**Notes on the meeting between Concerned Faculty and Ana Mari Cauce**

Friday, 27 January 2017

2 pm to 3 pm, Gerberding 301

*Attendance:*

Concerned Faculty\* included: Ahoua Kone, Rachel Chapman, Michele Andrasik, James Pfeiffer, Steve Gloyd, Clarence Spigner, Mary Anne Mercer, Amy Hagopian, Stephanie Smallwood, Jean Dennison, Jahn Jaramillo.

UW administration included: Ana Mari Cauce, Margaret Shepherd, Ed Taylor, Joel Kaufman, Shirley Beresford

*Note on these minutes: taken by Amy Hagopian. In some places (eg. Dogs), I moved a comment to where the topic was being discussed, even though it might have been said later because that is when the person had an opportunity to speak.*

The meeting opened with brief introductions. Everyone reiterated their motivation for being here was their devotion to our beloved community and institution.

Concerned Faculty were led by Ahoua, Rachel and Michele, who read aloud the statement we had written for this meeting.\*\*

AMC opened by saying “I will look at this and take it all very seriously.”

AMC said the UW is in the process of establishing a **Police Advisory Board (PAB)** of faculty, staff and students who would report to her. Steve tried to clarify what this body would be in relation to existing police committees. Margaret Shepherd said “we are looking at the role of the safety committee for overlap with this other body.” Rachel asked if police would be on the PAB, and the response was NO.

AMC said, “We are developing the charge, and we had in mind some of the things you are talking about.” She said UW Sociology Professor Alexes Harris is looking at UWPD records for bias over the last three years. It took a while to connect the police records with the ethnic identities of the individuals detained. Unfortunately, Alexes has been ill, delaying the work.

There was a back-and-forth discussion of whether the PAB proposed here is the same concept as the Concerned Faculty’s proposed **UW Police Reform Task Force**. Rachel expressed concern that hand-picked members would be problematic. Also, we need a short-term task force to propose some immediate reforms, which may not be the same as a permanent board. AMC said she would choose from among candidates proposed by the Faculty Senate, ASUW and GPSS. James said he thought the Task Force should include community organizations, like the NAACP.

AMC noted one of her new vice presidents is from Columbia University (where they don’t allow police to carry guns), so he can tell us how that happened and how it’s going.

We discussed the use of dogs. AMC said dogs sniff cars coming into the stadium. She might consider limiting the use of dogs to that circumstance. “They’re looking for explosive devices.” Ahoua noted the Black History month event last year was marred by the UWPD use of dogs in training.

At this point, AMC revealed new information about the events of Inauguration Day on the UW campus (the Milo Yiannopoulos talk). We do not know who the shooter is, and the perpetrator did NOT turn himself in, contrary to the news reported by Katherine Long at the Seattle Times. The UWPD does have the gun and the car it was in. “We know the subset of individuals who did it, and we have taken decisive action.”

Ed Taylor confirmed he chose to attend the Yiannopoulos talk (inside, sat next to the only other black person there), as were James and Rachel (outside). (others?). He said Katherine Long couldn’t have accurately reported on events in the Square (without a co-reporter) because she was inside Kane Hall the whole time.

AMC said there were 25 UWPD in Red Square and 200 SPD officers that night. There was scuffling but things were “under control until the Westlake group came onto campus.” She said SPD was calling the shots. James noted he thought things were out of control starting at 6 pm, and that he observed the police practice of “kettling,” corralling demonstrators or shoving them up against each together to instigate more conflict, perhaps so arrests can be made. A Task Force could look at events like this.

Who’s in charge of the Red Square investigation? UWPD. Steve asked if they have the capacity to do that, and AMC replied “When they charge the suspect, they want to be sure. It’s down to two people.” She also said, “Any investigation of Friday would need to primarily focus on SPD.”

Rachel noted that student safety won’t be guaranteed by identifying the single shooter. “If we had been in these conversations a year ago, as we requested, we wouldn’t be so far behind now.”

AMC noted the UW scheduled an alternative event to the Breitbart speaker, a speech by Kathleen Cleaver, a longtime civil-rights activist. Ahoua noted she attended that. AMC also noted hindsight was 2020, but “we would have allowed” the Yiannopoulos speech to proceed in any case. She added when they agreed to the speech they didn’t realize there would be a Trump presidency.

