

**University of Pennsylvania  
Public Safety Review and Outreach Initiative  
Hearing 4: Thursday, August 27, 2020, 2 p.m. EDT**

**Advisors:**

<b>Dorothy Roberts</b>	Penn Integrates Knowledge Professor of Africana Studies, Law, and Sociology
<b>Reverend Chaz Howard</b>	Vice President for Social Equity and Community

**Panelists:**

<b>Tamara Greenfield King</b>	Associate Vice Provost for Student Affairs, Division of the Vice Provost for University Life
<b>Sharon Smith</b>	Associate Vice Provost for University Life, Division of the Vice Provost for University Life
<b>Sara Bachman</b>	Dean, School of Social Policy and Practice
<b>Greg Ridgeway</b>	Chair, Department of Criminology Professor of Criminology and Statistics
<b>David Rudovsky</b>	Senior Fellow, Penn Carey Law School Founding Partner, Kairys, Rudovsky, Messing, Feinberg & Lin, LLP
<b>David Abrams</b>	Professor of Law, Business Economics, and Public Policy

[00:00:00] **Dorothy Roberts**

Good afternoon and welcome to the fourth virtual hearing of the Penn Public Safety Review and Outreach Initiative. I am Dorothy Roberts; a Penn Integrates Knowledge Professor of Africana Studies, Law, and Sociology. And I, along with Reverend Chaz Howard, are leading this initiative as appointed advisors to Penn President Amy Gutmann. Reverend Howard will introduce himself and welcome you in a minute. We are working with the Law School's Quattrone Center for the Fair Administration of Justice, and you will hear from its Executive Director, John Hollway, after Reverend Howard.

The Public Safety Review and Outreach Initiative is conducting a comprehensive review of public safety at Penn. The goal of the review is 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 equal dignity and respect, and in a way that prioritizes and promotes anti-racism, racial equality, and justice.

The outcome of the initiative will be a report and recommendations we will present to President Amy Gutmann, Executive Vice President Craig Carnaroli, and Vice Provost Wendell Pritchett in the fall.

Our report and recommendations will be based on two main efforts. First, we have begun collecting and reviewing hundreds of documents from Penn's Division of Public Safety regarding a wide range of policies, procedures, and outcomes, including use of force, vehicle and pedestrian stops, complaints, budgets, transparency, and relationships with other policing agencies.

The second part is why we are here today. We are holding a series of virtual hearings to receive input from members of the Penn and West Philadelphia communities on their experiences with Penn's Division of Public Safety and on their ideas and suggestions. The hearings will be made publicly available via live stream and recorded for future public access.

Reverend Howard and I both have long records of commitment to racial justice, and we approach our leadership of this initiative very seriously and independently. We have been given complete freedom to listen, to learn, and to make recommendations without any pressure from the university administration. Our aim is to move Penn toward achieving a vision of public safety that treats everyone with equal respect, in which everyone can feel physically and emotionally safe with a sense of equal belonging, and that prioritizes racial justice.

To be candid, many of us are finding it hard to go on with business as usual after the ongoing events in Kenosha, Wisconsin, where police officers shot an unarmed Jacob Blake in the back seven times and then let white supremacist Kyle Rittenhouse march through the street armed with an assault rifle after killing two protesters.

The work of reimagining public safety is more urgent than ever. And we are ever so grateful to everyone in the Penn and neighboring communities who are participating in this initiative.

I will now turn to my Co-Presidential Advisor, Reverend Chaz Howard.

[00:03:40] **Chaz Howard**

Thank you, Professor Roberts. Thank you for capturing how a lot of us are feeling right now

Just to add a little bit, too, we are committed to this whole process being one characterized by openness. And so, over the course of the weeks and months of this study, of this reflection, we are open to a range of voices, a range of faculty and staff members and administrators. Very soon, we will begin hearing from more students as they begin the school year. We have already heard and will hear again from different members of the community and different members of our Division of Public Safety. We really want to hear a wide range of perspectives so we can make the best recommendations possible. But again, we are also open in regard to transparency. And so, we wanted to do our best to make sure that this process was accessible to everybody who can tune in to watch this or watch the recorded proceedings later at a more open time. Because that is one of the things we have been hearing a lot is the need for greater transparency.

I want to add our gratitude to the Quattrone Center for their leadership and doing a lot of the heavy lifting behind the scenes in making this whole thing possible. And thank you, also, for our guests today who are taking time out of their schedules to help us improve as a university and as a community.

And I want to turn it over to the Director of the Quattrone Center, John Hollway.

[00:05:22] **John Hollway**

Thank you to Professor Roberts, thank you, Reverend Howard. I am John Hollway, the technically challenged Executive Director of the Quattrone Center for the Fair Administration of Justice. And on behalf of my colleagues, I want to extend our welcome to the members of the Penn Administration and Faculty that we will be hearing

from today, and also to the members of the Penn Community that are participating as audience members as we conduct this fourth in our series of hearings.

As Reverend Howard said, I would hope with every hearing we learn more and more about the many ways both that the Division of Public Safety interacts with the Penn Community, which we are broadly defining to include not just the campus, but the West Philadelphia area that surrounds us. And I think it has been fascinating to watch all of the unique valuable perspectives that we have received, and not just in terms of what our current relationship as a community is with the Division of Public Safety, but in terms of our thoughts about what that could be or what it should be and what it can become so that we can truly create an environment where all members of our broadly define community feel a sense of belonging and a sense of physical and emotional safety at the university.

