

---

---

## Response to Public Safety and Outreach Initiative Report

In the spring and summer of 2020, America bore witness to an appalling string of police shootings and violence aimed at Black citizens. Across the country and within the Philadelphia community many questions were raised about the role of policing in society. Specific to Penn was the question of how we best advance a safe and welcoming campus, which we hold as an unwavering priority. How do we ensure fairness, justice, and racial equity in police interactions both on campus and in our neighboring community?

To address these critically important issues, the University announced the launch of a Public Safety and Outreach Initiative (hereafter “Initiative”) to conduct a comprehensive review of public safety at Penn. The goal of the Initiative was first to assess and then to make recommendations that can help maximize Penn’s ongoing ability to create a safe environment both on campus and in the surrounding community that treats every person with dignity and respect, and promotes anti-racism and racial equity.

To lead the Initiative, Penn named as advisors: Dorothy Roberts, the George A. Weiss University Professor of Law and Sociology, Raymond Pace and Sadie Tanner Mossell Alexander Professor of Civil Rights, and Professor of Africana Studies; and Rev. Charles “Chaz” Howard, Vice President for Social Equity and Community and University Chaplain. They were supported by: John Holloway, Associate Dean and Executive Director of the Penn Carey Law School’s Quattrone Center for the Fair Administration of Justice; and Paul Heaton, the Quattrone Center’s Senior Fellow and Academic Director.

During August and September 2020, the Initiative held eight public hearings and listened to testimony from numerous members of the Penn and West Philadelphia communities, reviewed scores of documents, and received and reviewed written submissions from interested individuals. Based on this input, the advisors prepared a report that we are sharing with the community.

The report acknowledges the extraordinary work that Penn’s Division of Public Safety (DPS) does every day in working to keep the campus safe. Indeed, DPS has been recognized as the top public safety program in the country for 14 consecutive years by *Security Magazine*’s Security 500. The report also reflects the concerns, fears, and distrust of policing felt by some members of our University community, particularly students, faculty, and staff of color, as well as members of our West Philadelphia neighborhood. While these concerns are widely shared across our country, this Initiative reinforces rather than diminishes our commitment as leaders and stewards of the Penn community to do more to ensure that every member of Penn’s broad campus community feels physically and emotionally safe and shares a sense of equal belonging.

The report strikes four broad themes upon which we will reflect here and will act moving forward. First, it suggests a need for more transparency about the structure, funding, oversight, and activities of public safety at Penn.

Second, the report calls for greater accountability of DPS, including the need for more communication with members of the West Philadelphia community and expanding community input on policing activities.

Third, the report raises issues of funding and reinvestment. In order to keep our community safe, there is a need for investment in policing and security as well as continued and additional support for wellness, community engagement, and infrastructure initiatives. Our recent announcements regarding our partnership to preserve Mercy Philadelphia Hospital, collaboration with the West Philadelphia Skills Initiative to train lab assistants for Penn Medicine, and Penn’s historic multiyear commitment to the Philadelphia School District to accelerate the removal of environmental hazards are examples of the type of positive reinvestments that Penn can undertake.

Finally, the report urges a fundamental reimagining of what it means to have a Division of Public Safety. As a leading institution of higher education, we remain committed to being a model for our nation in carefully considering alternatives and in finding new structures and solutions that will ultimately make the systems of public safety and criminal justice more equitable for all members of our community and the nation.

These are all bold challenges. Some of the changes recommended in the report can be made quickly, and we will do so. Some, such as how to reimagine public safety for the future, have a longer timeline and will require a broader and deeper effort. Ensuring the safety of our campus community is critical, and it must be done thoughtfully and in a manner that guarantees the equal and just treatment of all.

The advisors and their team have raised truly important and welcome questions about how we view public safety. We are grateful for the thoughtful and far-ranging work that they have done, and we are committed to continuing to build upon this effort. Our endeavor to ensure effective public safety at Penn will not be fully successful until everyone on our campus and in our neighboring community feels equally safe and protected. That is our goal, and to that we are unflinchingly committed.

