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I am pleased to have reviewed and accepted the completed Robinson/Edley Report titled, 12-Month Implementation Report. From the start, the report was premised on the idea that free expression, robust discourse and vigorous debate are essential to the mission of the University.

The implementation steps taken by the entire University community in the last 18 months will ensure that we have a viable and fair set of best practices that preserve and promote the rights and responsibilities of free speech on the campuses, respond fairly and reasonably to civil disobedience when it occurs, and also provide safety and security to all the students, faculty, staff, and visitors on our campuses.

The Chancellors on all 10 campuses led the effort to create or revise policies that bolster communications efforts to diffuse problems before they reach a flash point, to revise or create police policies related to crowd control and use of force, and to provide students with ample opportunity to understand both the rights and responsibilities that accompany activities related to freedom of speech and civil disobedience.

I want to thank President Emeritus Mark G. Yudof for his commitment to this effort, General Counsel Charles Robinson and Dean Christopher Edley for their leadership, the Chiefs of Police for their thoughtful efforts in critical revisions to Police Policy, and the students, faculty, and staff who gave so much time in the town meetings, briefings and working committees to finalize this report.

This report is a living document. The Office of the President will continue to support each campus community by ensuring that policies and programs remain up to date and responsive to community concerns, that training continues for both police and administrative staff, and that accountability is in place.

Our University system has an obligation to maintain a responsible approach to protecting and managing protests on our campuses, and we are committed to fulfilling that responsibility in the years to come.

Yours very truly,

Janet Napolitano
President
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TWELVE-MONTH IMPLEMENTATION REPORT
In September 2012, General Counsel Charles F. Robinson and Dean Christopher Edley Jr., of Berkeley Law, presented a report entitled “Response to Protests on UC Campuses” (Robinson/Edley Report) to University of California President Mark G. Yudof.

The Robinson/Edley Report “was premised on the belief that free expression, robust discourse, and vigorous debate over ideas and principles are essential to the mission of our University. The goal of the Report [was] to identify practices that facilitate such expression and encourage lawful protest activity—while also protecting the health and safety of our students, faculty, staff, police, and the general public when protesters choose to engage in civil disobedience or possibly violate laws and regulations” (Robinson/Edley Report, page 1).

Based on extensive evaluation of best practices, discussion with campuses within the system and across the nation, and legal research on issues like use of force, First Amendment rights and the role of administrators in protest situations, the report made 49 recommendations. Over the past year, all 10 campuses have instituted practices, created new programs, undergone training and built new strategies to implement the recommendations and build confidence and capability to reduce the likelihood that serious clashes between protestors, the police and administration will occur.

It is important to note that several of the practices identified in the Robinson/Edley Report were already standard operating procedure on the campuses. Indeed, all of our campuses have long employed many of these recommended practices to positive effect in responding to protests—the vast majority of which are handled peacefully, every day, across the UC system.

As noted in the Robinson/Edley Report, “for some campus administrators and police, however, implementing the recommendations [has required] a substantial shift away from a mindset that has been focused primarily on the maintenance of order and adherence to rules and regulations” to a more open and communicative attitude. The goal always is to balance the fundamental right of protestors to their First Amendment freedoms while still maintaining safety and security on the campus.

With this implementation report, and the collaborative way that the implementation strategies have been developed on each campus, we expect to see continued growth of cooperation and communication related to campus protest among all stakeholders on campus, and also a heightened understanding on the part of protestors that will require them to take more responsibility for their activities. Campuses have increased opportunities for discussions related to civil disobedience, and it is up to the students and other campus constituents to avail themselves of these opportunities to be educated about protest-related rules and consider the impact that acts of civil disobedience can have on others in the campus community.

“UC Davis has emerged from this process a stronger, more reflective and more responsive institution, capable of working in a cooperative manner with faculty, staff and students and dedicated to cultivating an atmosphere of openness, trust and mutual consideration.”—UC Davis 12-Month Summary

In order to implement the recommendations, the Office of the President initiated the Civil Disobedience Initiative (CDI), a multilevel, collaborative approach to build communication, consistency and cooperation with campuses across the system. This implementation report provides a summary of the progress that the CDI has made toward fulfilling the goals of the Robinson/Edley Report. It describes implementation strategies at both the system and campus levels, and provides an overview of how recommendations were ultimately carried out. As will be addressed in this report, during the implementation process, some of the
original recommendations were revised in order to better meet the goals of the Robinson/Edley Report and to accommodate different needs and challenges among the UC campuses.

Each campus has addressed or is in the process of addressing every one of the 49 recommendations. They submitted their strategies for implementing the recommendations, which were then reviewed by the CDI Working Group to ensure the strategy met the spirit and intent of the report. This work took a major effort and focus on the part of the campus points of contact, each of whom was selected by their Chancellor, to reach out to the campus community and develop and review implementation strategies.

The CDI has provided the University of California with a valuable opportunity to engage with important issues impacting the safety and well-being of campus communities. As will be demonstrated in this report, this hard work has increased opportunities for communication and understanding among the campus community—administrators, faculty, staff, police and students—and created a template for working through other systemwide issues in this arena, should they arise.

Implementation Strategy for the Civil Disobedience Initiative

The CDI encompasses work done on the campus level, the systemwide level, and through collaboration between the campuses and the Office of the President. To coordinate campus-level work, each Chancellor named a campus point of contact to coordinate implementation of the Robinson/Edley recommendations on the campus and communicate progress and concerns to the Office of the President.

At the system level, the Office of the President has been active in facilitating discussion among campuses, police chiefs and a variety of experts in civil disobedience, First Amendment issues and leadership in crisis, as well as implementing recommendations that were best coordinated centrally due to their applicability throughout the system. To support this work, an implementation team was created at the Office of the President, comprising a project director and project lead, assisted by the Chief Justice Earl Warren Institute on Law and Social Policy at Berkeley Law, to track progress and verify the submissions. A higher-level Advisory Group and Steering Committee provided guidance and verified that the recommendations have been fully addressed.

Modifications to the Original Recommendations

During the implementation process, certain recommendations were flagged for further refinement. The concerns and opinions of CDI stakeholders were communicated to the Steering Committee to make a final determination about alterations to recommendation language and requirements. Several of the original recommendations were thus revised in order to meet the goals of the Robinson/Edley Report while accommodating the needs and challenges among the UC campuses.

The most critical and highly sensitive aspects of the Robinson/Edley Report dealt directly with the role of the administration in protest response planning and operation, crowd management and use of force. Though the original recommendations aimed at clarifying roles and responsibilities as well as defining the parameters of use of force more narrowly, they were in some cases overreaching or impractical to implement when tested against real-life situations on the campuses. Changes to two of these recommendations bear explanation here.

Recommendation 13

Original language: Absent exigent circumstances, bar commencement or escalation of force by police unless the Chancellor or the Chancellor’s designee approves it immediately before the action is taken. If the Chancellor designates decision-making responsibility, the Chancellor’s designee must (Edley) or may (Robinson) be a member of the Academic Senate.
Revised language: Absent exigent circumstances and to the extent practicable, the Chancellor or the Chancellor’s designee should be consulted prior to commencement of force.

Recommendation 35

Original language: Establish and implement a systemwide response option framework for use on each campus.

Explanation: Crowd control issues with a particular focus on their relation to use of force were examined. One of the major discussions in the Robinson/Edley Report was the possible implementation of a response option framework on each campus. Working with the UC Council of Chiefs of Police, and in consultation with California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) and many outside experts in use-of-force litigation, we concluded that the institution of a response option framework was not the optimal approach for the UC system. It is generally not used in California, according to POST, and there is a national debate about the efficacy of the framework concept, noting that officers must have the flexibility to react with reason and appropriateness rather than a proscribed escalation when facing a dynamic situation like a protest. Furthermore, the introduction of this type of framework is not applicable to protest scenarios and may constrict officers in more serious situations, including those involving an active shooter or other circumstances they may encounter.

Explanation: Under the original recommendation, the Chancellor or a designee would be required to approve use of force on site. While the Chancellor is ultimately responsible for all of the actions taken by administrators and police on the campuses during protest, having him or her dictate police tactics in the moment is impractical and would be counter to police procedure and incident command protocols. The implementation strategy that was crafted instead requires that the policy makers on the campus, including the Chancellor, meet with their event response teams to discuss the entire range of issues related to any potential protest, that they craft a strategy together, that they discuss issues like whether or not to let a building occupation proceed if it occurs, how forcefully to maintain order, at what point police will be called in and if they are, what the operations plan is. This way, there is a dialogue, all the voices are heard, the what-if scenarios are played out and decisions are made. Once this agreement is reached, it is with the knowledge that the events in the moment may force the police and administrators to reconsider their plan. Thus campuses have added a principle to their event response team charter that states that they will constantly reassess the situation and make adjustments to the plan. According to the implementation plans submitted by each campus, a senior administrator will be either at the scene or in touch with the Police Chief or commanding officer at each event. The bottom line is that all of the contingencies will be reviewed prior to and during management of a demonstration by those responsible, and strategic decisions will be made with the knowledge and involvement of the Chancellor or his or her designee.

The recommendation, as revised, below, is a viable process, particularly in light of the fact that all of the other activities of de-escalation, increased communication and heightened interaction among police, demonstrators and administrators will be in place.

“We have worked to redefine and refine the roles of senior administration, academics and the police—and we have forged new ways of working together that have been extremely positive.”

—UC Berkeley 12-Month Summary
### Crowd Management Intervention and Control Strategies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Law Enforcement Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lawful Assembly</strong>&lt;br/&gt;Free Speech and assembly are protected First Amendment activities: Speeches, Marches, Demonstrations, Rallies, Picketing, Public assemblies, Protests, Celebratory events</td>
<td><strong>Use Crowd Management strategies</strong>&lt;br/&gt;Meet with event organizers and stakeholders&lt;br/&gt;Determine the history and risk of the group&lt;br/&gt;Create a planning team&lt;br/&gt;Check permit limitations&lt;br/&gt;Develop Incident Action Plan and objectives&lt;br/&gt;Identify and assign resources&lt;br/&gt;Monitor and assess crowd behavior&lt;br/&gt;Note: This table is neither all-inclusive nor limiting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Isolated Unlawful Behavior</strong>&lt;br/&gt;Isolated unlawful activity by individuals or small groups within a crowd should not automatically form the basis for declaring an assembly unlawful.&lt;br/&gt;- Isolated destruction of property&lt;br/&gt;- Isolated acts of violence&lt;br/&gt;- Isolated rock or bottle throwers&lt;br/&gt;- Individual sit down demonstrators</td>
<td><strong>Use Crowd Intervention strategies</strong>&lt;br/&gt;Use organizers and monitors to gain voluntary compliance&lt;br/&gt;Isolate, arrest and remove law violators as quickly as possible&lt;br/&gt;Video action of officers and law violators&lt;br/&gt;Use amplified sound to communicate intent or to gain compliance&lt;br/&gt;Use low profile tactics when possible. Don’t become the focus of the demonstration&lt;br/&gt;Note: This table is neither all-inclusive nor limiting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unlawful Assembly</strong>&lt;br/&gt;Assemblies may be dispersed when they are violent, or pose a clear and present danger of violence, or the group is breaking some other law in the process. If a crime is occurring, action may be taken to stop it prior to a Dispersal Order being given. Per Penal Code §407, two or more persons assemble to:&lt;br/&gt;- Commit an unlawful act or&lt;br/&gt;- Commit a lawful act in a boisterous or tumultuous manner</td>
<td><strong>Use Crowd Control strategies</strong>&lt;br/&gt;Seek voluntary compliance&lt;br/&gt;Video action of officers and law violators&lt;br/&gt;Act quickly&lt;br/&gt;Request needed resources&lt;br/&gt;Put control forces in place&lt;br/&gt;Identify dispersal routes&lt;br/&gt;Consider a traffic plan&lt;br/&gt;Move media to protected area&lt;br/&gt;Use amplified sound to communicate intent to declare an unlawful assembly&lt;br/&gt;Disperse unlawful crowd&lt;br/&gt;Note: This table is neither all-inclusive nor limiting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Riot</strong>&lt;br/&gt;Penal Code §404: (a) Any use of force or violence, disturbing the public peace, or any threat to use force or violence, if accompanied by immediate power of execution, by two or more persons acting together, and without authority of law, is a riot.&lt;br/&gt;- Group violent behavior&lt;br/&gt;- Group acts of property damage</td>
<td><strong>Use Crowd Control strategies</strong>&lt;br/&gt;Video action of officers and law violators&lt;br/&gt;Request needed resources&lt;br/&gt;Put control forces in place&lt;br/&gt;Stop the illegal activity&lt;br/&gt;Put a traffic plan in place&lt;br/&gt;Track and contain groups involved in illegal behavior using cameras, observation posts, shadow teams or air unit&lt;br/&gt;Arrest law violators&lt;br/&gt;With proper approval, deploy appropriate less lethal munitions to defend officers or to stop violent behavior or property damage&lt;br/&gt;Note: This table is neither all-inclusive nor limiting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*From POST guidelines “Crowd Management, Intervention, and Control,” Appendix B

Note: This table is neither all-inclusive nor limiting.
Another consideration is that all sworn police officers in California are certified by POST and train to the POST “Crowd Management, Intervention, and Control” guidelines, adopted in 2012. These guidelines align levels of protester resistance to levels of police response and clearly spell out the likely scenario for both police and protesters should resistance escalate during an event. Given that we often call in mutual aid from other police agencies, it is logical that we would rely on the universal POST crowd control guidelines, rather than a response option framework, to serve as a guideline for officers responding to major crowds or protests. These guidelines, distilled into a matrix, Appendix B to POST’s “Crowd Management, Intervention, and Control,” detail the appropriate law enforcement response to escalation of resistance on the part of participants (see page 6).

The UC Chiefs of Police, campus points of contact and CDI Steering Committee all felt the approach reflected in the revised language below was more viable than the originally stated Recommendation 35.

Revised language: Establish and implement a systemwide framework that guides the officers’ response to specific actions in crowd control situations, always using the appropriately reasonable level of force to meet the level of resistance offered and maintain overall safety and control. Officers should be trained on the framework, and its principles should be incorporated into operation plans.

**Relationship Building throughout the Campus Community**

Every campus has continued to make concerted efforts to have strong relationships among campus stakeholders. Some campuses have created or better publicized existing office hours where students can bring issues to the attention of administrators and seek redress. Since the publication of the Robinson/Edley Report, many campuses have held town halls and created other events to air grievances related to issues impacting the campus community and likely to trigger protest as a way to give voice to students and others and to ensure the issues and possible solutions are heard. In fact, some of the issues, like the tuition increases of recent years, were the impetus for student support of Proposition 30, a 2012 tax measure that led to a freeze in tuition. Students registered 50,000 voters in the process of advocating for the ballot measure. Programs have also been developed to allow for more interaction and understanding between students and police. The intent of this work is to encourage dialogue, respect processes and include campus communities in productive discussions.

“**In addition to recommended practices that UCLA followed prior to the report being issued, the campus has undertaken tangible and meaningful changes as a result of the Robinson/Edley Report recommendations.”**

—UCLA 12-Month Summary
Role Definition and Coordination among Event Responders
To address the recommendations relating to protest response and management, each campus has created a guiding document for its event response team. For example, each campus has procedures in place for communicating with demonstrators and demonstration leaders before, during and after protests, and ensuring that demonstrators are aware of relevant policies and alternative means of communicating their opinions. Each campus’s protest response plan also includes steps for communicating with the entire campus community about major developments or any safety concerns. Beyond meeting the relevant recommendations, campuses have latitude in determining how best to coordinate campus response to protests and demonstrations.

Documenting and Review
Several of the recommendations focused on creating an objective record of major events and helping campuses to use each event as an opportunity to reflect and improve upon their event response process. In order to create an objective record of events, each campus has established a process for videotaping major events. Some campuses have also created volunteer observer programs. A new post-event documentation and review process has been established systemwide.

Summary
As the Robinson/Edley Report stated in the closing paragraph of its executive summary: “To be sure, no single report can resolve all the issues the university faces regarding protest and civil disobedience. Successfully laying the groundwork for safe and accountable protest activity will take the commitment and effort of all members of the university community. This Report is just the starting point—an attempt to assist the university in moving forward to celebrate the diversity of opinion and culture on our campuses, to do so with respect and civility, and to build on the illustrious history of public involvement and free speech that is the DNA of the University of California” (Robinson/Edley Report, page 3).

The implementation of the Robinson/Edley Report recommendations, as adopted by the CDI Steering Committee and implemented by the 10 campuses and the UC Office of the President, furthers the achievement of three important goals:

- To preserve and protect First Amendment rights,
- To promote the peaceful convergence of myriad ideologies and points of view, and
- To ensure the rights of all on the campuses to create and acquire knowledge in a safe and secure environment.

The process has been a substantial effort, and we as a system are better for it.

Hiring and Training
Various trainings that reflect the priorities and spirit of the Robinson/Edley Report have been developed for administrators and police. These include more in-depth police training in crowd management and control techniques, low-profile arrest techniques, as well as inter-agency training with local law enforcement and among UC police departments. Police hiring and promotions on all campuses now require community involvement.

“This review and assessment through the CDI process has provided an opportunity for UCI to improve and enhance a number of policies and procedures and to make additional efforts in engaging our student body to provide the best possible student experience and education.”
—UC Irvine 12-Month Summary
Over the past 12-plus months the UC campuses, as well as the Office of the President, have worked to implement the recommendations of the Robinson/Edley Report. Many of the campuses had in place or started implementing the recommendations prior to the formal acceptance of the report (September 2012) by UC President Mark Yudof. This implementation report fulfills Recommendation 48:

*Require a final report and certification from each Chancellor one year following the President’s acceptance of this Report’s recommendations confirming that all recommendations so accepted have been implemented.*

**Civil Disobedience Initiative Process Overview**

The work of the University of California over the past 12 months has focused on moving the organization forward.
Roles and Responsibilities

An organizational structure, along with roles and responsibilities, was established for CDI, as shown on the following pages. The organizational structure was updated as team members changed over the 12-month period.

Systemwide Level

President Yudof, in accepting the Robinson/Edley Report, appointed Lynn Tierney as the systemwide implementation manager. Lynn worked with the President as the executive sponsor to establish a steering committee that currently includes:

- Nathan Brostrom (Chair and Project Sponsor), Executive Vice President, Business Operations–University of California Office of the President
- Ralph Hexter, Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor–UC Davis
- Janina Montero, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs–UCLA (replaced Penny Rue, former Vice Chancellor for Students Affairs–UC San Diego)
- Karen Petrilakis, Chief Deputy General Counsel–UCOP
- Pam Roskowski, Police Chief and UC Systemwide Police Coordinator–UC San Francisco
- Peter Taylor, Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer–UCOP

Lynn worked with all of the individual campuses on this effort and regularly consulted and communicated with the various UC leadership groups. Some of the groups that she has worked with include:

- Council of Chancellors (COC)
- Council of Police Chiefs
- Student Body Presidents Advisory Council
- Council of Vice Chancellors of Administration (COVCA)
- Academic Council
- President’s Student Advisory Council
- Council of Vice Chancellors of Student Affairs (COVCSA)
- Executive Vice Chancellors (EVC)
- UC Student Association (UCSA)
- Association of Emergency Managers (AEM)
- UC Davis Community Advisory Board

The Civil Disobedience Initiative (CDI) was established to bring structure to the effort. Robert Judd was assigned as the project lead to ensure that the initiative met its primary objective to implement the recommendations of the Robinson/Edley Report by the end of September 2013.
_recommendation responses

The recommendations were classified according to the primary group named to address the recommendations: campuses or UCOP. A discussion of the recommendations that were centrally addressed by UCOP begins on page 19. A narrative summary of the campus responses to each recommendation is contained in the appendix. The narratives in some cases detail major policy shifts, exciting programs aimed at building understanding and camaraderie between police and campus constituents, and innovative approaches to engaging all stakeholders. The appendix is a separate document available on the CDI website: http://campusprotestreport.universityofcalifornia.edu/documents/implementation-report-appendices.pdf

campus level

Each campus has undertaken the implementation of the Robinson/Edley Report recommendations in a manner that aligns with the recommendations but also allows for flexibility to fit its own environment. One role common to all campuses, however, is the campus point of contact. The campus points of contact were appointed by the Chancellors. Participants include:

- Ann Jeffrey, Assistant Vice Chancellor and Chief of Staff, Administration and Finance–UC Berkeley
- Gary Sandy, Senior Executive Director in the Office of the Chancellor–UC Davis
- Paul Henisey, Police Chief–UC Irvine
- James Herren, Police Chief–UCLA (replaced Jack Powazek, Vice Chancellor, Administration)
- Jane Lawrence, Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs–UC Merced
- Chuck Rowley, Interim Vice Chancellor, Business and Administrative Services–UC Riverside
- Gary Matthews, Vice Chancellor of Resource Management and Planning–UC San Diego
- Pam Roskowski, Police Chief–UC San Francisco
- Dustin Olsen, Police Chief–UC Santa Barbara
- Jean Marie Scott, Associate Vice Chancellor, Risk and Safety Services–UC Santa Cruz (replaced Sarah Latham, Vice Chancellor, Business and Administrative Services)

This group has met regularly to coordinate efforts and discuss implementation of the recommendations. They have provided documentation for the verification of compliance with the Robinson/Edley Report recommendations.
Project Organization Structure
CDI Roles and Responsibilities

The Civil Disobedience Initiative (CDI) had as its primary objective to implement the recommendations of the Robinson/Edley Report, “Response to Protests on UC Campuses,” accepted on September 13, 2012. The organization of the team helped to ensure a successful implementation. The roles of the team are summarized below, along with their primary responsibilities.

