

April 15, 2014

**MOLLY THEODOSSY, POLICY COORDINATOR**  
**Campus Compliance**

**RE: UC Davis Policy and Procedure Manual Chapter 390, Emergency Management and Campus; Security**  
**Section 55, Video Security**

The draft Policy and Procedure Manual (PPM) section 390-55 was forwarded to all Davis Division of the Academic Senate standing committees and Faculty Executive Committees from the Schools and Colleges. Responses were received from the Committees on Faculty Welfare and Research, Graduate Council, and the Faculty Executive Committee from the College of Letters and Science.

The committees generally recognize value in the installation and use of video security on UC Davis campuses, but there were some hesitations and concerns:

1. The Letters and Science Faculty Executive Committee agreed with the rule of keeping video records for only a 30-day period. However, the language should be clearer about the conditions under which campus police can retain video records for longer. Section D.3.b of the proposal reads, "for evidentiary purposes or determined necessary . . ." but "determined necessary" should be deleted. It is too vague and potentially allows for unneeded retention of records.
2. The Committee on Faculty Welfare requested clarification on whether the policy covers monitoring in laboratories (e.g., biosecurity). Section III.C.4 reads, "Video recording is not permitted in the following areas..." Does this include classrooms and other protected learning spaces? Similarly, in section III.C.3.b it reads, "Primary locations for the installation of security cameras include: Public rooms and laboratories containing high value equipment or information." The Committee on Research (COR) hoped this means "at access to public rooms and laboratories" and not "inside public rooms and laboratories." Otherwise, those who work in the rooms and laboratories will need to give permission to be filmed while working.
3. COR did not see a clear motivation or justification for the proposed policy or have an understanding of how the cost would relate to the benefits. It is unknown how this policy will affect life on campus—there needs to be more oversight from the campus organizations. It is unclear just how effective the proposed policy will be in preventing or solving crimes. COR had the following specific recommendations for the proposal:
  - a. Section III.A.3 should explicitly include the Academic Federation.
  - b. The committee does not understand the wording and intent of section III.D.3.a (1). The reference to APM 110-4 (14) may need updating. If it is meant to provide additional protection to faculty, it should include Academic Federation members as well. If the reference is to members of the Academic Senate specifically, this should be stated.
  - c. Section D.4.d allows the "Release of images . . . As otherwise required by law." This is vague, and might cause confusion as to the intent of the policy or permit after-the-fact access. COR recommends that the video policy review committee or the UC Davis Police Department review each request in this category, rather than leave the blanket approval implied by this paragraph.

The Davis Division of the Academic Senate urges the Police Department to consider the above recommendations and concerns before implementing the draft PPM section 390-55.

Sincerely,

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA



(use)

Bruno Nachtergaele, Chair  
Davis Division of the Academic Senate  
Professor: Mathematics