

November 19, 2021

LORI KLETZER, Campus Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor  
Chancellor's Office

**RE: Review of UC Santa Cruz Pilot Support Structures for Free Speech and Protest**

Dear Lori,

The Academic Senate has reviewed the proposed pilot Support Structures for Free Speech and Protest. The Graduate Council (GC) and the Committees on Affirmative Action and Diversity (CAAD), Academic Freedom (CAF), Educational Policy (CEP), Faculty Welfare (CFW), Committees (COC), Library and Scholarly Communications (COLASC), Planning and Budget (CPB), and Senate Executive Committee (SEC) have responded. There was a notable degree of agreement among the reviewing committees. Overall, they were supportive of the efforts being put forth by the Administration to increase transparency and de-escalate conflict during campus protests and to “prioritize prevention over policing.” Despite the overarching stated goals of this proposal, the reviewing committees were unconvinced of the efficacy of the policy presented, as it left a good many questions regarding how the various advisory bodies will work together. Moreover, it is not clear how this pilot will actually improve the dynamics between faculty, students, staff, and campus leadership since it appears to maintain much of the structure that was in place during the graduate student strike, and provides little information on how participation in the process will be improved. The committee responses are extremely thoughtful and detailed and are enclosed so that they may be read in their entirety rather than summarized here.

Sincerely,



David Brundage, Chair  
Academic Senate

Enc: Senate Committee Responses (Bundled)

cc: Minghui Hu, Chair, Committee on Academic Freedom  
Kirsten Silva Gruesz, Chair, Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity  
Tracy Larrabee, Chair, Committee on Educational Policy  
Dard Neuman, Chair, Committee on Planning and Budget  
Melissa Caldwell, Chair, Graduate Council  
Nico Orlandi, Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare  
Kim Lau, Chair, Committee on Committees  
Abraham Stone, Chair, Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication

November 9, 2021

David Brundage, Chair  
Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

**Re: Pilot Support Structure for Free Speech and Protest**

Dear David,

The Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (CAAD) is encouraged by efforts to overhaul the university's approach to handling campus protests in the wake of police violence enacted against peaceful student protesters in 2020. We also appreciate the work of the Community Advisory Board in drafting its recommendations to "prioritize prevention over policing." Nonetheless, after careful deliberation, we have major reservations about the proposed Pilot Structures for Free Speech and Protest. We are not fully convinced that the bureaucratic management of student protest via the proposed structures will actually ensure the safety of our campus community--especially students of color, who have been disproportionately targeted by police surveillance and violence--during times of political unrest. We outline our concerns below:

1. One goal of the Pilot Structures for Free Speech and Protest, as we understand it, is to support peaceful and lawful protest on campus. Yet during the protest that led to the proposal of this very program--namely, the COLA strike in Winter 2020--physical violence on the picket line was initiated by UCPD officers. How will this program set expectations for peaceful protest when UCPD will continue to have a central role in two of the four groups charged with responding to protests--the groups also that appear to have the most institutional authority?
2. We are also concerned about the uneven distribution of authority and responsibility across the four support groups. Group 1 (First Amendment and Protest Oversight Group) and Group 4 (Protest Logistics Team) primarily comprise representatives from upper administration and UCPD, and as such have significant institutional authority. Group 2 (First Amendment Support Team) and Group 3 (Protest Support Team) comprise those UCSC stakeholders who would be most directly affected by protests on campus (e.g., students, faculty) as well as those who provide care services to members of the campus community. While we are heartened to see new channels for listening and reflection (as well as compensation for the labor of Group 2 members), we are concerned that Groups 2 and 3 are tasked with a great deal of direct responsibility yet seem to have very little institutional authority relative to Groups 1 and 4. This siloing of responsibility and authority across four groups also means that the campus constituencies who should be in conversation with each other during times of protest are given little opportunity to enter into dialogue with one another. Finally, according to this structure there is also no oversight of UCPD--who still retains the final authority to deploy force--beyond the police chief and the chancellor.
3. CAAD additionally has questions about how this new support structure of four groups will function with regard to oversight. Specifically, when upper administration and UCPD are re-constituted in the forms of Groups 1 and 4, how will this affect institutional accountability? In the case of an instance of harm, who would take responsibility--the group or the individual institutional unit within the group? If there

