May 12, 2021

Cheryl Lloyd
Associate Vice President, Chief Risk Officer
Interim Vice President, Systemwide Human Resources
University of California

Dear Associate Vice President Lloyd,

This letter is sent on behalf of the Public Safety Advisory Committee of UC Irvine. The 2019 Presidential Task Force Report on Universitywide Policing recommended that each UC campus establish a public safety advisory board. Since their establishment, these Boards have contributed to each campus’s efforts to transform and enhance the quality of public safety across the various campuses.

Despite the significant differences in the geographic locale, needs, and challenges of ensuring public safety at our respective campuses, UC operates under one common contract for our police officers. As the University of California begins its negotiations regarding the collective bargaining agreement with the Federated University Police Officers Association (FUPOA), we write to ensure that two critical points are recognized and taken into account as a new contract is drafted.

First, as you are well aware, at the request of and with the full support of, the Board of Regents and the Chancellors of the UC, the Public Safety Advisory Boards of each UC campus have been working diligently and purposefully to critically review the current state of policing on our campuses and are developing plans toward the full transformation of public safety at each of our campuses. Although some recommendations for change across the campuses are the same or very similar, given the localized nature of public safety and the distinct needs of each UC campus community, many recommendations for next steps are community- and campus-specific. There is no one model of “public safety” that fits each UC community.

Consequently, it is imperative that flexibility and adjustability be key features in any new labor contract with FUPOA. Any labor agreement which hampers or constrains any one campus’s ability to change existing conditions or develop new public safety practices and guidelines to meet their specific needs will compromise the fundamental transformation of public safety at UC.

Second, in the aftermath of demands for fundamental change in policing practices, the challenges of rethinking public safety in our communities is simultaneously unfolding across the country in various cities and towns, as well as campuses. Labor law experts are developing models to ensure police officers’ right to collective bargaining while also ensuring much greater public accountability and transparency of officers’ encounters with the citizens and civilians they serve. Indeed, UC’s faculty bring expertise in labor law, police-community relations, negotiation,
mediation, and arbitration, and police accountability mechanisms. In drafting a new contract with FUPOA, it is imperative that UC draw on its own expertise to negotiate a contract that protects officers’ right to collectively bargain while protecting our community’s need to develop mechanisms that ensure accountability and transparency that are effective. If steps are not taken to negotiate a forward-thinking, progressive contract that recognizes the needs of UC’s constituents, from faculty, to students, and to staff, the legitimacy and the integrity of calls for transformation will be fundamentally undermined.

We would welcome further discussion of these issues as the negotiation process begins. To the extent that time can be allotted to seek feedback—either on the existing agreement or potential aspects of the future one—to ensure the objectives of flexibility and transparency that allow room for our locations to transform public safety, we would welcome being a part of that effort. We thank you for your time, efforts, and consideration.

Sincerely,

Public Safety Advisory Committee
University of California, Irvine