For any of you who would like to go back and review the last hearing, which we conducted last Thursday, August 20, I think there was a lot of great insight from West Philadelphia community members about the University of Pennsylvania Police Department; [www.pennpublicvsafetyreview.org](http://www.pennpublicvsafetyreview.org) is the website where we are storing and archiving all of the videos. And we had four community association participants last week, in addition to Richard Gordon, IV, the Principal of Paul Robeson High School in West Philadelphia; James Wright, Director of Community, Economic, and Real Estate Development at the People's Emergency Center in West Philadelphia. And we heard from Ira Harkavy, the Director of Penn's Netter Center for Community Partnerships, and Glenn Bryan, the university's Assistant Vice President of Community Relations.

And so, I commend that to you. We are posting, as we will with this, we are putting the videos, again, at [www.pennpublicsafetyreview.org](http://www.pennpublicsafetyreview.org). And we are also transcribing the hearings, the transcript of our first video, or very first hearing has been posted. Hearings two and three are not far behind, and we will transcribe this one as well.

Today, we are going to be getting perspectives from Penn Administrators and Faculty, particularly faculty with experience of the impact that different models, modes, policies, or procedures within policing can have on the communities that they serve.

We are going to start with two representatives from the Division of the Vice Provost for University Life, Ms. Tamara Greenfield King, the Associate Vice President for University Affairs; and Ms. Sharon Smith, the Associate Vice Provost for University

Life. Ms. King and Ms. Smith have been invited to share a brief opening statement one at a time, and once each of them has spoken, Professor Roberts and Reverend Howard will engage them in a question and answer session.

From there, we will turn to two members of the Penn Faculty, Doctor Sara Bachman, the Dean of Penn Social Policy and Practice School; and Doctor Greg Ridgeway, the Professor of Criminology and Statistics and Chair of the Department of Criminology in the College of Arts and Sciences. And once again, we will do opening remarks one at a time, and then a Q and A with Professor Roberts and Reverend Howard.

And then, we will end up with two faculty members from the university's law school, David Rudovsky, a Senior Fellow at the Law School and a Partner at the Philadelphia law firm of Kairys, Rudovsky, Messing, Feinberg & Lin; and Doctor David Abrams, a Professor of Law, Business Economics, and Public Policy.

The ground rules for this hearing are the same as we have had for others, but just to restate them for the record. We are recording it. We will post the recording and transcript at [www.pennpublicsafetyreview.org](http://www.pennpublicsafetyreview.org). Members of the audience are encouraged to submit questions at any time through the Q&A feature that is found on the ribbon at the bottom of the window that you are looking at. We are monitoring that Q&A, but given time constraints and the number of speakers, we may not be able to answer every question today. We do want to make sure that every speaker has a full opportunity to speak within the time allotted, but we will keep a record of your questions, and we will strive to answer them either to the extent possible today or by posting an answer on the website.

Last but not least, we do have some schedule constraints; we will completing today by 4 p.m. And with that, I will turn it back to Professor Roberts, Reverend Howard, and our first speaker, Ms. King.

[00:10:18] **Dorothy Roberts**

Ms. King, please go ahead and give your statement; thanks.

[00:10:23] **Tamara Greenfield King**

Good afternoon! My name is Tamara Greenfield King, and I currently serve as the Associate Vice Provost of Student Affairs in VPUL, here at Penn. I am directly responsible for the oversight of five particular areas in that portfolio: the Naval ROTC Program, the Career Services Center, the Platt Student Performing Arts Department, the Office of Fraternity and Sorority Life, and the Office of Student Activities.

I have been employed at Penn for a very short time; since January of 2019. Prior to that, I worked at Washington University for almost twenty years. I had a position there during my tenure, where I was the Director of Student Conduct and Student Responsibilities and Community Expectations. So, prior to my transition into higher education administration, now almost twenty-three years ago, I was a practicing attorney.

I am going to make my remarks based on what I perceive to be the complexity of this issue. I don't believe there are any simple answers, and I am going to demonstrate through my own life the complexities that are surrounding this particular topic.

First, I did serve as the first African American person to ever be employed in the Office of the Northampton District Attorney's Office in Pennsylvania. I was the first-ever black prosecutor in that small county. That was big news in 1992. I served in that role for six years. I then moved to St. Louis. I have a history rich in student protest, student engagement, and student activism. I attended Pennsylvania State University in the early 1980s and worked alongside other colleagues and friends to enhance to racial climate on campus there. I then attended NYU School of Law in the mid-1980s to 1988. If anyone remembers, that was a time when racial unrest was also at its height, and there were a lot of police shootings, civilian shootings, and unarmed black and brown people still being killed.

During my time at law school, I did protest in New York City for police reform. I also protested for LGBT rights in Washington, DC. I protested the—my undergraduate school and their failure to divest from the funds that they had in the endowment in the Apartheid system of South Africa. So, protests, civil unrest is not unusual for me.

I provide all that just to give you some context about my remarks and kind of my viewpoint from where I come. I am complex. I have a rather unique perspective when it comes to the police, when it comes to police reform, systems of racism, institutional racism, and the complex nature of the tensions between Penn's Public Safety and its

absolute, and I repeat, absolute necessity to be at Penn on this college campus in West Philadelphia.

The perpetrators of racist policing, black and brown murders, are all part of a broken system that we know and are urging needs repair. I also wanted to point out that I did minor in Black Diaspora Studies while at Penn State, and had a minor in Sociology, with an emphasis on Criminology and Social Deviance. So, these are topics that are near and dear to my heart.