- are no robust structures of accountability, then we fear this pilot program would only reproduce the same imbalances of power that promoted the proposal in the first place.
4. We would like clarification about the move to rename the Demonstrations Operations Team to the Protest Logistics Team. Is this name change cosmetic, or does it also entail a significant reworking of the group's purpose and function? We are concerned that the PLT will simply continue the work of the DOT, with "logistics" being used in practice as placeholder for various forms of policing.
  5. Finally, given that there are still unresolved questions about potential bias in the application of conduct-related disciplinary measures to some student protestors in 2020, we are concerned that the additional bureaucratic structure of the Protest Support Team might backfire. Although it is described as a resource for supporting students that can be accessed prior to a demonstration, what happens if a group of protestors does not choose to inform the PST of its plans beforehand, as is likely to occur? Could this be used negatively as evidence in a student conduct case?

CAAD feels that any new structures for supporting freedom of speech and protest on campus should genuinely decentralize the role of UCPD and move in the direction of alternative, non-police based emergency response systems such as the CAHOOTS program currently in place in Eugene, Oregon.<sup>1</sup> Municipalities across the country, including many in the state of California, are already moving in this direction, and UC Santa Cruz's efforts should take heed.

Sincerely,



Kirsten Silva Gruesz, Chair  
Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity

cc: Senate Executive Committee  
Minghui Hu, Chair, Committee on Academic Freedom  
Tracy Larrabee Chair, Committee on Educational Policy  
Melissa Caldwell, Chair, Graduate Council  
Dard Neuman, Chair, Committee on Planning and Budget  
Nico Orlandi, Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare  
Kim Lau, Chair, Committee on Committees

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://whitebirdclinic.org/what-is-cahoots/>

November 12, 2021

DAVID BRUNDAGE, Chair  
Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

**Re: Review of UCSC Pilot Support Structures for Free Speech and Protest**

Dear David,

On October 25, 2021, the Committee on Academic Freedom (CAF) discussed the UCSC Cruz Pilot Support Structures for Free Speech and Protest and has the following observations and recommendations to share.

We appreciate the administration's plan to create a policy that will deescalate conflict during campus protests. However, we are concerned that the proposed administrative reforms will not achieve the desired outcome and ultimately come across as little more than window dressing. We find the overall document does not address the goal expressed by its title: the promotion of free speech and expression on campus when there are divisions between community members and the administration about campus policies. And we have three critical concerns:

1. The First Amendment and Protest Oversight Group (FAPOG) does little to change the previous situation in which senior administrators found themselves in an adversarial position with protesting campus community members. The proposed new structure is new only because it adds the police chief and a staff member responsible for marketing. As such, FAPOG seems like little more than a label for existing structures that control policing and now are expanded to control and coordinate campus messaging. We fail to see why the same senior administrators who presided over a response to recent campus protests with the heavy use of force, under a different name, would generate much of a different outcome. If the goal is to change how the campus leadership navigates inevitable conflicts in the community, we believe this is not the right way forward. We would like to note that the absence of other campus community stakeholders from the FAPOG group - notably faculty, staff, and students - maintains the adversarial stance that has existed until now. The proposal is also seriously in conflict with conversations about policing taking place across the country. We note numerous reforms of policing to introduce community policing and civilian oversight, including in Santa Cruz, that are much more sophisticated than the proposal currently under review.
2. We are concerned that the First Amendment Support Team (FAST) group, while potentially a valuable addition to the campus response during protest events, may have no

teeth. There is no requirement or even procedure through which FAPOG consults with FAST. On its own, FAST is a paper tiger made up of faculty, staff, and students whose job is to consult with protestors for an unclear purpose.

3. It may create unrealistic expectations to require the Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) and the Campus Advocacy Resources and Education (CARE) team members to remain “neutral” as part of their involvement with the Protest Support Team (PST). Such a requirement may go against professional psychological and mental health care standards. It is also unclear that CAPS and CARE professionals could effectively remain neutral, given that they may have a different political stance from the protestors.