**Executive Sponsor**
- Is highest point of contact and escalation for system
- Has final approval authority

**Project Sponsor**
- Provides executive support for the initiative
- Ensures alignment of internal organizational support
- Has final authority on recommendations to present to President

**Project Director**
- Has overall responsibility for the implementation of the Robinson/Edley Report recommendations
- Negotiates viable solutions for recommendations that conflict, are redundant or don’t work
- Oversees team organization and performance
- Provides quality assurance

**Project Lead**
- Manages project deliverables to project schedule
- Tracks and updates actions, risks, issues (project log), project reporting
- Keeps project on track

**Communications Lead**
- Designs communications structure
- Defines communications objectives
- Monitors and manages project communications with key stakeholders
- Manages Web content

**Warren Institute**
- Reviews reports and submissions
- Conducts further analysis
- Assists in drafting the six-month and 12-month reports

**Steering Committee**
- Reviews final recommendations and implementation scenarios
- Confirms the final number of recommendations for implementation
- Concurs with the campus methodology

**Advisory Group**
- Provides subject expertise and guidance
- Has decision-making capability
- Has understanding of the whole project
- May be in the discussion meetings with the campuses
- Is responsible for keeping their stakeholder groups informed and involved

**Communication Liaisons**
- Provide feedback from their stakeholder groups
- Have responsibility for keeping their stakeholder groups informed of initiative’s progress
- Work with campuses to maximize opportunities to bolster communication objectives

**Campus Points of Contact**
- Serve as the primary point of contact for each campus
- Ensure that deliverables are being completed
- Provide feedback from their stakeholder groups

**Working Group**
Comprising internal subject-matter experts who:
- Advise and propose implementation strategies
- Ensure that the recommendations are being implemented consistently across the university and reflect current best practices
- Review submissions from the campuses and the Office of the President

**Incident Management Training Team**
- Creates and delivers an incident management training curriculum
Recommendations as Implemented

The following is a list of the Robinson/Edley recommendations as implemented. An asterisk (*) indicates that the implemented recommendation has been revised from the original report. See the Centrally Addressed Recommendations Summary section, beginning on page 19, for comparison and further description.

**Recommendation 1:** Add to current campus “Free Speech” and police policies language formally recognizing that civil disobedience has had a historic role in our democracy, but that it is not protected speech under the Constitution, and that it may have consequences for those engaging in it.

**Recommendation 2:** Increase and better publicize opportunities for students, faculty, staff and others to engage with senior administrators, particularly on issues likely to trigger protest or civil disobedience events.

**Recommendation 3:** Discuss with the Regents the possibility of increasing opportunities for students and other campus constituencies to address concerns directly with the Regents at times other than during the public comment period at formal meetings.

**Recommendation 4:** Collect each campus’s current time, place, and manner regulations and all policies governing the response to events of civil disobedience, including applicable systemwide and campus police policies; post collected policies on system and campus websites.

**Recommendation 5:** Create user-friendly summaries of each campus’s time, place, and manner regulations and policies governing the response to events of civil disobedience, and distribute the summaries at least annually during student orientations; highlight in the summaries descriptions of conduct that is or could be perceived as threatening to safety and thus might trigger a police response.

**Recommendation 6:** Increase opportunities for routine interaction between police and students and between the police and key administrators (especially the Police Chief and the Chancellor).

**Recommendation 7:** Establish a standing event response team on each campus to plan and oversee the campus response to demonstrations; include on the team faculty members and/or administrators recognized by students and faculty to be sensitive to the university’s academic mission and values.

**Recommendation 8:** To the extent necessary, modify police policies to require the participation of senior administrators in decision making about any police response to civil disobedience; clearly define the respective roles of administrators (objectives) and police (tactics) in this process.

**Recommendation 9:** As specified in Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) and documented in the “UC Police Crowd Management Gold Book Policy” Appendix B, “Crowd Management Intervention and Control,” when a response is deemed necessary, limit the use of force to that which is objectively reasonable considering the totality of the circumstances to manage the situation and maintain public safety.*

**Recommendation 10:** When faced with protesters who are non-aggressively linking arms, and when the event response team has determined that their presence causes an imminent threat to public safety and that a police response is required, police will limit the use of force to that which is objectively reasonable considering the totality of circumstances to maintain public safety, restore order and effect an arrest, if necessary.*
Recommendation 11: The Chancellor may choose to have a senior administrator on site within viewing distance to communicate immediate situational awareness to the Chancellor and serve as a real-time communication link between the Chancellor and the Chief of Police or police commander at the scene.*

Recommendation 12: During the course of an event, continuously reassess objectives, and the wisdom of pursuing them, in light of necessary police tactics; seek to pursue only important goals with the minimum force necessary.

Recommendation 13: Absent exigent circumstances and to the extent practicable, the Chancellor or the Chancellor’s designee should be consulted prior to commencement of force.*

Recommendation 14: Coordinate in advance of planned demonstrations with other police departments likely to provide assistance.

Recommendation 15: Require each campus police agency to seek aid first from other UC campuses before calling on outside law enforcement agencies, except where there is good cause for seeking aid from an outside agency.

Recommendation 16: Obtain input from members of the campus community (e.g., students, faculty, staff) in the process of hiring campus police officers and promoting or hiring officers for command-level positions within the department.

Recommendation 17: Require the Chief of Police on each campus personally to interview and approve all newly hired sworn officers.

Recommendation 18: Review UC police compensation practices to ensure that compensation is sufficiently competitive to attract and retain highly qualified officers and police leaders.

Recommendation 19: Increase training of campus police officers in the areas of crowd management, mediation and de-escalation of volatile crowd situations.

Recommendation 20: Create specialized response teams with additional training in crowd management, mediation and de-escalation techniques at the systemwide level.

Recommendation 21: Establish a regular program for joint trainings, briefings and scenario planning with law enforcement agencies on which each campus police department is likely to call for assistance or mutual aid.

Recommendation 22: Implement formal training of administrators, at the system and campus levels, in the areas of crowd management, mediation, de-escalation techniques, the Incident Command System and police force options, to be refreshed annually.

Recommendation 23: Conduct simulations jointly with campus administrators and campus police to rehearse responses to civil disobedience scenarios.

Recommendation 24: Make every reasonable attempt to identify and contact members of the demonstration group—preferably one or more group leaders—in advance of the demonstration to establish lines for communication.

Recommendation 25: Inform protesters, in advance of the event, of the availability of alternative avenues for communication of their concerns or proposals.

Recommendation 26: Coordinate in advance of planned demonstrations with other police departments likely to provide assistance.

Recommendation 27: Require each campus police agency to seek aid first from other UC campuses before calling on outside law enforcement agencies, except where there is good cause for seeking aid from an outside agency.

Recommendation 28: Require each campus police agency to seek aid first from other UC campuses before calling on outside law enforcement agencies, except where there is good cause for seeking aid from an outside agency.

Recommendation 29: Require the Chief of Police on each campus personally to interview and approve all newly hired sworn officers.

Recommendation 30: Review UC police compensation practices to ensure that compensation is sufficiently competitive to attract and retain highly qualified officers and police leaders.
Recommendation 28: Campuses should have senior administrators present and visible during protest absent good cause.*

Recommendation 29: Make every reasonable attempt to establish a communication link with identified leaders or sponsors of the event; for leaderless groups, communicate broadly to the group as a whole (through social media and otherwise) until relationships form.

Recommendation 30: To the extent not already available, establish a communication mechanism for promptly informing the campus community at large about material developments in ongoing protests, for use when appropriate.

Recommendation 31: Establish an internal mediation function at the campus or regional level to assist in resolving issues likely to trigger protests or civil disobedience.

Recommendation 32: Consider deploying this mediation function as an alternative to force, before and during a protest event.

Recommendation 33: Where possible, police should pursue tactics designed to defuse tensions and avoid tactics likely to increase tensions.

Recommendation 34: Develop or modify existing student discipline processes to ensure that, in appropriate circumstances, they are an available response option.

Recommendation 35: Establish and implement a systemwide framework that guides the officers’ response to specific actions in crowd control situations, always using the appropriately reasonable level of force to meet the level of resistance offered and maintain overall safety and control. Officers should be trained on the framework, and its principles should be incorporated into operation plans.*

Recommendation 36: Require that campus police and other authorities (to the extent controlled by the university) act in accordance with the response option framework, absent exigency or good cause.

Recommendation 37: Develop a systemwide process for determining which “less lethal” weapons may be utilized by UC police officers.

Recommendation 38: Require each campus Police Chief personally to approve the specific types of less lethal weapons available to officers in their department.

Recommendation 39: Create a systemwide list of approved weapons that police chiefs can choose from for use in their departments. Chiefs may use their discretion in assigning weapons for their campus. For any weapon selected by the campus, individual officers must be trained in the weapon’s use prior to deployment.*

Recommendation 40: Recommend that appropriate authorities commission further studies on the effects of pepper spray on resisters as compared to the effects of other force options.

Recommendation 41: Establish at each campus a formal program to allow designated, trained observers to gain access to the protest site for purposes of observing, documenting and reporting on the event.

Recommendation 42: Establish a program for video recording protest events designed to develop a fair and complete record of event activity solely for evidentiary or training purposes.
Recommendation 43: Amend existing police department policies to require after-action reports for all protest events involving a police response, regardless of whether the response resulted in force, injury or civilian complaint.

Recommendation 44: Coordinate review of after-action reports on a periodic basis with campus event response teams and with the Office of the President.

Recommendation 45: Establish a structure and process at the system level for discretionary review of campus responses to protest activity, consistent with existing legal limitations.

Recommendation 46: Establish a systemwide implementation manager to develop specific policy language in those areas where recommendations call for common or system policies or practices, and to track campus-level measures.

Recommendation 47: Require status reports from each campus six months following the President’s acceptance of this Report’s recommendations concerning progress on implementation of the recommendations.

Recommendation 48: Require a final report and certification from each Chancellor one year following the President’s acceptance of this Report’s recommendations confirming that all recommendations so accepted have been implemented.

Recommendation 49: Establish similar reporting and certification requirements for future recommendations arising out of the event review process described above.

*NOTE:* “w” indicates that the implemented recommendation has been revised from the original Robinson/Edley Report. See the discussion beginning on page 19 for comparison and further description.
The overall goal of this set of recommendations is to ensure that there is appropriate emphasis on communications, decision making and a full airing of possible scenarios to reduce the possibility of an inappropriate use of force outside the understanding of the Chancellor and the event response team.

After discussion and review, the Steering Committee has elected to revise several of the recommendations to conform to current best practices while still aligning closely with the mission and intent of the Robinson/Edley Report.

The newly revised recommendations aim to ensure the following:

- Police and administrators have full understanding and involvement in the decision-making process as it relates to the appropriate operational plan to handle the situation at hand.
- The relevant people are heard in any discussion of use of force.
- All discussions about use of force begin with the consideration of de-escalation and a thorough look at options for management that don’t involve police.
- Absent exigent circumstances, any operation involving contact between the police and protestors will only involve the application of objectively reasonable force considering the totality of the circumstances to accomplish the lawful mission of the operation, maintain public safety and effect arrests, if necessary.

The Steering Committee and Working Group were careful in their review and discussion to ensure that the recommendations set forth implementation strategies related to policy issues and did not dictate tactics.
Recommendation 9

Original Language
Develop principles to guide the event response team in determining whether particular acts of civil disobedience merit a response—when a response is necessary, specify use of lower levels of force (e.g., persuasion, hands-on compliance) before resorting to higher levels of force (e.g., baton strikes or jabs, pepper spray), barring exigent circumstances.

Revised Language
As specified in POST training and documented in the “UC Police Crowd Management Gold Book Policy” Appendix B “Crowd Management Intervention and Control,” when a response is deemed necessary, limit the use of force to that which is objectively reasonable considering the totality of the circumstances to manage the situation and maintain public safety.

Recommendation 10

Original Language
When faced with protesters who are non-aggressively linking arms, and when the event response team has determined that a police response is required, principles should specify that administrators should authorize the police to use hands-on pain compliance techniques rather than higher levels of force (e.g., baton strikes or jabs, pepper spray), unless the situation renders pain compliance unsafe or unreasonable.

Revised Language
When faced with protesters who are non-aggressively linking arms, and when the event response team has determined that their presence causes an imminent threat to public safety and that a police response is required, police will limit the use of force to that which is objectively reasonable considering the totality of circumstances to maintain public safety, restore order and effect an arrest, if necessary.

Recommendation 13

Original Language
Absent exigent circumstances, bar commencement or escalation of force by police unless the Chancellor or the Chancellor’s designee approves it immediately before the action is taken. If the Chancellor designates decision-making responsibility, the Chancellor’s designee must (Edley) or may (Robinson) be a member of the Academic Senate.

Revised Language
Absent exigent circumstances and to the extent practicable, the Chancellor or the Chancellor’s designee should be consulted prior to commencement of force.

Recommendation 20

Original Language
Create specialized response teams with additional training in crowd management, mediation and de-escalation techniques at the systemwide level.

Implementation
The Steering Committee has approved the concept of specialized response teams as a fulfillment of the recommendation. The policies to create a systemwide Special Response Team are currently under review. Members have been chosen and training has been scheduled. Not only will the police have a specially trained group of officers from each campus who can respond to major incidents, but each campus will have members who can share their training locally as trainers to heighten skills and awareness of all officers.
Recommendation 35

Original Language
Establish and implement a systemwide response option framework for use on each campus.

Revised Language
Establish and implement a systemwide framework that guides the officer’s response to specific actions in crowd control situations, always using the appropriately reasonable level of force to meet the level of resistance offered and maintain overall safety and control. Officers should be trained on the framework, and its principles should be incorporated into operation plans.

Context
The Robinson/Edley Report authors recommended that the UC Police adopt a systemwide force matrix that would guide the officers through a series of steps as they confronted civil disobedience on the campus. The intent of that recommendation was to ensure that officers responded with the least amount of force possible to control the situation, that the force was reasonable based on the provocation and that the force matrix remained flexible enough not to impede the officers’ response in exigent circumstances.

Further research and simultaneous updating of the UC Police Systemwide Crowd Control Policy that guides all 10 UC police departments found that the POST Crowd Management Intervention and Control Strategies matrix (see page 6) is in essence a framework that, in the spirit of the Robinson/Edley Report, ties the police response to provocation and demonstrates that as resistance escalates, the minimum amount of force to control the resistance is employed. The matrix is consistent with campus police training and in fact reflects the standard operating procedure of the police departments. In addition, our research and discussions with POST indicated that most professional police agencies in California do not operate with a response option framework.

Recommendation 36

Original Language
Require that campus police and other authorities (to the extent controlled by the university) act in accordance with the response option framework, absent exigency or good cause.

Implementation
All California police follow the POST guidelines and are trained to POST standards, which will raise the expectation that they will follow the guidelines in a mutual-aid situation. The campus police will utilize the POST Crowd Management Intervention and Control Strategies matrix (see page 6). Whenever possible, all departments responding for mutual aid will follow the Incident Command System protocols and the POST matrix.

Police throughout California adhere to mutual aid protocols that call for the mutual aid responders to follow the incident command structure and be under the direction of the incident commander, who will be a designee from the home police force. While responding to a mutual-aid request, the mutual-aid responders remain under the direction of their home agency policies. There is no way to force responding agencies to follow any protocol other than their own command. However, Recommendation 21 of the report (which calls for joint trainings, briefings and scenario planning with potential mutual-aid responders) is the opportunity for UC Police to stress the importance of patience, to talk through appropriate tactics and to ensure that objectively reasonable use of force is the priority of all respondents. When mutual aid arrives, the UC Police Incident Commander should consider deploying outside agencies to the demonstration perimeter and, when possible and tactically sound, deploy UC Police personnel in the positions most likely to encounter student demonstrators.
Administrator Involvement

As time, events on campus and discussions have progressed since November 2011, both administrators and police have come to advocate for participation in a formalized pre-event meeting with the designated event response team during which contingencies are discussed and agreed upon with the full concurrence of the Chancellor and Chief of Police. The event response team can then decide if it chooses to place an administrator with the chief (or incident commander) during an event in either the role of observer or as an informational direct line contact with the Chancellor.

The Steering Committee has decided that agreement on a pre-event meeting of the police, Chancellor (or the Chancellor’s designee) and event response team before a major event will produce a consensus on how best to proceed, which will be reflected in the event operational plan. The meeting will also foster communications throughout the event and ensure that all parties understand their roles and responsibilities.

The event response team on each campus must evaluate action in both active protest scenarios and disruption scenarios. There should be discussion and consensus on how to respond when protestors engage in civil disobedience—passive or active—as well as when they disrupt events or functions that deprive other students of participation. These responses are best evaluated in the event team discussion, where the range of options, from no action to police action, can be weighed and decisions made after all voices have been heard.

Recommendation 8

Original Language
To the extent necessary, modify police policies to require the participation of senior administrators in decision making about any police response to civil disobedience; clearly define the respective roles of administrators (objectives) and police (tactics) in this process.

Recommendation 37

Original Language
Develop a systemwide process for determining which “less lethal” weapons may be utilized by UC police officers.

Implementation
The Council of Police Chiefs has developed a method of looking at all weapons annually, not just less lethal weapons.

Recommendation 39

Original Language
Require each campus police department to include the list of weapons approved for use in response to demonstrations and civil disobedience in its use-of-force policies, and to make the list available to the public.

Revised Language
Create a systemwide list of approved weapons that police chiefs can choose from for use in their departments. Chiefs may use their discretion in assigning weapons for their campus. For any weapon selected by the campus, individual officers must be trained in the weapon’s use prior to deployment.

Context
The Council of Police Chiefs will prepare a list of all weapons approved for use by the UCPD. The police chief on each campus will have the discretion to choose weapons from this list for the members of their department. All police personnel must be trained in the appropriate use of the weapon, and verification of that training must be maintained by the police department on each campus. All of the weapons listed should be used appropriately at all times and in keeping with approved training. In the spirit of the recommendation, campuses will include, when appropriate, some information about the use of weapons most likely to be deployed in crowd control situations during student orientations, during police and student meetings, during administrative meetings with student affairs organizations or in discussions with other campus constituencies. Due to security considerations, the full weapons list will not be made public.
**Implementation**

All campuses now have a defined event response team. Each event response team has a charter or guidelines that clearly outline mission, goals, responsibilities of the team and the threshold for activation of the team. For events that meet the designated threshold, the campus event response team decides when an event merits a police response, recognizing that a mere police presence can be construed as an escalation of force under some circumstances.

At that decision point, the Chancellor or designee, Police Chief, senior administrative officials and those closest to the situation will fully discuss the mission, operation, objectives, ramifications, possible scenarios and outcomes. Consensus should be reached on these points.

**Recommendation 11**

*Original Language*

Place an administrator on site within viewing distance of the event and with instant communication to the police incident commander and to the Chancellor or to the individual to whom the Chancellor has delegated decision-making responsibility.

*Revised Language*

The Chancellor may choose to have a senior administrator on site within viewing distance to communicate immediate situational awareness to the Chancellor and serve as a real-time communication link between the Chancellor and the Chief of Police or police commander at the scene.