—Amy Gutmann, President

—Wendell Pritchett, Provost

—Craig Carnaroli, Executive Vice President

# Report on Public Safety and Outreach Initiative

## Executive Summary

During the summer of 2020, protests erupted around the country and the world in response to the killings of George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, Rayshard Brooks, and many other unarmed Black people by police. Protesters demanded that their elected representatives take action to end police violence, hold police officers accountable, defund police departments, and reallocate funding to programs and services that better ensure safety and meet people's needs. In this context, President Amy Gutmann and Provost Wendell Pritchett asked us to serve as Presidential Advisors to conduct a comprehensive review of the Division of Public Safety at Penn ("DPS") and to make recommendations to them and Executive Vice President Craig Carnaroli regarding Penn's success in creating a physically and emotionally safe environment on campus and in the surrounding community, while treating every person with equal dignity and respect, and in a way that prioritizes and promotes anti-racism, racial equality, and justice.

In July of 2020, we launched the Penn Public Safety Review and Outreach Initiative. With the help of the Quattrone Center for the Fair Administration of Justice, we requested and reviewed hundreds of documents submitted by DPS. During August and September, we held eight public hearings and listened to testimony from numerous members of the Penn and West Philadelphia communities, and we received and reviewed written submissions from many other interested members of these communities.

Many people praised the Penn Police Department, the leadership of DPS Vice President Maureen Rush, and other members of the Division for their responsiveness, professionalism, and service over the years. Still, four major concerns about the Penn Police (and policing in our country in general) stood out in the testimonies.

First, we heard many students state that they feel less safe and welcome at Penn because of the police presence. Black students, in particular, feel they are profiled by the Penn Police and need to wear Penn gear to avoid being stopped and questioned by officers.

Second, the Penn Police are called on to provide a number of services that could be safely and more appropriately performed by unarmed and/or non-police personnel.

Third, many felt that West Philadelphia neighborhoods within the Penn Police Zone are "over-policed," and that this worsens the relationship between the University of Pennsylvania and its neighboring Black communities. They encouraged us to consider transferring services away from police and reducing the size of the police force, freeing up funds to re-invest in other approaches to promoting public safety, well-being, and equal belonging in the Penn and West Philadelphia communities.

Finally, there was considerable distrust around the handling of these concerns, including complaint and disciplinary procedures. These are completely controlled by the Penn Police themselves and may not serve as appropriate accountability mechanisms.

We designed our recommendations with two conversations in mind—these central concerns raised in our hearings as well as broader challenges facing contemporary policing in America. Thus, the following recommendations should not be interpreted simply as responses to shortcomings and complaints made about the DPS. Indeed, we heard from some community members that, in comparison to most municipal and university police departments, ours is among the best. Instead, the following recommendations reflect not only "what's wrong," but also "what could and should be." Our aim is to reimagine public safety at Penn and in its surrounding neighborhoods in a way that enhances safety, well-being, and equal belonging and can serve as a model for transforming public safety systems in need of critical examination and creative change.

This has been an emotionally painful process for everyone involved. The fact that they did not occur on Penn's campus does not make images of George Floyd's murder, the story of Breonna Taylor's killing, and the hundreds of other deaths at the hands of police officers any less heartbreaking, infuriating, and traumatizing for those in our Penn community. Penn's staff, faculty, and administration, including those in DPS, are a tightly-knit community and many have been working together for many years. These hearings and this larger moment in our country have put a strain on many of these relationships.

Still, the two of us find hope in the resilience of the Penn community and the shared common goal to make Penn a safe and equitable space for everyone. We make the following four main recommendations:

1) Transparency: Increase transparency about DPS by making more information and documents public and easily accessible to the Penn and West Philadelphia communities.

2) Accountability: Increase accountability of DPS to the Penn and West Philadelphia communities by implementing independent supervision, strengthening complaint procedures, and increasing input from West Philadelphia residents.

3) Re-imagine Public Safety and Reduce Policing: Develop new approaches to ensure the safety, well-being, and belonging of the Penn and West Philadelphia communities that do not involve the police and that reduce the Penn Police presence, personnel, and budget.