Moreover, we have three recommendations.

1. The protestors fundamentally regard senior administrators as adversaries, not representatives of the campus community. We recommend a solution that represents a genuine devolution of power over the campus response from a core group of administrators to a broader body that requires meaningful consultation with community members, including some campus faculty and students. Before undertaking any reforms, we recommend that senior administrators seriously consider whether their role is primarily to represent the interests of community members to the central administration and the state legislature or to govern the campus in the name of the latter. Increasing the former dimension - representation - is critical for community members to feel that honest conversations about the university can take place.
2. We recommend that the proposed changes also include a mechanism of mandatory consultation between FAST and FAPOG in the time leading up to and during protest events.
3. We recommend clarifying that the neutrality requirement on service providers associated with the PST should not be interpreted as preventing clinicians from expressing attitudes about the protest in the context of providing individual mental health support to students.

Sincerely,

/s/

Minghui Hu, Chair

Committee on Academic Freedom

cc: Senate Executive Committee  
Kirsten Silva-Gruesz, Chair, Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity  
Tracy Larrabee, Chair, Committee on Educational Policy  
Nico Orlandi, Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare  
Dard Neuman, Chair, Committee on Planning and Budget  
Melissa Caldwell, Chair, Graduate Council  
Kimberly Lau, Chair, Committee on Committees

November 12, 2021

David Brundage, Chair  
Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

**Re: UC Santa Cruz Support Structures for Free Speech and Lawful Protest Proposal**

Dear David,

The Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) has reviewed the Campus Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor's (CPEVC) new UC Santa Cruz Support Structures for Free Speech and Lawful Protest proposal. The committee found that the original communication from CPEVC Kletzer lacked sufficient context, as provided by the [campus-wide messaging from the Chancellor](#). The committee appreciated the apology and reflection that was offered in helping our campus community to further heal.

Overall, CEP applauds and approves the increase in the transparency and support that is being offered in this proposal. Although members found the format of the document to be a little confusing, we understand the legal implications that the document potentially holds. The committee noted that an Executive Summary would have greatly helped the review of the proposal, and many members spoke in favor of identifying the goals and potential rights and responsibilities of each group.

The training must be transparent to show that it is appropriately supporting a developmental process rather than a confrontational one. CEP is interested in monitoring this training as an important part of the UCSC curriculum.

Lastly, the committee wanted to raise concern regarding the student perspective. CEP wonders if students will actually trust and hold value in the mechanisms, like the Protest Support Team (PST) portal, being presented. How does leadership intend to encourage support and trust? As an example, CEP members found the format of [the survey](#) linked from the Chancellor's message to be overwhelming and cumbersome from a student perspective. We are concerned that this will be a barrier in gaining campus trust and support; members would have preferred to see more student collaboration in the drafting of this proposal.

In closing, we thought we would provide a summary of what members find important going forward:

1. There should be more student involvement going forward with at least one more student member in the groups.
2. Everyone involved with this effort needs to be committed to an increase in transparency and support. Students are unlikely to trust this mechanism unless exactly how support will occur is detailed.

3. CEP feels a need to monitor the curriculum on first amendment rights (as supported by local experts in those fields).
4. Every effort should be made to show students that they can trust these new mechanisms (and that they are useful to student protestors—that they will help to keep protestors safe in body and educationally).
5. The curriculum provided to students should communicate not only the administration's support for first amendment rights, but also that civil disobedience can have consequences.
6. Formal feedback from students should include in-person (one on ones with students, small group meetings) interactions and not just the published survey--we need student buy-in.

In summary, CEP members found this to be an improvement, and they support efforts to improve our relationship with students as they work to provide feedback and sponsor change on campus. We maintain that there should be efforts aimed at reducing the harm of BIPOC and LGBTQ+ students who have already endured so much in these trying times, as they have had several concerns. We look forward to continuing dialogue about how to create the most effective and equitable solutions moving ahead. As always, feel free to reach out for more conversation.

