



Davis Division Academic Senate

Request for Consultation Responses

Proposed PPM 390-55 - Video Security

March 12, 2014

A draft Policy and Procedure Manual (PPM) section 390-55 is provided for review and feedback.

Council of School & College Faculty Chairs (LS: SOC SCI)

March 3, 2014 4:41 PM

The L&S Executive Committee discussed this proposal on 3/3/14 and agreed with the rule of keeping video records for only a 30-day period. We thought the language should be clearer about the conditions under which the campus police can retain the video record for longer. Where the proposal says, in Section D3b, "for evidentiary purposes or determined necessary . . ." the part of the sentence after "for evidentiary purposes" should be deleted. It is too vague and potentially allows for unneeded retention of the records.

Faculty Welfare

February 24, 2014 11:39 AM

The committee has no substantial issues with the document, except clarification on whether the policy covers monitoring in laboratories (e.g., biosecurity).

Graduate Council

February 18, 2014 9:39 AM

No response at this time.

Research

March 4, 2014 2:13 PM

COR discussed the Proposed Policy and Procedure Manual (PPM) 390-55 regarding Video Security. COR agrees that there are three layers of issues with this new policy. First is the motivation. There is no clear justification (history, reason, benefits, etc.). Second is the cost. Again, this should be tied to the benefits. Third, it is unknown how this will affect faculty, staff, and student life on campus. There has to be more oversight from the campus organizations. These being said, some COR members agree that some video monitoring may prevent or help solve crimes, if that is the main purpose of this proposed policy. However, it is unclear just how effective the proposed policy will be.

In addition, COR has the following specific recommendations:

1. III.C.3.b.: It says that "primary locations for the installation of security cameras include: Public rooms and laboratories containing high value equipment or information." The committee hopes that they mean "at access to public rooms and laboratories" and not "inside the public rooms and laboratories". Otherwise, how will people agree to work with cameras on them all the time?
2. III.C.4.: "Video recording is not permitted in the following areas..." What about labs, classrooms, etc.?
3. III-A-3 should explicitly include the Academic Federation. Although it may be implied in "all parties having a recognized interest" there is no reason not to include the AF in the list to acknowledge that there is an organization on campus that represents non-Senate academic employees.
4. The committee is confused by the wording and intent of III-D-3-a-(1). If it is meant to provide additional protection to faculty, it should include AF members as well. If not, what is the purpose of written notification to the Academic Senate chair?
5. Paragraph D-4-d allows "access to recorded media as evidence ... As otherwise required by law." This is rather vague, and would permit the sorts of NSA surveillance and/or after the fact access that many citizens currently find distasteful, although the Federal Government claims that it is supported by law. COR recommends that at least the video policy review committee or another entity review requests in this "otherwise required by law" category, rather than have the blanket approval implied by this paragraph.