**Context**

As stated above, the Chief of Police and event response team will have had a thorough discussion of the operations and planned response, including contingency planning, prior to the event. At that point, the Chief of Police and the Chancellor or the Chancellor’s representative should arrive at a clear understanding of what the level of communication and involvement will be going forward.

**Recommendation 27**

*Original Language*

Absent special circumstances, assign administrators or faculty members, rather than police, to serve as the primary university representative communicating with protesters during a demonstration.

*Revised Language*

In all cases, the most appropriate representative—faculty, administrator, police representative, mediator—should be designated by the event response team as the primary university representative communicating during a protest.

**Context**

The goal is to give the campuses the ability to pick the most appropriate and effective university representative while not putting faculty, students or administrators in an uncomfortable position.

**Recommendation 28**

*Original Language*

Establish senior administrators as a visible presence during protests, absent good cause.

*Revised Language*

Campuses should have senior administrators present and visible during protest absent good cause.
**Reporting and Evaluation**

Included among the goals of the Robinson/Edley Report were recommendations to strengthen documentation during events, enhance the post-event review process and create central oversight for the recommendation implementation. The recommendations provide for an ongoing process for event documentation that will allow the central administration to look at individual campus incidents and make additional recommendations. The recommendations in this section speak to the formalization and establishment of existing practices and the creation of new ones that will provide a clear view of how the campus responds to acts of civil disobedience that can be evaluated to reduce the risk of future confrontations.

**Recommendation 41**

**Original Language**

Establish at each campus a formal program to allow designated, trained observers to gain access to the protest site for purposes of observing, documenting and reporting on the event.

**Implementation**

Each campus that does not have an observer program should consider setting up and managing a formal trained observer program.

**Recommendation 43**

**Original Language**

Amend existing police department policies to require after-action reports for all protest events involving a police response, regardless of whether the response resulted in force, injury, or civilian complaint.

**Implementation**

Following any demonstration that reaches a pre-set threshold (to be determined by the campus event response team chair and the Police Chief, if it is a police matter), which may include convening of the event response team and/or activation of the incident command process, or any incident involving police use of force, submit appropriate documentation, such as a post-event summary, through the chair of the event response team to document decision making, use of force and adherence to event response team guidelines.

**Recommendation 44**

**Original Language**

Coordinate review of after-action reports on a periodic basis with campus event response teams and with the Office of the President.

**Implementation**

Police will prepare reports if they respond to activities related to protest or civil disobedience, if that response meets a predetermined threshold level. Those reports will be available for review by UCOP.

Campus police respond to hundreds of instances weekly and it is insensitive to their operational needs to require after action reports for all events. The Robinson Edley intent is to record responses to events involving protestor civil disobedience that reach a certain threshold, and review the responses to insure they are within the spirit and intent of the recommendations and in line with the changes enacted through the implementation process. Each campus will determine the threshold based on their unique circumstances and then maintain and review those reports internally and as well as keep them for possible review by UCOP.
Recommendation 45  
**Original Language**  
Establish a structure and process at the system level for discretionary review of campus responses to protest activity, consistent with existing legal limitations.  

**Implementation**  
The Office of the President will designate one official (currently the systemwide CDI Implementation Director) as the single, systemwide reviewer. This recommendation reflects a desire for administrative accountability. The single systemwide reviewer will promote consistency in the review process and facilitate the application of best practices in event response across the system. The current CDI Implementation Director is the appropriate individual to maintain this system initially, in order to conserve resources and assess demand. The reviewer has the authority to consider or reject requests for review and to initiate reviews without a request. Review results will be shared with the individual campus and if applicable with the system and the public.

Recommendation 47  
**Original Language**  
要求 status reports from each campus six months following the President’s acceptance of this Report’s recommendations concerning progress on implementation of the recommendations.  

**Implementation**  
A six-month report was developed and distributed. It includes a status report from each campus.

Recommendation 48  
**Original Language**  
Require a final report and certification from each Chancellor one year following the President’s acceptance of this Report’s recommendations confirming that all recommendations so accepted have been implemented.  

**Implementation**  
This implementation report, which includes a campus summary and certification from the Chancellor for each campus, fulfills this requirement.

Recommendation 49  
**Original Language**  
Establish similar reporting and certification requirements for future recommendations arising out of the event review process described above.  

**Implementation**  
The Office of the Executive Vice President for Business Operations within the Office of the President has memorialized the CDI process, including campus points of contact, SharePoint site, designated progress report schematic, public input template, organization charts and communications strategies that can be implemented again should the need arise. The formula for working through multi-campus issues is cost effective, minimally invasive and achieved the desired review within budget and on time, not to mention the positive outcomes of campus policy enhancement, increase in police training and enhanced communication across the board. Currently the charge to maintain the process rests with the CDI Implementation Director.
Other Recommendations with Central Lead

Additional recommendations have been implemented with a central lead. Some of the recommendations were the sole responsibility of UCOP while others required involvement by the campuses as well as a central group.

Recommendation 1

Original Language
Add to current “free speech” and police policies language formally recognizing that civil disobedience has had a historic role in our democracy, but that it is not protected speech under the Constitution, and that it may have consequences for those engaging in it.

Implementation
UCOP provided suggested language for campuses for the police and Student Affairs. The campuses have used this language or their own version of the language and have incorporated it into websites, protocols, policies and brochures as they deemed appropriate.

Recommendation 3

Original Language
Discuss with the Regents the possibility of increasing opportunities for students and other campus constituencies to address concerns directly with the Regents at times other than during public comment period at formal meetings.

Implementation
The Regents have increased and documented the opportunities for interaction with students and other campus constituencies.

Recommendation 4

Original Language
Collect each campus’s current time, place, and manner regulations and all policies governing the response to events of civil disobedience, including applicable system-wide and campus police policies; post collected policies on system and campus websites.

Implementation
UC Office of the President worked with the campuses to obtain links to each campus’s current time, place, and manner regulations and all policies governing the response to events of civil disobedience. These are displayed on the systemwide website as well as on each campus site. (http://campusprotestreport.universityofcalifornia.edu/resources.html)

Recommendation 18

Original Language
Review UC police compensation practices to ensure that compensation is sufficiently competitive to attract and retain highly qualified officers and police leaders.

Implementation
The Human Relations Labor Relations group within the UC Office of the President has completed a survey of UC police compensation. The recently negotiated agreement with the Federated University Police Officers Association (FUPOA) reflects this work.
Recommendation 22
*Original Language*
Implement formal training of administrators, at the system and campus levels, in the areas of crowd management, mediation, de-escalation techniques, the incident command system, and police force options, to be refreshed annually.

*Implementation*
Executive seminars in crisis management were conducted on a systemwide basis. Additional training is planned and is currently ongoing on the campuses.

Recommendation 40
*Original Language*
Recommend that appropriate authorities commission further studies on the effects of pepper spray on resisters as compared to the effects of other force options.

*Implementation*
Believing that the University of California is not the appropriate entity, the Steering Committee recommended that the appropriate entities commission further studies on the effects of pepper spray on resisters as compared to the effects of other force options. The appropriate entities could include Law Enforcement Agencies, Manufactures, and Federal Agencies who have this expertise.

Recommendation 46
*Original Language*
Establish a systemwide implementation manager to develop specific policy language in those areas where recommendations call for common or system policies or practices, and to track campus-level measures.

*Implementation*
Lynn Tierney was appointed by the President as the systemwide implementation manager. She has managed the recommendation implementation as part of the scope of the Civil Disobedience Initiative.
As required by the Robinson/Edley Report, each campus has provided a final campus 12-month summary with the Chancellor’s certification. The following summaries highlight each campus’s implementation of the Robinson/Edley Report recommendations. The summaries are focused on those recommendations that campuses are taking the lead on, including campus-level policy development, training and outreach to students, faculty and staff.

As the following summaries demonstrate, each campus has been proactive in its effort to implement the Robinson/Edley Report and has adapted the recommendations to its individual campus culture and community. All have spent resources on police training and increasing the opportunities for students and police to interact. Some have begun by establishing new groups and teams to respond to protest events. A number of creative new models and programs have emerged, which the campuses have shared with each other.

SYSTEMWIDE INVOLVEMENT IN IMPLEMENTATION

All campuses reviewed policies, current and past practices, history, best practices and campus cultural considerations in order to devise workable implementation strategies that align with the recommendations and will work on each campus and for the system.

Implementation strategies reflect engagement and ongoing attention to safety and the rights of individuals, and respect for all communities and campus constituencies.
Campus Progress Tracker

As campuses moved through the recommendations, they detailed their implementation strategy for each, on a master tracking summary. That summary is the appendix to this document and is available at:


Almost all of the campuses are or are close to 100% complete for each recommendation. Those that are less than 100% are generally awaiting approval of a proposed policy that is currently in review, have police training planned for the future, or have events scheduled but not completed.
UC Berkeley shifted its approach to management of civil disobedience events in January 2012. Since then, we have worked to redefine and refine the roles of senior administration, academics and the police—and we have forged new ways of working together that have been extremely positive. Many of these changes foreshadowed recommendations that were made in the Robinson/Edley Report and all of our efforts have been consonant with the spirit of the report. Highlights of these changes include:

- In December 2011, we reconstituted the Protest Response Team (PRT) to manage civil disobedience events. The group is co-chaired by the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost (EVCP) and the Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance (VCAF) and includes faculty representatives and appropriate vice chancellors and senior administrators. The group meets at least quarterly to review how we responded to any protests that occurred and discuss what worked well and what could have been improved. The PRT also reviews any current or emerging issues that might lead to protests in the upcoming months and identifies any planning or action that should be started. A charge that includes a roster of current members is included in the UC Berkeley documents folder (Recommendation 7).

- During an event, the EVCP and VCAF are actively involved in monitoring and assessing the situation as it unfolds. The associate vice chancellor who oversees the police department is the primary Senior Administrator on the ground and updates the EVCP and VCAF as the situation changes. Four vice chancellors are designated to serve as potential back-ups if the AVC is not available. In planning for expected protests in November 2012, the senior administrator and a back-up were calendared through the month to accommodate travel and vacation plans and to ensure that the PRT coordinator and UCPD knew whom to contact in the event of a protest. The co-chairs work closely with the Chief of Police, the administrator on the ground, and other faculty and administrators appropriate to the given event to discuss tactics and do scenario planning (Recommendations 8, 11, 12, 13).

- The campus has focused on proactive communications with protesters, before, during and after each event. In 2012, the VCAF produced a series of Web videos on the campus budget and encouraged students to propose and vote on questions that he could address in follow-up videos. He then produced videos addressing the top three. Later in the year, in planning for anticipated protests after the November election, a subgroup of the PRT developed a communications plan. Two forums for students were organized in partnership with student government, an op-ed was published in the campus paper by the EVCP and VCAF, fact sheets were generated and distributed, and communications were prepared by the Chancellor assuming either the success or failure of Proposition 30.
• In a second example, the occupation of Eschleman Hall in November 2012 was the result of unhappiness over perceived changes in the Multicultural Student Development (MSD) program. The Vice Chancellor of Equity and Inclusion had been meeting with students to discuss the issues. During the occupation, he and the Dean of Students spoke with the occupiers at length and ultimately committed to a follow-up process to further explore their concerns. The protesters agreed to his offer and left the building. The campus honored its commitment to convene an MSD task force and the group completed a report in May 2013 that provided the Chancellor with recommendations on the future of the MSD programs (Recommendations 2, 24, 25, 27, 29, 30).

• Local involvement of faculty, chairs and deans whose facilities are impacted by protest activity has been an important change to the campus’s approach to protest activities since 2012. These individuals are known to the protesters and therefore have more credibility than central administrators or the police.

• Although leading campus administrators, including the EVCP and VCAF, met personally with a delegation of Occupy the Farm protesters in spring 2012, the PRT adopted a wait-and-see approach to responding to some events and worked to partner with neighboring cities to address events that extended beyond campus borders. Through the spring and summer 2012, during Occupy the Farm protests at the Gill Tract and at the multiuse development site adjacent to Albany Village, the campus worked closely with the City of Albany as the situation unfolded to keep city officials informed of expected activities and our approach as events unfolded. Public Affairs, Community Relations and the UCpd worked closely with the city, schools and Little League, and the public to address and alleviate concerns (Recommendations 12, 14, 26, 29, 30). Throughout, the dean of the College of Natural Resources served as a liaison between the protesters and campus senior administrators.

• While it has been campus practice to include the campus community in the search process for command-level positions in the police department, we used the community extensively this year in our chief, captain and lieutenant searches. Representatives from faculty, staff, the ASUC, the Graduate Assembly, and relevant other student and staff groups were included in the interview process. Input received during the search for a new chief helped guide the campus decision to initiate the accreditation process for the department, strengthen outreach to neighboring police departments, identify and implement a means to improve the use of data in our approach to crime reduction, and the continued extensive involvement by the community to help select progressive leaders in our department (Recommendation 16).
We hereby certify that all the Robinson/Edley Report recommendations that were finalized and accepted through the Civil Disobedience Initiative have been implemented or are in the process of being implemented at the University of California Berkeley. The campus is committed to continue to improve our practices in order to effectively manage civil disobedience in a manner that is consistent with our principles as the birthplace of the Free Speech Movement.

George Breslauer  
Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost  
Co-Chair Protest Response Team

John Wilton  
Vice Chancellor Administration & Finance  
Co-Chair Protest Response Team

Nicholas B. Dirks  
Chancellor
Executive Summary
In the wake of the demonstrations and incidents of November 18, 2011, UC Davis faced the challenging, and in many ways unique, task of reviewing and implementing recommendations from a variety of groups, including those put forward in the Robinson/Edley Report. The sheer volume of these recommendations, issued by a variety of groups without coordination or a central strategy, made the process a complicated one. The breadth of the Robinson/Edley Report recommendations and their systemwide emphasis provided a still broader context for many of these policies. Nevertheless, UC Davis responded to these challenges with both vigor and dedication.

As an organizing principle, the campus divided recommendations into four separate categories:

- Administrative Leadership and Decision Making
- Freedom of Speech and Protest Policies
- Community Engagement
- Police Operations

A review of the work accomplished within these categories is evidence of an organization committed to deep and lasting change. The process of reform reflected a commitment to improve the campus’s ability to make appropriate leadership decisions in a timely manner, to develop a backdrop of appropriate policy to safeguard and protect the role of protests and protestors, to engage the campus community in open and dynamic conversations, and to improve the quality and transparency of police operations. In the process, the campus has reaffirmed its commitment to protect freedom of speech for the students and the community, to recognize protest as a legitimate aspect of those same freedoms that is necessary and vital to the life of any great institution of higher learning and to remind the campus that our police force is a vital and valued member of our community, dedicated to public safety and guardianship of everyone’s rights. None of this could have been accomplished without significant analysis, consideration, debate, deliberation and a strategic investment of resources designed to move the campus forward.

Over the course of a year, the administration submitted periodic updates to a special committee convened by the UC Academic Senate. Each of the reports was delivered on schedule and addressed topics of interest to the committee. In response, on June 17, 2013, the Academic Senate committee issued its own review and assessment to the Chancellor, acknowledging a “great deal of progress” in addressing various recommendations. The report was critical of what it deemed to be insufficient progress on formation of a police oversight board. It also urged the administration to take action to “…spread the newly formulated emergency, crisis and policing culture of consultation and communication to all other arenas of interaction between administration, faculty, staff and students.”

The UC Davis Academic Senate also exercised significant leadership in working with the administration on freedom of expression issues. The Senate formed its own committee and issued a set of eight recommendations to the campus administration. Upon receipt of the Senate’s report, Chancellor Linda Katehi convened a blue-ribbon committee on freedom of expression, with broad representation from campus groups, to consider the Academic Senate’s recommendations and to issue a proposed campus policy on freedom of expression. The draft report is due by October 31, 2013.

Moreover, to ensure that the pace of reforms was kept on track, Chancellor Katehi also formed the Post-Incident Reform Review Committee, consisting of faculty, students, staff, representatives from UCOP, the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST), and elected officials to take testimony and examine progress made on different recommendations. The group took testimony, reviewed the reports and issued a final report to the Chancellor on June 14, 2013. The report concluded that the campus had made significant progress in responding in an effective manner to the host of recommendations and singled out areas that it thought deserved continuing attention.
Underlying all of these efforts was the letter and spirit of the Robinson/Edley Report recommendations, which envisioned a perspective on protests that would render them less as occasions for emergencies and police response and more as activities that were consistent with the intellectual discourse and climate of a university environment. This transformation from a police-oriented response system to one based on clear and open communication, a reliance on civility and mediation, and an organizational decision-making process that recognizes the necessity of accommodating divergent viewpoints and debate prior to taking an action has been the capstone of this entire exercise.

UC Davis has emerged from this process a stronger, more reflective and more responsive institution, capable of working in a cooperative manner with faculty, staff and students and dedicated to cultivating an atmosphere of openness, trust and mutual consideration. As a result, UC Davis is better positioned to respond to and deal with emerging issues in a positive, professional and proactive manner. This marks significant progress, and the campus continues these efforts with dedication and diligence.

To promote greater transparency and access to information, UC Davis also created a website to enable interested parties to track the progress on specific recommendations. Reports submitted to the Academic Senate were posted regularly, along with the Post-Incident Reform Committee’s findings. Campus leadership was kept updated through a weekly half-hour meeting designed to promote discussion around key recommendations and related topics.

The campus also engaged the wider UC Davis community by convening Strengthening Campus Community forums with students, faculty and staff. The forums provided an opportunity for members of the campus community to contribute their own thoughts and ideas on how to improve the university’s performance and outreach.

Formation of the Campus Community Council was another action resulting in genuine progress. The presence of students, faculty, staff, retirees and others on the council provides for a healthy mixture of perspectives and experiences. The council’s monthly meetings serve as an important forum where campus executives can test reactions from a variety of viewpoints and can, in turn, also inform members of the wider campus community about incipient policy changes, emerging trends and areas of concern on campus.
Training was a significant aspect of the Robinson/Edley Report. The UC Davis administration has received substantial training in decision making, emergency protocols and response and has participated in ongoing emergency training scenarios. Campus police, for instance, hosted an exercise directed by the Department of Homeland Security to allow police supervisors to practice what was learned in a recent NIMS/SEMS update provided by CALEMA and the Department of Homeland Security for supervisory personnel. The exercise included other campus community members and executives. All police supervisors have completed both NIMS/SEMS training. In addition, all police supervisors have been provided with advanced small-group leadership training, and various supervisors have attended critical-incident training for management (Recommendation 22).

The Federal Emergency Management Agency’s “Introduction to the Incident Command System, ICS-100 for Higher Education” was completed by all members of the Council of Vice Chancellors (COVC) and the ECMT (40 individuals in all). A separate course in event management training and participation in a series of trainings to improve understanding of the NIMS/SIMS vernacular and decision-making processes was also completed (Recommendation 22).

Administrative Leadership and Decision Making
The recommendations regarding administrative leadership and decision making focused on training and new methods of communication for the administration, as well as on decision-making policies and procedures. These efforts included:

- Formation of the Event and Crisis Management Team (ECMT) to address potential campus crises and emergencies. The ECMT is an integrated, multilevel emergency management team of administrators and faculty members with a clear delineation of roles and responsibilities; requirements for administrators to be present at major events or incidents where direct police involvement is contemplated; and systematic weekly review by a policy-level team of emerging (potential crisis) issues. In addition, the ECMT has developed the UC Davis Campus Emergency Operations Plan to ensure full compliance with NIMS/SEMS, to provide training in NIMS/SEMS to the members of the team, including action scenarios, and to put in place a number of other systems such as the All Hazards Building Notification process to augment campus safety and familiarity with emergency planning and response procedures (Recommendations 7, 8, 22).

- Creation of the Campus Community Council, established on April 6, 2011, to serve as the foundation for addressing the creation of a consultative and inclusive process for the campus community. The council reflects the diversity of the campus community and meets regularly (Recommendation 2).

- Establishment of proactive communication efforts and consultation with UC Davis faculty, staff and student groups such as the Academic Senate, Academic Federation, Staff Assembly, Associated Students of the University of California, Davis (ASUCD), etc., which are now practiced.
**Protest Policies and Management**

While there are a few items in this category that are still works in progress, improvements in this area have been significant.