Sincerely,



Tracy Larrabee, Chair  
Committee on Educational Policy

cc: Senate Executive Committee  
Minghui Hu, Chair, Committee on Academic Freedom  
Kirsten Silva Gruesz, Chair, Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity  
Dard Neuman, Chair, Committee on Planning and Budget  
Melissa Caldwell, Chair, Graduate Council  
Nico Orlandi, Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare  
Kim Lau, Chair, Committee on Committees



November 10, 2021

David Brundage, Chair  
Academic Senate

**Re: UCSC Pilot Support Structures for Free Speech and Protest**

Dear David,

During its meeting of October 7, 2021, the Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) reviewed the proposal for the UC Santa Cruz Support Structures for Free Speech and Protests. Overall, members welcomed the recognition that better communication and support are needed during times of strike. On the specific proposal, members had suggestions and comments along three dimensions: representation, charge and authority, and workload.

The first dimension concerns representation on the new proposed First Amendment and Protest Oversight Group (FAPOG). Members noted that there is no Senate faculty representation in this group, and that the interim Vice Chancellor for Research (iVCR) is also not included. Since part of the charge of the group is the continuation of learning during times of uncertainty, the committee feels that Senate representation and the iVCR should be included in the conversation. Lab access, for example, is an important issue in times of strike and protest.

The second dimension concerns the charge and authority of the First Amendment Support Team (FAST). Members agree that it is important to formally recognize the work that faculty and staff have been doing and will continue to do in times of strike. Members noted that this formalization might incentivize more faculty and staff to get involved. Nevertheless, the committee questioned the exact charge of FAST. Are they to serve primarily as an intermediary between FAPOG and the strikers? What authority (if any) does FAST have?

The third dimension concerns workload. CFW is concerned about the additional burden placed on our overworked staff for these now formalized responsibilities without consideration of additional compensation.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback.

Sincerely,



Nico Orlandi, Chair  
Committee on Faculty Welfare

cc: Minghui Hu, Chair, Committee on Academic Freedom  
Kirsten Silva Gruesz, Chair, Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity  
Dard Neuman, Chair, Committee on Planning and Budget  
Tracy Larrabee, Chair, Committee on Educational Policy  
Melissa Caldwell, Chair Committee on Graduate Council  
Kim Lau, Chair, Committee on Committees  
Senate Executive Committee

November 16, 2021

David Brundage, Chair  
Academic Senate

**RE: UC Santa Cruz Pilot Support Structures for Free Speech and Lawful Protest**

Dear David,

The Committee on Committees (COC) has reviewed the proposed “UC Santa Cruz Pilot Support Structures for Free Speech and Protest document.” COC appreciates that these issues are of critical importance to the campus, and while the committee agrees that we need to re-think policing and protest within our community, members felt that the proposed “structures” fail to do so because of the exclusive focus on student development. The committee stressed that all campus constituencies need development in this area if we are to work together as a community to support free speech. COC raised many of the same concerns identified and discussed by several other responding committees, especially that this proposal represents an administrative effort to manage protest activity, particularly around labor actions, rather than support free speech.

Several COC members felt that rather than instilling confidence in the campus’ desire to support free speech and protest, the proposed structures have the opposite effect because of their overwhelming and unnecessarily complex bureaucracy. As a result, members believe that the proposed plan reads as an attempt to manage free speech and protest, rather than to support them. There was also wide agreement among committee members that trust between the administration and faculty (not to mention administration and students) has been broken, and the proposed structures feel like an attempt to move forward without redressing the past issues and actions underlying that breakdown in trust. The committee cited as evidence of this breakdown in trust the fact that none of the faculty members nominated by COC to participate on the Campus Safety Advisory Board last academic year were willing to do so. Moreover, COC fears that this will be an increasingly persistent issue moving forward if the committees are constituted as framed in the proposal. In this context, committee members expressed a concern that it is not the best use of faculty time to appoint them to serve on the committee as defined in the proposal (10 faculty), although we would of course be more than happy to support the appointment of faculty to such groups should they be reframed as articulated by our colleague committees and should those committees have some actual power in relation to oversight mechanisms.