I also want to layer on my personal life experience and how it adds to the complexity. I have a 16-year-old black son who is six feet tall. I worry every time he leaves our house. Will he return? Will he be safe? Will he become the next headline? The next Trevon Martin? The next Michael Brown? What will his encounter with the police look like? Now, in today's world, I have to focus on my two daughters, as well. I have family members and very personal friends who serve as campus, community, state, and federal police officers. I can assure you, all of them are not bad.

No one likes to be lumped into one basket or stereotyped. The issue that we are talking about is much more complex than that. Not every cop or police officer or law enforcement officer is racist. However, we must address what we will term the "bad apples" today, in this conversation.

At Penn, I have had the opportunity to work very closely with Public Safety, I am responsible for open expression on our campus, and I have to navigate very carefully, the absolute right for students and others to express their views; the good, the bad, the ugly, and the hurtful views that may be expressed. We have speakers from around the globe that come to our campus with a variety of perspectives. There is an enormous amount of pre-planning that goes into hosting such events. Public Safety is always at the forefront in those conversations. And I should indicate, not from a dictatorial perspective, but from a perspective of working with the student or student groups or the academic divisions, and really trying to ensure that the events go off as planned.

My presence in those meetings serves as a reminder that our approach has to be educational. The police are there, in my opinion, to de-escalate situations. Many times, I am in the process of helping to assist them in that de-escalation.

There are no easy answers, but I firmly believe that if all sides come to the table with honesty, integrity, frank conversation and dialogue, we can begin to seriously attack police reform in a meaningful way. In our society, I repeat, the police are necessary. I wish that weren't the case, but it is not. So, let's figure out how to have them do their difficult jobs in a more socially just and humane manner. We must acknowledge there is room for improvement, and that would be the first step towards true reform.

Thank you for inviting me, and I will be happy to share additional thoughts.  
Thank you.

[00:18:35] **Chaz Howard**

Thank you, my friend.

[00:18:37] **John Hollway**

Thank you very much, Ms. King. At this point, we would turn over to Ms. Sharon Smith.

[00:18:55] **Sharon Smith**

Good afternoon! And thank you for inviting me. Again, my name is Sharon Smith, and I am the Associate Vice Provost for University Life and have been a member of the Penn community for over thirty years.

First and foremost, I want to acknowledge for the past six months the incredible, sad transformation we have seen around our country regarding violence towards black people, especially our young black males. It is not lost on me; these violent acts are being committed by people who are charged with protecting all of us. Nor that I have two brothers and nephews that I fear any day I could potentially get a call about their lives in today's America as a Jamaican who was born in Jamaica and raised here and had brothers who were born here.

When I was first asked to speak, I did not hesitate. However, since the request, I have had a chance to think about it. I hope my presence here today sends a clear message. One, that I am an advocate and a resource for all of our students, and that I collaborate with many offices and administrators across the campus on behalf of students. But



specifically, today, I want to talk about the people that I have worked with for more than twenty years. The Penn Police Department, in the Division of Public Safety. Why do I say that? It is because it is one of many departments on Penn's campus that is charged with protecting, advocating, supporting our Penn family. The Penn Police, Special Services, Allied and Fire Emergency Services, and MERT are all offices that I have worked with over the years.

I speak from my heart for all our community, those who understand, and those whom I suspect want to see changes in the Police Department at Penn.

I want to talk about public safety in our community. Those who understand, and those who I suspect want us to be a part of chest changes. Specifically, today, I am talking about Special Services and the Penn Police. Those are departments.

Let me go back around twenty years ago when I first started in my role as Director of Student Intervention Services. When I first started, Student Intervention Services is an office that functions twenty-four/seven. I recall getting a phone call at 2 a.m. from an officer. It was a student who he was taking to the hospital in serious condition. That officer called me on the way to the hospital, right after the student was seen by a doctor, and he stayed until he was sure the student was stable, and then he called me to say, yes, indeed; he was leaving because he was confident that the student was in good hands. I remember thinking what compassion, what thoughtfulness. That was my first experience with an officer, and it has continued for more than twenty years.

The Public Safety Department are [in]dispensable partners in support of students, mental health. Few people on campus know how often the police check on students and get them support with those who are concerned about suicidal thoughts or other mental issues. The police have the capacity to respond immediately at any time of the day and night, which no other department can do. And I know when I started this journey, in this job, I could not have done it alone.

Officers collaborate with partners such as CAPS, Student Intervention Services, and college house staff to provide the best support for students in distress or at risk. As collaborators, they are in the room, with us – and with students – to plan and implement intricate, complex, potential contentious situations, and they do so nonjudgmentally.

Another example, many years ago, I recall meeting Officer Gary Williams, who is now Lieutenant Williams. He called me from the bookstore in response to a shoplifting case. Instead of taking the student to 4040 Chestnut, he called me and then walked the student to my office. At that time, I wondered...Why? The situation had nothing to do with books; there were no books stolen. Instead, it was a lack of food, and in that moment, Gary was able to capture the situation and thought the best place for the student in with Student Intervention Services.

