recommends UCSC implement a mechanism for filing complaints against campus police that is processed and investigated outside of UCPD. Right now, [the current process for making a complaint against a police officer](#) is by filing a complaint that is reviewed by other police officers. It is not possible to make anonymous complaints. This gives the impression that police officers on campus can act without oversight.

Benefit to campus and shared values: This recommendation is consistent with the systemwide guidance, and would increase community trust by providing an external accountability mechanism. It's more likely to surface concerns and opportunities for meaningful change and engagement. Shared values: transparency and accountability.

Notes for implementation of this recommendation: We recommend that you consult with the following units on campus: Ethics and Compliance Office at UCOP (while ensuring that complaints are not referred back to PD and that UCOP is willing to accept jurisdiction to respond and investigate), SHR/ELR, Risk, BAS, and UCPD (for questions about union contract rights related to complaints).

Establish a Low-Level Crime Self-Report Portal

This recommendation was passed by the CAB with 79% approval and no opposing votes on June 21, 2021. This recommendation is made collaboratively with interim Chief Mary Garcia.

A self-report portal should be established for community members to make reports of low-level property crimes/"cold crimes" (little to no leads, not in-progress, not violent), such as bike theft, noise complaints, and abandoned cars to police.

These reports would be reviewed by an officer during business hours for appropriate follow-up and classification to ensure compliance with crime statistics gathering obligations under Clery and other relevant state and federal laws.

Officers can then contact reporters via phone or email prior to issuing a case number to establish information provided is complete and meets CA criminal code requirements.

The form should include transparency about expectations regarding follow-up from officers, and allow reporters to designate their preferred method of contact, including no contact. All other forms of reporting should still remain available. This recommendation creates an additional, not a substitute, method of reporting.

Benefit to campus and shared values: Establishing a portal would be a service to community members who would not otherwise report low-level property crimes. It would reduce in-person engagement by police for community members who would prefer not to have interactions with uniformed officers. It also provides the convenience and safety of reporting on-line and preserves policing resources for in-progress and priority calls that do require physical police response.

Notes for implementation of this recommendation: This recommendation would require collaboration between Chief Mary Garcia, an IT analyst to build the on-line report form, and University relations for a community education campaign.

We recommend that you consult with the following units on campus: UCPD, Risk Services, VC BAS, ITS, and the Chancellor.

Establish an Ambulance Fund for Medical Transport Rather Than Relying on PD Transport (reflected in CRT response)

This recommendation was passed by the CAB with 64% approval and 14% opposing votes. The remaining 22% are ex-officio members of CAB who do not vote.

The CAB recommends the establishment of an ambulance fund. Currently, UCSHIP offers grants up to \$500 for medical care that students can apply for. However, [it is only available for people with UCSHIP](#) (Campus Medical Care Assistance Fund). Slug Support also grants students funding for ambulances but has limits on how much money students can receive. We recommend full relief for people who require emergency medical transportation.

Benefit to campus and shared values: Currently, when students have a mental health crisis or are suffering from substance abuse, it is normal to call UCPD to transport patients to the appropriate medical facility. This can be a traumatic and potentially dangerous experience for the patient and any witnesses. For example, UCPD policy includes handcuffing patients. During CAB meetings the high cost of ambulances was cited as reason to continue using police for this service. A dedicated fund will eliminate that problem. This reflects the core value of removing reliance on police for mental health crisis transport.

Notes for implementation of this recommendation: Some funds for this program can come from the police budget, as this will be alleviating some of their burdens.

We recommend that you consult with the following units on campus: UCPD, CAPS, SHC, units who have mechanisms for handling funds requests.

Develop Community Safety Strategies and Agreements Toolkit

This recommendation was passed by the CAB with 71% approval. 21% of voting members abstained.

The CAB recommends the campus have a shared toolkit to support building coordinators and community members who have responsibility for physical spaces on campus to develop agreements with occupants of these spaces to promote community safety and provide alternatives to contact with PD. These agreements will:

1. Outline which resources to call to address safety issues and clearly articulate alternatives to campus police for non life-threatening issues.
2. Include communications plans for the group when a safety incident occurs - many issues are made worse by a lack of communication.
3. Be piloted at the building level with the principal officer in charge of the building and the facilities manager consolidating the conversations. These individuals will be responsible for turning in completed safety agreements.

Benefit to campus and shared values: As we move back to more on campus activity, safety needs and assumptions about what makes someone safe are changing. We need proactive community conversations to ensure that we are supporting our community members. Often, issues arise within a unit and are escalated to the police or to upper administration because there is disagreement. To have community safety, we need community members to come together and have an agreed upon set of expectations for behavior and responses to safety issues. Calling the police is too strong of a response for many issues. However, the police are required to manage the issues they are called for. Instead, we need ways for people to have conversations about community safety together. This will promote community safety, and will specifically create more safety for Black and brown people on campus by reducing the risk of bodily harm and physical encounters with police as a result of profiling and bias by concerned parties.

Notes for implementation of this recommendation: The CAB recommends a central body develop templates, collect safety agreements, and have resources to facilitate conflicts. We also recommend these materials detail procedures to contact non-police safety officials and resources.

We recommend that you consult with the following units on campus: UCPD, Risk and Safety Services, Student Affairs and Success.