COC appreciates the administration’s acknowledgment that UC Santa Cruz faculty have, over many decades, mentored, advised, and generally supported students who are considering or engaged in protest activities. These relationships are possible and effective precisely because students trust the faculty members from whom they are seeking advice and support. The proposed attempt to “formalize” this (often unacknowledged) faculty labor by integrating faculty into an administrative committee tasked with listening, as has been articulated in the proposal, is a welcome recognition of the work that faculty do in this regard (as is the proposal to compensate faculty). That said, COC members are extremely skeptical that such a structure will be effective, particularly in the intended “student development” framework, because students are

very unlikely to trust faculty who are serving on administrative committees that give the appearance of managing protest activity.

Of particular relevance for COC, the committee also notes that there are several new campus committees being created as a part of this proposal and, particularly disconcerting for COC, that there are no members of the academic community on the oversight group (FAPOG). COC understands not including academics on an emergency response group, although we hope the practice of consulting with the Senate Chair, Vice Chair, and chairs of CEP and GC in real time to determine whether classes will be canceled will continue, but if FAPOG is intended to provide oversight, we feel strongly that academic voices and perspectives be present to help the campus community understand and respond to the meta issues surfaced by the work of the other coordinating bodies.

Thank you again for providing an opportunity for all Senate committees to opine on this proposal. We hope our input is of use when articulating the Senate perspective(s) on how the campus can continue to work toward its goals of supporting free speech.

Sincerely,



Kimberly Lau, Chair  
Committee on Committees

cc: Minghui Hu, Chair, Committee on Academic Freedom  
Kirsten Silva Gruesz, Chair, Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity  
Tracy Larrabee, Chair, Committee on Educational Policy  
Dard Neuman, Chair, Committee on Planning and Budget  
Melissa Caldwell, Chair, Graduate Council  
Nico Orlandi, Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare  
Kim Lau, Chair, Committee on Committees  
Abraham Stone, Chair, Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication  
Matthew Mednick, Executive Director, Academic Senate

November 12, 2021

David Brundage, Chair  
Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

**RE: UCSC Cruz Pilot Support Structures for Free Speech and Protest**

Dear David,

The Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication has reviewed the UCSC Cruz Pilot Support Structures for Free Speech and Protest memo from CPEVC Klezter (dated September 16, 2021). At its October 21st meeting the committee discussed this proposal. The committee found many aspects of the proposal to be problematic.

COLASC appreciates the desire to support free speech on our campus but found the structure to continue a past practice of administrative isolation during free speech activity. In its present form, the First Amendment and Protest Oversight Group is comprised entirely of university administrators. COLASC recommends that this group also include student and faculty representatives to ensure administrative accountability. Additionally, FAPOG is not advisable as an acronym because “fap” is a term of vulgar internet slang.

In addition to listening and reflecting, COLASC would like to recommend that the First Amendment Support Team (FAST) also be charged with reporting protestor concerns to the highest levels of university administration or be empowered to make decisions. The current proposal does not provide a clear path for negotiation.

COLASC noted that, beyond drinking water, there are many things that protesters may be in need of such as first aid, shelter, legal advice, etc. The functions of the Protest Support Team (PST) seem incomplete. It would also be helpful to have further explanation as to the relevance of CARE’s presence at free speech activities.

The extreme division of responsibility into small groups, each with its own lines of communication and its own representative to “liaise” “on the ground,” might prove unwieldy and chaotic in practice. While some members of COLASC saw the value of using protest as a moment to teach and advise students about First Amendments issues, others noted concern regarding the policy’s paternal tone.

COLASC members unanimously felt that the proposed policy failed to differentiate between free speech activities and labor disputes. Some protests raise only First Amendment issues of free

expression (speech, assembly, petition), but in the case of a labor dispute (where the “protest” is actually a picket line) there are other rights at issue that should be addressed as such.