As partners, they give rides or walking escorts to anyone at any time. They comfort and support students who are victims of crime, especially interpersonal violence, and in this case, In times of crisis, or pre-crisis, they are in problem-solving mode, as Gary did. They also use their own emotional intelligence and people skills to establish rapport with students and persuade them to seek help when they need it. Penn Police Officers have even helped take care of distressed students' dogs or animals to overcome barriers for her to go to the hospital or for him to take action. And I was actually there one of the times when the officer offered to take care of the dog so that the student could come with me.

Finally, I work very closely with Special Services, the other resource that many of us rely on for many issues, including critical incidents, death of a student, and missing students, sexual assaults—all of that, we work together.

Pat Brennan, Director of Special Services, can you recall the time we went all the way to Southwest Philadelphia, at the request of CAPS, to check on the wellbeing of a student. Once we arrived, we knew there was something very wrong, and that we could not leave without the student. It took us a while, but we were able to convince the student to come with us. The very next day, we were called and were told by CAPS that we saved the life of that student by the mere fact that we took the student to the hospital to get care.

Penn Police Special Services: they help find our students, get students help, assure families, connect people to resources. They employ therapeutic practices in their interaction with students and community members to diffuse potentially volatile situations.

Finally, when I sit on the interview panel to hire new officers, I look for a person first—someone who recognizes that they work in a diverse and inclusive community. So,

when I walk down Locust Walk, and I recognize an officer, I know that that was someone who I saw in an interview and that that person is now an officer on our campus who will be supportive, compassionate, and advocate for our students in the best way possible.

Finally, in this moment, I feel that Maureen has opened the door, invited us in to make a difference, make changes, enhance the department in ways that improve trust collectively and together. And so, I hope that we will continue these conversations, and I hope that I will be a part of those conversations.

Thank you so much!

[00:27:43] **Dorothy Roberts**

Thank you so much, both of you, for your complex and important statements. Let me begin with a question for you, Associate Vice Provost King. You have emphasized the complexity of the issues that this initiative is dealing with, both the worry that you have for your son, and it was a worry that something bad might happen at the hands of police officers. And it was interesting that Associate Vice Provost Smith also made that statement about her own family members.

On the other hand, you said that, and you kind of emphasized this, there is absolutely a need for a Division of Public Safety, including, I think you meant the Department of Police at Penn. And so, the way you framed it was it's a broken system that needs repair, but we still need it.

So, I wanted to explore a bit, maybe in a concrete way with you, some of the public safety issues that you have had to face in your role as Associate Vice Provost for Student Affairs, and when it's been necessary to bring in the police. And I am wondering if sometimes the Philadelphia Police are involved, or this would be only the Penn Police. And how you balance then that tension you talked about in concrete situations where you feel it is a public safety issue. And what your experiences might tell us in terms of our recommendations for improving public safety at Penn.

[00:29:48] **Tamara Greenfield King**

I will say that my experiences center around open expression. So, whether or not it is an impromptu situation where the preachers come on campus unrehearsed and

untimed, they just pop up. I will get a call, generally, to go down and make sure that the situation is calm and being handled appropriately. And in that instance, the Department of Public Safety will be down there to assist with open expression and to ensure that everyone who wants to stay and listen, or have dialogue with the preachers, is able to do that in a safe manner.

I will say that I have firsthand witnessed our police take a step back, allow the dialogue to happen, which, if you think about it, is the true essence of an educational institution. We come here to hear different views that may or may not persuade us to think differently, long-term, in our lives.

In other situations, it has been much more tense. So, I bring back when Thomas Holman was here the first time at the Perry World House and then, the second time, when he came because he was not able to give his full presentation the first time. So, in that second time, we had advanced notice of what was probably going to happen, that there would be protesters, and that the situation would be tense. So, leading up to that, literally, for two to three weeks leading up to the event, we had briefing meetings, we had planning meetings, what is our plan of attack going to be if, in fact, someone gets out of control, how are we going to ensure the safety of not just the speaker, but our students who want to hear the speaker and, then, our students who don't want the speaker to speak at all. So, really trying to work through those logistics.

That was a tough one for me because I was in the hallway with our Public Safety Officers, our police, and I was yelled at, screamed at, called all sorts of names. And although it was uncomfortable, I will say the Penn Police allowed those protesters to express their outrage and displeasure with what was going on inside the room. So, although it was uncomfortable for me as an administrator, they really did allow the protesters to have their opportunity to be heard.

That also happened in a couple of other invited guests that we have had over the last, I will say the last twelve months, before COVID changed our lives. But they have been at the table. I will also say that whenever I have called them, whether it is personally, it is one o'clock in the morning, and I need someone to be escorted home, or whether I personally need to be escorted back to my home, they don't hesitate. They want to make sure that everyone is safe and that everyone feels comfortable.

Again, I have been in rooms where students have expressed that they felt like they were being targeted, that they were being racially profiled. And in those situations, we do, I know because I have worked directly with Mo and her team, we have worked to interview the students, have conversations with the students, go back and have conversations with the police officers on is there or should there be a different or better approach? So, that critical feedback is important, and I really stress, when students complain, we listen.

[00:33:53] **Dorothy Roberts**

Is anything done about it?

[00:33:56] **Tamara Greenfield King**

Absolutely, there is follow up, yes.