4) Re-Investment: Invest more in campus and West Philadelphia initiatives that promote safety, well-being, and belonging and do not involve police.

—Dorothy Roberts, George A. Weiss University, Professor of Law and Sociology, Raymond Pace and Sadie Tanner Mossell Alexander Professor of Civil Rights, Professor of Africana Studies  
—Rev. Charles Howard, Vice President for Social Equity and Community, University Chaplain

## About the Initiative

### Charge & Members

On July 10, 2020, President Gutmann and Provost Pritchett established the Public Safety Review and Outreach Initiative and charged it with conducting an independent review of public safety at Penn. A team of Presidential Advisors has undertaken the review and outreach program to develop recommendations to present to President Gutmann, Provost Pritchett, and Executive Vice President Carnaroli.

The review sought to assess Penn's success in creating a physically and emotionally safe environment on campus and in the surrounding community, while treating every person with dignity and respect, and in a way that prioritizes and promotes anti-racism, racial equality, and justice. It sought to help Penn provide an environment in which every member of the University community can feel physically and emotionally safe and experience a sense of equal belonging.

The Presidential Advisors are Dorothy Roberts, George A. Weiss University Professor of Law and Sociology, Raymond Pace and Sadie Tanner Mossell Alexander Professor of Civil Rights, and Professor of Africana Studies, and Charles "Chaz" Howard, Vice President for Social Equity and Community and University Chaplain. They have been supported by the Quattrone Center for the Fair Administration of Justice at the University of Pennsylvania Carey Law School, a nationally recognized research and policy center dedicated to improving fairness and accuracy in the criminal justice system.

### Process

The Quattrone Center and Presidential Advisors began by requesting an extensive set of data and documents from Penn DPS and other entities within the University. DPS was responsive and collaborative in providing documents, and ultimately furnished 563 documents to the Initiative, including documents covering confidential matters. Information collected for review included the Penn Police Directives, accreditation reports, reports and directives dealing with use of force, racial profiling, and other potential forms of bias by the Penn Police, and data on vehicle and pedestrian stops. Also produced were documents governing virtual patrol, transparency, and the process to review complaints against police officers and other DPS personnel, along with strategic planning information, recruiting materials, and data and statistics regarding Allied Universal Security Services, a private security company overseen by DPS. Additionally, we reviewed the Memorandum of Understanding between the Penn Police and the Philadelphia Police Department, certain budgetary information related to DPS and the Penn Police, and other documentation referred to elsewhere in this report. DPS furnished documents describing community outreach efforts, such as the College House Detective Liaison Program, the Police Athletic League, and the First Thursday community meetings.

To gain further insights regarding community views about public safety, the Presidential Advisors and Quattrone Center convened a series of "virtual hearings," conducted on Zoom due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

These hearings, which were open to the public, provided a forum that allowed Penn and West Philadelphia community members to describe their experiences with DPS and offer ideas and suggestions on ways to achieve the common goal of providing an environment in which every member of the Penn community could feel physically and emotionally safe and experience a sense of equal belonging.

Eight (8) public hearings were conducted. Forty-five (45) individuals, including undergraduate and graduate students, faculty, staff, and members of the West Philadelphia community, provided statements at the hearings. At each hearing, invited speakers presented opening remarks, after which the Presidential Advisors had an opportunity to question the speakers. We invited members of the public who attended the hearings to also submit questions, a number of which were shared with and addressed by the speakers. The hearings were recorded and transcribed in their entirety and published online at [www.pennpublicsafetyreview.org](http://www.pennpublicsafetyreview.org).

To gain additional community input beyond that available through the hearings, we invited anyone interested to provide their views and ideas in writing through the [www.pennpublicsafetyreview.org](http://www.pennpublicsafetyreview.org) website; a telephone number with voice mail was also provided as an alternative submission method. We advertised this opportunity for comment to leaders of the Faculty Senate, Penn Alumni, and through articles in *Penn Today* and *The Daily Pennsylvanian*. We ultimately received written comments from 112 individuals who shared a variety of experiences, observations, and ideas regarding DPS and the Penn Police. Submitters of written comments included students, faculty, staff, parents of Penn students, alumni, and members of the West Philadelphia community.