The policy begins by stating that “The campus seeks to better support students and their educational development as they participate in First Amendment activities while simultaneously supporting the essential functions of the campus;” however, the entities created with the ability to take action seem aimed mostly at maintaining order, continuing operations, and managing public relations. The policy aims to support students (and others) in exercise of their legal rights. However, many protests involve civil disobedience — deliberately exceeding legally protected rights. The policy is silent on how the University intends to respond to that. The policy does not outline the rights and responsibilities of protesters, COLASC would like to recommend these be clarified.

COLASC appreciates the opportunity to opine in this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Abe Stone".

Abe Stone, Chair

Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication

cc:

Minghui Hu, Chair, Committee on Academic Freedom

Kirsten Silva Gruesz, Chair, Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity

Tracy Larrabee, Chair Committee on Educational Policy

Lissa Caldwell, Chair, Graduate Council

Dard Neuman, Chair, Committee on Planning and Budget

November 8, 2021

David Brundage, Chair  
Academic Senate

**RE: Review of UC Santa Cruz Pilot Support Structures for Free Speech and Protest**

Dear David,

The Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) has reviewed the "UC Santa Cruz Pilot Support Structures for Free Speech and Protest document." We appreciate the administration's effort to rethink how the campus supports and responds to student protests.

This campus discussion began out of UCSC Graduate student protests and police response, but it also reflects a longer history of racial problems as well as a national reckoning with matters of racial justice in response to events in the spring 2020, including national calls for abolition, defunding, or reform of police. At the very minimum, this national context calls for a significant reform of the way police are trained and do their work, and a reorganization of associated support services. This means rethinking the mission, training, and organization of police workers, and considering which public order tasks do not need to be done by police. The Free Speech and Protest document takes place within this broader context of police reform, and should be consistent with and support these policy changes.

As such, CPB has read this document in two registers: first, with an eye to the broader context from which this document arose, and second, at a practical level, to understand how well the document responds to the UC Community Safety Plan, Campus Safety Community Advisory Board (CAB) recommendations, and concerns raised in correspondence from various Senate committees (GC's 7/23/20 and CAAD's 6/5/20 letters related to institutional racism and racial bias in the student conduct process; Senate responses to the Universitywide Police Policies 4/21/21 and Presidential Campus Safety Plan 6/22/21).

**Overall context and response**

National events have led to calls to reimagine the roles of police, security, mental health, and other support services at UCSC and on other UC campuses, including calls for maintaining, defunding, or abolishing police departments and shifts from an emergency management to a student development framework. Notably, the UC Community Safety Plan, to which this document aims to be responsive, outlines principles of:

*Community and Service-Driven Safety:* Campus safety policies and practices must reflect the needs and values of our diverse community and be in service to them. This fundamental idea is reflected throughout the plan.

*A Holistic, Inclusive and Tiered Response Model for Safety Services:* Safety will be defined in its broadest terms, and include mental health, wellness, basic needs and bias/hate response as well as other services. Multidisciplinary teams will triage behavioral health crises, conduct wellness checks and safely connect individuals to coordinated care, including health and social support resources.

With this in mind CPB raises the following issues:

1. Framing: There is no mention of the national and local context out of which this document arose. Both Graduate Council and CPB have raised the need for such contextualization in earlier communications (see April 2021 letters to the Academic Senate) given that these proposed reforms are responsive to both a specific local incident and a broader discussion about reforming policing.

*These matters should be addressed or at least mentioned in the proposed policy, including by stating if there are plans for such matters to be addressed elsewhere.*

2. Tone and approach: Students consistently argued that while they were the objects of disciplinary processes, it was the administration that was out of step with changing national attitudes toward policing. In adopting a “student development” centered approach (e.g., in aiming to “better support students and their educational development as they participate in First Amendment activities”) rather than an explicitly community-centered one, this document may suggest that students are the only ones in need of “educational development” rather than that all of us (administration, faculty, staff, campus police, and students) need to be learning new ways of approaching these problems. *“Student development” and associated strategies (e.g., providing water and mental health services at protests, and a channel for grievances) are not adequate to a) capture the fundamental shift from a policing model to community-centered alternatives of holistic mental health, community collaboration, and prophylactic wellness support for which many have called, nor do they b) recognize the campus administration’s responsibility to develop their own knowledge and understanding of these matters.*
  
