



University of California, Riverside  
Campus Safety Task Force  
Meeting Minutes  
November 25, 2020, 1:00-2:00 p.m.

**Minutes**

Participants: Chair Jack Clarke, Tom Smith, Brian Haynes, Mariam Lam, Jason Stajich, Dennis McIver, Alton Carswell, Kim Overdyck, John Freese, Wade Stern, Luis Huerta, Sharon Oselin, Nichi Yes, Brianna Simmons, Keona Henderson

Non-member participants: Christine Victorino, David Bergquist, Megan Johnson, Blanca Alba

- Call to Approve Minutes from 11/12/2020 meeting by Dennis McIver and Task Force Chair Jack Clarke; The Motion was approved by the Task Force.
- John Freese informed the Task Force that he has reviewed all questions and comments received after the Town Hall from the UCR community. Tom Smith noted there were a lot of references to specific incidents; the Task Force may want to look at current incident reporting structure.
- Chair Jack Clarke led a discussion on uniforms and use of force:
- Tom shared that police in militaristic gear and who carry weapons can be a trigger for people with prior negative experiences. What are the possibilities for police to be unarmed and have less threatening attire? Could on-campus patrol be conducted by campus safety officers or unarmed security guards? What kinds of calls require armed response by the police? Can there be a safer space for reporting?
- John noted that the main reason for uniformity in law enforcement is for officers to be immediately recognizable in emergency situations. In regard to lethal force, these tools are required to immediately respond to lethal force situations; there is potential for using non-armed non-sworn staff for some situations.
- Dr. Haynes asked if UC PD uniforms are standardized; John responded they generally they are (dark blue uniform, with same patch, minor differences across campuses)
- Nichi Yes asked about the possibility of a covering/layer that is less threatening and could be easily removed; John responded this is something that could be explored.
- Keona Henderson asked for clarification on what the Task Force is addressing as "threatening" (e.g. the weapon, the uniform?).

- Jack noted that the community would likely see “paramilitary” dress as threatening, coupled with lethal force weapons; addressed non-lethal options, e.g., pepper spray, taser
  - John responded that officers are expected to immediately respond to lethal force situations.
- Mariam Lam noted the issue of limited personnel and job distribution; regular patrol can be triggering – do they need to be armed? If the problem is expediency or personnel, what are the pragmatics involved?
- Wade Stern asked for input as to what people would want taken away as far as uniforms or weapons. What are alternatives? He is concerned that without uniforms, there could be problems when uniformed officials do come onto campus. Wade also noted that in his opinion, the police could not be abolished because of the crime that does occur on campus.
- Jack called for the Task Force to submit data to support a recommendation. Jack asked how many times an officer had to draw a firearm in order to affect an arrest; Wade responded that the important question is not how many times (slim to none), but when do they need to.
- Brianna Simmons stated that the conversation of reform contradicts the purpose of the Task Force. She brought forth some statistics on police budgets and noted that these budgets are unnecessary and funds could be allocated to establish alternative responses. Abolishing UCPD would require revisiting relationship with UCPD and considering other mutual aid models (e.g., CAHOOTS, public safety group in Oregon, Northern California); consider perspective of BIPOC, queer/trans communities.
- Nichi addressed creating a level of campus safety; focus on prevention work. Nichi also suggested implementing a VC of Campus Safety to focus on all elements of campus safety, with focus on prevention, climate - “future state” consideration.
- Alton Carswell brought up recent data on legitimacy of campus police; campus community has lost trust; address student perceptions of UCPD vs. police overall; need to establish trust building (not occurring currently); Will obtain mental health resources/readings to share
  - Extent to which individuals are able to participate in procedures
  - Neutral, objective, unbiased factors to determine action
  - Treated with respect
  - Decisions are fair
- Alton also recommend combined force with mental health professionals (who also need protection)
- Keona called for a shared understanding of what safety looks and feels like; examine range of situations from non-threatening vs. threatening situations; see both sides of situations; be solution-oriented and focus on facts and statistics.
- Wade noted that Student CSOs are primarily on campus, and UCPD are primarily on the perimeter of campus; Discuss other options to take calls/reports, explore alternative options through campus departments (e.g., Title IX, CARE advocate); campus allies to help navigate

UCPD reporting and responses; Investigate online and web-based reporting systems (e.g., bicycle theft)

- Jason Stajich echoed the need to minimize direct interaction with UCPD and to explore mutual aid options; recognize assumptions and bias; in which situations can other departments respond? (e.g. medical aid/counseling)
- Mariam affirmed Alton and Nichi's comments; be mindful that there are members who may not be in privileged position to publicly speak about abolishing police
- Brianna asked the Task Force to establish which activities would or would not require police response; be willing to take a stand across the UC, and revisit options regularly; Speaking on behalf of the black student community, Brianna noted that many black students do not trust police and do not want them on campus; Divestment in RPD as an option.
- Timeline:
  - Next meeting: University of Oregon police chief, and focus on restorative and transformative justice
  - Christine will have an outline of the report and tentative recommendations for the December 18th meeting.
  - Suggests working in smaller groups of 2-3 for individual recommendations (to be due at January meeting)
  - January: Formalize report to share with campus for feedback