The UC Davis Police Department addressed the rights and responsibilities of protestors in a new crowd management policy. The police department also created a link on its website to information provided by the ACLU that is designed to acquaint potential protestors with their rights. In addition, the UC Davis Police Department will disseminate this same material in printed form to students prior to and during an event (Recommendation 25).

In addition to more conventional means of updates (posting on the campus website, press advisories, emails, etc.), the campus relies on decisions made by the ECMT and the Emergency Manager to utilize the WarnMe system for issuing messages associated with potential immediate and life safety concerns. WarnMe gives the campus the ability to deliver timely and rapid messages to the entire university community (Recommendation 30).

Student Affairs has developed a set of criteria to facilitate the use of Student Judicial Affairs as an alternative to the county court system when considering appropriate responses to violations of campus rules or regulations. In addition, the campus now participates in a “Neighborhood Court” process that provides an alternative to the use of the court system when addressing violations committed on campus. Both approaches employ and rely on the principles of restorative justice (Recommendation 34).

Integrated Critical Incident Negotiations Team training has been instituted to ensure effective communication with the community well in advance of any event. This type of training is also consistent with the adopted use-of-force policy (Recommendation 33).

UC Davis has also organized a Neutral Observer Program (NOP). The mission of this program is to provide trained volunteers to serve as neutral witnesses at protests and demonstrations on campus where there is the potential for illegal activity, violation of campus regulations or police response.

Guidelines indicate that:

- The role of the neutral observers is to watch and report impartially on acts observed.
- Observers do not interpret or evaluate actions or behaviors, give advice or mediate a conflict.
- The Office of Campus Community Relations (OCCR) manages the NOP and is responsible for recruiting, training and coordinating neutral observers.
- The NOP manager schedules neutral observers. The manager also provides neutral observer armbands for identification, supervises neutral observer placement on site, maintains the neutral observer log and follows up as needed on neutral observer reports.
- Volunteer neutral observers participate in a six-hour training session administered by OCCR.
- Training includes topics such as the observer’s role, neutrality, report writing, dealing with difficult people, police practices, complaint procedures, safety issues and site logistics.
- UC Davis Police Department, Student Judicial Affairs and the Engagement Team are involved in a portion of the training.
- Written neutral observer reports are provided directly to the NOP manager. These reports are accessible in accordance with the law and university policy. Submitted neutral observer reports are not edited.
- A six-hour neutral observer training is conducted once a year. The first training is expected to take place November 2013.
- When possible, the goal will be to have two or three neutral observers at an event and for those neutral observers to represent more than one role at UC Davis, e.g., student/academic/staff (Recommendation 41).
On April 11, 2013, Chancellor Linda Katehi created a Blue Ribbon Committee on Freedom of Expression to review recommendations made to the university by the Academic Senate on freedom of expression and related areas, and to solicit campus input on a broad range of areas related to free speech. The committee is chaired by King Hall Law School Dean Kevin Johnson. A number of public forums on freedom of speech and expression were held in the fall. A draft report with policy recommendations is currently under review (Recommendation 1).

**Police Operations**

Clearly, the lion’s share of campus changes has taken place within the police department, although other campus offices, including the administration, Emergency Services and Student Affairs, have also undergone significant changes. As a result, the campus is better equipped to address or respond to major events.

UC Davis aspires to become a model for campus law enforcement. Numerous improvements in policy and procedure are under way. This is evidenced by several changes made in current community policing philosophies. These include the creation of a truly community-based hiring process, a citizens’ academy, Police Chief/staff formal monthly meetings, a student cadet program, outreach officers, increased bicycle patrols and a department-wide policy that seeks input from the community on policies and practices.

Police Officers Standards and Training (POST) conducted an audit of all police department background files (June 8–12, 2012). An outside expert was also secured to assist with the review of all policy and protocols. This work included the implementation of formalized policy revisions utilizing LEXIPOL. Community input has also been sought when reviewing draft policy. POST background and training audits are now complete, and corrections have been made and approved.

The Police Chief routinely meets with student groups, including Associated Students of UCD (ASUCD) and the Graduate Student Association (GSA), to exchange information and discuss campus topics of mutual interest. The campus Police Chief’s Student Advisory Committee has also been established to review and comment on police policy (Recommendation 6).

The UC Davis Police Department hosted a cultural awareness and diversity training in April 2013. The training was conducted by Peer Education and Community Empowerment (P.E.A.C.E.), a student-to-student “train the trainer” program dedicated to addressing racism, sexism and homophobia and to promoting a welcoming, respectful environment for living and learning. In all, 49 members of the UC Davis Police Department participated, including the chief and command-level officers. P.E.A.C.E. offers UC Davis students, faculty and staff the opportunity to engage in meaningful and productive conversations about diversity issues, facilitated by UC Davis students. Forums are open to all student organizations, departments, residential groups and other UC Davis affiliates (Recommendation 6).

Effective March 2012, all police department operations plans now identify the difference between passive and active resistance and are specific on the appropriate use of force in each category. These plans also include guidelines for police use of chemical weapons, including when they can be deployed and when prior authorization would be needed (Recommendation 9).

All police department supervisors have completed Incident Command Structure (ICS) training along with small-group leadership and critical-incident management training. All officers have received alternative use-of-force techniques as well (Recommendation 10).

All police officers attended a use-of-force training in September 2012. Officers were taught an innovative approach to control and restraint called the Compliance, Direction and Take-Down (CDT) System. Unlike other types of so-called non-deadly force systems, the CDT System teaches individuals to physically control or disarm a hostile aggressor and keep him/her in compliance or completely restrained until help arrives. It addresses peace officer well-being and subject safety while decreasing the liability factors of all concerned. The CDT System is viewed as
the UC Davis Police Department has adopted the new UC PD policy on Crowd Management, Intervention and Control. The policy emphasizes the importance of safeguarding constitutional rights and the First Amendment, as well as providing an outline of basic steps to be taken and/or considered by the UC Davis Police Department in management of demonstrations. In addition, Chief Matt Carmichael continues to receive input on the policy from the campus community (Recommendation 19).

The UC Davis Police Department has purchased 15 personal-wear video cameras to be used in various situations, including protest activity. The camera, a VIEVU PVR-LE2, is simple to use and contains video and audio recording devices that are pinned to the front of an officer’s shirt. Each camera bears a clear, discernible label that reads: “CAMERA.” This designation is meant to inform members of the public that an exchange with the police officer is being filmed and audiotaped. UC Davis also developed a procedure to ensure that, during a large or potentially troublesome event, cameras are deployed into the field at specific locations. Typically this includes putting a camera on the field commander, arrest teams and line officers to provide a variety of views of the activity. Each significant incident then may be filmed from five different placements. This is to ensure that the full spectrum of interaction is recorded and available for subsequent viewing. This is a tremendous educational resource and will assist in resolving complaints and in determining how specific events were managed and/or how they might have benefitted from different approaches. The university also utilizes in-car cameras on police vehicles as standard operating procedure. The cameras are activated when transporting prisoners or when near the scene of activity. UC Davis is one of a few departments in the country that actually has a policy, titled “Video Recording and Photographing of UC PD Members by the Public,” related to the public video recording of officers and how officers shall respond. In addition, UC Davis provides officer training on all video devices. Campus Tasers also have video-recording devices built into them as safeguards for officers and the public.
Community Engagement

UC Davis held five separate Strengthening Campus Community forums. These two-hour meetings were designed to identify strengths of the university and areas for improvement, including identification of potentially controversial or troubling issues that could lead to demonstrations or civil disobedience. Among other things, forum participants discussed some of the challenges to creating a stronger and more cohesive UC Davis campus community. The forums were held at different times and at different locations in an attempt to boost student participation. The entire campus community was invited to take part. Each of the forums was widely publicized through such channels as The Aggie, Friday Update, Academic Senate and Federation listservs, and individual invitations. Participants agreed to guiding principles and then focused on four questions:

• Based on your experience, what are the characteristics of a strong campus community?
• What are the strengths of UC Davis as a campus community?
• What are the barriers to a stronger UC Davis campus community?
• What are your ideas to address challenges and enhance strengths of UC Davis as a campus community?

A trained facilitator moderated each forum and invited input. Feedback was gathered and compiled for a final report to the administration.

In addition, four open workshops on Crucial Conversations were held in March, April and May. All members of the campus community were invited to participate. The goal of the workshops was to better equip campus staff, faculty and students in handling challenging conversations in a productive manner and to enhance the capacity for leadership. The workshops proved very popular and a few were oversubscribed. In addition, individual departments have asked for interdepartmental workshops on Crucial Conversations (Recommendation 6).
The Student Affairs staff convened a joint meeting of the Chancellor’s Graduate and Professional Student Advisory Board and the Chancellor’s Undergraduate Advisory Board to solicit ideas on how to improve communication outreach to students (Recommendation 2).

The Center for Student Involvement (CSI) added a Student Expression and Activity Coordinator, specifically to assist students in engagement, dialogue, assistance with student conflicts and protest activity (Recommendation 34).

UC Davis formed an Engagement Team (ET) comprising three individuals, each with advanced training in group processes, dispute and conflict resolution, and negotiations. These individuals may meet with protestors individually or in teams to communicate alternative means of interaction and resolutions to issues. The ET engages with potential leaders, contacts members of specific organizations, performs extensive outreach to club members and individuals associated with certain groups and engages through a broad range of methods that includes individual meetings and social and campus media (Recommendations 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32).

The Office of Student Judicial Affairs staff participated in a UCOP-sponsored training in restorative justice. In addition, a staff member within Student Judicial Affairs has been designated a campus restorative justice facilitator (Recommendations 6, 8).

The campus has established a Director of Campus Dialogue and Deliberation. This position will strengthen UC Davis as a civic-minded campus. The director will serve all aspects of the campus community as a focal point to support, create, convene, design and facilitate civic engagement for UC Davis. The director will work with campus partners such as Student Affairs, the Academic Senate and the University Library to support and enhance civic engagement efforts underway as well as to pilot new and complementary programs. The Director of Campus Dialogue and Deliberation will:

- Plan and initiate a series of training and capacity-building workshops to promote the use of skillful dialogue as a means to understand and appreciate varying viewpoints. Example topics may include freedom of expression, crucial conversations and interest-based negotiation.
- Design custom workshops and dialogue processes for and among a range of campus partners, including, for example, ASUCD, student groups, Academic Senate, Academic Federation and other campus entities.
- Work as a member of the Engagement Team (ET) to plan and prepare for campus demonstrations and protests with an emphasis on effective communication, identification of strategic issues, accepted negotiation techniques and emerging methods of addressing leaderless movements.
- Support ongoing success of the ET by attending to its infrastructure needs, such as training and documenting processes.
- Assist the Freedom of Expression Committee to plan for and convene forums on freedom of expression and related issues.
- Serve as a third-party neutral mediator for group-level conflicts on campus.
- Perform preliminary work on establishment of an engagement office on campus to resolve disputes around difficult topics, improve relations between organizations and assist the campus community in negotiating difficult issues in an effective and productive manner.
- Advise other campus offices, including Student Affairs, on implementing restorative justice and similar initiatives.
- Provide regular reports to the Offices of the Chancellor and the Provost on engagement and dialogue efforts (Recommendation 31).
President Janet Napolitano  
Office of the President  
University of California  
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor  
Oakland, CA 94607  

Dear President Napolitano:  

I hereby certify that to the best of my knowledge all the Robinson/Edley Report recommendations that were finalized and accepted through the Civil Disobedience Initiative have been implemented or are in the process of being implemented at the University of California, Davis.  

Along with this letter, I am submitting UC Davis' final report, which describes the steps we have taken to implement the Robinson/Edley recommendations and the efforts we are continuing to develop in that implementation process. UC Davis believes that the Robinson/Edley recommendations are an invaluable guide for best practices in furthering UC Davis' commitment to make appropriate leadership decisions in a timely manner, to employ and implement appropriate policies that safeguard and protect the role of protests and protesters, to engage the campus community in open and dynamic conversations, and to improve the quality of police operations. The report reflects our view that this is an ongoing process, and we invite our students, faculty, staff, and campus community to help us use it as a tool of engagement as we follow the recommendations of Robinson/Edley and the many other recommendations we have received from our community.  

Sincerely,  

Linda P.B. Katehi  
Chancellor  

/
The University of California, Irvine, takes great pride in the fact that many of the recommendations in the Civil Disobedience Initiative had been included as part of the campus culture well before this initiative began. Our constructive engagement model, which has been in place for several years, emphasizes a collaborative, cooperative working relationship that is a hallmark of UCI. There exists an integrated level of proactive communication and mutual respect among all the departments and divisions throughout the university that facilitates the incorporation of these principles. At the same time, this review and assessment through the CDI process has provided an opportunity for UCI to improve and enhance a number of policies and procedures and to make additional efforts in engaging our student body to provide the best possible student experience and education. UCI has established our foremost commitment to meeting the recommendations of the Robinson/Edley Report and to foster the rights and responsibilities of free speech within its campus community.

To address UC Irvine’s efforts in meeting these recommendations, the campus has established two work groups. The first is organized under the Advisory Council for Campus Climate, Culture and Inclusion and is chaired by Daniel Wehrenfennig, director of the Olive Tree Initiative and the Program in Conflict Analysis and Resolution at UCI. The work group is titled Constructive Engagement, Policing and Crisis Response. Members include two faculty members, several administrators, a law professor, an assistant dean, a graduate student, several undergraduate students and the Police Chief. The second group is the UCI administrative work group, including senior administrators from the Office of the Chancellor, Office of Campus Counsel, Office of the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Office of the Dean of Students, and Administrative and Business Services. In addition, the work product, documents and reports have been shared with leadership of both the Associated Student (ASUCI) and Associated Graduate Student (AGS) leadership councils.

As noted above, UCI had engaged in many of the Robinson/Edley Report recommendations well in advance of this report. As an example, UCI has been involved in the practice of constructive engagement for many years. This practice involves the active participation, coordination and communication with students, staff, administrators, faculty and UCI Police to address concerns and issues in a proactive manner. In another example, UCI has regularly activated an event planning team, which includes representatives from Scheduling and Conference Services, Dean of Students, Office of Communications, Student Affairs, student leadership and UCI Police, to effectively manage high-profile events, including known demonstrations or protests. The event planning team uses the concept of the Incident Command System (ICS) to manage events on campus and works in conjunction with the Chancellor’s Executive Policy Group (CEPG) to address key issues and crises when appropriate.

While recognizing the success of many of these past efforts, it is important to note the many tangible and meaningful changes UCI has implemented stemming from the recommendations of the Robinson/Edley Report. The following list summarizes many of the existing practices and notes the changes, along with how they have impacted the campus:
The constructive engagement model is a key component in meeting many of the Robinson/Edley Report recommendations, including facilitating free speech. In general, this is a cross-divisional event planning process to promote constructive, active engagement with the students and among the campus offices responsible for managing student leadership development, community safety and the use of university facilities. There are five principles:

- Active engagement
- Deliberate socialization
- Unique teachable moments
- Collaborative cross-directional planning
- Mutual permeable boundaries

The foundations for effective constructive engagement include:

- Personal engagement of students and all other participants
- Community safety
- Care of university facilities

UC Irvine’s commitment to building authentic, open dialogue with students is the foundation for our constructive engagement model. We approach each moment as a teaching moment for our students and for ourselves. Student engagement is the responsibility of every administrator and staff member and requires a campuswide dedication complementing the leadership provided by the Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs. Some of the key efforts by UC Irvine are:

- Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs (VCSA) meets biweekly with the President of Associated Students to review plans and programs addressing news, issues and events.
- The Associate VCSA attends the weekly Associated Students Legislative Council meeting.
- Senior staff attends all undergraduate and graduate student association meetings. Other staff members attend as requested.
- Members of Chancellor’s Cabinet, the Chair of the Academic Senate, the Chair of the Academic Senate Committee on Student Experience, the Deans of Undergraduate and Graduate Divisions, the Dean of Students, the UCI Chief of Police and other key university staff meet monthly with the leadership of Associated Student and Graduate Student Association leadership to discuss issues, share information and define opportunities for students on campus.
- The Assistant Vice Chancellor and Dean of Students have a Student Life Advisory Group composed of 25-plus student leaders.
- The Chancellor, VCSA and/or other senior staff meet quarterly with student newspaper editors and reporters to discuss issues and campus news.
- Student Affairs employs more than 50 percent of all students working on campus, and regardless of the student’s role—intern, employee, volunteer, resident assistant—the division strives to provide each student with core competencies in administrative skills, ethical decision making, interpersonal development, valuing diversity and social responsibility.
• The Vice Chancellor for Budget meets with elected student government and student organization leaders and invites other students to meet with her to provide information on the UC and campus budget process.

• Student Life and Leadership hosts the annual fall student leadership retreat for more than 240 current and emerging student leaders, with most key officials, including the Chancellor and other senior administrators, either attending or presenting at the conference. This year’s conference will focus on the constructive engagement effort.

• Leaders from all 599 student organizations are required to participate in an annual online orientation managed by the Student Life & Leadership team.

• As needed, special websites are created to provide up-to-date information on critical issues. Each site will include context for the issue, where to attend programs and public forums to learn and discuss the topic, statements by university officials, and educational information, including UC research or public policy on the topic.

• The VCSA holds open office hours three times a quarter.

• The VCSA and Student Affairs senior leadership attend hundreds of student-sponsored events each year as participants, presenters and guests.

• The Chancellor and Vice Chancellor, along with other senior members, participate in a variety of events involving diverse sets of students (ethnic, LGBT, religious, political, etc.), including fall welcoming events, student-initiated outreach programs, campus cultural traditions and celebrations.

• The Chancellor, VCSA, Dean of Undergraduate Education and Dean of Students all teach undergraduate classes.

• The VCSA walks the campus to talk with students. If there are student-sponsored events that have a high interest from the community, he will engage the student organizers to learn of their desired outcomes for the program.

• The VCSA, Associate VCSA and/or the Dean of Students visit with students staging a public street theater protest to learn about the desired outcomes for the event.

• Students hosting events and programs on topics of high public interest and potential controversy are required to meet with any one or all of the following offices so that the campus can learn how it may support the event goals while keeping within policies and procedures: Scheduling and Conference Services, Dean of Students, UCI Police and Office of the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs.

• Student Housing professionals hold small-group training sessions, community education, groups meetings, conversation hours and town halls to instill the living-learning community practices to create a culture of mutual respect and appreciation.

• GUSH (Government in Undergraduate Student Housing) is the housing student government body that meets regularly with senior housing administrators.

• The Chancellor and his wife host quarterly dinners with students at Tierney House and University House.

• The Chancellor meets regularly with student leaders to discuss campus life and areas of concern.

• Student Affairs supports and funds a wide array of town halls, special events and programs designed and implemented by students to address the issues and topics identified as critical by students.

• Use of university properties and free speech pamphlets are distributed to each student at new-student orientation programs outlining time, place and manner policies and student rights.

• The VCSA, Dean of Students and/or the Associate VCSA reach out to students and student organizations with concerns about campus climate. Student Affairs works to quickly provide support to explore the concerns through a town hall, group meeting or information sessions to bring the facts forward and to provide a channel of communication for voices of apprehension.
The UC Irvine Police Department is committed to active student engagement and community involvement as noted in its mission statement:

The UC Police Department actively collaborates with our community to create a safe and secure campus through education, problem solving and enforcement. We use innovative practices, technology, continuing training and partnerships to provide professional police services to prevent, prepare for, respond to and recover from all criminal activity, hazards and threats. In doing so, we foster and maintain an environment that supports the well-being of our students, faculty, staff and visitors at UCI.

The police department participates in the university’s constructive engagement model and strives for open and authentic dialogue with UCI students. Student engagement is encouraged and expected of all members of the police department. Some of the key efforts by UCIPD include:

- The UCI Chief of Police, along with the Chancellor and other university staff and faculty leaders, meets monthly with the leadership of Associated Students and Graduate Student Association to discuss issues, share information and define opportunities for students on campus.
- The Police Chief meets regularly with the Chancellor's chief of staff to review and discuss issues of importance and interest.
- The Police Chief is a member of UCI's Mental Health Initiative Committee, which includes participation from students, staff and faculty, and reports to the EVC/Provost.
- The Police Chief serves as a presenter in the university’s Diversity Development program, the Orientation and Professional Training Program, Department Team Building Workshops, Managing Distress Workshops for staff and faculty, New Athlete Orientations and a wide range of student, staff and faculty lectures and meetings.