[00:33:59] **Dorothy Roberts**

With the officer who was—

[00:34:02] **Tamara Greenfield King**

With the officers directly involved, with the officers more generally speaking, and then with the students. So, there is a full looping back to the students regarding the officers' perspective. Oftentimes, it is difficult because the student sees the situation or the interaction from their perspective. The police officer sees it from their perspective. And, in my opinion, there could probably be training on the side of the police officers about how better to address and de-escalate some of that. And I also think that our students should work on how we, or how they engage with police officers. Because we can't forget, whether you agree or disagree, police officers have a job to do. Now, I am not suggesting at all that they way they always do it is always appropriate, but what would be helpful is that, again, if we come to the table, the student should be allowed to openly discuss their displeasure with how a police officer engaged with them. I think that is completely appropriate; it should happen. And on the flip side, I think that Maureen, in

being the supervisor of that department, has every opportunity to then review, give feedback, and help with the training of the officers.

[00:35:41] **Dorothy Roberts**

Thanks. I am going to let Reverend Howard take over here. Thanks so much for your answer.

[00:35:50] **Chaz Howard**

I really appreciate your remarks, my friend; thank you so much. I just have one question, and it centers around the intersection of grace and privilege. And I think that in your position in Student Affairs and in University Life, broadly, and your oversight of the Greek community, I think you will have an insight into this that others may not.

Could you speak to the interesting moments where the police are called on a frat party, or the police are called because of legit criminal activity by a student, be it around substance abuse or distribution or fighting or something. How do you think our Penn Police handle that? And I think there are so many stories after years and years of quick responsiveness, certainly, but these moments where someone who may be intoxicated at a frat party does something that normally would result in arrest, kicking at an officer, spitting and all those sorts of things, but they kind of get written up for like student conduct. Or someone gets caught up with possession of something, a student, and instead of sort of being treated the way they might if this was a completely separate environment with a 19-year-old and possession of something, distributing something, it plays out very differently in a college context.

This is hard, but how do you think we, maybe as the university, but we as Public Safety do in those moment of we want to show grace and give knucklehead kids a chance to kind of learn rather than have a scarlet letter the rest of their life. On the other hand, there is this tension around privilege that is not always extended to people off-campus. I think the question is ultimately around how are Penn Police doing in policing the criminal activity of Penn students?

[00:37:44] **Tamara Greenfield King**

That's an interesting dynamic and a way to phrase it. So, every week, when we would be in normal times, we would have a meeting about all the events that happened the week prior. And in those meetings, sometimes we get to review the police bodycam footage, or what have you, based on a situation. And I have often said to our campus police; you have the patience of Job because they are in situations, oftentimes, where you indicated, the students are intoxicated, they may be high on a particular substance, they may be not thinking clearly. And it is beneficial, and I have seen our officers de-escalate those situations.

When we're talking about, and, again, let's put it other there, I am a prosecutor, drinking under the age of 21—illegal in the State of Pennsylvania. We gotta own that, but we choose, as an institution, to address it through our own individual university disciplinary processes. And that is if we choose to. But that makes a big difference in how we engage.

I do see that the Penn Police have an enormous amount of patience and latitude when it comes to addressing student issues. Sometimes, I will say to students, if you were not on a college campus being engaged with the Penn Police, the outcome in this situation would be very different. And sometimes they believe me, and sometimes they don't. It just depends.

When it comes to criminal activity, again, universities are still educational institutions, and if they are relatively minor infractions, for the most part, we are going to still try to address it through our university systems, if appropriate. Where applicable, not an everyday occurrence, a student may be arrested for, let's just say, a felony-level offense, or something like that. Those are far and few between. That is not our daily work. So, I think that matters.

Where I hear the tension between fraternity parties and, let's say, off-campus behavior, there is no secret that currently, our Greek systems across the county are coming under attack. Penn is not special in that regard. Our Greek system has come under attack for a variety of reasons. And I can tell you that I have worked, since I arrived here at Penn, have worked to change the culture, the dynamics of our Greek system here at the university.

[00:40:38] **Dorothy Roberts**

I just have one quick follow up question to that, playing off of Reverend Howard's terms, grace and privilege, which it sounds as if Penn Police do accord grace and privilege to Penn students. The one thing about grace and privilege, though, is that it can be given to some and not to others. And I wonder if you have seen or heard any allegations of the Penn Police treating some students with more grace and privilege than other students?

[00:41:08] **Tamara Greenfield King**

Yes, I have heard of those situations, I am not going to be untruthful about that. And like I said previously when we do hear about it, and a student complains, which I encourage students to complain. We won't know that there is an issue if they do not tell us that there is an issue. I encourage that, and then, generally speaking, there is going to be an investigation or a review of what happened. And the student has every opportunity to be fully heard, and I think that is important. No one is going to say, well, too bad; we don't believe you. We encourage that dialogue, and the police, also under Maureen's leadership, has an obligation to review what the officer indicates happened in the field when they were doing their job. But no, that's people will complain about Penn Police.

[00:42:05] **Dorothy Roberts**

Thank you. Reverend Howard, do you want to move on with questions for Associate Vice Provost?

[00:42:15] **Chaz Howard**

Sure. You know, both of you are long colleagues and who became friends and family and, so, I really do appreciate your presence today. But the work you have done over the years, so much it in conjunction with our Division of Public Safety.

AVP Smith, my question stems from a conversation we have had in a couple of our previous hearing panels. And it is this notion of who is best to respond to moments of a psychological breakdown of community members, specifically kind of students, when a student expresses a desire to hurt themselves when they are showing behavior that seems



abnormal for them, and it is two in the morning. Who is best to respond to that? Because I think there have been some suggestions that maybe Penn Police shouldn't be the first call. I think I hear you in that they are here twenty-four/seven; they have cars, they can get there the quickest. But someone imagined what if we had kind of an on-call, after-hours therapist team or social work team that could be sent out to be the first line of defense. Could that work? What do you think about that?