Based on the information provided by the document review, the hearings and community submissions, a review of publicly available information on policing at other comparable campuses, and a review of the scholarly literature evaluating campus police and various potential police reforms, the Presidential Advisors have made their recommendations for ways Penn can more fully achieve its vision of providing an environment in which every member of the University community can feel physically and emotionally safe and experience a sense of equal belonging.

#### *Limitations*

The Initiative has conducted a wide-ranging review of public safety at Penn, including examining the work of DPS and the community's views of both DPS as a whole and the Penn Police specifically. As with all organizational reviews, we did face certain constraints. The review was conducted entirely remotely due to the COVID-19 pandemic. This may have limited the ability of some community members to share their full thoughts and perspectives or of reviewers to fully grasp all points made by participants in the Initiative.

In addition, while the Initiative was devoted to broad outreach and engagement, not every individual we invited to speak participated. There were many reasons for that, ranging from mundane scheduling issues to more substantive opposition to the Initiative (e.g., by the Police Free Penn collective) and concerns about reprisal or damaging relationships.

Finally, in light of the compressed timeframe of our review, we were not able to engage in original data collection (e.g., a community-wide survey) or to perform full statistical analyses of DPS performance. This could lead to a "selection" effect, meaning that the ideas, concerns, and positions of those people most motivated or enabled to speak could be overrepresented.

**Scope of Review & Recommendations:** Our review did not extend to policies and financial decisions of the University beyond the Penn Police and DPS. Some members of our community have tied policies related to policing at Penn to other University budgetary issues, such as Payments in Lieu of Taxes, severing ties with the carceral state and the prison-industrial complex, and divesting from fossil fuels. Although these issues may be related to our recommendations regarding re-investment, they were beyond the scope of our inquiry and therefore were not evaluated. We note that Penn's intention to contribute \$100 million to the Philadelphia School District, announced after the completion of our review, is an example of the University's consideration and action on these issues.

#### **What We Heard**

One of the Initiative's most critical tasks was to hear from members of the Penn and West Philadelphia communities regarding their perspectives on and experiences with Penn's public safety system. To do this, we solicited input from Penn affiliates and West Philadelphia residents through public hearings and other non-public mechanisms, including the Initiative's website and designated telephone line.

The feedback we received was extensive, thoughtful, and compelling, and we are profoundly grateful to those who participated in this process. The responses reflect a wide range of views on public safety at Penn and demonstrate the complexity of the issues that the Initiative had to address. A selection of the most salient points expressed by the participants, along with representative quotations, can be found here <https://www.law.upenn.edu/live/files/11592-whatweheard>.

#### **Recommendations**

*1) Transparency: Increase transparency about DPS by making more information and documents public and ensuring they are accessible to the Penn and West Philadelphia communities.*

**Recommendation 1:** Make the following documents publicly accessible online and hard copies available on demand at Van Pelt Library: all the Penn Police Directives; any Memoranda of Understanding with other law enforcement agencies (or similar documents) or descriptions of relationships with those agencies, including financial support to or from them; the Penn Police collective bargaining agreements; reports issued by DPS related to civilian interactions (including uses of force, profiling, discrimination, and bias), complaints, employee demographics, community demographics, crime data, recruitment, hiring, training, community outreach, CALEA accreditation, and diversity and inclusion; DPS recruitment and promotion processes (without revealing confidential information, such as interview questions); DPS budget information, including the Penn Police Department budget; DPS fleet and equipment information; DPS strategic plan documents; policies regarding the access to, control of, permitted uses for, and retention of closed circuit television (CCTV) cameras or video; commendations; information about the structure, membership, and activities of the DPS Advisory Board and DPS Review Board (described below); reports and findings issued by the DPS Advisory Board and DPS Review Board (see below); and any additional policies or other information that another Division at Penn would make available to the public or the Penn community, absent a strong public safety, employment, or legal justification to the contrary, in which case the reason for non-disclosure should be publicly documented.

**Description:** Our review revealed not only a wide diversity of views regarding what the roles and responsibilities of DPS and the Penn Police should be, but often a lack of community awareness around the Penn Police activities, activities performed by other parts of DPS, and activities performed by other police departments but not performed by the Penn Police. Increasing the level of information available about DPS and the Penn Police will facilitate fact-based, open, and honest conversations that include diverse viewpoints about the actual and desired role of the Penn Police in producing public safety throughout the University and its neighboring communities.

As a practical matter, transparency should mean that information about DPS and the Penn Police is available for public review by all, including people who are not affiliated with Penn and people who may not have internet access. Additionally, in instances where legitimate University confidentiality interests exist, the University should provide a public explanation for withholding information.

*2) Accountability: Increase accountability of DPS to the Penn and West Philadelphia communities by implementing independent review, strengthening complaint procedures, and increasing input from West Philadelphia residents.*

**Recommendation 2:** Organize an external review board (hereafter "DPS Review Board") with monitoring and review responsibilities with respect to DPS. To implement this recommendation, we suggest the following:

- The DPS Review Board should be a separate entity from the DPS Advisory Board, with members selected by the Provost or a designee thereof.
- The DPS Review Board could have the following roles and responsibilities:
  - The authority and duty to review and comment upon proposed modifications to the Penn Police Directives and policies prior to their implementation.
  - The authority and duty to review and comment upon any proposed changes to the Penn Patrol Zone boundaries.
  - The authority and duty to review all data supporting complaint determinations made by DPS.
  - The authority and duty to review and comment upon any and all disciplinary determinations imposed upon the Penn Police officers by DPS or the University.



- The authority to conduct (or have conducted) periodic reviews of DPS, including soliciting feedback on DPS by the Penn community and West Philadelphia residents.
- The authority and duty to review and evaluate the propriety of the Penn Police activity outside the Penn Patrol Zone. The Board shall produce a report to the President, Provost, and Executive Vice President within 30 days setting forth the conclusions emerging from any such review and evaluation.
- The authority and duty to provide direct input into DPS hiring and promotion protocols, as well as hiring and promotion of the Penn Police and DPS senior leadership. The Board could consider applicants directly or receive some number of seats on internal interviews.
- In addition, the DPS Review Board should:
  - Ensure continued dynamism on the DPS Review Board through reasonable membership term limits.
  - Ensure that the DPS Review Board includes representation from individuals who live in the Penn Patrol Zone but have no affiliation (i.e., student or employee) with Penn.
  - Conduct meetings of the DPS Review Board at non-DPS locations where helpful to encourage community feedback and engagement.
  - Submit an annual report to the President, Provost, and Executive Vice President on its activities.
  - Make records of its meetings available to the public.

**Description:** DPS currently uses an Advisory Board comprised of faculty, staff, and students for feedback, guidance, and public education. The Advisory Board lacks any supervision authority, includes only Penn affiliates, and has a membership chosen primarily by the Vice President for Public Safety. A desire for more substantial community supervision of Penn's public safety system was expressed repeatedly in our hearings and the commentary we received.

Accordingly, we recommend the creation of a DPS Review Board to monitor and report on certain DPS and Penn Police activities, with membership requirements, responsibilities, and practices that will ensure its effectiveness. The Review Board would exist in addition to the DPS Advisory Board, which we hope will continue to fulfill its important role.

**Recommendation 3:** Expand community input in guiding DPS. To implement this recommendation, we suggest the following:

- Develop an annual survey of Penn and West Philadelphia community members regarding the conduct and perceptions of DPS, including the Penn Police. This survey could be conducted through a research course at Penn, and the results could be received by the DPS Review Board.
- Hold community feedback meetings, including CALEA accreditation meetings, at non-DPS locations and advertise such meetings widely.
- Ensure that the Penn Police community meetings, including those with Penn and West Philadelphia community members, actively solicit specific feedback on the conduct and perceptions of the Penn Police.

**Description:** A recurrent theme raised by participants in our review was the importance of community engagement with and input into DPS as a way of solidifying a positive relationship between DPS and all parts of the Penn and West Philadelphia communities, and to ensure that the services provided by DPS meet community needs. Of course, this is not a new suggestion, and DPS and the Penn Police presently engage in extensive community outreach efforts that some participants reported are valued by many members of the community. However, many of these initiatives have a primary focus on responses to crime rather than on gathering feedback from the community about our public safety system, and existing feedback mechanisms do not capture all community concerns. Therefore, we recommend several mechanisms that might increase and improve community input on the operations of DPS.

**Recommendation 4:** Enable individuals who wish to file complaints regarding the Penn Police to do so through a mechanism that is not solely managed by DPS, such as the Ombuds Office or the Division of Human Resources.

**Description:** The Penn Police have developed policies to actively seek out feedback and to routinely notify (and even encourage) community members to submit complaints if they are dissatisfied in any way with an interaction with any of their officers. Nevertheless, our review indicated that many community concerns are not captured in complaints. This may be in part because community members who would otherwise submit complaints may find it intimidating or futile to interact directly with the Penn Police, who are in the twin positions of being both the causes of and the recipients of the complaints.

Accordingly, we recommend that an office not associated with DPS be formally available to receive complaints or allegations of DPS misconduct. That office could, among other things, encourage potential complainants to voice their concerns, support them by guiding them through their available options and the complaint process, and ensure that negative experiences—even those that do not lead to formal complaints—are incorporated into DPS decision-making by sharing anonymized allegations of misconduct with the DPS Review Board. Our review suggests that much of this currently happens through varied means, and our recommendation seeks to augment and centralize these support mechanisms.

**Recommendation 5:** Strengthen DPS's internal procedures for submitting, investigating, and reporting complaints against the Penn Police. To implement this recommendation, we suggest the following:

- Ensure that the procedure for submitting complaints is accessible to the Penn community and to West Philadelphia residents by a) including this information in Penn employee, student, and community orientation sessions introducing DPS and the services it provides; and b) making complaint/feedback forms available to local West Philadelphia community organizations and downloadable from the DPS website.
- Expand the existing Community Interaction Survey to cover all law enforcement interactions (e.g., pedestrian stops, vehicle stops, arrests, uses of force).
- Expand the existing Early Warning System to require an intervention based on a set number (e.g., five) of negative Community Interaction Surveys.
- Require that original complaints (e.g., complaints including the original writing or statement as categorized by the complainant), complaint investigations, and disciplinary determinations be reviewed by the DPS Review Board.
- Ensure that investigations of complaints are conducted in a manner that is convenient for complainants, including ensuring availability to discuss the complaint during non-business hours.
- Eliminate the provision of the collective bargaining agreement that allows a complaint to be rejected if it has not been investigated in 60 days.
- Retain the full disciplinary records of officers who have been terminated or who have resigned in lieu of termination.

**Description:** During our hearings, DPS stressed the expansiveness of the Penn Police's misconduct avoidance systems and that, when the Penn Police officers are disciplined, it is often through a "self-policed" internal process that is triggered even without the filing of a formal complaint. While this is useful, it is important to ensure that members of the Penn and West Philadelphia communities have meaningful opportunities to report complaints about DPS and the Penn Police. Negative experiences with the Penn Police still appear to be underreported, and local community members do not seem fully aware of the available misconduct reporting mechanisms. These suggested steps that could provide additional strength to DPS's existing feedback and misconduct reporting, detection, and prevention systems.

**Recommendation 6:** Establish a policy that in public areas on and off Penn's campus, an individual's actual or perceived affiliation with Penn is not relevant to any assessment of whether that person should be stopped, questioned, or surveilled by the Penn Police.

**Description:** Many Initiative participants expressed the view that the Penn Police treat people differently according to their actual or perceived affiliation with Penn, and that race, socioeconomic status, or similar traits are used as proxies for affiliation with Penn. Black students in particular frequently wear Penn-branded clothing to signal to security officials that they "belong." That, in turn, means that our neighbors in West Philadelphia may feel excluded from even public areas of our campus and disrespected in their own neighborhoods. Participants reported that Penn-affiliated community members who are Black or people of color have been stopped, questioned, and surveilled by the Penn Police and made to feel unsafe or subject to unwarranted suspicion. Accordingly, we recommend the Penn Police adopt and enforce a policy that prevents stopping, questioning, or surveilling people on the basis of their actual or perceived affiliation with Penn in public places. The recommendation is limited to public areas because Penn affiliation is necessarily relevant for security purposes in private locations, such as dorms. However, we emphasize our view that race, socioeconomic status, or similar traits should never serve as a proxy for Penn affiliation, or as a reason for the Penn Police to stop, question, or surveil individuals, in any location or context.

3) *Re-imagine Public Safety and Reduce Policing: Develop new approaches to ensure the safety, well-being, and belonging of the Penn and West Philadelphia communities that do not involve the police and that reduce the Penn Police presence, personnel, and budget.*

**Recommendation 7:** Transfer services currently provided to Penn students, faculty, and staff by the Penn Police that do not require police to non-police DPS personnel or other University units (e.g., Penn Violence Prevention (“PVP”) or Counseling and Psychological Services (“CAPS”)).

**Recommendation 8:** Establish a default presumption that non-armed personnel are primary responders to the HELP line (215-898-HELP) or other calls for service.

**Description (Recommendations 7 and 8):** An important aspect of reimagining public safety is to transfer certain activities currently performed by police officers to non-police personnel. For example, in response to the killings by police of individuals (such as Rayshard Brooks and Daniel Prude) who were experiencing substance use or mental health crises, many people in Philadelphia and elsewhere have called for deploying constructive emergency response systems that do not involve police. A related concern raised by a number of hearing participants is that they would not feel safe calling the University HELP line or any other service system that dispatches armed police, because they perceive the presence of armed police as creating rather than diminishing the risk of harm. The fact that a segment of our community feels unsafe utilizing the University’s response system is itself a public safety concern. Our recommendations take these calls and concerns into consideration. Although Penn already employs a more holistic model of emergency response than many other institutions, we are confident that there are additional ways it can improve public safety while reducing its use of police.

**Recommendation 9:** Reduce the presence of the Penn Police in West Philadelphia neighborhoods.

**Recommendation 10:** Reduce the number and deployment of armed Penn Police officers within the Penn Patrol Zone.

**Description (Recommendations 9 and 10):** Re-imagining public safety to address the harms reported by those who feel unsafe in the presence of police will require a meaningful, recognizable decrease in armed police presence both on campus and in neighboring communities. Some Initiative participants, from both the Penn and West Philadelphia communities, expressed the view that the Penn Police contribute to the over-policing of residents within the Penn Patrol Zone. Although research has found that campus police in general, and the Penn Police specifically, reduce certain types of crime in their patrol areas compared to areas outside of the patrol zone, it has also suggested that armed police are not the only approach by which physical safety can be protected. And while crime reduction is valuable, it is not the only outcome to consider in evaluating our system of public safety. A growing number of scholars and activists argue that research supporting the role of police in securing public safety has discounted the harms caused by policing, and has not rigorously reviewed a range of measures that could promote public safety without involving police. Accordingly, we recommend that the University and DPS work with West Philadelphia residents and local community organizations and residents to explore ways to reduce the armed police presence throughout the Penn Patrol Zone while promoting true public safety in all its forms.

Additionally, we suggest revisiting the Penn Patrol Zone boundaries, which have stayed constant since 1975, even as the campus and West Philadelphia, as well as ideas about public safety, have changed dramatically.

**Recommendation 11:** Prohibit the purchase and possession of military equipment, such as tear gas, armored vehicles, or explosives, by the Penn Police.

**Description:** In discussing how the Penn Police assisted the Philadelphia Police Department in responding to recent protests on 52<sup>nd</sup> Street, a number of hearing participants decried police use of armored trucks and tear gas. Based on a Fleet and Equipment List provided by DPS to the Initiative, “military equipment” owned or maintained by the Penn Police is limited to personal protective equipment and an unspecified number of Colt 6490 rifles. While the objections voiced to the 52<sup>nd</sup> Street incident were far broader than the issue of what equipment was deployed, confusion about what equipment is owned and operated by the Penn Police may have contributed to a mistaken belief that the Penn Police threatened the deployment of military-style weapons against residents.

We recommend that the University adopt and publicize an explicit policy against ownership of military equipment by the Penn Police.

**Recommendation 12:** Direct new funding away from the Penn Police and toward important non-police services.

**Description:** DPS is comprised of eight departments. Of these, the Penn Police is the largest, accounting for just under 50% of the total DPS operating budget. For the years 2015–2020, expenditures by DPS increased by 22%, placing it 6th among 12 Penn Administrative Service Centers in expenditure growth, and outpacing the 16% overall expenditure growth for Administrative Service Centers during that same period. Virtually all (96%) of the Penn Police total operating budget is spent on officers. If the University meaningfully reduces the number of armed police, there should be a concomitant reduction in the Penn Police budget.

However, it is hard to predict the precise impact of our recommendations on the University budget, and we do not view cost savings as the primary driver behind re-imagining DPS as an organization with fewer armed police. Under the recommendations above, for example, the University may choose to hire additional clinical staff to assume emergency response duties previously performed by the Penn Police. The ultimate effect of these proposals on the budget for DPS and other entities within the University depends on future decisions about where services will be located within the University structure; we believe those decisions should be made with input from DPS, Penn community members, and other University stakeholders, including PVP and CAPS.

4) *Re-Investment: Invest more in campus and West Philadelphia initiatives that promote safety, well-being, and belonging and do not involve police.*

**Recommendation 13:** Re-invest funds currently spent on policing and saved by reducing the role of policing in public safety in other initiatives that would promote safety, well-being, and belonging for all groups throughout the campus and in West Philadelphia. Examples of potential initiatives noted in the hearings include: Philadelphia public schools; community-based violence prevention and restorative justice programs in West Philadelphia; other West Philadelphia community groups, health care facilities, and housing; Penn student financial aid; Penn student organizations; anti-racism education for the entire Penn community; and Penn violence prevention programs.

**Recommendation 14:** Seek recommendations, input, and engagement from West Philadelphia residents on any community re-investment initiatives undertaken under Recommendation 13.

**Description (Recommendations 13 and 14):** Although participants in the review process expressed diverse views regarding the appropriate role of the Penn Police within the University’s larger framework for ensuring public safety, there was a broad consensus that the University should work creatively toward ensuring the physical and emotional safety of both its affiliates and our nearby neighbors. These final recommendations address the question of how the University might help to promote safety, well-being, and belonging in the Penn and West Philadelphia communities by investing more in initiatives that reduce harm without relying on police.

The question of how much to invest, over what time frame, and in what projects is a complex one that lies beyond the scope of the present inquiry. Moreover, as its recent investment in the Philadelphia school system (announced after our review was completed) indicates, the University has established processes for identifying and selecting from among potential investments that could be applied to this question. Therefore, our recommendations are not designed to replace or supplant such processes, but rather to suggest two principles the University should adhere to as it considers such investments.

First, rather than simply reallocating any savings garnered by implementing our recommendations to the University’s general fund, we recommend that they be directed toward initiatives that are designed to promote safety, well-being, and belonging for all groups throughout the campus and in West Philadelphia. Second, we encourage the University to seek recommendations and input from West Philadelphia residents regarding areas ripe for such funds. Among those who expressed distrust or criticism regarding Penn’s current public safety posture, a repeated refrain was that they felt Penn excluded community members from decisions about public safety. Accordingly, we believe that decisions about re-investment require an inclusive process and robust community discussion and participation. By actively seeking West Philadelphia community engagement in future public safety investments, the University can work to address some of this exclusion and maximize the chances that its reimagined public safety efforts will truly meet community needs and be welcomed and supported by a wide range of community members.