- The Police Chief and employees of the police department are active members of UCI’s Coordinated Community Response Team and participate in many events and activities throughout the year such as Take Back the Night, Denim Day, Stalking Awareness, RAD Training, Champs, White Ribbon Campaign, Bystander Intervention, the Green Dot program and others.
- The Police Chief is an active participant in the LGBT’s Transgender Taskforce.
- The police department’s command staff meets quarterly with the ASUCI and AGS leadership council.
- The police department is a key member of the Campus Assault Response Team in managing sexual assault, domestic and dating violence, and stalking.
- The police department participates on the UCI Consultation Team for behavior assessment, resource coordination and threat management.
- Student Life and Leadership hosts the annual fall student leadership retreat for more than 240 current and emerging student leaders with members of the PD command staff attending or presenting at the conference.
- The police department manages CLERY training for over 500 student employees, staff and faculty.
- The police department has received student and staff-led training in Islam 101, LGBT issues and other diversity-specific topics.
- The Police Chief and command staff regularly meet with leaders of many student groups. They actively engage the students in a wide variety of issues and concerns and work to develop professional relationships and mutual respect with the student community. Many student leaders reach out to the UCIPD as part of their planning for programs and protests.
• The police department employs about 35 students as community service officers. These student workers operate the Safety Escort Program, conduct security patrols, help manage athletic and special events, and provide safety and crime prevention education efforts. Police staff regularly mentor and educate these students in policing operations and career opportunities.

• The police department has a corporal assigned as a liaison with the Cross Cultural Center, and the corporal meets with students and staff from the center on a regular basis.

• Any time a special event is planned on campus, the special event sergeant meets with student groups or outside groups organizing the event and discusses with them ways to ensure their event occurs without any issues or disruptions.

• An officer has been assigned as a liaison with the Department of Social Ecology (Criminal Justice) for the specific purpose of mentoring students and encouraging them to become police officers at UCIPD. Nearly 30 percent of the officers who work at UCIPD are UCI graduates.

• UCIPD has established a social media presence on Facebook, Twitter and Nixle for the specific purpose of providing timely information to the campus community, including crime trend information, emergency management information and crime prevention tips. This same information is also posted on the UCIPD website.

• A sergeant is assigned as a liaison to the English as Second Language students and provides safety presentations several times a year to the students. UCIPD has officers who are fluent in five languages other than English and conduct presentations in those languages.

• A sergeant is assigned as a liaison with the Greek Life organizations on campus and has quarterly meetings with the leaders of those groups.

• UCIPD participates with the Student Affairs office in a restorative justice program at UCI and has established an administrative citation process for managing discipline issues through the Office of Student Conduct.

• UCIPD has divided the UCI campus into three zones and assigned patrol sergeants, corporals and officers to each of those zones. Each sergeant, corporal and officer has the responsibility of developing and maintaining a working relationship with the zone captains, building coordinators, floor wardens, housing assistants or resident assistants, and student groups in their zone.

• A sergeant is assigned as the student housing liaison and regularly meets with housing management staff to discuss issues and problems. This sergeant coordinates meetings, training and activities between housing residential and community advisers at the beginning of every school year and throughout as appropriate.
The police department has specifically addressed several of the Robinson/Edley Report recommendations as follows:

- The hiring and promotional processes for the police department include students, staff and faculty on the interview panels and town hall presentations. In the current hiring process for police officers, four students and two staff members are included on the panels.
- The UCI Police Chief personally interviews all final candidates for all full-time positions within the police department and includes an extensive discussion of the unique culture in a campus environment.

Training has been and will continue to be conducted at all of the following levels:

- All sworn officers and supervisors have received at least 30 hours of training in the past two years in crowd management, use of force, control techniques and verbal de-escalation techniques.
- Additional train the trainer and advanced instruction has been provided to specific supervisors and commanders.
- Emergency Operations management, Incident Command System and Chancellor’s Executive Policy Group training and exercises have been conducted within the SEMS and NIMS guidelines.
- Joint training sessions and planning exercises have included Irvine PD, Newport Beach PD and the Orange County Fire Authority.
- UCIPD is fully participating in the Orange County Mobile Field Force training effort and has taken a leadership role in this project.

One area of change for UCI is the development of a formal Event Management Team (EMT) policy. While UCI has engaged an informal event planning team for significant and high-profile events, there were no specific policies or procedures in place. This formalized policy has now been developed. Key objectives are noted as follows:

- Provide executive administrative leadership oversight and direction before and/or during significant special events, protests, demonstrations or other similar events that could have a major impact on campus operations.
- Implement Incident Command System protocols and identify a senior administration leader as Incident Commander.
- Coordinate planning, communications and decision making before and during such special events.
- Engage student leadership to proactively address student interests, issues or concerns.
- Stay informed of emerging issues and monitor campus climate topics that may impact regular operations.
- Provide context-specific advice/counsel to the Chancellor’s Executive Policy Group (CEPG) and other key leaders and decision makers across campus and serve as a connection point for issues.
- Conduct regular assessments of campus practices with regard to special event planning and management.
- Keep the CEPG apprised of key areas of concern.
The Event Management Team Policy also incorporates all of the Robinson/Edley Report recommendations regarding managing protests and demonstrations.

UCI is addressing several areas in moving forward. First, the formalizing of the Event Management Team will require some degree of more definitive organization and the calendaring of meetings. This effort is now in process. Second, UCI Student Affairs is conducting the All U Leadership Conference for student organization leaders in October. A portion of this conference will include training and discussion on free speech issues and constructive engagement. Third, UCI is working on a tutorial training guide for all incoming undergraduate and graduate students on civility and positive engagement, including education on UCI’s values of respect, intellectual curiosity, integrity, commitment, empathy, appreciation and fun. Lastly, the Constructive Engagement, Policing and Crisis Response work group has been established on a permanent basis and will continue to meet and assess UCI’s efforts in meeting the Robinson/Edley Report recommendations into the future.

Over the past few years UCI has experienced hundreds of protests and demonstrations covering a wide range of issues and concerns. During 2011 and 2012, UCIPD responded and handled 71 such events without significant or problematic outcome. In each of these circumstances, university staff from Student Affairs, Scheduling and Conference Services, Human Relations, faculty and UCI administration convened together to assess and effectively manage these events. UCI recognizes its role as a leading academic institution with significant responsibilities to ensure the freedom of speech within legal parameters while protecting the health and safety of students, staff, faculty and the general public. We are committed to these efforts.
Office of the Chancellor

510 Aldrich Hall
Irvine, CA 92697-1900
(949) 824-5111
(949) 824-2087 FAX

November 18, 2013

President Janet Napolitano
University of California
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, California 94607

Dear President Napolitano:

We hereby certify that all the Robinson/Edley Report recommendations that were finalized and accepted through the Civil Disobedience Initiative have been implemented or are in the process of being implemented at the University of California, Irvine. Our campus takes great pride in the fact that many of the recommendations in the Civil Disobedience Initiative were included as part of the campus culture well before this initiative began and are reflected in our campus values.

Wendell C. Brase
Vice Chancellor
Administrative & Business Services

Michael V. Drake, M.D.
Chancellor

Thomas A. Parham
Vice Chancellor
Student Affairs
The UCLA community has a long history of working to achieve mutual understanding and respect throughout the campus by focusing on building collaborative partnerships among campus departments, student groups and individuals. All involved campus departments are committed to meeting the recommendations of the Robinson/Edley Report and the Civil Disobedience Initiative. The UCLA community understands the need to move forward and improve, and we are confident our implementations of the Robinson/Edley Report recommendations will help us accomplish that purpose. In addition to recommended practices that UCLA followed prior to the report being issued, the campus has undertaken tangible and meaningful changes as a result of the Robinson/Edley Report recommendations.

At UCLA, events involving discussion and debate of ideas and social issues, even conflict itself, are seen as an opportunity for awareness and a component of the developmental process. With a foundation of shared long-term objectives as envisioned by the Student Affairs’ True Bruin Values and the police department’s Core Values, the implementation efforts for the Robinson/Edley Report recommendations become a continuation and enhancement of current campus practices.

The UCLA campus understands and embraces the value of open lines of communication and strong relationships within the community. Policies concerning free speech and time, place, and manner guidelines are easily accessible from the police department and Student Affairs websites, and links to applicable systemwide policies are also clearly identified. The clear communication practices include handouts and flyers for demonstration participants that explain applicable laws and policies and what the participants can expect from other campus entities such as the police department. Regarding access to the Chancellor and the university administration, programs such as the Chancellor’s office hours provide opportunities for students to interact with the Chancellor; UCLA Staff Assembly cohosts Breakfast with the Chancellor, allowing staff members to dine and speak freely with the Chancellor; and the UCLA Academic Senate continues to be an avenue for faculty members to express their opinions on matters of campus concern. A myriad of other opportunities exist for members of the campus community to exchange information.

The Robinson/Edley Report made several recommendations regarding the defining of roles in response to incidents of civil disobedience. UCLA has had and continues to have policies in place that clearly define administrator and police roles in incidents of civil disobedience. The incident response team, consisting of administrators from the police department, Student Affairs, the Academic Senate, Legal Affairs, Human Resources, Community and Public Outreach, Campus Life and the Chancellor’s office, plans and oversees the campus’s response to demonstrations, in part by attempting to determine whether particular incidents are acts of civil disobedience merits a response and by providing input on the appropriate response, if needed. UCLA has a long tradition of administrators, faculty and Student Affairs working together on site with the police department to coordinate and strategize responses. These relationships are critical to maintaining university operations while providing for the safety of everyone involved and preserving individuals’ constitutional rights during civil disobedience incidents.

The police department continuously assesses all demonstrations and incidents of civil disobedience. Such occasions are coordinated by established Incident Command System guidelines, which include provisions for mutual aid of both local police and police from other UC campuses. UCLA communicates regularly with local mutual aid law enforcement agencies, and when advance planning allows, arrangements are made to seek mutual aid first from the police departments of other UC campuses.
Hiring and training of police officers was another area that the Robinson/Edley Report addressed. The UCLA Police Department currently involves community members in the promotion/hiring processes of sergeant and command-level positions, and the Chief of Police personally interviews every new police officer candidate prior to final hiring. UCLA police officers are highly trained in areas of crowd management, mediation and communications skills by a variety of in-person and Internet-based training programs. A UCPD Systemwide Response Team (SRT) has been created, and the UCLA Police Department is a founding member. Participants on the UCPD SRT receive additional specialized training in areas such as crowd control, crowd management and police use-of-force. Training at UCLA doesn't just involve the police department; campus administrators regularly participate in training in the form of table-top exercises and scenario drills. More formal training is planned for senior campus administrators on an annual basis to expose the administrators to crowd management techniques, mediation, de-escalation, the Incident Command System and police force options. Such training will better equip campus administrators to make appropriate decisions at incidents in the future.

The UCLA campus believes that open communication among police, administrators, protesters and the campus community assists in ensuring safe events and preventing misunderstandings. UCLA Student Affairs has increased outreach efforts, through websites and newsletters to student organizations and the community, in order to ensure that students are aware that Student Affairs is prepared to assist them in support of their First Amendment rights. The Intergroup Dialogues program, an effective alternative for addressing hot button issues, has been expanded. Student Affairs proactively reaches out to demonstration organizers before their event to strategize on how to make their event safe. Student Affairs advises the organizers on other options to accomplish the demonstration goals, such as alternative methods of communication other than a protest, and they will facilitate delivery of messages to administration when appropriate. Student Affairs provides the organization with a copy of police protocol and applicable campus policies, and they begin a dialogue in support of the organization. They staff events and provide a conduit to the police by taking the lead and acting as the primary university representative with whom the organizers can communicate during events. The Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs, the Associate Vice Chancellor of Student & Campus Life, or the Executive Director of Recreation & Student Activities attend or are represented at all demonstrations. Student Affairs and the police department work closely together, allowing a seamless transition if and when a police response is required.

UCLA uses the Internet, social media and the Bruin Alert System, an email and text-based alert system, to quickly send information to over 60,000 students, faculty and staff members to promptly inform the campus community of ongoing protests or incidents.
UCPD is a founding member of USAC’s Campus Safety Alliance, which is chaired by the student government’s internal vice president and consists of representatives from varied student organizations and campus services. Police officers serve as mentors for student athletes and are involved in student activities, from safety fairs and presentations to theme weeks and special projects. The Cultural Awareness Workshop program, founded by UCPD police officers, has enabled groups of officers and students to participate in a workshop that provides opportunities to talk about policing and issues of the represented communities. These workshops particularly address areas of concern such as racial profiling, where students and police officers can learn more from each other about their particular issues and concerns. Students are routinely invited on police ride-alongs, and many student government leaders have taken advantage of the invitations. A majority of UCPD officers are former students themselves, with over 60 percent of the sworn personnel having earned bachelor’s or master’s degrees. In addition, 40 percent of the sworn personnel who are college graduates are UCLA alumni.

For significant incidents occurring at UCLA, UCPD completes after-action reports that are reviewed by police supervisors and the campus incident response team on a periodic basis. When needed, a civilian staff member video records protests for evidentiary and/or training purposes. On a systemwide level, UCLA Police Department managers and staff have played a major role in establishing the UCPD SRT for activation and response to major demonstrations and critical events on all UC campuses. The UCLA Chief of Police has actively worked with the UC Council of Chiefs to develop and implement consistent systemwide policies for crowd management and use of force.
Ongoing campus efforts to implement the Robinson/Edley Report recommendations include continued community outreach efforts and improved training opportunities for the UCLA police officers and campus administrators. The police officer training concentrates on changes in policies and tactics that apply to crowd management and large demonstrations, all of which incorporate the recommendations from the Civil Disobedience Initiative. Training for campus administrators focuses on the Incident Command System and practical exercises to ensure good communication and effective partnerships during these challenging events. Moving into the future, UCLA remains committed to free expression while also protecting the health and safety of students, faculty, staff, the police and the general public.
President Janet Napolitano
Office of the President
University of California
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607

Dear President Napolitano:

I hereby certify that all the Robinson/Edley Report recommendations that were finalized and accepted through the Civil Disobedience Initiative have been implemented or are in the process of being implemented at the University of California, Los Angeles.

Sincerely,

Gene D. Block
Chancellor

October 23, 2013
Introduction
As the University of California’s smallest (fall 2013 enrollment, 6,195) and newest campus (opened in 2005), UC Merced does not have a history of protests or civil disobedience. Over the past eight years, we have worked to create a culture of communication and collaboration between the Chancellor and senior Student Affairs staff and our students. We interact frequently, attempt to address concerns before they become contentious and have found having policies that are quite general, rather than too specific, has provided us with greater flexibility when issues do arise.

The Civil Disobedience Initiative, however, has given the leadership of the campus the opportunity to review best practices from across the UC system and to put into place some procedures, training and mechanisms that could be helpful in managing protests or civil disobedience incidents that may arise in the future.

It also has allowed us to publically reaffirm our commitment to free speech and peaceful assembly, which is discussed prominently in our Protocol for Responding to Peaceful Assembly or Protest on the Property of the University of California, Merced. In addition, the charter for our Events Response Team includes the following principle: “UC Merced’s leadership is committed to protecting the free speech rights of students, faculty and staff and will work to ensure that lawful and peaceful assemblies are supported and encouraged on campus.” That said, the leadership understands we must ensure that the normal academic, research and administrative activities must be carried out in an environment that is safe and free from intimidation or harassment.

Review Process
To oversee the implementation of the recommendations included in the Robinson/Edley Report and growing out of the Civil Disobedience Initiative, our campus created a committee comprising Associate Chancellor Janet Young (now retired), Assistant Vice Chancellor for Communications Patti Waid, Police Chief Rita Spaur and Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs Jane Lawrence, who was designated by Chancellor Leland as UC Merced’s campus point of contact for CDI.

This committee met regularly to review and formulate UC Merced appropriate responses to the recommendations of the Robinson/Edley Report. The committee, along with the senior leadership of the campus, believes that the Robinson/Edley Report and recommendations should be seen as a guide and that each campus should be allowed flexibility in implementation of the recommendations based upon that campus’s context and history. UC Merced’s context is unique among the system, given our short history, student culture, and infrequency and small size of protests.

The committee also, through the auspices of the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, has been able to reach out to offices across campus and to students about these issues. A priority for the committee was ensuring that the campus protocol for responding to peaceful assembly or protest on the property of the University of California, Merced approved and issued by Chancellor Leland in 2012 was maintained as the principle policy for the campus.

Throughout the past year, Vice Chancellor Lawrence kept Chancellor Leland and campus leadership informed about and, as appropriate, involved in decision making about UC Merced’s responses to recommendations. Chancellor Leland, Vice Chancellor Lawrence, Police Chief Spaur and Associate Vice Chancellor and Dean of Students Nies attended the executive training program held at the Claremont Hotel in March 2013. Subsequently, the campus sent 16 staff members to the trainings offered by the Office of the President. The trainings have allowed UC Merced staff at multiple levels and in critical leadership positions on our campus to better understand the range of issues that need to be addressed and responded to prior to, during and following a large protest or civil disobedience event.
Recommendations
UC Merced has responded to and complied with all of the recommendations that are the responsibility of a campus rather than the Office of the President. It seems appropriate, however, to highlight a few of the recommendations and their impact on the campus.

Recommendations 7, 8, 11, 12 and 13 speak directly to the creation of response teams on each campus and the importance of clarifying the role of the Chancellor and other senior leadership and the police before and during a protest. As a result of these recommendations:

- The campus Protocol for Responding to Peaceful Assembly or Protest on the Property of UC Merced was revised to reflect practices gleaned from the CDI process.
- An Event Response Team was created and members appointed.
- A charter for the Event Response Team, which clarifies roles and responsibilities, was written and approved by the Chancellor.

The membership of the Event Response Team and a copy of its charter were submitted to the Office of the President as part of the Civil Disobedience Initiative process. The Event Response Team had its first meeting on September 19, 2013. Since this meeting was held prior to the visit of President Napolitano to UC Merced, it gave the group the opportunity to discuss how we might respond to a protest and put into practice the guidelines and procedures outlined in the charter.

Recommendation 23 recommends that Event Response Teams periodically participate in simulation training. Chief Spaur is currently organizing a training exercise for the Event Response Team that will be held on December 19, 2013. Details on this training have been provided to the Office of the President as part of the CDI process.

Recommendations 8 and 13 address specifically the decision-making role of the Chancellor and other senior administrators prior to and during a protest, including the Chancellor’s involvement in a request by the police to use or escalate the force being used unless under exigent circumstances. Our campus Protocol and Event Response Team charter puts the responsibility for these decisions solely in the hands of the Chancellor: “The Chancellor has ultimate responsibility to approve strategy before and during a protest.”

Summary
UC Merced is pleased to submit this final report. The campus has fulfilled all of its responsibilities and attempted to comply with all requests made by the Civil Disobedience Initiative staff. We believe that now is the time to allow campuses to assimilate and work with new processes, to identify what may need to be modified given differences in campus culture and history, and to recommend system level efforts that may assist campus leadership and law enforcement in successfully managing major protest events.
President Janet Napolitano  
Office of the President  
University of California  
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor  
Oakland, CA 94607  

Dear President Napolitano:

I hereby certify that to the best of my knowledge all of the Robinson/Edley Repot recommendations that were finalized and accepted through the Civil Disobedience Initiative have been implemented or are in the process of being implemented at the University of California, Merced.

Our campus contact, Vice Chancellor Jane Lawrence, has been submitting required documents and information that describe the steps we have taken to respond to the recommendations. We appreciate your recognition that campus context and culture matters and that especially in the area of responding to peaceful assemblies and protests, one size does not fit all. We hope that the Office of the President will continue to give campuses the latitude to implement the recommendations as appropriate to their unique situations.

If you have any questions about our responses, please do not hesitate to contact Vice Chancellor Lawrence or me.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Dorothy Leland  
Chancellor
Executive Summary
The University of California, Riverside, is strongly committed to the values of free speech, freedom of expression, and peaceful and lawful assembly. This commitment to open dialogue and debate is at the heart of any university community, and it is a core, fundamental value at UCR.
UCR is also committed to the notion that any open exchange of ideas must occur within an environment of mutual respect.
These dual values—a commitment to free speech and discourse within an environment of civility and respect—are embodied within UCR’s Principles Guiding Speech and Assembly, which was issued in December 2012 (available at chancellor.ucr.edu/expression). The Principles Guiding Speech and Assembly provides context for UCR’s responses to the Civil Disobedience Initiative, and it clearly demonstrates UCR’s commitment to free speech and expression within a university setting that welcomes, encourages and respects differing points of view.