Amy noted these people are planning more events for Monday (a wall-building on Red Square to oppose immigration). AMC said they are trying to develop guidelines for future events. The problem with regulations is that they have to be applied equitably. For example, do we really want to require all protestors to get a permit? (NO, and how would that help anyway?) “We have been very tolerant of student demonstrations,” AMC noted.

Stephanie suggested the student code of conduct could be invoked to stop some actions. AMC said if it was a registered student organization we could do that. The wall-builders are not.

AMC: I have never been so confused about we as a country. Some people in our government want to shut down free speech and demonstrations. “And then they come after me…” and all that. I hate to shut down speech, but the guidelines have to apply to everyone. It’s all beyond belief. (tears)

Michele: the events in Global Health traumatized many of us. Students are drawn to the few faculty of color in the department, and they come to us for help and information. We were told we couldn’t talk to them about it. Students come to me for support and my department let me down. This Task Force needs to figure out a better way to respond when these things happen. The report didn’t accurately say what happened. We need transparency and information.

AMC: when we are told we can’t speak, and therefore choose not to speak, at the end of the day it was our choice not to speak.

Ed Taylor said, “I position myself as a fellow traveler, but we’ve been too distant from each other.” Some of our colleagues are admittedly less culturally competent. A lot of people were struggling to know how to talk to one another.

Rachel pointed out we had not been asked to advise the administration, despite having alerted them to our interest in this issue many months ago. “You know us, we have been working on this issue for years on this campus, and you don’t call us.” And added, “You say ‘we would have held the event (Friday) regardless,’ but who is the ‘we?’ You didn’t ask for faculty advice.”

Ed Taylor asked who should chair the Task Force, and Ahoua replied, “first, let’s get it established.”

AMC: Can we limit controversial speakers to the daytime? They are looking at the spaces they can best control. We are going to see more of this. We are seeing reports of people being harassed, and the (Nazi recruiting) posters. Often responding leads to more harassment. “I’ve been advising faculty to call UWPD or Denzil Suite to tear down posters so people won’t be photographed doing it (images that could be used to harass people).” She suggested we have to be strategic about what protest looks like now. For example, when the “Be Boundless” campaign sought advertising space, somehow it ended up on Breitbart, and that had to be removed.

Jean said a better approach than to set limits on protests would be to say there is a difference between free speech and hate speech. Clarence added that speech protections don’t include that speech that leads to inciting violence.

James said what *not* to do is what happened last year at Global Health. That report was a whitewash and it disrespected the community. We got railroaded and the errors and mistakes were swept under the carpet.

AMC asked if anyone was interviewed for that report. Ahoua and Steve said they were interviewed, but Steve added his views were misrepresented.

James continued that he saw a very heavy handed response last spring, and it actually could have had much uglier results. That’s why we need a review board.

Stephanie said the response to events like that sets the context and expectations for the future. That’s how students and staff of color come to feel not valued. We now know “someone can be deported for smoking on campus,” even if that’s not exactly what happened. That doesn’t feel anything like a Sanctuary Campus. You said in your message we are already not reporting (and deporting) people, but that event makes people think it’s not true.

Rachel tried to bring it back to the Task Force. Can AMC empower a task force that brings together the events of last year and the one this past week?

AMC: **What I will do is get you the Charge for the Police Advisory Board that we are now writing BY THE END OF NEXT WEEK, and ask for your feedback**. Another next step is to see Alexes’ work (on police profiling). We will have some back and forth about that.

Shirley confirmed that AMC will consult with THIS group.

Ed Taylor noted students were here Monday asking for similar reforms. Rachel suggested we bring them together with Concerned Faculty.

AMC suggested we all talk with our Faculty Senators because she’d like to work through established channels.

AMC reiterated she will follow the laws of the state of Washington. Cauce noted she abides by Initiative 200 [Stating the state “shall not discriminate against, or grant preferential treatment to, any individual or group on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin in the operation of public employment, public education, or public contracting,” widely interpreted as opposing affirmative action], even though she disagrees with it.

Thanks for meeting all around.

