

Final Report

Civilian Oversight of Police Services

Disappearing Task Force

May 16, 2025

Table of Contents

Foreword & Acknowledgement of Charge	2
DTF Description, Roles, & General Operations.....	2
Research Process	3
Broad Recommendations	4
Oversight Board Composition, Selection, & Service Terms	8
Requested Recommendations from the Executive Team.....	9
Key Question #1	9
Key Question #2	11
Key Question #3	11
Key Question #4	12
Key Question #5:	13
DTF-Generated Question #1	14
DTF-Generated Question #2	15
Appendix A – Governance Charge	16
Appendix B – Text Entry Survey Responses	19

Foreword & Acknowledgement of Charge

The Civilian Oversight of Police Services Disappearing Task Force (COPS-DTF) received its initial charge on December 20, 2025. The charge was to conduct research, consult and engage stakeholders, and provide specific recommendations based on the DTF's findings. The charge in its full form is included as an appendix item for reference.

All members of the DTF initially expressed anxiety about the gravity of the charge, its potential impacts on the campus community, and the importance of an Oversight Board (OB) for transparency and accountability. As the members delved deeper into their research, the complexity of civilian oversight of police came to the forefront. It became apparent the history of security and policing itself on campus was unclear, and the legal authorizing environment surrounding an OB would limit its scope and abilities.

That all being said, the members of the DTF acknowledged these tensions and leaned into the tensions cited in the original charge. They recognize that structured intent, community buy-in, and the ebb-and-flow of interest in campus policing over time framed their research and recommendations.

DTF Description, Roles, & General Operations

The DTF consisted of seven members and two administrative support staff from the President's Office. The seven sitting members of the DTF consisted of two full-time staff members, the Interim Chief of Police Services, a member of the faculty, one Geoduck Student Union (GSU)-appointed student, and two student shared governance appointees. A Chair of the DTF was identified and selected by the President's Office shortly before the initial meeting of the group. The two administrative support staff provided crucial minutes writing, space scheduling, calendar coordination, and technology support.

The DTF held its first official meeting on Thursday, February 6, 2025. On that date, the members made introductions, discussed and determined community norms, and mapped out a general pathway to complete the associated charge. Although majority vote was agreed upon for decision-making, all decisions put to a vote were reached via consensus – this was no small feat. In the initial meeting, DTF members determined that research into other institutions, a community survey, and interviews of previous Police Services Community Review Board (PSCRB) members would be necessary to make adequate recommendations.

In subsequent meetings, several sub-committees formed based on voluntary interest to distribute DTF labor to gather as much data, research, and archival documents in as little time as possible. These subcommittees were Higher Education Research, Previous Evergreen Models & Archives Review, Survey Design. The work of these subcommittees is detailed in a later section. After completing their respective work, the subcommittee members brought their findings to the larger group for review and discussion.

Three interviews of previous PSCRB members and chairs were conducted to deduce the strengths and weaknesses of previous iterations. These interviews brought several issues into view, illuminated several chapters of security and policing on campus and helped focus the recommendations of the DTF.

On behalf of the DTF members via consensus, the DTF Chair requested that the charge be extended twice. Once to May 9, 2025 to conduct enough research to provide adequate recommendations, and again to May 16, 2025 to provide a complete and polished report. President John Carmichael approved both requests.

Research Process

The following research methods were used and conducted in sub-committees to consider police oversight history at Evergreen, common practices for other higher education campus' police and their oversight, and the opinion and perspective of the Evergreen community.

Higher Education Research Subcommittee:

The Higher Ed Sub-committee reviewed current institutional processes at various higher education institutions within the state and across the nation.

Higher education institutions in the State of Washington were researched. Those institutions included the University of Washington, Washington State University, Western Washington University, Central Washington University, and Eastern Washington.

Higher education institutions that were similar or were recommended for review included the University of California-Davis, University of California-Santa Cruz, Michigan State University, and Portland State University.

During the review process, the sub-committee focused on institution size based upon student population, police department size, review board membership, membership selection, service terms, complaint procedures, meeting schedules, and other functions.

Previous Evergreen Models, Interviews, & Archive Retrieval

Initial research into Evergreen history of policing and oversight subcommittee analyzed all digitally available archives regarding the PSCRB, its structure, bylaws, and meeting minutes, as well as Cooper Point Journal articles referencing police actions and student opinion, police data and reports. What was found at this initial stage were from the years 2002- 2017.

Interviews with former PSCRB members revealed many shortcomings of the former board and uncovered the history of Evergreen policing. These narratives were confirmed through archival documents that communicated the progression and development of Evergreen security turned police presence. Also found useful in forming recommendations were meeting minutes and documents from both the PSCRB and the Deadly Force Review Board (DFRB)

Survey Design Subcommittee

The Survey Design subcommittee consisted of two staff members and one student. Microsoft Forms was used to create the survey for ease of use, dissemination, and data review. The questions on the survey were informed from already-conducted research and sought to gain insights from the Evergreen community on models and best practices found at other institutions.

The survey was conducted between March 19, 2025 and April 14, 2025. It collected feedback from 100 Evergreen community members, including 41 students, 48 staff, and 11 faculty. Survey questions asked respondents about OB representation, service terms, selection method, meeting frequency, complaint procedure medium, and included a single text-entry question. The text-entry responses are included as an appendix item. A summary of collected data can be accessed with this link: <https://tinyurl.com/DTF-Summary>.

Broad Recommendations

The members of the DTF strongly recommend reconstituting the original PSCRB, albeit with changes to its composition and support structure. The DTF members emphasize two recommendations:

- 1) The OB must have consistent access to the College Archives, with the assistance of an Archivist. The history of security and policing on campus is long and there are many rumors surrounding their origins, major events, armament,

etc. It is important to the mission of the OB that a complete and accurate history and timeline of policing is conducted.

- 2) The OB must adopt nimble and agile organizational practices in an environment of small budgets and limited resources. Practices, policies, and procedures change over time, and the OB should adjust its scope, mission, and goals necessarily.

Goals

- Serves to hold the Evergreen Police Services (EPD) accountable to the student, staff, and faculty populations.
- Acts in service of the community as a counterbalance to the power of the campus police department.
- Provide an environment to access information around policing, including “town halls” to engage the community in conversation.
- Maintain anonymity of community members who testify or report misconduct as well as those that were involved in incidents.
- Maintain public knowledge around history of evergreen policing: policy decisions, arming, major events, student opposition.
- Focus on preventative action rather than damage control.
- Facilitate transparency surrounding police actions and incidents on campus.
- Track larger trends in American policing: popular culture, politics, academics, the Evergreen community.

Roles

Discussion on the roles on the OB, as well as their selection, composition, and service terms, occupied a significant amount of time for the DTF members. It is important to the members of the DTF that there is adequate representation from constituent members of the Evergreen Community, in particular student representation. This is primarily due to the overall impact that EPD has on the student population. Recommended selection, composition, and service terms are included as a full section later in this report. The identified and recommended roles on the OB consist of:

- 1) Voting Members
- 2) Ex-Officio Subject Matter Experts (SMEs)
- 3) Support Staff

Voting members are sitting members of the Oversight Board. Voting should be conducted via a simple majority.

Ex-Officio Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) are a non-voting group of staff members who hold stewardship over information and processes of value to the OB. SMEs will provide the OB with the knowledge and expertise to make diligent, sound, and informed decisions when necessary. SMEs would be welcome to attend regular meetings of the OB but would not be required to. The DTF members identified several positions in the College could serve as SMEs for their respective areas.

- Archivist, Archives & Special Collections
- Chief of Police Services, EPD
- Dean of Students or Dean-Appointee, SEES
- Director or Director-Appointee, BLISS
- Director or Director-Appointee, Human Resources
- Union Representative, Washington Federation of State Employees (WFSE)

An Archivist from the Archives & Special Collections department would provide historical documentation regarding the history of security and policing on campus. They would act as a steward of this history and partner with student representatives of the OB to create and maintain an accurate record of security and policing at Evergreen.

The Chief of Police Services would provide information and insight into police policies and procedure at Evergreen. They would provide the OB with requested documents relating to crime and policing on campus.

The Dean of Students of the SEES Division or their appointee would provide information and insight into student conduct investigation policies and procedures, and how they interact with police investigations on students.

The Director or Director-Appointee of BLISS or their appointee would provide a social justice framework for the OB. Roles performing similar duties exist on Civilian Oversight Committees at other institutions of higher education.

The Director or Director-Appointee of Human Resources and the Union Representative from WFSE would provide both employer and employee policy and procedure as it relates to any potential disciplinary action of officers. Required employee privacy, negotiated union contracts, investigative procedures, and similar areas which require this expertise would be covered here.

An OB Chair or Administrator should also be externally appointed to the Board. The Chair would be considered support staff and serve as an administrator and advisor. The Chair would be a non-voting and neutral member of the Board and be a full-time professional staff member of the college. The Chair should have experience with

administrative support, de-escalation, and group facilitation. The DTF members identified this role as critical to the functioning of the OB and wanted to minimize its potential for undue influence. This role could rotate personnel on a regular basis (quarterly or yearly) to minimize the impact on staff time and effort. Alternatively, a Chair and a Chair Alternate could be identified to spread time and effort over several staff members.

Responsibilities

The responsibilities invested into the OB attempt to strike a hard balance between stewardship, research, community communication, staff sustainability, and student learning. Ultimately, the OB would serve as stewards of campus safety policy and procedure, and act as a vehicle of discussion and facilitation between EPD and the broader Evergreen Community.

The intent of the DTF members is to emphasize transparency, fairness, and adherence to the existing authorizing body surrounding employee / officer discipline. The DTF members frequently agreed that creating an agile, and responsive OB is imperative to its longevity. Policies and procedures change. The OB must be nimble enough to respond to changing circumstances as they arise.

Dispelling myths surrounding current and historical campus safety, security, and policing was also identified. Echoing previous statements in this report, the research phase of the DTF illuminated how widely unknown the long history of security and policing at Evergreen is, even to long-employed administrative staff members and members of EPD. It is of paramount importance to the OB that this history is thoroughly researched, catalogued, and compiled into a living historical document. Bearing these in mind, broad responsibilities of the OB include:

- Hold semi-monthly public meetings.
- Create, conduct, and maintain a complaint review process.
- Review campus crime and policing statistics (when available).
- Document relevant policies relating to officer discipline and campus safety.
- Provide evidence-based recommendations considering current trends in civilian oversight, policing policy, and similar topics to the Board of Trustees (BoT) and the Executive Leadership Team (ELT) with regular review and tailored to be appropriate for Evergreen culture and community.

Oversight Board Composition, Selection, & Service Terms

The composition, selection, and service terms of the sitting OB members were of significant interest to the DTF members and reflects both their research into other institutions and the community survey. Below is a table providing three different options regarding composition. This was one of the few decisions that the DTF did not reach consensus on. The DTF determined a short decision package would be the best option to present the ELT.

Voting Member Type	Option A	Option B	Option C
Students	3	3	4
Staff Members	1 + 1 Alternate	2	2
Faculty Members	1 + 1 Alternate	2	2

Drawing from both research and our survey data, the DTF presents three potential options for Voting Member composition of the OB. Where student representatives are mentioned, it is assumed that both Undergraduate and Graduate students are eligible to serve. As an option to help ensure consistent student presence on the OB, one seat could have a requirement to be held by a current GSU member.

Option A is a 5+2-member model inspired by the composition and function of the Clean Energy Committee at Evergreen. In this model there are several student voting members hired for 1-year service terms and several faculty and staff members who have appointed alternates. These alternates are tapped into meetings when the primary voting member is unable to attend due to other job obligations or responsibilities. Alternates are able to join regular meetings, but do not possess voting rights while the Primary is present and able to vote.

Option B is a similar model to the previous iterations of the OB, consisting of seven total voting members: three student members, two staff members, and two faculty members.

Option C is an 8-member model which emphasizes student representation on the OB and would require a process for tie-breaking. It is recommended that the normally non-voting Chair/Administrator fulfill this tie-breaker role, like the Student Co-Chair role of the Clean Energy Committee.

Regardless of which composition option is selected, DTF members' recommendations on the selection methods and service terms are the same across all options. These recommendations are informed by existing frameworks, research and survey data.

	Student Members	Staff Members	Faculty Members
<i>Selection Method</i>	Application, reviewed by Geoduck Student Union (GSU)	Appointment by ELT with GSU approval	Appointment by Faculty Agenda Committee (FAC) with GSU approval
<i>Service Term Length</i>	1 year	2 years	2 years
<i>Total Service Terms</i>	2 terms	1 term	1 term

The above table details the voting members and their selection methods, service term length, and total service terms. For student voting members, the recommendations are informed by and consistent with existing frameworks for student governance and shared governance appointments at Evergreen. Within student governance (GSU, CEC, and S&A Board), students apply for their roles for 1-year service terms and are allowed to serve at most two terms. The GSU would review and appoint student voting members via application, in a comparable manner that shared governance appointees go through.

To levy some kind of check and balance system in the OB composition, the DTF members recommend that the GSU review and approve any staff and faculty appointments made by the ELT and FAC. The involvement of the GSU in this stated capacity helps ensure student voice and power is recognized and uplifted, while also elevating and enforcing transparency.

Requested Recommendations from the Executive Team

Key Question #1

How do we create a system of civilian oversight that respects current collective bargaining agreements that govern personnel investigations and discipline?

This component of the DTF members' research, discussion, and deliberation occupied a significant amount of time, effort, and consideration due to its legal and authority-determining nature. Any recommendations made by the DTF members' have been made with careful consideration of the legal, ethical, and authorizing environments relating to the reconstitution of an OB.

Recommendation

A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that details the official acknowledgement of the duties, scope, and purpose of the OB should be reviewed and signed by Evergreen's Human Resources department, the stewards and representatives of the Evergreen State

College Police Bargaining Unit of WFSE recognizing their relationship. In addition, future collective bargaining agreements (CBAs) should include language that acknowledges the duties, scope, and purpose of the OB. **Note:** Attempts were made to reach out to the Police Bargaining Unit for context, but the DTF members received no official response.

The Office of the President should identify designated management and union resource person(s), acting as Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) for the OB. These SMEs would provide knowledge, context, and available options regarding potential personnel investigations and discipline. Identified SMEs relating to officer discipline by the DTF members include the VP of Human resources (regarding all contract issues) and the Union Steward of the Police Bargaining Unit.

Due to the complexity of the authorizing environment of EPD that straddles institutional, county, and state statutes, policies, and procedures, a bifurcated approach to investigations and discipline is needed – external vs. internal.

- Internal Investigations & Discipline
 - The OB would need to develop a process for collecting official statements from community members that is realistic about the OB's abilities and scope to act.
 - The OB should act as an intermediary entity to ask questions of related parties and to be an interface between the community and the ELT and/or the Board of Trustees (BoT).
 - The mechanisms for applying any necessary pressure to the ELT or BoT should be specific and related to filing complaints on behalf of community members and supplying information and knowledge of official processes to the broader community in the event of a personnel investigation and any related discipline.
 - In the event of deadly use of force on part of EPD, the OB should work in conjunction with the already established DFRB to determine any required action involving investigations and discipline.
 - The OB should intentionally establish an MOU for FY25-26 with the VP of Human Resources and establish an awareness of the FY27-29 union contract negotiations, with an emphasis on centering communication and contact.

- External Investigations & Discipline
 - EPD's unique nature as an institutional and state law enforcement entity requires the involvement of state and county-based agencies to conduct investigations and discipline of its officers.
 - Washington State [Office of Independent Investigations](#) (OII) for death and serious injury resulting from use of force.
 - Washington State [Criminal Justice Training Commission](#) (CJTC) [complaint process](#) and [form](#) regarding officer behavior and misconduct.
 - Relevant RCWs and WACs
 - ♣ RCW 43.101.105
<https://app.leg.wa.gov/rcw/default.aspx?cite=43.101.105>
 - ♣ WAC 139-17-010
<https://app.leg.wa.gov/WAC/default.aspx?cite=139-17-010>

Key Question #2

How does a civilian oversight body balance transparency with confidentiality where complaints may involve sensitive and private information?

Recommendation

Balancing transparency with confidentiality relating to public employee investigations and discipline is challenging. The OB should use a targeted, two-pronged approach to address investigations and discipline proceedings: utilize already-existing official complaint processes for both the state and the institution as referenced in Key Question #1.

The complaint mechanism(s) to be developed by the OB should be anonymous in an effort to reduce and mitigate retaliation to complainants and should be FERPA-compliant for students' personally identifiable information, if relevant.

The OB should identify a Human Resources SME to provide information, clarity, and context for classified vs non-classified staff investigations. This position is likely to be the VP of Human Resources but could also be another position close to both union representatives and Human Resources, if available.

Key Question #3

When investigations are necessary under a system of civilian oversight, who conducts the investigation? What training and resources are needed to ensure a fair and complete investigation?

Recommendation

Investigations relating to officer conduct are broadly detailed in Key Question #1.

Either Evergreen Human Resources, an independent law enforcement investigative body (OII or CJTC), or a combination thereof would be the primary investigators of officer conduct. The OB would act as an intermediary between the campus community and the ELT and BoT. It would also offer recommendations to the ELT based on just cause from investigations. The OB would be able to request information from relevant parties involved in any investigation to provide these recommendations to the ELT for action.

The OB should be tasked with releasing a Community Report, preferably monthly, that details actions, requests, and investigations prompted by the OB. The Community Report would act as a passive transparency tool for the community, providing updates that are sensitive to ongoing investigations.

The OB should investigate a peer mentor or peer interview process between the student members of the OB and any student complainants, to mitigate trust, speech, and engagement issues. This peer mentor model could vary in scale, role, and resourcing based on the current needs of the OB and the campus community. The needs of the peer mentor model would be identified in community-oriented forums that exercise all available information and emphasize transparency and accountability.

Independent investigations and discipline from state agencies (OII / CJTC) should be prioritized within their own necessary contexts and would be the primary investigative tool for the OB.

Key Question #4

What budget or other resources are necessary to implement your recommendations, keeping in mind that resources are limited?

Recommendation

Considering already limited resourcing, potentially high utilization of public employee time and effort, low budget capacity, as well as looming state budget cuts to the institution, it is the recommendation of the DTF Members to create a lean scaffolded support environment consisting of already-existing resources and budget pools. This proposed support environment would be highly collaborative and nimble.

- Grant Funding: Exploration of additional grant funding for police oversight committees would be needed, specifically for training resources. Partnering directly with Grants & Foundation Relations Office personnel to explore outside grants is recommended. Examples of outside grant funding sources are included below.
 - o Department of Justice (DOJ) [Community-Oriented Policing Services \(COPS\)](#)
 - o [Inatai Foundation](#)
- Training Resources: Members of the OB should be given equal and ample opportunities to develop their skills, knowledge, and abilities regarding community oversight of police. Existing resources, conferences, and workshops are available at the local, state, and federal level. Funding to access these resources may be provided out of either appropriated grants, the Office of the President (e.g. the Equity Fund), Student Governance (e.g. GSU), or a combination of all proposed funding resources.
 - o NACOLE (National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement https://www.nacole.org/annual_conference)
- Student Member Compensation: Student members of the OB should be compensated for their service. There are two existing options, and a third option could be explored by the OB once it is seated.
 - o Shared Governance Stipend - Using existing precedent for student participation on college governance committees, student members would be compensated \$50 per meeting (or \$100 per month, based on the meeting frequency recommendation). This compensation would originate from the GSU and be disbursed on a regular basis via Student Activities operations.
 - o Leadership Learning Allotments - Student voting members could also be compensated using the Leadership Learning Allotment stipend model at a current (as of FY26) rate of \$700 per quarter. This compensation would originate from the GSU and be disbursed on a regular basis via Student Activities operations.
 - o Internships – Organized either through partnership with the Public Service Centers (e.g. CCBLA, CELTC, CCAS, SPP, Washington Center, House of Welcome, Institute for Public Policy) for compensation at their relative rates and/or through Academic Internship Contracts for credit.

Key Question #5:

What type of public process might be established to precede any potential rescinding or changing of implemented recommendations?

Recommendation

The OB would vote via majority in a public meeting regarding any changes or removal of its own implemented recommendations.

There is a public duty of the OB to effectively notify the community about any changes that may go into effect. Both written and email notifications through Inside Evergreen and/or other means of mass communication available to the OB should be utilized to convey what proposed changes or removals are being made.

Before the vote takes place, the OB would schedule a public town hall event. This public town hall event would function as a forum for community members to hear, review, and discuss any questions, concerns, or comments regarding the proposed changes. All public comment would be taken into account during the voting process. Both steps, the notification of proposed changes/removal and the call for a town hall meeting, are recommended to emphasize transparency and accountability to the campus community.

DTF-Generated Question #1

What is the relationship between the Oversight Board and the Evergreen Tacoma campus, or any future campuses?

Recommendation

For the Evergreen Tacoma Campus, security and policing is already provided by the Tacoma Police Department (TPD) in the event of an emergency. Additionally, EPD and TPD are both already connected regarding emergency response. Future security and policing arrangements will need to have an agreement to recognize the OB as an official authorizing entity. This may be done through a MOU, through the respective union's Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), or both. For any employment contracts or CBAs, the OB will have an opportunity to provide bargaining agreement recommendations for input or engagement.

DTF-Generated Question #2

What is the board tasked with in their meetings/ their work?

Recommendation

In the spirit of creating the day-to-day operations of the OB would broadly be determined by the board members themselves. General guidelines for tasks related to Board Activity are listed below, but the list is not exhaustive and is expected to change as practices change.

- Making Policing Policy recommendations to the BoT and ELT.
- Advising trainings, including student development theory trainings for campus officers.
- Attending Police Oversight Conferences.
- Meeting with/ maintaining relationships with other relevant Police OBs.
- Facilitating/ directing grievance procedures.

Appendix A – Governance Charge

Background

Police agencies (and contracted agencies who supplement security service needs) should be accountable to civilian (i.e., non-police) authorities and ultimately accountable to the people that police agencies serve. An effective system of civilian oversight provides for accountability, protects civil rights, and ultimately can help build community trust in its police agency. Without an effective system of civilian oversight, a police agency loses democratic legitimacy.

Evergreen long ago decided that it was useful to have a campus police department directly accountable to the college. You are asked to make recommendations for a system of civilian oversight that meets the college's needs. It is time to do this work for two reasons.

First, the Police Services Community Review Board (PSCRB) that was established when the Police Department was created has not met since 2018. That board had a dual mission: to improve relationships between campus police and the community and to provide a system for receiving and considering complaints. When the board last met, I remember a lot of discussion about the tension between these two missions.

Second, as part of the agreement between the college and the Evergreen Gaza Solidarity Encampment, the Civilian Oversight of Police Services is charged. The agreement calls for the task force to propose a new Police Services Community Review Board structure.

Charge

At the task force's first meeting, please develop a work plan that includes these elements at a minimum:

1. Research

- Research civilian oversight models used by other universities and municipalities.
- Consider best practices and potential pitfalls revealed by the experience of other universities and municipalities
- Review Evergreen's current policies, practices, and history of campus policing and civilian oversight.
- Review the history of the Police Services Community Review Board and determine if that group needs to be reconstituted (and revised), or if a new structure and system needs to be created.

2. Consultation and engagement

- Seek input from campus stakeholders, including students (both living on-campus and off campus), faculty, and staff, including staff in the police department.
- Provide quarterly progress reports to Geoduck Student Union, the Faculty Agenda Committee, and the Executive Leadership Team.

3. Recommendations

- Based on your findings, recommend goals, roles, and responsibilities for a proposed civilian oversight body.
- Make recommendations for the structure of the oversight system, including composition of the oversight body, member selection process, and terms of service.

Your recommendations should include specific consideration of key questions, including:

- How do we create a system of civilian oversight that respects current collective bargaining agreements that govern personnel investigations and discipline?
- How does a civilian oversight body balance transparency with confidentiality where complaints may involve sensitive and private information?
- When investigations are necessary under a system of civilian oversight, who conducts the investigation? What training and resources are needed to ensure a fair and complete investigation?
- What budget or other resources are necessary to implement your recommendations, keeping in mind that resources are limited?
- What type of public process might be established to precede any potential rescinding or changing of implemented recommendations?

Membership

Under the agreement, the disappearing task force will include up to three students appointed by the Geoduck Student Union, two faculty members appointed by the Faculty Agenda Committee, and additional staff appointed by the President. The President will designate a chair or co-chairs of the task force and be responsible for assigning administrative support to the task force.

Timeline

Please deliver recommendations to the President by the end of Winter quarter 2025. The President will respond to accept, modify, or reject recommendations. A new civilian oversight system will be implemented to begin no later than Fall 2025 with full implementation no later than Fall 2026.

Modifications to this charge

As the task force progresses, please address any requests for modification to the scope, membership, or timeline of the task force to the Presiden

Appendix B – Text Entry Survey Responses

Please include training that addresses communication, group process, engaging respectfully, and how to integrate equity, inclusion, and belonging in the work of the committee
These are all challenging questions. I do know that when an investigation is necessary, Police Services should have no leadership role in the investigation. Those leading it should have at least some training in transparency, DEIA, de-escalation, and other relevant subjects.
If personnel investigations are a part of the task force's work, representation from HR and union reps would help ensure the body has the subject matter expertise to support implementation. / Confidentiality with specific cases should take priority and high level of transparency on the processes to hopefully engender trust (i.e. student conduct). / I would hope that civilian oversight means establishing the values and helping set priorities for areas that might be in conflict (i.e. privacy vs. transparency), while the appropriate staff (or third party as appropriate) are entrusted to implement and carry out the actual investigation. Expecting civilian bodies to learn the relevant policy and gain the subject matter expertise to adequately carry out an investigation I think would be a mistake. / No comment on budget. / Public, pushed communications of changes are sufficient (i.e. Inside Evergreen) along with web presence.
Note: for the faculty, the selection process should be overseen by the faculty agenda committee.
Evergreen College Police Services needs to be transparent with the community.
I'm curious about this statement in the email this survey was included in: "Considering the history of prior civilian oversight of Police Services at this campus, we want to approach our charge with the care, diligence, and insight it deserves." As a former member of the TESC Police Services Community Review Board I am puzzled as to what this means/infers. Thanks!
Civilian Oversight has a right to all FACTUAL information surrounding the occurrences. Civilian Oversight has an opinion and should be accounted for fairly and impartially. However, there are instances where discipline and/or investigations are mandated (by law) to be handled by the legal system. When an instance occurs where confidentiality is paramount, inform the committee members of the overarching situation. Proceed to speak with the Civilian Oversight members directly

impacted by the incident. Evergreen Police shall handle all investigations regarding a crime/possible crime and violations of the law. Campus policy violations, internal investigations; of Staff, Faculty, Student, and Police Services members, should be investigated by all Civilian Oversight members not associated to the individual(s) under investigation. If both of the above listed conditions apply, the investigation should be turned over to a law enforcement agency unaffiliated with TESC and Police Services.

No need to make any changes, its been quiet for nearly a year. If students were properly educated about historical facts and not relying on misinformation from activists who agitate for the sake of agitation, we would not have this problem. The needs of the entire Evergreen campus outweigh the needs of a few.

I don't know that I have enough information to answer these questions thoroughly

We have had an oversight board in the past and it needs to be revived. Police should not be involved in oversight of their own department. The committee needs to determine when confidential cases or complaints should be made public, but the committee needs to agree to confidentiality in their processes. The committee should have a chair, possibly the Dean of students in collaboration with a GSU leader or faculty. I do wonder if just an oversight committee is enough or if Evergreen needs to re-envision the ways in which we conceive of community safety, so that we can limit the reach and role of Police Services. This would include a less militarized approach to policing (arms, etc), more care services that don't involved armed police, safety escorts, apps, etc.

This has to be dealt with by de-escalation and more focus on community needs being met and education of community members. We should remove and disarm police as much as possible at Evergreen. Police are ineffective at fostering safety and accountability and instead create an atmosphere of escalated violence and pervasive fear among students, staff, and community members. Police also disproportionately target, harass, and use violence towards people with marginalized identities. That is not what Evergreen stands for, it is not supportive to Evergreen students and staff, and it is not representative of the Evergreen that I want to see in the world.

I think as far as the training required, the non-police members of the task force should learn about what police do day to day, the kind of pressure they are under, and how they are making decisions in high-stress situations. Policing is a difficult job, and empathy should be extended to both civilians and police when there are complaints. There should also be confidentiality and FERPA training to all members of the task force if they have not received it already, with examples.
1. Don't. Follow the law. 2. Don't. Follow the law. 3. No kangaroo civilian oversight. 4. No budget. 5. No public process; just follow the law.
Once a body for the DTF is elected or appointed, each event to be reviewed by the DTF should be presented individually. All relevant sections of the Standard Operating Procedure should be identified and reviewed by the DTF. All body camera footage and reports should be acquired by Public Records Request and subsequently compared against the Standard Operating Procedure to identify discrepancies.
get rid of all the cops stop wasting my money on fucking cops thanks
Trainings around restorative justice, active listening, and trauma-informed practices seem like they could help equip all involved in the oversight body with important skills related to their work. Creating a culture that holds space for nuance and compassion seems key (both in the oversight body and on campus more broadly). Given the ways that policing can be so contentious and polarizing, I wonder whether frameworks/tools from these bodies of knowledge (restorative justice, etc) could also be built into any public process related to the oversight body's work (i.e., if there are listening sessions, etc). Perhaps gathering written responses/feedback could be a good way to hear different perspectives (in addition to or instead of having public meetings).
I would say that there has to be a good understanding of the bargaining agreements, the spirit behind them and possible compensation with the creators. Keep things to the point, no unnecessary detail, An attitude of respect for everyone involved, including the person being investigated. A non-voting member of the task force, or have a pool of qualified individuals that are represented to call on if needed. Trainings on investigative techniques and procedures. There should be educational material that teaches how to investigate in an unbiased manner. I have no clue. It would be hard to have the amount of representatives I put. I was thinking about voting stuff. Trainings could be hard to implement. The turnover rate

for the members would also be hard to keep up with. A disappearing task force of hopefully paid members of the represented body.

I would need to do more research/read reports from the research that the task force has done in order to answer these questions. Ultimately, what I see as most important in the (re)creation of a Civilian Oversight Board is that the power to make decisions and hold Police Services accountable lies in the hands of students, staff, and faculty. I do not think it's appropriate to give people who are or have been employed by Police Services voting rights on this Board because my understanding of such a Board's purpose is to act as a check on Police Services' powers.

Ensure committee hasample support; staff with a coordinator/admin professional with expert knowledge in collective bargaining, student conduct, college policies, etc.--ideally someone in SEES administration. This should be a quasi-permanent appointment based on level of expertise, and should be a non-voting role. It would not replace other staff or faculty community members. The workload could be significant at times, and this person's job description should reflect that. The college should keep one or more independent investigators on retainer to conduct investigations about police misconduct, unless the complaint involves compliance with established college processes (e.g., Title IX, Civil Rights, etc.). Then an investigation may be conducted by the appropriate college office, or in collaboration between a retained investigator and the college office. You need experience and independence in this kind of work. Budget from student fees and/or appropriated funds.

How does a civilian oversight body balance transparency with confidentiality where complaints may involve sensitive and private information? Have civilian participants take a short course on confidentiality, and sign an agreement related to this.

Regarding the privacy concerns, I don't think it is lawful for civilians to have that kind of criminal information. If members want to do an investigation, it should be done by a quorum of the individuals on this board, that would require all board members to be vested in the task force and most to be present for any investigations they would want to pursue. I don't think members should be paid by the college, if the members really want to be on this board, then they should volunteer their time. I don't think civilians can change how the law operates unless it is done by the legislature. You may be able to suggest some type of extra training or something of that nature.

The College already has a structure in place for community oversight of police services. Is there some reason that organ is no longer fit for purpose? Previous administrations may have allowed it to lapse, but that doesn't mean the current administration can't restore it. <https://archives.evergreen.edu/webpages/committee/policereview/review.htm> That previous board was populated as follows - I see no reason to modify this distribution: A. Three (3) students to be appointed by Geoduck Student Union B. Two (2) faculty to be appointed by the Agenda Committee C. Three (3) staff members, including a staff member from Finance and Administration, a staff member from Student Affairs, and a staff member from College Advancement D. Two (2) ex-officio, non-voting members (the Vice President for Student Affairs and the Director of Police Services)

Part of the issue with police accountability is that many times the behavior of police is investigated within a rigged system: the police investigating themselves is not a fair investigation. Police unions are very powerful, they have comparatively higher membership rate which equip them to invest in campaign efforts to block reforms. All that is just to acknowledge that a lot of the issue is way up stream. That being said, I don't have a great understanding of how much autonomy Evergreen police force has or the history and culture of their union. I do know that the lethality of their equipment has increased over the years, as is the case with most all police forces in the country. This has been a serious concern for students and their safety. This is made more complex by the increase in campus shootings. In other words, its not lost on me that it may be the case that no one wants anyone to have a gun on campus, until someone else has one.

I believe this is an unnecessary board as it is not legal nor realistic. Civilian Oversight of Police Services is something that as for all government agencies I can see as being something needed. Police Services disappearing task force is not something that is realistic because of the RCW in place for university and college campus safety.

Everyone on this committee should receive training in Restorative / Transformative Justice, should read Danielle Sered's *Until We Reckon* and other relevant texts, should have a regular seminar on topics and discourses in the history of criminal justice and policing, such as reform, abolition, political economies of detention and incarceration, as well as training in trauma-informed care and the nervous system, alternative models, etc., so as to make the best decisions.

I'm gonna be completely honest. I'm not a 100% sure what this survey is talking about so I feel like I can't give a good answer to these questions.

How do we create an oversight board that doesn't have a "chilling effect" that prevents the police from doing their jobs when there is an emergency on campus? What kind of authority will the oversight board have to take action if something comes to the board that is found to have been inappropriate? What about the police services need to be "fixed" in the first place, and is there a need for an oversight committee?

Your first question (How many voting representatives from each group should be on the committee?) and following related questions indicated separation between "Staff" and the Student Engagement, Equity & Support staff, which is confusing - both are staff. I indicated 2 staff should be on the committee, but I meant 1 member from SEES and 1 other staff. I feel like there should be a member of Police Services on the committee, but then it's not a "civilian" committee in the truest sense. It's hard to understand without knowing the goal of the committee. In light of budget cuts and the likely recession soon to follow, is forming this committee (and adding to staff workload) appropriate at this time? What requirements are in place for police to follow recommendations for accountability that this committee might make? Would there be consequences if they do not follow recommendations made? How would those be implemented? I think all the questions you provided above are also important.

I believe we can do without Police Services here. The funding used for them could go into keeping staff. Especially the cost of their remodel could have kept several staff members in jobs. Maybe they can be part of the 25% staff reduction.??

For transparency of the police, the task force should be able to ask and receive compliance in answering questions revolving around what the officers are trained to do in various situations, what the process is for consequence/rehabilitation when a officer does something harmful to a civilian, where funding goes. This information should be accessible to the public. For the task force to be transparent and accessible to the public every other meeting could be held in person/streamed so people can submit questions/concerns to the chat. Holding forums/discussions, It is very important for any task force to have an understanding of the role of police is in the evergreen community so they know what the purpose/pursuits of investigations, processes, and oversight should be achieving. Understanding the climate that

exists on campus towards police and maybe working with RAD and other student facing departments to find ways to bolster the community to prevent the need for police intervention.

* the civilian oversight body should have the authority to ensure that the social contract, current student rights, and CBA are followed. all officers deserve due process, but my hunch is that part of the problem is that we're not enforcing current norms. * my other hunch is that police officers themselves would be far more effective than anyone else in enforcing those norms through social support, mentoring, and coaching. so I suppose that means that they should be involved early on in setting expectations. * I would recommend hiring external mediators to work with committee members and officers (do we have any right now?) on designing expectations and establishing mechanisms of accountability to the committee and the university.

The company must understand the complicated nature of having a sworn police department on a university campus. if they're truly will be resources added, then having a counselor that is attached to police services is a model that is being used across the country to help deal with behavioral situations. I think that would be a great investment for Evergreen . It is also critically important that there be 24 seven coverage. It only takes one uncovered situation to create a situation that will result in an avoidable crisis

I would look to other successful models to inform a model for civilian oversight, which considers all of the various stakeholders. Working with an independent investigation team will help balance transparency and ideally provide an informed and experienced review. I don't know what the cost of this would look like. Training would be very important to help a civilian oversight committee understand the breadth and scope of issues and concerns of the various stakeholder groups, and the limitations of what a state college is able to do in order to provide a safe and healthy campus.

1. They would make recommendations and public statements rather than engage in the actual disciplinary process for police with education (Venn diagram???) of what is under whose purview. 2. With a rigorous and transparent process regarding how members are selected, the public information the review, the limits of their power, and a clear (specific, in layman's terms) statement of when they publicly disclose information and when they don't. 3. Are there national models to draw from? 4/5 I don't know.

It's ridiculous to have police on the Civilian police oversight board. It opens up avenues of intimidation and corruption, and calls the group's legitimacy into question. Dont do that! Please.
I can't answer this survey because the questions don't make sense without an explanation of what this Oversight Board is supposed to do. The first question is about the composition of a committee, but there's no explanation of what committee you're referring to. A new committee to oversee the police I assume, but that's just an assumption. You assume I know more than I do about what your task force has been up to and what it's trying to address.
With regards to sensitive information. If the criteria for why information is redacted or omitted(personal identifying information, ongoing investigations, etc) a method of communicating those criteria on a regular basis and whenever an incident occurs. With regard to this it would also be helpful to communicate what the scope of the oversight group is when they are called on to review an incident
i dont have the capacity to answer these questions on a form, i am happy to do so in person.
Training is important as is ongoing evaluation of processes and protocols, perhaps an annual report? Budget for training and for conferences.
Have a firm grasp of WA state law, and have community.
I support a system which encourages feedback and transparent, closed loop communications regarding internal investigations, if/when complaints are filed. I do not feel civilian "oversight" (i.e. civilian lead investigations) needs to be a part of that process. I believe it is sufficient for a civilian volunteer (staff, faculty, etc.) to participate in a committee, (most often) lead internally by paid police services personnel who report to the committee and/or board. Occasionally, the committee/board may elect to hire or elicit external investigations by a third party, if deemed appropriate. It would make sense to have an executive level administrator on said committee/board, able to authorize certain actions on behalf of the college.
I don't have enough knowledge of this topic to answer these questions with any depth. I'd say that a general consideration is centering the value and principle of democracy and democratic decision making. If the College were to center genuine

democracy as an institution, then all services and offices would need to be help accountable by those who are most impacted by their actions, which is a central part of democracy. The police are supposed to serve the community, so the community needs to hold the police services accountable and police services needs to be open to this accountability. There's no integrity without accountability to those who are impacted by their actions.