UCR Leadership—Commitment to Engagement
Several foundational components and themes are found throughout the Robinson/Edley Report recommendations. An overview of these themes is as follows:

• Free Speech and Civil Disobedience—Context and Vision for Campus Dialogue and Practices Relating to Events, and Gatherings
• Engagement—Senior Leadership and UCPD with Campus Students, Staff and Faculty
• Time, Place, and Manner—Principles, Practices, and Policies Relating to Free Speech, Assembly and Civil Disobedience
• Practices Relating to Police Training and Hiring
• Event Management and Response—Clear Definitions of Practices and Approaches That Are Repeatable and Auditable

An overview of UCR’s responses to the Robinson/Edley Report recommendations is presented below. However, “engagement” is particularly important to successfully meeting the goals and objectives put forth by Robinson/Edley Report. This engagement of senior campus leadership (including police leadership) with students, faculty and staff allows for the formation of relationships, understanding of protocols and approaches, and the promotion of shared values and common understandings.
UCR has a foundational commitment to such interactions, and it has provided the campus with substantive benefits during the past decade. UCR’s Chancellor includes both the undergraduate and graduate student body presidents within his cabinet, and UCR’s chancellors have historically sought out opportunities to interact with students in a variety of ways. These interactions provide opportunities for dialogue on issues of the day, but they also create relationships that become invaluable during events that may become stressful or lead to acts of civil disobedience.
UCR’s Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs and the campus’s Dean of Students serve as models for the UC system in terms of student engagement and interaction. The Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs and Dean of Students engage students and student leadership in multifaceted ways, from regular attendance at student leadership (ASUCR) meetings, to participation at commencements and convocations, to partnering on major event planning and promotion. This commitment of senior management to regular, formal interactions with students creates an environment that is “dialogue friendly” when events occur that might result in conflict or tension.
Finally, UCR’s police department (which includes many sworn officers who are UCR graduates) actively and regularly interacts with faculty, staff and students in a variety of formal and informal ways, from ad hoc meetings to presentations during student orientation. Moreover, the UCR Police Chief interacts directly with the Chancellor and Provost on a regular basis, and these interactions create a shared understanding of police approaches, protocols and tactics.
Overview of UCR’s Responses to the Robinson/Edley Report Recommendations

Within its responses to the Robinson/Edley Report recommendations, UCR has documented both existing and new practices/initiatives in each of the categories noted above, and the campus has provided this information in a detailed submission to UCOP. A brief summary of UCR’s responses within the five broad categories noted above is as follows:

Free Speech and Civil Disobedience—Context and Vision for Campus Dialog and Practices Relating to Events and Gatherings

In December 2012, in response to both campus and UC-wide dialogue on issues relating to free speech, assembly and civil disobedience, UC Riverside’s Task Force on Speech and Assembly issued UCR’s Principles Guiding Speech and Assembly (available at chancellor.ucr.edu/expression).

The Task Force on Speech and Assembly included campus faculty, students and staff, and this group engaged in substantive dialogue concerning free speech and assembly. The Principles Guiding Speech and Assembly issued by the task force provides the context and framework guiding UCR’s responses to the Robinson/Edley Report recommendations. The following notes are taken from the document’s introduction:

A core value of the University of California, Riverside, is to provide a safe, nurturing and enabling environment for faculty, students, and staff to freely pursue the academic mission of teaching and learning, research and creative activity, and engagement with the broader community through outreach and service. Of equal importance are the business and operational activities that enable the academic mission to be executed.

UC Riverside is committed to the belief that free speech, expression and peaceful and lawful assembly are rights that must be protected, valued, and encouraged. Peaceful protest, while assuring an ongoing opportunity for the expression of a variety of viewpoints, is one form of the rich debate and dialogue that are at the heart of a university community. The campus is equally committed to the responsibility and accountability that must accompany the exercise of these rights.

Engagement—Senior Leadership and UCPD with Campus Students, Staff and Faculty

- This document has already noted several examples of engagement that currently occur between campus leadership and UCR’s faculty, staff and students. In addition to those already highlighted, UCR has also implemented the following:
  - The VCSA will make time, place and manner information available during orientation (via the UCR student portal) and will highlight this information for all students during the fall quarter (again, through the UCR student portal).
  - UCR’s police leadership will dialogue with ASUCR and GSA at least annually concerning assembly, civil disobedience, respect and civility, etc.
  - The Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs, Vice Chancellor of Business and Administrative Services, and the Chancellor’s Office will host periodic discussions of First Amendment, free speech and other issues at the UCR campus. These discussions will be led by the Office of General Counsel. The discussions will be open forum, and faculty, staff and students will be invited.
Time, Place and Manner—Principles, Practices and Policies Relating to Free Speech, Assembly and Civil Disobedience

• As noted above, UCR has issued its Principles Guiding Speech and Assembly, documentation that formally presents UCR’s commitment to free speech and assembly within a campus environment of mutual respect and civility (available at http://chancellor.ucr.edu/messages/scotmail.html).

• Additionally, for scheduled events, UCR has a time, place and manner procedure/process, including access to professional staff, that enables faculty, staff and students to plan events in a fashion that accommodates protests but within the law and campus policy; please see the General Provision section available at http://hub.ucr.edu/EventScheduling/Pages/SchedulingPolicies.aspx.

Practices Relating to Police Training and Hiring

• UCR provides its police officers substantial training from a variety of sources, and it formally invites and includes faculty, staff and students on officer search committees. More information concerning these efforts may be found within UCR’s detailed responses/submission.

Event Management and Response—Clear Definitions of Practices and Approaches That Are Repeatable and Auditable

• The Robinson/Edley Report recommendations provide input and guidance relating to how events and gatherings (in particular, those that might lead to acts of civil disobedience) should be optimally managed. The objective of these recommendations is to ensure, to the extent possible, that practices are adopted that facilitate dialogue with event participants, and use alternative dispute resolution techniques and other approaches that obviate the need for direct police involvement or the use of police force.
To: Kim Wilcox, Chancellor
From: Charles Rowley, Interim Vice Chancellor, Business and Administrative Services
Date: October 24, 2013
Regarding: Robinson / Edley Civil Disobedience Initiative (CDI) Recommendations

The University of California (UC) has produced a suite of recommendations to better prepare campuses for incidents of civil disobedience (the report was prepared by UC’s Chief Counsel and the Dean of UC Berkeley’s Law School). As you know, the recommendations are far reaching and address the following broad themes:

- **Free Speech and Civil Disobedience** – Providing Context and Vision for Campus Dialog and Practices relating to Events, and Gatherings
- **Engagement** – Senior Leadership and UCPD with campus Students, Staff, and Faculty
- **“Time, Place, and Manner”** – Principles, Practices, & Policies relating to Free Speech, Assembly, and Civil Disobedience
- **Practices relating to Police Training and Hiring**
- **Event Management and Response** – Clear Definitions of Practices and Approaches that are Repeatable and Auditable

Attached to this memo, please find an overview of UCR’s responses to the Robinson / Edley recommendations. These responses have been vetted with various campus stakeholders, including UCR’s Deans and Vice Chancellors as well as faculty and student leadership. While UCR’s responses will of course evolve over time, the Office of the President is requesting your affirmation that the Robinson / Edley report recommendations have been implemented, or are in the process of being implemented, at UC Riverside.

On a final note, there were many individuals who contributed to formulating and documenting UCR’s responses to the Robinson / Edley recommendations. While I can’t mention everyone here, please let me thank Police Chief Mike Lane, Assistant Chief John Fesce, CFAO Georgianne Carlson, and Analyst Karen Springer who provided invaluable support throughout the entire Civil Disobedience Initiative process. During the past year, there were many competing priorities for their time, and I am therefore extraordinarily grateful for their contributions relating to this important process / project.
Affirmation that the Robinson / Edley Report recommendations, associated with the Civil Disobedience Initiative, have been implemented, or are in the process of being implemented, at UC Riverside. UCR also affirms that future recommendations will be considered and implemented in a manner consistent with the campus process used to implement the Robinson/Edley recommendations.

Kim A. Wilcox, Chancellor

cc:    Dallas Rabenstein, Provost
       Mike Lane, Chief of Police
       John Freese, Assistant Chief of Police
       Georgianne Carlson, CFO, Business and Administrative Services
       Karen Springer, Analyst, BAS Shared Services Group
UC San Diego is consistently ranked among the best universities in America and most recently ranked in the top 10 public universities by *U.S. News and World Report*. As a result, we recognize and appreciate the responsibility we have to manage civil disobedience in the least intrusive manner possible in order to continue to build on that legacy.

We understand there is always room for improvement, and we continue to develop new methods of managing significant issues such as those described in the recommendations from the Robinson/Edley Report and implemented through the Civil Disobedience Initiative (CDI). We possess a full understanding of the recommendations and in most cases were already performing them as regular practice prior to the CDI. That said, we have embraced the recommendations as an opportunity to reaffirm our commitment to provide our students, faculty, staff and community with an environment that will enable them to safely pursue their individual goals and activities. Whether they seek a quality education, employment opportunities, cutting-edge research, advanced patient care or an enduring appreciation of the arts, they can feel safe to do so at one of America’s finest universities, UC San Diego.

At UC San Diego, approaches used to prevent unintentional violation of campus policies and the law include educating students about their rights and responsibilities involving speech and expressive activities using the online resource [http://freespeech.ucsd.edu](http://freespeech.ucsd.edu). This website includes an FAQ on topics such as civil disobedience. It contains a summary of the UCSD speech policy and the forms of expressive activities that violate campus policies. It includes a section on ways students can respond to speakers or events they disagree with in a manner that does not violate campus policies or the law.

The free speech website has a link to UCSD’s policy on Free Speech, Advocacy, and Distribution of Literature on University Grounds (PPM 510, Section 9). The policy describes the approach the university uses to respond to speech and expressive activities in violation of the campus policy. Per this policy, “When enforcing this policy, UC San Diego officials authorized to maintain order on the campus shall make a reasonable attempt to warn and advise a university affiliate to cease or modify the prohibited conduct or activity before imposing university sanctions and/or applying appropriate law enforcement measures for violation of this policy, except where the conduct violating this policy reasonably appears to create a threat to or endanger health, safety, or property.”

The free speech website also has a link to Section 16 (Expression and Advocacy) of UC San Diego Policies and Procedures Applying to Student Activities. This section explains the procedures the university uses to respond to speech and/or advocacy on the university grounds, including violations of campus policies.

UCSD also maintains a resource for student organizations planning events that may generate opposition, including a protest, which describes how student organizations can work with the university to ensure the event occurs without disruption and the violation of university policies and the law.
Student engagement is the responsibility of every administrator and all staff members, and requires a campuswide dedication complementing the leadership provided by the Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs. Some of the key efforts by UC San Diego are as follows:

- Chancellor and Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs have standing meetings with the president of the Associated Students and Graduate Student Association.
- Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs hosts twice-quarterly lunches with student leaders, for a total of six lunches a year, at the UC San Diego Faculty Club for the purpose of developing relationships between the university administration and our student leaders and within the student leadership group.
- Director of Associated Students Administration attends the weekly Associated Students Council meeting. Other staff members attend depending on the council agenda and as requested.
- Assistant Vice Chancellor of Student Life has standing meetings with the presidents of the Associated Students and the Graduate Student Association.
- Deans of Students from each undergraduate college attend the weekly College Council meetings.
- Students appointed by Associated Students and the Graduate Student Association serve on 24 standing university committees.
- Undergraduate and graduate students serve on the Student Conduct Standards Group, which reviews all proposed changes to the Student Conduct Regulations.
- Student Life advises and provides funding support to the UCSD Guardian, the campus newspaper.
- The UCSD policy on speech, advocacy and distribution of literature was developed by a committee composed of undergraduate and graduate students appointed by the Associated Students and Graduate Student Association.
- Staff of University Ombuds Office attends AS Council meetings when controversial issues are on the council agenda.
- Representatives of Student Affairs and UCSD Police Department meet and advise student organization principal members when their organization has scheduled an event that may trigger counter protests. In addition, Student Affairs staff members are present at the event, advise the student organizers and respond to any potential disruption.
- Student Affairs manages the Triton Activities Planner, a Web-based tool to help student organizations to plan and schedule their events. The TAP system is a resource for identifying potentially controversial student activities at least three weeks before they occur.
- Student Affairs administers programs for student leaders on intergroup dialogue and effective conflict resolution. Student Affairs coordinates an ongoing dialogue between Muslim and Jewish students.
- Student Affairs established a Diversity Workgroup to develop initiatives to support underrepresented students and continually improve the campus climate.
- Student Affairs has a comprehensive assessment program, which regularly conducts focus groups and surveys to identify and respond to students’ needs, interests and concerns. The program is supported by the Student Affairs Research and Information unit and Student Affairs Assessment Coalition, composed of administrators from each Student Affairs unit.
- Student Affairs employs over 800 student employees.
**Community Interaction**

- The Campus Climate Committee comprises representatives from all segments of the university and members of the community. They routinely meet to discuss campus climate and issues that can be defused well before social activism is taken. Issues related to the treatment of the historically underrepresented communities and protected classes are routinely addressed. Topical issues such as enrollment focused on enhanced diversity and campus improvement concerns (resource center development) are also reviewed. An open forum that allows groups and individuals an opportunity to discuss sensitive issues is routinely part of each meeting. Justice in Palestine week, Jewish Muslim relations, LGBT, Chicano, Latino, African American students and community members have all had an opportunity to present concerns.

- The Chancellor’s Community Advisory Group comprises community members representing a cross-section of the San Diego community. This group assists in advising the Chancellor on community concerns and issues. They routinely discuss community interface with the university (charter school operation and collaborations, enrollment, community service and outreach efforts).

Student engagement is encouraged and expected of all members of the police department. Some of the key efforts by UCSD PD include:

- The Police Chief meets with the Vice Chancellor, Resource Management & Planning to review and discuss issues of importance and interest.

- The police department is a key member of the Sexual Assault Response Team in managing sexual assault, domestic and dating violence and stalking.

- The police department participates on UCSD’s threat assessment and management team.

- The police department coordinates and manages all CLERY training for student employees, staff and faculty.

- The Police Chief has requested training from the LGBT Resource Center.

- The command staff regularly meet with leaders of a variety of student groups. They actively engage the students in a wide variety of issues and concerns, and work to develop professional relationships and mutual respect with the student community. Student leaders reach out to the UCSD PD as part of their planning for programs and protests.

- The police department employs about 60 students as community service officers. These student workers operate the Safety Escort Program, conduct security patrols, help manage athletic and special events, and provide safety and crime prevention education. Police staff regularly mentor and educate these students in policing operations and career opportunities.

- The police department has two community program corporals who are assigned to liaison with a variety of student, staff and faculty entities.

- Any time a special event is planned on campus the Specialized Services Division sworn personnel meets with student groups or outside groups organizing the event and discusses with the groups ways to ensure their event occurs without any issues or disruptions.
Safety presentations are provided to international students on an ongoing basis.

The police department is liaison to Greek Life organizations on campus to discuss event planning and liability issues and provide feedback post event for future event planning purposes.

Unique partnership with Housing, Dining, Hospitality services provides nightly security and safety services in all residential areas via the Residential Security Officer (RSO) program. RSOS work closely with Residential Life staff to ensure the residential environment is safe and conducive to the university’s educational mission.

The UCSD Police Department has specifically addressed several of the CDI recommendations as follows:

- The hiring and promotional processes for the police department include non-department personnel from our key stakeholders including Housing and Dining, Student Affairs and Academic Affairs.
- The UCSD Police Chief personally interviews all final candidates for all full-time positions within the police department and includes an extensive discussion of the unique culture in a campus environment.

Training has been and will continue to be conducted at all of the following levels:

- All sworn officers and supervisors have received training in the past two years in advanced officer training, which includes crowd management, use of force, control techniques and verbal de-escalation techniques.
- Sworn personnel are scheduled to attend a DOJ/COPS funded train-the-trainer course in fair and impartial policing. Upon their return they will train remaining department personnel.
- Additional training and advanced instruction has been provided to specific supervisors and commanders.
- Emergency Operations management, Incident Command System and Chancellor’s Executive Policy Group training and exercises have been conducted within the SEMS and NIMS[25] guidelines.
- Joint training and planning sessions have included our neighboring partner, San Diego Police Department.
- UCSD is part of the UC systemwide response team.
UCSD has developed a formal Event Management Team charter and protocol. Key objectives are noted as follows:

- Provide executive administrative leadership oversight and direction before and/or during significant special events, protests, demonstrations or other similar events that could have a major impact on campus operations.
- Implement Incident Command System protocols.
- Coordinate planning, communications and decision making before and during such special events.
- Engage student leadership to proactively address student interests, issues or concerns.
- Stay informed of emerging issues and monitor campus climate topics that may impact regular operations.
- Provide context-specific advice/counsel to the Executive Policy Group (EPG) and other key leaders and decision makers across campus and serve as a connection point for issues.
- Conduct regular assessments of campus practices with regard to special event planning and management.
- Keep the EPG apprised of key areas of concern.

The Event Management Team protocol also incorporates CDI recommendations regarding managing protests and demonstrations, including the following:

- Develop principles to guide the EMT in determining whether particular acts of civil disobedience merit a response, and what that response might entail.
- Place an administrator on site within viewing distance of the event and with instant communication to the police Incident Commander and to the Chancellor or the Chancellor’s representative with decision-making authority.
- During the course of an event, continuously reassess objectives and the wisdom of pursuing them, in light of necessary police tactics—seek to pursue only important goals with objectively reasonable force.
- Absent exigent circumstances and in a static event, commencement or escalation of force by police will be initiated in consultation with the Chancellor or Chancellor’s representative before action is taken.
- If a demonstration or protest is planned, make every reasonable attempt to identify and contact one or more of the group leaders of the event in advance to establish lines of communication.
- In advance of the event, inform the protestors of alternate appropriate avenues of communication of their concerns or proposals.
- Absent special circumstances, assign administrators rather than police to serve as the primary university representatives to communicate with protestors during a demonstration.
- Make every reasonable attempt to establish a communication link with identified leaders or sponsors of the event; for leaderless groups, communicate broadly to the group as a whole (through social media and otherwise) until relationships form.
• Identify appropriate staff members to serve as observers of the event activities when the event is significant.

• Determine to the extent necessary or appropriate, the need to communicate to the campus community at large about material developments in ongoing protests, demonstrations or other significant events using social media or other communication means.

• Continue to review and assess the event to determine if the incident objectives or the incident action plan should be revised or modified and ensure notification to all event staff of any such changes.

• Assess the value of initiating a mediation function and consider the use of mediation as an alternative to force, before and during a protest event.

• Ensure the completion of an after-action report following any significant event that has a major impact on university operations. The after-action report is to be completed by the Incident Commander or designee and forwarded to the EMT co-chairs.

Over the past few years UC San Diego has experienced numerous protests and demonstrations that have covered a wide range of issues and concerns. These have included labor, student fees, civil rights, political disagreements, religious and ethnic issues and disruptions regarding the Occupy Movement. We have and continue to embrace a philosophy that police intervention is utilized only when absolutely necessary, and others such as Student Affairs staff are directly involved in the planning and address of all student-based acts of civil disobedience. Our community policing efforts provide a positive supportive environment where police officers are perceived as valuable helping professional members of the community.

UC San Diego is dedicated to the dissemination of information and ideas, and supports the presence of engaged scholarly, cultural and political debate. The ability of the campus community and the community at-large to engage in expressive activity is central to the identity of a public university. UC San Diego continues to promote an open atmosphere and to honor the First Amendment rights of each individual.
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Dear President Napolitano:

I hereby certify that all the Robinson-Edley Report recommendations that were finalized and accepted through the Civil Disobedience Initiative have been implemented or are in the process of being implemented at the University of California San Diego.
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Best regards,

Pradeep K. Khosla
Chancellor
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Introduction
The University of California, San Francisco (UCSF), is committed to the exercise of free speech as protected by the First Amendment and to upholding the Constitutional rights and freedoms of all people while meeting our responsibilities to maintain a safe and secure campus environment where learning, research, patient care, and the free and robust exchange of ideas can thrive.