\* Ahoua Kone <ahoua.kone@hai-ci.org>, Clarence Spigner <cspigner@uw.edu>, Stephen Gloyd <gloyd@uw.edu>, Rachel R. Chapman <rrc4@uw.edu>, Noah Simon <nrsimon@uw.edu>, MaryAnne Mercer <mamercer@uw.edu>, Andrasik, Michele <mandrasik@fredhutch.org>, Joseph B. Babigumira <babijo@uw.edu>, James Pfeiffer <jamespf@uw.edu> Aaron Katz <garlyk@uw.edu> Jean Dennison <jden@uw.edu> Jahn Jaramillo <jahnj@uw.edu> Stephanie Smallwood <ses9@uw.edu>

\*\* STATEMENT WE PRESENTED:

**“Safe campus for all”**

To: President Ana Mari Cauce

From: UW Concerned Faculty

Date: 27 January 2017

UW Concerned Faculty call for a Safe Campus for All: an environment where everyone, especially people of color, is respected and is safe on campus. A community police model is required to build trust and respect for the campus police. While we all share these goals, events on campus last spring and last week demonstrate the UWPD has repeatedly exhibited its incapacity to provide for a safe campus for all and to manage complex situations. This has eroded trust and respect.

The Southern Poverty Law Center report of the 20 January shooting on Red Square suggests violence could have been avoided with more effective policing practices. Our UW community is increasingly concerned UW police are not protecting people equally – underscored by the fact the police and prosecutors have been unwilling to charge or detain the Red Square shooter. Last year’s incidents involving UWPD racial profiling and the use of excessive force further highlights the inadequacies of the UWPD. The September 2016 UW-commissioned “independent investigation” did nothing to point out how better policing might have led to a much better outcome, while describing racial profiling, excessive force and a failure to de-escalate at every opportunity. We conclude the UWPD needs a major overhaul to build trust and to effectively meet its own stated goals to “collaborate with the community to maintain a safe environment.”

We wrote to the UW President in the spring of 2016, and again on November 30th, 2016, to propose a Police Reform Plan to help the UWPD become a model for campus policing nationally. We hope this plan will help the UW move to a new level of policing that can make students, faculty, and staff feel safe regardless of their race, political affiliation, and beliefs.

We ask that you:

1. Issue a campus-wide statement establishing zero tolerance of bias by UW Police, with full and transparent access to UWPD policies and procedures to confirm the zero tolerance policies.
2. Establish an independent, community-based Citizen Police Review Board, with an independent prosecutor, to review all complaints regarding UW police abuse and misconduct. The Board would also examine the overall performance of the department’s complaint process, the quality of police-community interactions, and make policy recommendations concerning those issues. The board should have, at a minimum, complete access to UWPD records, adequate staff and resources to investigate police practices and incidents, and independent authority to provide recommendations to the UWPD and UW leadership.
3. Establish a policy whereby UW Police will not carry firearms, joining a number of major universities in the US, including Columbia University and most public universities within the CUNY system in NY, DePaul University in Chicago, and Auburn University in Alabama. We propose an exploration of the effects of disarming with input from the community and with national experts, and a willingness from UW leadership to engage the topic through open forums, as other universities have done. This discussion must start with a serious assessment of the potential effects of disarming, without the heretofore dismissive response to this from UW leadership.
4. Ban the use of police dogs by the UWPD. Police dogs commonly cause intense fear, in part because of the historical use of dogs to terrorize people of color. Campus police dogs do not further the purpose of community policing and are wrong more than they are right at detecting bombs, drugs, or weapons.
5. Establish a mental health response team, in partnership with, but independent of, the UWPD. A large number of police shootings result from inappropriate responses to mental health crises. This mental health crisis response team would be comprised of police and non-police professionals. This team might respond in lieu of UWPD when the goal is to safely de-escalate situations for persons in distress.
6. Convene a UW Police Reform Task Force to address the above points. The Task Force should include students, faculty, staff, and UWPD representatives, and promote a partnership between the community and uniformed colleagues. The Task Force will propose revisions of UWPD policies to establish a new, comprehensive, community-oriented “Safe Campus for All” security approach. This would include establishing clear and ongoing processes to increase cultural awareness, insight and humility among members of the UWPD. We also believe, given the current national political environment, that our “Safe Campus for All” proposal must also include a clear and transparent UW sanctuary policy.

We request today’s meeting end with the following commitments:

1. Assign a liaison to work with the UW Police Reform Task Force by 15 February, 2017, to pursue these discussions forthwith, beginning before the end of February.
2. Provide a research assistant to compile data regarding police policies of other universities.
3. Provide the Task Force administrative support to manage and document meetings and findings. FTE release should be provided to task force members.

Finally, because this is a highly charged issue, we request assurance there will be no retaliation against anyone involved in this effort. We share a devotion to the betterment of our University of Washington community.