3. Scope: In focusing narrowly on matters of free speech, this document, in the absence of others, risks sidestepping many substantive concerns raised by students and faculty. *We do not feel that this document advances ambitions to position UCSC as a national leader in alternatives to a policing framework on campus. It does not fulfill ambitions as laid out in the UC Community Safety Plan, which calls for such plans to be community-centered, “holistic, inclusive, and tiered”, and service-driven. If broader programmatic documents outlining the administration’s view of such matters are planned, it should be clear how this procedural document articulates with these broader concerns.*

### **Substance of proposed free speech support structures: Group organization and training**

The free speech support structures as described in this document show only modest signs of police reform and retraining. CPB imagines that this document sits within broader efforts to reform the UCSC police department (and police departments UC-wide), including the training and organizational changes described above, but we see no information on how the Free Speech and Lawful Protest policy articulates with these changes. This document focuses appropriately on the pedagogical role of the university to “better support students and their educational development as they participate in First Amendment activities.” But it is a serious omission that it does not spell out how police, security personnel and others will be trained.

In addition to looking for connections between the free speech policy and broader police reforms, CPB analyzed how well the policy responded to the principles of the UCOP Safety and Community Plan, CAB recommendations, and extensive campus correspondence. We see significant changes towards advancing some of these recommendations. We welcome, in particular, the creation of the new First Amendment support team, FAST, which responds directly to the CAB recommendation to hear and engage with student protesters. The clarification of the roles and responsibilities of different group members is also welcome.

Nevertheless, CPB thinks that there should be significant clarification of how the proposed reorganization responds to UCOP Community Safety guidelines for Community and Service Driven Safety, and for Holistic, Inclusive and Tiered Response (guidelines 1 and 2 above), with some additional thinking in relation to the other two guidelines (Transparency and Continuous Improvement, Accountability and Independent Oversight), as well as CAB recommendations for better external complaint mechanisms.

The proposed reorganization somewhat changes the composition of the former **Emergency Management Policy Group- EMPG**, to the new **First Amendment and Protest Oversight Group (FAPOG)**, with the



addition of two new members from Communications and Marketing and the Chief of Police. The mention of additional training and the reframing of the group from emergency management to support for free speech is welcome.

1. The proposed organizational changes focus on changing student behavior through the management of first amendment and protest structures but pay little attention to retraining administration, police, and other personnel. The UC Safety Plan guideline calls for all members of the tiered response to safety to receive training in inclusive and respectful service, cultural competency and diversity, and much more. A key demand of student protesters was for the administration to recognize its own role with issues that arose during and after the protests. CPB wonders if the type of training, communication, and support structures proposed respond adequately to this recommendation, and whether broadening who is trained, and what support structures are proposed, would be more appropriate.
2. The rationale for the composition of the FAPOG group could be further clarified and better connected with the need for accountable and independent oversight (UC Safety Plan Guideline 4). As it stands, FAPOG does not include faculty, graduate, or undergraduate student representatives. As the top oversight group on campus, this is a notable omission.
3. The term “tiered response” clearly implies a decision-making process for addressing different kinds of needs, across and between groups. What is the role of FAPOG in coordinating a tiered response, from basic mental health services to law enforcement? (UC Safety Plan principle 2). There is need for additional clarity about the relationships between FAPOG and the other three groups (FAST, PLT, PST), and between these groups. How are decisions made about the appropriate services provided by each of these groups? How does each of these groups communicate to each other, and with FAPOG?
4. The UC Safety Plan mentions the possibility of using “non-sworn security personnel” but the proposed policy makes no mention of these. CPB lacks sufficient information to assess in what ways such non-sworn security personnel might be part of the free speech policy. This seems like an important topic as part of the ongoing rethinking of policing, and demands further consideration.
5. The training received by members of the PST group currently focuses on de-escalation and student support. Additional training, including anti-bias, anti-hate, and cross-cultural competency training would be beneficial. Doing so would respond to UCOP Safety Plan guideline 1, which says “safety systems must reflect the needs and values of a diverse campus community”, as well as UCOP Safety Plan action 1.1 and its detailed recommendation for training.
6. In terms of participation in these proposed new structures, campus police are restricted to membership in FAPOG and Protest Logistics Team. The role of campus police in the tiered response decision process is not spelled out, nor is the retraining, if any, received by the entire campus police department. To be clear, the UCOP safety principles retain a role for law enforcement and emergency response. Failing the abolition of the police force, the process through which decision to use law enforcement in the context of protests should be clarified, in the relation to the recommendation for a “tiered response” (UCOP Safety Plan guideline 2).
7. The UC Safety Plan recommended that there should be transparency and continuous improvement through data (UCOP guideline 3). The proposed free speech policy includes some mention of feedback from support groups, and post event recommendations and after-event summary by PST. Nevertheless, there is a need for much better gathering of information, including complaints.

(UCOP Safety Plan Action 1.7, recommendation for real-time feedback platform). Continuous learning through assessment and reflection should be strengthened and highlighted.

Again, we applaud the administration's efforts to respond to the events of 2020 and the good steps this document takes in First Amendment support and clarification of roles and responsibilities. However, we believe further consideration of the above matters is warranted.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Dard Neuman", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Dard Neuman, Chair  
Committee on Planning and Budget

cc: CAF Chair Hu  
CEP Chair Larrabee  
Graduate Council Chair Caldwell

November 12, 2021

David Brundage, Chair  
Academic Senate

**RE: Review of UC Santa Cruz Pilot Support Structures for Free Speech and Protest**

Dear David,

At its meeting of November 4, 2021, Graduate Council reviewed CP/EVC Kletzer's document outlining a proposed pilot mechanism for supporting free speech and protest on our campus that is responsive to the UC Community Safety Plan and the recommendations of the Campus Safety Community Advisory Board. Graduate Council reviewed the pilot document in this context, and also of previous Senate responses to the Universitywide Police Policies (4/21/21) and the Presidential Campus Safety Plan (6/22/21), as well as GC's 7/23/20 and CAAD's 6/5/20 letters related to institutional racism and racial bias in the student conduct process.

Graduate Council appreciates the effort that has gone into the planning for this document. Members appreciate the attempt to respond to the recommendations of the Campus Safety Community Advisory Board, but note a lack of engagement with the broader local and national context in which this planning has emerged. Overall, Council observed that the descriptions and proposed plans were vague, and members therefore reported that it was difficult to comment and provide substantive feedback that will be useful in further revision of this document.

Members noted that, as a procedural document, the pilot proposal was unclear in identifying what specific activities would be defined as free speech and protest (for example strike, teach-in, protest concerning the LRDP or wages). The document also seems to lack awareness of how different kinds of events that might fit under the umbrella of "free speech and protest" are fluid and often spontaneous, resulting in goals and activities that shift quickly; this lack impacts the document's flexibility and nimbleness to address these varying situations.

Second, Graduate Council had questions about the student development framework presented in the document. Council would like more information about what this framework entails, how it is differentiated to recognize diverse student communities and experiences (including, but not limited to, distinctions between undergraduate and graduate student communities), and whether this is a behavior management plan to generate "positive" student behaviors and suppress "negative" behaviors. Council suggests re-thinking this framework, which seems to put the onus on students, and instead consider approaches from a more community-centered perspective that takes into account local and national contexts.

Members also noted that descriptions of the committees seemed very general and that there was considerable overlap across committees, making them difficult to evaluate in terms of their roles, responsibilities, reporting structures, potential conflicts of interest, and potential effectiveness.

Graduate Council appreciates the opportunity to provide feedback on this proposed pilot mechanism for supporting free speech and protest on the UC Santa Cruz campus.

Sincerely,



Melissa L. Caldwell, Chair  
Graduate Council

cc: CAF Chair Hu  
CEP Chair Larrabee  
CPB Chair Neuman