UCSF has embraced its responsibilities to evaluate and implement the spirit and intent of the Robinson/Edley Report recommendations to best support and facilitate the expression of protected speech while integrating protocols and policy within UCSF campus and public safety operations. UCSF has supported this effort through leadership with the UC Chiefs of Police Council, UC Student Affairs Leadership Council, through participation as a member of the Civil Disobedience Advisory Committees and Workgroups and as part of the systemwide Crisis Leadership Training development team. Additionally, UCSF has experimented and served as a “living lab” for implementation of selected recommendations given the planning and crowd management opportunities attendant to the UC Regents meetings supported by UCSF Police.

Lessons learned from this living lab experiment have been shared and integrated into CDI work group discussions and policy positions and UCSF policies and protocols.

Civil Disobedience Initiative Value
In reflecting on the efforts of the past year, we find the Civil Disobedience Initiative and related work has added significant value in how we understand, plan, engage and respond to crisis incidents as a campus leadership team. Key elements of significant added value have included:

Crisis Leadership and Accountability
- The systemwide executive crisis leadership training was effective in highlighting crisis leadership responsibilities, decision-making skills, relationships, organizational dependencies and crisis communication needs that are now top of mind. This enhanced mindfulness has improved early inclusion of key partners in problem identification, resolution and communication while also more keenly defining roles and accountability. Process tools including the Policy Group Crisis Management Team, Special Event Team and Strike Management annexes to the UCSF Campus Emergency Response Plan grew out of this effort.

Flexibility of Implementation
- The recognition that each campus organization, environment and demonstration is unique and requires flexibility in how the Robinson/Edley Report recommendations are implemented has been key to success. As UCSF has experimented with implementation of key recommendations—most particularly the advisor on the ground, Special Event Management Team and Student/Staff Police Observer Programs—we have developed a threshold for activation of these protocols that enables us to remain nimble in planning for and responding to minor events, while ensuring full engagement and on-site resources for events most likely to lead to civil disobedience and/or disruption of university business. Flexibility and ongoing communication at all involved levels has been key to our successful strategy.

T W E L V E - M O N T H S U M M A R Y
San Francisco
Systemwide Police Policy Improvements

- University of California Police Chiefs have worked together collaboratively to draft systemwide policy in some of the most challenging areas impacting police response to civil disobedience, including freedom of speech, use of force, crowd management, approved weapons and development of a Systemwide Police Special Response Team. In completing this work, the police chiefs have brought all 10 police departments into closer alignment in philosophy, tactical training, equipment and deployment practices thereby increasing the likelihood of consistent police leadership, response and mutual-aid preparation across the University of California system.

Student and/or Staff Police Observer Program

- In implementing a Student and/or Staff Police Observer Program, UCSF began with requiring student observers at every planned demonstration event and quickly encountered challenges in recruiting sufficient volunteers to cover the many demonstration events that occur throughout the year. Experience and the program evolved so that observers are now drawn from students and staff volunteers and are assigned to events meeting the threshold of events likely to result in civil disobedience or significant disruption in university business. Volunteer observers participate in an orientation to police crowd management and use-of-force protocols, are escorted by police for safety, document observations about events witnessed and participate in debriefing of observations. The program serves both as a method to accomplish community observance and transparency of police crowd management and to develop broader UCSF community awareness and understanding of police practices.

Key Accomplishments

During the implementation period, we have conducted an assessment of the 49 recommendations and the state of operations and readiness at UCSF. We have evaluated existing policies, protocols and operations and have incorporated the spirit and intent of the recommendations whenever they add value to our operations and are not already in place. Following are UCSF key accomplishments:

- Police response to demonstrations and crowd management and use-of-force policies have been reviewed with student government leaders, Student Affairs and campus leadership. Additionally, police have demonstrated arrest procedures for removal of passively resisting arrestees for leadership awareness and understanding of policy and techniques for control and safety of bystanders and arrestees.

- Police Operations Orders are now confidentially shared in writing with the Chancellor and Senior Vice Chancellor for Administration and Campus Counsel in advance of each major planned demonstration. Operations Orders related to UC Regents events are shared with the Regents Secretary and Senior Vice President for Business Operations. This process ensures collaboration, communication and common expectations prior to each planned event response.

- Chancellor Desmond-Hellman and Senior Vice Chancellor for Administration John Plotts are personally notified and briefed by the Chief of Police regarding the police operations plan, expected level of conflict and disturbance from demonstrations and use-of-force protocol in advance of each significant event. A threshold for personal presence of the Chancellor or designee has been determined through experience and considers the variable size and complexity of demonstration events, likelihood of civil disobedience and tolerability of disruptions of university business. The Chancellor or designee is otherwise available by cell phone as needed to problem-solve with the Chief of Police.
- Civilian observers are used at each major demonstration, including volunteer student observers and/or staff as appropriate to the event. Observers are briefed, wear identification, are escorted/protected during the demonstration and document their observations following each event. A formalized observer program protocol is now in place and is reviewed annually as part of the annual police policy review.

- After-action critique and documentation is made following each formal event—whether or not improvements or correction actions are necessary. Beginning January 2014, the campus will report the number of demonstrations requiring a police response as part of its annual police report to the community.

- Orientation regarding police demonstration management and arrest techniques has been completed for the UCSF Chancellor, Provost and Senior Vice Chancellor of Administration and Finance as well as the Secretary of the Regents. Additionally, key executive, senior leaders and Emergency Operations Center members participated in systemwide crisis leadership training, bringing the level of exposure to these important crisis management concepts to key staff at four levels of the organization.

- While students and UCSF community members have long been participants in the interview and selection processes for police managers and supervisors, they are now also included in all interview panels for sworn police officers at every level, providing valuable feedback regarding the candidate fit within the UCSF campus culture.

- Crowd management and free speech policies have been updated and are available on the Police and Student Affairs websites respectively. Additionally, a UCSF Demonstration Management protocol was developed and incorporated as an annex to the UCSF Emergency Response Plan which outlines the principles, roles and responsibilities for all UCSF members involved in responding and managing a demonstration at UCSF.

- UCSF Police and UC Systemwide Police Policies are now available to the public on the Police website and are highlighted on the home page for easy access.

- UCSF Time Place and Manner Guidelines and Special Use Rules have been updated for clarity of understanding are now available to the public on the Police and Student Affairs websites for easy public access.

- UCSF Police officers have ongoing training in crowd control and management tactics including a “soft-hands” approach applying the lowest level of force reasonable and necessary to facilitate arrest of passively resisting arrestees.

- UCSF Police officers have trained with their mutual-aid partners, including San Francisco Police and key UC campuses, to ensure coordination of tactics and procedures. All UCSF officers have been trained in low-profile arrest procedures and employ these procedures during demonstrations.

- UCSF Mediation Services are available through the UCSF Ombudsperson Program and have been made available as resources during emergency events as needed by Vice Provost Sally Marshall (now retired).

- UCSF Emergency Response Plan has been updated to include a new Policy Group Crisis Management Protocol to assist the Chancellor and UCSF senior leadership in executing their roles and responsibilities in a variety of campus crisis situations, including a significant demonstration that interferes with university operations.

- UCSF Chief Pam Roskowski, Assistant Chief Paul Berlin and Lieutenant Barney Rivera have collaborated with other UC Police leaders around the state and provided leadership in development of a UC Systemwide Police Special Response Team. SRT team leaders and members have been selected, and systemwide policy has been developed and submitted to UCOP for review and adoption.
As UC Systemwide Police Service Coordinator, UCSF Police Chief Pam Roskowski has provided leadership to the UC Council of Chiefs and facilitated development of the following systemwide police policy drafts and documents that have been submitted for UCOP approval:

- Freedom of Speech
- Use of Force
- Crowd Management, Intervention and Control
- System-wide Police Special Response Team
- Approved Weapons

As UC Systemwide Student Affairs Coordinator, former UCSF Student Affairs Vice Chancellor Joe Castro has provided leadership to the UC Council of Student Affairs Vice Chancellors in review of recommendations related to Student Affairs processes and reviewed and affirmed the current student discipline process as meeting campus needs.

- During FY 2012-13 and 2013-14 to date, in addition to demonstrations at UCSF primarily related to animal rights and labor disputes, UCSF Police have implemented and refined its crowd management protocols in managing security for 15 UC Board of Regents meetings, most with attendant demonstrations. Doing so has provided the living lab for continuous training and protocol improvement.
University of California, San Francisco
Civil Disobedience Initiative
Highlights and Final Implementation Report
October 20, 2013

Chancellor Certification

"I hereby certify that all the Robinson/Edley Report recommendations that were finalized and accepted through the Civil Disobedience Initiative have been implemented or are in the process of being implemented at the University of California San Francisco."

Susan Desmond-Hellmann, Chancellor
For the past 20 years, the response by the UC Santa Barbara campus to student demonstrations has been wholly consistent with the spirit of the Robinson/Edley Report recommendations and has largely met the letter of the recommendations, as well. However, the recommendations have provided the campus an opportunity to review its practices and make improvements in several areas. The first is the documentation of the campus’s approach to student demonstrations. The campus recently memorialized in a detailed 30-page paper its practices and philosophy relative to the First Amendment, student activism, protests and civil disobedience.

Additionally, the campus has strengthened our already extensive collaborations between administration and campus police, particularly in the area of shared trainings and exercises; has prepared a clear and concise statement to students on their First Amendment rights (available in hard copy and electronic form); and has developed a more robust method for recording events at student demonstrations. While one of the keys to our successful interactions with students has been open and transparent flow of information, the Division of Student Affairs and the campus police have used this opportunity to make existing policies and information more readily accessible to students and the public via websites and other means (pamphlets, brochures and handouts). Because the campus’s approach to communicating with students and managing protests “in the field” has, for at least two decades, mirrored the Robinson/Edley Report recommendations, the few items that needed to be addressed have been completed in accordance with the report’s recommendations.

Laying the groundwork for effective protest management involves attitude and philosophy as well as action. Quality day-to-day interactions with students set the stage for successful communication during times of heightened tension and emotion.

The tenor of our interactions with students has an impact only if we have repeated opportunities to engage with students in both informal and formal dialogue and to take part, alongside them, in the life of the campus. Visibility and accessibility are key components of positive, constructive relationships with students. At UC Santa Barbara, visibility and approachability begin with the Chancellor, who lives on campus, teaches classes and makes a point of strolling the campus and interacting with students. He stops by the dining commons and library to chat with students, attends numerous student events, including Associated Students Senate meetings, and is available for individual meetings with students, including groups of students. He and his wife are known for their open, friendly attitude toward students and have contributed significantly to defining this campus as student friendly.

Much of the same description can be applied to the Executive Vice Chancellor, who is a regular attendee at student events, respects student rights to demonstrate and invites students to meet with him on issues of concern.

Partnering with the excellent staff in Housing and Residential Services, Student Affairs has created a variety of venues in which structured, meaningful interactions with students can and do take place and in which mutual understanding can develop:

- Vice Chancellor meets biweekly with the president of Associated Students, keeping in close communication on issues and events.
- A member of the division’s executive group and, as often as possible, the Vice Chancellor attend the weekly meetings of the Student Senate.
- A member of the division’s executive group attends all meetings of the Graduate Student Association and other staff members attend as requested or needed.
- The division’s executive group members meet quarterly with the leadership of Associated Students, Graduate Student Association, and the Daily Nexus to become acquainted and discuss or preview issues before they become crises.
• A student intern works in the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, meets with the Vice Chancellor regularly, and works on a variety of projects to facilitate communication between divisional leaders and student leaders.

• Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer for the division meet weekly with the powerful Student Fee Advisory Committee (comprising undergraduate and graduate students as well as faculty and staff representatives).

• The division’s executive group attends the annual fall retreat for the Student Fee Advisory Committee during which exec members explain the work, issues and needs of the departments within the division and hear from students about their priorities and concerns.

• Divisional staff members, including the Vice Chancellor when possible, attend hundreds of student events each year as a way of showing support, making connections with students and staying current on issues.

• Vice Chancellor “officiates” at the annual Queer Wedding and, along with various members of the executive group, attends Lavender Graduation.

• Vice Chancellor along with other executive group members participates in a variety of events for students of color, including Black Graduation Celebration and other graduation events for special communities, NUF student presentations, African American leadership retreat.

• Vice Chancellor and other Student Affairs executive group members meet with the Student Regent whenever s/he is on campus.

• The Chancellor, Vice Chancellor and Student Affairs executive group members attend and support events for various “communities” of students, such as the American Indian Harvest Dinner, residence hall welcome receptions for incoming LGBT, Black, Chicano/Latino, Asian, Middle Eastern, Jewish, mixed heritage and Euro-American students, etc.

• Residential Services takes advantage of the fact that the vast majority of our incoming freshmen live in campus-owned residence halls by providing each student resident with a written document that educates students on community living, emphasizes and promotes a sense of mutual respect and appreciation, and explains the rights and responsibilities of each student, highlighting student accountability. The staff follows up with conversations in the halls about the responsibilities of community living.

• The Vice Chancellor and Student Affairs staff collaborate closely with Office of Housing and Residential Services to train the large residence hall staff and convey the values and responsibilities of being a community member. Student Affairs personnel regularly attend residence hall functions.

• Although Housing and Residential Services is not in the Division of Student Affairs, the executive director of Housing and Residential Life periodically attends meetings of the Student Affairs executive team in order to enhance collaboration and identify early any emerging student issues.

• Student Affairs sponsors quarterly dinners for leaders of special student communities, such as LGBT, veteran, African American, Chicano, Jewish, Middle Eastern, Asian, American Indian and international student communities.

• Student Affairs sponsors and SA executive group members attend an annual student leadership conference and an annual conference for students working in the Division of Student Affairs where student issues are discussed.

• Student Affairs provides money for a “Critical Issues” fund that can be accessed quickly to support presentations, panels, information sessions, etc. around current events or issues as they arise, particularly around issues that may develop into crises if not addressed in more structured venues.
The point of this list is not to be comprehensive but to demonstrate the level of accessibility to students and involvement in campus life of the Vice Chancellor and other members of the division’s leadership.

Additionally, the division’s leadership adheres to a tone for interactions with students set by the Vice Chancellor. Divisional staff members are authentic, respectful, humble and, above all, honest with students. Following the Vice Chancellor’s lead, they are always straightforward and candid with students, even when the news is not what the students want to hear. Staff members view student leaders as partners in governing the university, resolving issues and responding to student needs and concerns. The Vice Chancellor often states publicly that the A.S. president and the chair of the Student Fee Advisory Committee are his “bosses,” and he sincerely values their ideas and input, seeking their counsel and collaboration.

This campus emphasizes positive relationships and productive interactions with students. However, our students are active and do engage in demonstrations and protests on a routine basis. We recognize that protests are a common and valuable way for students to express their ideas and opinions, and we strive to help them get their message across while not violating our campus regulations. Because demonstrations are common on our campus, we have had for at least two decades a standing event response team with an established membership and pre- and post-event protocols as well as standard in-the-field practices.

The UCSB campus has made sustained progress in its efforts to enhance existing protocols, policies, plans and training in order to remain well positioned to effectively handle large campus demonstrations or acts of civil disobedience. Specific focus has been given to enhancing existing mechanisms and formalizing a mutual agreement between campus administrators and students in the form of a memo of understanding that holds each side to a set of community standards that focus on upholding the First Amendment, practicing nonviolence and encouraging civil exchange of opinions.

At UCSB we have an established internal mediation function that is staffed by trained Student Affairs professionals who are able to draw upon already-developed solid relationships with student leaders to communicate effectively and facilitate discussions between protestors and the campus. We believe strongly that using staff members who are known and trusted by students as mediators/negotiators decreases the volatility of a protest, helps to avoid adversarial posturing and sends a message that the situation is not so extreme or overwhelming that a peaceful resolution cannot be reached. Our goal is always to try to normalize the protest situation and rely on the goodwill, trust and communication that have already been established between the administration and students. When negotiations with protesting students have been undertaken in the past, Student Affairs administrators have proven up to the task of successfully communicating with students and eventually arriving at a suitable resolution for students and administrators alike.
Rarely does a demonstration at UC Santa Barbara cross the line into civil disobedience, and even more rare is a demonstration marred by violence. Despite our best efforts to encourage a lawful protest, some events do take a turn into the arena of civil disobedience. When they do, we try to meet the escalation with the lowest-level response possible—that may mean no response at all beyond the presence of a representative from Student Affairs. We try to make initial contact with almost all demonstrations at UCSB as a way of determining whether the demonstration should continue to be monitored, so in almost all cases a Student Affairs administrator is on hand and can alert colleagues and the police if the character of the demonstration changes.

At UCSB force is used as a last resort in protest situations, and the campus always attempts to give as much latitude as possible to protesting students. We recognize that many acts of civil disobedience can be tolerated, at least for a time, as long as they do not pose a safety or security threat or unduly interfere with the business of the university. We have no desire to thwart students or their efforts to communicate their stands on issues. With that said, we know from experience that demonstrations and protests go more smoothly and student goals are more often met if the administration and the campus police have an agreed-upon plan of action that includes responding to serious violations of law and campus policy.

UCSB has a robust student disciplinary process (as well as a restorative justice component) that is available should there be a determination that it is an appropriate option in responding to a student violation of campus regulations during protests and demonstrations. Any incidents of civil disobedience involving serious violations of campus regulations would be reviewed on a case-by-case basis, and the student disciplinary system would be considered and evaluated as a response option.

Additionally, the UCSB campus has formalized an observer program utilizing trained Student Affairs staff members. Specific staff members are designated to observe demonstrations, while one observer is tasked with taking notes on the demonstration as it unfolds and the response by the campus. All demonstrations are recorded in electronic logs (or databases) located in the Office of Student Life and UCPD. Descriptions of larger protests are captured in greater detail in the PD’s after-action reports and Student Affairs’ notes, which become part of the database and are also reviewed immediately by the event response team.

The Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, in collaboration with the Associate Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services and the Chief of Police, has established an annual training and exercise calendar for administrators, particularly Student Affairs staff who work with protests and campus police officers. Being launched in fall of this year, the training will address crowd management, mediation, de-escalation techniques, and use-of-force options available to police and will also include simulation exercises that give administrators and police a chance to work together through a variety of protest scenarios. Ongoing training opportunities will emphasize the roles and responsibilities of the “on-site administrator” and how that individual/individuals will interact with campus police personnel and provide clear guidance and oversight for establishing strategic objectives.
Campus police have continued to spend a considerable amount of time and resources completing a variety of trainings with an emphasis on best practices in crowd management/control techniques and de-escalation, incident command training, the most up-to-date use-of-force laws and policies, and hands-on “soft techniques.” The campus police continue to hold campuswide tabletop exercises (TTX) that involve campus, county stakeholders and allied agencies and that also conform to NIMS/ICS standards. These types of exercises serve to reinforce the roles and responsibilities and enhance communication mechanisms within a simulated scenario environment. Also important is the execution of a memorandum of understanding between the UCSB campus police and the local law enforcement agency (Santa Barbara Sheriff’s Office). This MOU establishes command and control during a campus protest or acts of civil disobedience. In addition, the campus police department has maintained a long-standing practice of utilizing other UC campus police personnel, whenever feasible and prudent. Additionally, the campus police have routinely subscribed to the concept of shared governance in its promotion and hiring practices and continue to involve a variety of campus stakeholders in the selection and promotion process. This arduous selection is always completed with a personal interview and hiring decision by the campus Chief of Police.

UCSB is fortunate to have a Police Chief who is also accessible, student oriented and extraordinarily supportive of student rights. He has a student affairs background and approaches his job as one of service to the campus and community. Each quarter he attends a meeting of the Associated Students Senate to introduce himself and entertain any questions or concerns. He also brings new officers to the Senate meeting to introduce them. He has appointed a community relations and education officer who is highly visible around campus, attends a variety of student meetings and trainings, and joins the Police Chief on panels to discuss a variety of issues and police practices.

The past year has entailed working with various campus departments to strengthen existing processes and working relationships and to formalize practice and protocols. An agreement has been reached with the director of the Office of Audit and Advisory Services to investigate student complaints about the campus’s handling of a demonstration. In addition, any police complaints are effectively handled in accordance with written policies and applicable statutes.

The Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs has mandated the implementation and use of an electronic form to be the basis for the Student Life demonstration log and to ensure the recording of details of protests and demonstrations. Entries in the log include minimally the date, beginning and ending times, sponsors, issue or reason for the demonstration, and a description of the event with an estimate of the numbers of participants and what occurred (the nature of the demonstration and the campus response). The entries are typically brief but contain these details, unless the demonstration size and nature warrant more elaboration. In addition to photographic documentation of larger demonstrations by police and other campus personnel, demonstration events are recorded (in writing) as they are occurring by a designated Student Affairs staff member, who notes the time, place and actions of the demonstrators, police and other campus personnel.

At the end of each year, the Associate Dean of Student Life and Activities submits to the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs (convener of the event response team) a summary report of the demonstrations and protests that she has monitored. Larger demonstrations requiring more staff and police involvement are debriefed at a meeting of the event response team in the days shortly following the event, if possible. The debriefing allows the team to review the flow of the event and evaluate the campus’s response. The debriefing is especially important if any type of force was used by the police. If there are recommended changes in policy or practice related to the handling of the demonstration, the Vice Chancellor ensures the implementation of the changes.
The UCPD also documents all demonstrations to which an officer is assigned. For small demonstrations that are simply monitored by the police, a log entry at the police department is all that is required to document the event. For larger events involving police intervention of any kind, after-action reports are used to capture more details of the event and police action. The greater the intervention, the more details are given. If any type of police force is used during a protest, a full and detailed account of the operation is given in the after-action report. The after-action reports are shared with the event response team as a basis for discussion and future strategic planning for demonstrations; they are also available to the Office of the President upon request.

In conclusion, the UC Santa Barbara administration is relaxed, informal, visible, available and respectful of students, their issues and opinions. It is also highly vocal about protecting student rights, encouraging involvement in issues and supporting a variety of ways to express ideas and opinions. The Chancellor, Vice Chancellors, Associate Vice Chancellors and the Chief of Police play central roles in determining the climate on campus and treatment of students, both on a daily basis and in times of tension and unrest. The leadership of the campus is unambiguous in its support of the First Amendment and the value of student engagement with social and political issues. It is also clear in its willingness to work through tense situations with students, hearing them out and attempting to find outcomes acceptable to everyone.
September 25, 2013

President Janet Napolitano
Office of the President
University of California
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607

Dear President Napolitano:

I hereby certify that all the Robinson/Edley Report recommendations that were finalized and accepted through the Civil Disobedience Initiative have been implemented or are in the process of being implemented at the University of California, Santa Barbara.

Sincerely,

Henry T. Yang
Chancellor
Introduction and Overview
The following executive summary highlights several topics specific to the UC Santa Cruz campus implementation of the Robinson/Edley Report and the recommendations that were formalized in the University of California Civil Disobedience Initiative.

The intention of the Robinson/Edley Report was to encourage the University of California to identify best practices that facilitate free expression and encourage lawful protest activity while protecting the safety of the UC community and the rights of the community to conduct their business on the campus. The comprehensive process resulted in the identification of a set of 49 proposed recommendations. These recommendations provided a framework for each UC campus to develop policies and practices that would enhance demonstration and protest management and be responsive to the direction outlined in the Robinson-Edley Report.

A UC Office of the President implementation team was assigned to coordinate the systemwide planning. Individual campus implementation was measured through a tracking and documentation system, with final review by a panel that included membership from the UC Office of the President implementation team, Office of General Counsel, Council of Police Chiefs and other experts.

UC Santa Cruz Civil Disobedience Initiative Project Implementation Strategy
At the campus level, the implementation responsibilities were assigned to the Business and Administrative Services Vice Chancellor, and direct support for implementation was assigned to the Associate Vice Chancellor, Risk and Safety Services, who served as the campus contact for the UCOP implementation team and coordinated all required submittals. Additionally, the Chief of Police submitted all required materials for university police through the UC Council of Chiefs.

Where appropriate, planning and implementation was coordinated with other campus units, including Chancellor’s Office, Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor Office, Campus Counsel, Dean of Students, Student Judicial Affairs, Academic Personnel Office, Staff Human Resources and the Demonstration Operations Team.

Campus Summary and Background
UC Santa Cruz has at our core, the mission of education, research and public service. In support of this mission, the university embraces the position that freedom of speech and First Amendment rights are cornerstones of the academic community. Our success as a university is predicated upon our ability to embrace diversity of opinions and to allow safe space for discourse to flourish. The university community and the administration have long held a commitment to upholding First Amendment rights and supporting the ideals of scholarship and social activism. Equally, we strive to support the rights of the community to conduct the business of the campus. Social justice and practical activism are integrated throughout the academic curriculum and into the student engagement programs both in Campus Life and our colleges.

Many of the Robinson/Edley Report recommendations have historically been operational standards of practice for the campus, especially in the areas of early outreach, protest response and support for civil discourse and demonstration activities. UC Santa Cruz has had over 40 years of experience in supporting a very active and engaged student body, faculty and staff, a community that has valued their right to protest and engage in civil disobedience. This engagement has been understood and supported by faculty, Student Life staff, college staff and the administration.

The administration has worked with intention to uphold both First Amendment rights and the need to conduct the business of the campus. Frequently, these two needs are in conflict, which requires delicate leadership and response.
As a more recent historical reference, in 2007, the Demonstration Operations Team was assembled following several reports that were written specific to campus demonstration response, civil disobedience and protest management. These reports emerged following Tent University in spring 2006. The reports were developed by both internal and external advisory groups, and feedback was provided to the administration by the Academic Senate, Graduate Student Association, Staff Advisory Board and the Council of College Provosts. The Chancellor at that time accepted the report and charged the former vice chancellors of Student Affairs and Business and Administrative Services to form the Demonstration Operations Team (DOT) in 2007. The emphasis for the DOT was essentially to deliver on the same recommendations that were outlined in the Robinson/Edley Report, with a few minor additions. The formation of the DOT in 2007 uniquely prepared UC Santa Cruz to ensure responsiveness to the UC Civil Disobedience Initiative of 2013.

In addition to the charge to the Demonstration Operations Team, during the 2011–12 academic years, the campus substantially redefined the emergency management operational structure and protocols for managing campus emergencies, events and incidents, including demonstration activities. The outcome goals were to streamline analysis, consultation and senior leadership decision making. Through this reframing, the Emergency Management Policy Group emerged. This reframing also allowed for a more defined articulation of the relationship between Incident Command, the Emergency Operations Center and the Demonstration Operations Team. This redefined structure greatly enhanced effectiveness of the leadership team and decision-making structure.

As a campus community, we continue our long-held commitment to protecting the free speech and other First Amendment rights of the community. Additionally, we have integrated the ideals of community policing into our university police program. Our police department is a critical member of the community, and officers and leadership continue their role in supporting First Amendment rights of all and protecting the community.

We are a community of change agents who act at the campus level, in the local community and throughout the world. We are confident that the implementation of the Robinson/Edley recommendations will further enhance and preserve our dedication to student voice and social activism.
Emergency Management Policy Group/Emergency Response Coordination Structure

In 2011–12, the campus adopted a new structure for emergency response and articulated the Emergency Management Policy Group (EMPG) as the team that serves as adviser to the Chancellor on all matters related to policy and decision making in crisis situations, including major demonstrations (see reference graph above).

The core charge for EMPG is to ensure comprehensive management response to crisis situations, to provide the Chancellor with an efficient process for analyzing issues, identifying key policy and decision points that result in strategic decisions, and to ensure campus safety and operations. Ultimate decision-making responsibility resides with the Chancellor in this model.

The Vice Chancellor, Business and Administrative Services, coordinates and the Emergency Management Policy Group documents all critical decision-making activity of the group. The Associate Vice Chancellor, Risk and Safety Services, provides for campuswide operational coordination inclusive of work with the Demonstration Operations Team, Incident Command and the Emergency Operations Center (as applicable).
Membership in the Emergency Management Policy Group includes:

- Chancellor
- Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor
- Vice Chancellor, Business and Administrative Services, Chair
- Associate Chancellor
- Vice Chancellor, University Relations

Support staff to the Emergency Management Policy Group includes:

- Vice Provost/Dean of Undergraduate Education
- Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
- Dean, Graduate Education
- Special Assistant to the Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor
- Associate Vice Chancellor, Risk and Safety Services
- Campus Counsel
- Director, Public Information

Other (based on nature of incident):

- Chief of Police
- Fire Chief
- Emergency Operations Center Director
- Associate Vice Chancellor/Dean of Students
- Associate Vice Chancellor, Colleges, Housing and Educational Services
- Assistant Vice Chancellor, Staff Human Resources
- Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Personnel
- Director Health Services
- Director Risk Services
- Director Environmental Health & Safety
- Campus Veterinarian

Not all demonstration events require the convening of the Emergency Management Policy Group. The Vice Chancellor, Business and Administrative Services, coordinates closely with the Associate Vice Chancellor, Risk and Safety Services, and when appropriate, based on the nature of a planned or emerging demonstration or emergency event, will convene the Emergency Management Policy Group. Sometimes, convening of the group may happen in advance of a planned event, and often it happens when incidents occur. Additionally, the Emergency Management Policy Group is convened to review use-of-force tactics, mutual aid and impacts on campus operations. The group also addresses short and long-term planning and communication planning.

**Demonstration Operations Team**

The Demonstration Operations Team (DOT) has undergone significant changes in membership and the functions have evolved since the initial inception of the team in 2007. The current charge to the DOT reflects this evolution and aligns directly with the UC Civil Disobedience Initiative. On average, the team will review, plan for and respond to 50–75 events per year. Only a small few require the Emergency Management Policy Group to convene.

The Demonstration Operations Team is charged with coordinating the campus’s specific operational planning and response needs related to campus activism, including demonstrations, labor relations activities, labor strikes and other large public events that require campus response, coordination and management. The team is coordinated by the Associate Vice Chancellor, Risk and Safety Services. The three overarching outcome goals for the team are to:

- Provide analysis and planning to support the safety needs of the campus community.
- Support participant First Amendment rights to freedom of expression, open dialogue and discord.
- Support the academic mission of the university.
The Demonstration Operations Team identifies and implements effective strategies to communicate with the campus community with respect to campus policies and procedures, the campus freedom of speech statement, including the time, place and manner policy, the importance of the Principles of Community, the possible consequences of unacceptable behaviors, and mechanisms to file complaints and/or raise issues through appropriate university processes and policies.

Through the role of the Demonstration Operations Team chair, the following are responsibilities that will be integrated into planning, operations and response. As applicable, these responsibilities are integrated with the Emergency Management Policy Group.

- Monitor emerging issues and campus climate and identify topics that may impact campus operations.
- Provide oversight, coordination, planning and support during protests or major events that may impact campus operations.
- Conduct early outreach to protest or major event organizers.
- If a demonstration or protest is planned, make every reasonable attempt to identify and contact one or more of the group leaders of the event in advance to establish lines of communication.
- In advance of the event, inform the protestors of alternative avenues for communication of their concerns or proposals.
- Absent special circumstances, assign faculty/administrators rather than police to serve as the primary university representatives to communicate with protestors during a demonstration.
- Make every reasonable attempt to establish a communication link with identified leaders or sponsors of the event; for leaderless groups, communicate broadly to the group as a whole (through social media and otherwise) until relationships form.
- Determine to the extent necessary or appropriate, the need to communicate to the campus community at large about material developments in ongoing protests, demonstrations or other significant events.
- Provide policy advice and clarification for protest or major event organizers.
- Coordinate preplanning and provide logistical support required for protest or major events.
- Provide advice and analysis to key executive leaders, advise VC BAS and EMPG on planned and unfolding protest and major events.
- Assign staff and academic administrators to observe, document and report on events. Ensure that observers provide timely observation and feedback to support operational planning and EMPG policy development and strategic decision making. Ensure observers receive orientation and training in the nature of protest and the dynamics of crowd safety and the role of the observer.
- Utilize mediation support as appropriate for events and situations that may be mitigated by the use of internal or external resources to support and encourage positive outcomes.
- Debrief significant events and prepare an After Event Summary for events that have a major impact on university operations. Utilize a standard threshold (events requiring decision making by EMPG) for those events that will require an After Event Summary and ensure appropriate dispensation of records management.
### Demonstration Operations Team - Roles and Responsibilities Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Overview of Roles/Responsibilities</th>
<th>Designated Alternate(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Associate Vice Chancellor Risk and Safety Services | • Chair of Demonstration Operations Team  
• Coordinates with Emergency Management Policy Group, Incident Command and Emergency Operations Center  
• Link to Campus Counsel  
• Process manager for Civil Disobedience Initiative                   | Associate Vice Chancellor Colleges, Housing and Educational Services              |
| Associate Vice Chancellor Colleges, Housing and Educational Services | • On-site lead for Demonstration Operations Team (observers)  
• Link to Colleges, Housing and Educational Services  
• Coordinates on-site assignments                                            | Director, Housing Services                                                       |
| Director, Public Affairs                        | • Link to University Relations and Executive Communications                                        | TBA                                                                            |
| Associate Vice Chancellor Staff Human Resources | • Link to Academic Personnel Office and Staff Human Resources  
• Link to UCOP Staff Human Resources  
• Coordinates with Campus Labor Relations                                          | Manager, Employee and Labor Relations                                           |
| Manager, Employee and Labor Relations           | • Coordinates with Staff Human Resources  
• Link to Represented Groups                                                                 | Partner, Employee and Labor Relations                                           |
| Manager, Emergency Response                     | • Link to Emergency Operations Center                                                               | Business Continuity Planner                                                    |
| Chief, University Police                        | • Campus Safety and Incident Command  
• Links with mutual aid and local law enforcement                                                                 | TBA                                                                            |
| Director, Office of Physical Education, Recreation and Sports | • Link to Campus Life  
• Coordinates with student organizations, SUA, GSA             | Assistant Dean of Students                                                      |
| Director, Physical Plant                        | • Link to Physical Plant Operations  
• Coordinates with Physical Planning and Construction  
• Coordinates external communications with contractors                                | Assistant Director, Physical Plant                                               |
| Planner, Business Continuity                    | • Admin support to Demonstration Operations Team  
• Coordinates with major event planners                                             | Executive Assistant, Office of Resource Management, BAS                         |
| Business and Operations Manager, Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor Office | • Link to CP/EVC and Chancellor’s Office  
• Link to Kerr Hall administrative team                                                  | Special Assistant to Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor                     |
| Director, Transportation and Parking Services   | Link to campus and regional transit services                                                        | Assistant Director, Transportation and Parking Services                         |
In addition to the membership of the Demonstration Operations Team as noted above, there are 65-plus faculty and staff members who have been trained to serve as on-site observers at demonstration events. These observers include academic faculty/administration who are members of the Academic Senate, Campus Life staff, Labor staff and executive leadership of the campus. Observers are assigned based on the nature of demonstration events and availability. The on-site observers are coordinated by the Demonstration Operations Team on-site lead. Generally, the on-site staff includes two representatives from Labor Relations, four representatives from College/Campus Life and an academic administrator. This varies based on the nature of the protest. The primary role for on-site observers is to provide information and observations to the campus administration, provide support and policy information for protestors, and report emergencies to university police if needed.

The chart below represents the conceptual planning stream that unfolds as the Demonstration Operations Team works to analyze, plan and respond to a major demonstration event. While the chart suggests sequential process flow over time, in many instances, the planning activity may be parallel and in some circumstances, the demonstration emerges and the analysis/planning/decision/response unfolds in real time.
Highlights of Actions Taken to Support Implementation of the Civil Disobedience Initiative

With respect to specific initiatives that the campus has undertaken, the following were developed as an intentional, comprehensive strategy for strengthening the campus approach for supporting First Amendment rights and responding to demonstration events:

- Reframing the administrative leadership team through the articulation of the Emergency Management Policy Group structure
- Continued solidification of the role of the Demonstration Operations Team and assignment of leadership for the demonstration operations process to the Associate Vice Chancellor, Risk and Safety Services
- Continuance of our practice for having senior academic administrators on site for major demonstration events
- Introduction of a new Police Chief, who has introduced a community policing philosophy
- Ongoing emphasis on early outreach and leadership engagement with students, staff and faculty
- Introduction of a training requirement for all staff that are assigned to support the Demonstration Operations Team on-site observer program. The training includes an overview of roles and responsibilities, incident command structure, Emergency Management Policy Group, Demonstration Operations Team structure and personal safety in crowds
- Increased and repetitive outreach and communication by the campus administration, Dean of Students and Police Chief to labor groups, student leadership, faculty and staff
- Increased training and detailed articulation of roles and responsibilities for membership of the Emergency Management Policy Group, Incident Command, Emergency Operations Center, Demonstration Operations Team and on-site observers

These changes have resulted in the following outcomes:

- Increased awareness and preparedness and improved response for handling events that may be large or potentially disrupt campus operations
- Improved training and preparedness, especially with our regional law enforcement partners for events that intersect with the local community
- Improved coordination of our process for analysis, executive leadership consultation and decision making, and improved understanding of roles and responsibilities

Engagement Activity

The following represents a high-level summary of the ongoing engagement activities between campus administrators, university police and our student leaders and students at large. These efforts have been enhanced during the past three years to support improved communication flow across various sectors of the administration and the community.
Engagement between Administration and Students, Faculty and Staff

- EVC/CP standing meetings with Graduate Student Association and Student Union Assembly
- EVC/CP open office hours for students
- Cops and Coffee sessions
- New student orientation sessions
- Student resource fairs
- Chancellor/student media meetings
- EVC/CP and Student Union Assembly campus budget forums
- Chancellor and EVC/CP meetings with college governments
- PD Chief meetings with college governments, Student Union Assembly and Graduate Student Association
- Chancellor Undergraduate Internship Program (CUIP)
- Sponsored Student Regents visits
- UCPD Citizens Academy
- Chancellor “Work Place Walks”
- EVC/CP and Staff Advisory Board – campus forums
- Chancellor, EVC/CP and Staff Advisory Board—staff appreciation events

Engagement between Police and Students

- Cops and Coffee sessions
- Presentations at new student orientation sessions
- Presentations at student resource fairs
- Presentations at graduate student orientation session
- Participation at campuswide events, forums, meetings
- Presentations on safety training, personal safety, activity shooting trainings
- Co-hosting Campus Public Safety Days
- UCPD Citizens Academy
- Cadet Program (Student employees at UCPD)

Summary

In summary, the UC Santa Cruz administration continues to embrace our responsibilities for supporting First Amendment rights, providing for the safety of our campus community and ensuring campus operational continuity to support the academic mission.

With commitment and detailed planning, we have implemented the recommendations as outlined in the Robinson/Edley Report and where applicable to the campus for action. Equally, we continue our long-held commitment to the aspirations as offered through the Robinson/Edley Report.
Chancellor Certification

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA CRUZ

OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR

209 Clark Kerr Hall
1156 High Street
Santa Cruz, CA 95064-1078
Phone (831) 459-2058
Fax (831) 459-2098

October 29, 2013

Janet Napolitano, President
University of California, Office of the President
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607

Dear President Napolitano:

Re: University of California Santa Cruz Civil Disobedience Initiative Certification

This letter serves as my certification that the University of California, Santa Cruz campus has implemented the Robinson/Edley Report recommendations that were finalized and accepted through the University of California, Civil Disobedience Initiative. While most of the initiatives have been fully implemented, a few are prepared and will be completed by the end of the fall quarter, 2013.

Campus Staff have worked extensively with UCOP Staff to ensure that we are in alignment with the initiatives and that the required documentation has been submitted for verification purposes.

Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor Galloway and I continue our commitment to the aspirations of what has been promoted through this process and have encouraged these ideals through our leadership during the past several years. We also believe that we have developed a common understanding across our leadership team in support of these ideals and have created an administrative infrastructure to effectively institutionalize the ongoing implementation of the Civil Disobedience Initiative.

We strive to provide a safe and supportive environment for civil discourse with an active emphasis on early outreach, leadership engagement and measured consideration as cornerstones for our approach.

Please let me know if you should have any questions or need further information.

Sincerely,

George Blumenthal
Chancellor, UC Santa Cruz

cc: Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor, Alison Galloway
Vice Chancellor, Business and Administrative Services, Sarah C. Latham
Associate Chancellor, Ashish Sahni
Associate Vice Chancellor, Risk and Safety Services, Jean Marie Scott
Appendix
Campus Progress Tracker

This appendix is available in PDF on the Civil Disobedience Initiative website: