

Resolution To Oppose the Deployment of Potentially Lethal Tasers on SDCCD Campuses

1st Read: 7 October 2024

2nd Read: 21 October 2024

Whereas in 2022, under the leadership of Chancellor, Carlos Cortez, the San Diego Community College District (SDCCD) purchased Conducted Energy Devices (also known as Tasers) to arm SDCCD police officers, spending \$1600- \$1700 on each Conducted Energy Device (CED) and an additional \$78,000 on officer training, not including annual costs for recertification.

Whereas the SDCCD Police Taskforce Subcommittee reviewed over 40 academic studies, none of which were affiliated with law enforcement, CED manufacturers, or relied on anecdotal evidence, and contradicts many of the findings discussed in the report conducted by “Secure Brand Management,” a PR company founded in part by a former law enforcement officer,¹ and hired by Vice Chancellor Peterson, that rely heavily on interviews with police and data from CED manufacturers, and excludes essential student and campus community perspectives.

Whereas a 2020 study by *Reuters* on deaths associated with tasers “documented 1,081 cases through the end of 2018 in which people died after being shocked by police with a Taser, the vast majority of them after 2000. At least 32% of those who died were black, and at least 29% were white. African-Americans make up 14% of the U.S. population, and non-Hispanic whites 60%.”²

Whereas the SDCCD “Board of Trustees Goals for 2024 -25” states their commitment “to maintaining high levels of student success and well-being, to promoting a community consistent with the values of social and racial justice...”³

Whereas one of the San Diego Community College District’s strategic goals in their “Mission and Goals” page is to “Ensure fiscal solvency through sound fiscal planning and management.”⁴

¹ <https://www.securebrandmanagement.com/about>

² “Black Americans disproportionately die in police Taser confrontations,” <https://www.reuters.com/article/world/black-americans-disproportionately-die-in-police-taser-confrontations-idUSKBN23M16D/>

³ “Board of Trustees Goals for 2024-25,” <https://www.sdccd.edu/about/leadership/board-of-trustees/board-goals.aspx>

⁴ “Mission and Goals,” <https://www.sdccd.edu/about/mission-and-goals.aspx#:~:text=We%20create%20spaces%20where%20access,and%20the%20state%20of%20California>.

Whereas if the priority of the SDCCD is to improve relationships between the police and the campus community, it is essential to prevent arming campus police with potentially lethal weapons that will further increase the likelihood of deployment of these weapons and therefore instill fear amongst the student population, as the presence of a heavily armed police force on campus presents as intimidating and hostile for our campus communities, and communities of color specifically, since they are already overpoliced.

Be it resolved that the San Diego Community College District uphold its commitment to “student well-being” by opposing the implementation of Conducted Energy Devices (CED) on San Community College District campuses.

Be it resolved that the San Diego Community College District uphold its commitment to fiscal solvency and prevent additional spending on CED police training and recertification and instead use these resources to “Maximize student access, learning, and success” as outlined in the District’s Mission and Strategic goals.

Faculty Signatories:

Norell Martínez, PhD
Darius Spearman
Justin Akers Chacón, EdD
Mona Alsoraimi-Espiritu
Octavio García