And then, the part two question after that is, can you imagine how the last several years would have looked without Public Safety here?

[00:43:49] **Sharon Smith**

I will start with the second question first. I hear a little echo, are we okay now? [Yeah.]

So, I will start with the second question first. I cannot imagine that. And I guess I am one of the people who, since I have worked so closely with them, I don't know how, and I am going to be frank about that, I don't know how to separate that because that phone call or, yes, that phone call that we get about the wellbeing of someone, I can recall having to go to an apartment for a student at one a.m. and having the police officer or Patty Brennan say, wait, and that was the right decision in that moment for them to enter first and then to let me know if I should come in also. And a lot of times, when I am walking in, also, I am there, or someone else is there to help the situation and to see that there is a partnership.

So—maybe there is, but in this very moment, I really can't think of it because of the realness of where I have been with many of these students and these situations and know about the partnership of the Penn Police. And that's when I talked earlier; I talked about the Division and the fact that there is the Penn Police Special Services because many times that phone call, it's two of us going, and it is actually not the Penn Police itself, but maybe Special Services. They have a car, while their officers, they are in plain clothes, this is what they are charged with doing regularly.

Should we do more of that? Maybe. Maybe so. I don't know, but I know that I do that with Special Services a lot. I know that after 6 p.m., sometimes that means an officer and myself or someone else.

So, the second part of the question, I hope I answered. Remind of the first part again, because that was—

[00:46:00] **Chaz Howard**

Yeah, I mean, I think they were connected around should it be non-police officers who are responding first. And then, could you imagine us doing what we do in student interventions first without cops?

[00:46:15] **Sharon Smith**

So, I think I answered that part, that, yes. I have talked with my colleagues, both in student intervention services and some in the school, and I have been asked, why in the middle of the day, if we are sending someone over to the School of Engineering, why not send plain clothes? And I reply that I am torn because I can see that. But I don't know, and we don't know until we get there. The student might very well be very cooperative, and so forth, but we could potentially have a very volatile situation, I have mentioned that. And that's where the partnership comes in, and that's why I think this is a time where we can think about what that means going forward.

But I do see a role for the police when we work. I do see a role for Special Services because—and a lot of times, it is also CAPS. CAPS might be on the phone while we are talking. I might say, can you hand the phone to the CAPS professional. So, it's a collaboration, really it is, Chaz, and for numerous reasons, I think it is important.

You know, I always like to give examples. And I remember the one year that CAPS called, the student needed to go to the hospital. They didn't want the police with me, and I normally have someone. So, I said, that's fine if they are cooperating and saying they are going to go; let's do that. So, I go over to CAPS, and I pick the student up, and we are on our way, we were walking, and we get to 36<sup>th</sup> and Walnut, and the student took off. Seriously. This is some time ago. But that is why we implemented the always having someone with us and transportation because that ensures that, one, the situation that could potentially be volatile, we have several different people can do that. And we want to safely transport a student from one location to the next, and that is why the partnership with the Division of Public Safety is so important. That student was safe,

but we came up with a plan of how to go after that student. I was able to quickly call to say this is happening, and someone was on the scene right away, and we were able to... But after that, we all looked at each other and said, that request, I was trying to be accommodating, but probably the best thing to do is to be a partner, to make sure we are taking students from one space to the next safely, to go onto the scene and to diffuse the situation to the best of our ability.

[00:48:57] **Dorothy Roberts**

This is such an important and interesting aspect of this, especially because many people who are calling for defunding the police, in the sense of reducing funding for police and putting that, the funds, the resources elsewhere, look specifically at mental health services as a place where people, other than police officers, can do the work, and perhaps do it more safely.

So, I just want to ask some follow-up questions about that because you're so involved in that exact intersection. [Yes.] So, Special Services, are they part of the police? Maybe one way we could distinguish is officers who are armed versus other people working for the university in the Division of Public Safety. So, are Special Service armed officers or no?

[00:49:59] **Sharon Smith**

I believe they are officers, but if I came onto—let's say you are there, and I came with Special Services to work with you. They are in plain clothes. There is nothing obvious about that person being an officer. There is nothing obvious about that person having a weapon. To be honest, I have never seen it, but I know that they are police officers, and I suspect I am going to say they probably do have a weapon somewhere, but I don't see it, and I have never seen it when I have worked. It is not something that is very obvious. It is not—usually, Pat Brennan, for example, or [*Perdetha*] has to say, I am also a police officer because it is not obvious in any way.

[00:50:43] **Dorothy Roberts**

Okay, so they must be trained especially for these kinds of situations, and they—

[00:50:49] **Sharon Smith**

I believe they are trained, yes. I believe [*they are*]... yes.

[00:50:51] **Dorothy Roberts**

So, what is it about them that is so necessary that couldn't be done by someone else with the same training? What is it special about the police? I mean one, if the being armed doesn't seem to be necessary... [Mm-hmm.] if you don't usually see the weapons. Is it just a sense that they could intervene, if necessary?

[00:51:18] **Sharon Smith**

I think it is important that they could intervene if necessary. I really do think. It's a tough question, and I am like, okay, why? And I am trying to think why it is important and why I need to articulate why that is. And Maureen can probably better explain it than I. But in Special Services, there is the Director, Patty Brennan, I believe she is an officer. There is Perdetha; she is an officer. But then there is the Associate Director, Paige, who also goes with us many times and she is not an officer. And I believe there is an advocate there that is not an officer. So, really, when I say we are in the room together, a lot of times, we are making a decision about who is the team that is going to go on site. And many times, when we have to respond in the moment, it is best to have someone that is most equipped to do anything in the moment.

So, I think, I do—I am talking out loud, and yeah, I think they do. And I know that some people will say, no, Sharon, that is probably not. But knowing that the vast majority of situations that I have been in, I think so. The student that I am walking to the hospital and walked away, I, in the moment, thought about it; I should have had someone. Should that person have a weapon? Absolutely not. But still, there should have been someone who would be able to do that.

I go on the scene, and we hear that someone is in a building, and they are very, very upset, and we are heading there. I am not an officer, or someone from my staff is not an officer. But on the scene might be myself, again, someone from Special Services, and a police officer. And many times, the police officer is off to the side. They are not like

very, very present. They are there in the event that we need to have something. And we have had to. I mean, I have been doing this for twenty-some years, I have been in the room with a student with Patty, and we realized that we needed some additional support. So, yes, I would say yes.

[00:53:30] **Dorothy Roberts**

Thank you. That's a complicated situation, but it was really helpful and clearly something that we need to explore in our review and recommendations. Thanks so much. [Thank you.] Thanks to both of you for these insightful remarks.

[00:53:52] **John Hollway**

Thank you very much, Ms. King. Thank you very much, Ms. Smith. We really appreciate your time, your insights, and the work that you do at the university every day. So, thanks very much for your participation.

We will turn now to the second phase, I guess, of the three sections of today. And I would like to invite Dean Sara Bachman of the School of Social Policy and Practice to offer her remarks. Dean Bachman...

[00:54:20] **Sara Bachman**

Can you see me? Can you hear me? Thank you, John.

Thank you, Professor Roberts, and Vice President and the University Chaplain Howard for asking me to participate in these hearings of the Penn Public Safety Review and Outreach Initiative. You have asked me to provide remarks describing my experience with the University of Pennsylvania Division of Public Safety, and my ideas and suggestions on ways to achieve the common vision of providing an environment in which every member of the Penn community can feel physically and emotionally safe and protected and experience a sense of equal belonging.

I am going to speak to you today in my role as the Dean of the School of Social Policy and Practice. It is a role I filled for three semesters, having moved to Penn from Boston University. And I would like to begin my testimony by first drawing on my

record as a Health Policy Scholar, since you may not know much about my research and scholarship.

I am a national expert on financing health and social support services for people who are living in poverty and vulnerability, especially those long-term or chronic conditions, including people living with mental health disorders, children with special healthcare needs, adults with disabilities, or people who are living with chronic medical conditions, such as HIV.

Often the populations that are the focus of my work experience multiple health conditions and harmful social determinants of health, such as unstable housing, economic insecurity, and the long-term and systemic effects of racism and oppression.

For those of us who think about systems that support groups of people who are poor and vulnerable, it is inevitable that we have also given considerable thought to law enforcement. For example, if I am thinking about methadone clinics, I am also thinking about the war on drugs and how an injection drug user might end up in a drug treatment slot in one jurisdiction, but in another location, that same person might be incarcerated. Similarly, a person who is homeless and HIV-positive in one city might be enrolled in a residential program to receive comprehensive services to reduce viral load, but in another city, that same person might be sentenced to jail and receive HIV antiretrovirals in that setting. A child who is the victim of neglect could end up in a family reunification and support program, but that same child might also be placed in a very structured, restrictive foster care home.

That social policy and practice experts must acknowledge that there are permeable boundaries between social service and law enforcement systems, depending on a number of variables, such as local jurisdictions, social tolerance for difference, and a range of other factors. But we do not share a common value system for how to respond to difference, and we frame it as deviance. The roots of this variation are deep and broad. Social service agencies themselves are agents of social control, and they implicitly or explicitly depend on law enforcement as an extension of their efforts to protect, but also to control social norms.

For example, when a family calls the police to come to their home because their young adult son has experienced a violent mental health episode, several factors come

into play. The police officers, undoubtedly, primarily concerned about ensuring the safety of everyone. The family is in despair, and perhaps ashamed of their son's uncontrollable behavior. They are also afraid of him and what will happen next. The son probably has a long history of mental health system encounters that, for many reasons, have not been successful in healing his suffering. The outcome of this volatile situation could take many turns, and it will undoubtedly be influenced by race, class, and culture.

Isabel Wilkerson's new book, "Caste," critically analyzes this intersection and the enduring impact that the caste system has on all we do. Our caste system is so entrenched that words or even conscious thought are not necessary for its insidious control to wield its power.

As described in these hearings, law enforcement, including the Penn Police, have been charged with picking up more and more power to ensure that our unspoken, unwritten mechanisms of social control, our caste system, stay firmly entrenched. The control of difference has been handed to social service agencies and also to law enforcement.

So, what do we do about this? We must engage in the important and necessary work of honoring difference, embracing variation, and breaking down systems of oppression. We must find a better way, and Ms. Wilkerson provides guidance, see page 383: Those of us who are the most valued in a given caste system have amoral duty to develop empathy for those who must endure the indignities they themselves have been spared. It calls for radical empathy.

It is in this context that I turn now to the Penn Police and this initiative. I join in the crowd in witness who have stated that institution review, such as the one you are conducting, are healthy and good. Based on my experiences with Vice President Rush and her team, I am confident that the Penn Police prefer empathy to violence. Ms. Rush has provided me with every support that I could possibly need. She and her team answered my questions, provide consultation, and promote the safety of our school community. I have experienced the desire of the Division of Public Safety to treat every person with dignity and respect. This group, as much as any group on campus, has welcomed me as a new Dean, made me feel part of our Penn Community, and as a

newcomer, helped me understand the culture in which I lead our school. The Division is highly professional and well-integrated into the fabric of the Penn community.

At the School of Social Policy and Practice, our mission is to contribute to the advancement of more effective, efficient, and humane human services through education, research, and civic engagement. We are all about honoring difference, embracing variation, and breaking down systems of oppression, and we are committed to finding a better way.

As part of the Penn Public Safety Review and Outreach Initiative, I suggest that we need to turn our gaze on ourselves, our community, and our role in sustaining the U.S. caste system. This caste system promotes actions that hold power and balances and oppressive systems firmly in place. We have seen again and again how brutally powerful our caste system is, such as in the almost nine-minute murder of George Floyd of the devastating events occurring in Wisconsin.

As this initiative conducts its review of the Penn Police, I suggest that we must also consider other critically important questions. What are we doing individually and as a community to take on more of the necessary work of repairing relationships with our neighbors? What more can we do to use our high caste status to continue our effort toward inclusion, humble collaboration with our local community? From our high-value status in the caste system, how will we, as an institution continue to grow in our ability to humbly practice radical empathy? Thank you.

[01:02:53] **Dorothy Roberts**

Thank you very much. John, go ahead.

[01:02:57] **John Hollway**

Thank you, Dean Bachman; we appreciate it. We will turn to Professor Ridgeway now, and then we will circle back for Q and A.

[01:03:12] **Greg Ridgeway**

Good afternoon, everyone. I am Professor Greg Ridgeway; Professor and Chair of the Department of Criminology, as well as a Professor of Statistics. I am a statistician by



training. I spent much of my research career studying public safety and the criminal justice system, with a particular focus on policing. As a statistician, I have developed methods that have been used, and are used, to evaluate police performance, specifically in the area of racial bias. I have worked directly with police departments: Cincinnati, New York, Seattle, Los Angeles, others. I have also worked with agencies who conducted investigations of police departments. Right now, I am currently working with the U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division on consent decrees in Baltimore, and the Maricopa County, Arizona, Sheriff's Office. I work with the Illinois Attorney General's Office in their consent decree, with Chicago PD, and most recently, with the Minnesota Department of Human Rights and their investigation of the Minneapolis Police Departments. This is in addition to what I do at Penn.

So, it is hard to have the conversation we are having right now in such raw moments. As a scientist, I generally study averages, trends, I compare costs and benefits. It's hard to have an unemotional, measured conversation with the events going on in Minneapolis and Kenosha, which draw our attention to egregious flaws in American policing. So, I recognize the need to express outrage in these moments, but your job as a review panel, you need to make recommendations that aren't just for this week, but that will affect Penn and its Public Safety over the next decade.

So, I come today, recognizing the moments happening right now. But I also come as a social scientist and public policy analyst. So, I tend to be methodical and scientific in this way.

I want to make three points. Crime is expensive. Crime prevention is important. And the Penn Police can be a model.

First, crime is expensive. About ten years ago, I worked for Paul Heaton, who is one of the, at Penn Law, one of the advisors, too, on this review, about trying to help communities understand the crime burdens in their cities. We used the best available science to estimate how much crime costs a community. The loss of property, the justice system costs, as well as the intangible costs, such as associated with sexual assault.

We calculated for Philadelphia, that it costs the average person in Philadelphia \$3,000 per year. And that turns out to be four percent of the city's gross municipal product. Those costs largely fall on victims. Something as minor as a stolen bicycle, more

serious things like medical treatments and lost work, disability, loss of life; the costs are largely on the victims.

And because crime is expensive, just about anything that reduces crime be even a percentage point, passes any cost-benefit tests. So, that gets us to policing. It turns out; police are effective at crime prevention. All the best science, including randomized trials, indicate that police prevent crime. Contractions in police services, like when police go on strike, cause crime increases. Expansion of police, such as new foot patrols, those cause crime reductions. And the calculations show that an additional officer in Philadelphia could bring an estimated half a million dollars in crime cost savings,

I will admit there are other cost-effective crime prevention methods. And my colleagues in the Department of Criminology study things like improving street lighting and remediation of vacant lots and abandoned housings, and these also have crime prevention and crime reduction benefits. And I am sure there are new creative models that are also cost-effective.

I am also fully aware of the costs, aside from the monetary cost of police. I have read, in my work with other police departments, I have had to read dozens of police shooting investigations. I have created performance benchmarks for officers and identified those who egregiously target black pedestrians. I am also working right now on methods to identify officers with an excessive propensity to escalate their use of force when more modest approaches would suffice.

So, that the background, the scientific aspect of me, and the science of police and costs of crime.

So, briefly, especially about the Penn Police, we should aim, therefore, to get all of policing's crime prevention benefits while minimizing the negative externalities that come with policing. And there are several reasons why Penn Police and DPS, more generally, can get us there. First of all, we are Penn, and the Penn Police are us. They are knowable. Sometimes, they are our students. They are part of us. The Associate Vice Provost Smith earlier described them as part of the Penn Family. So, as a result, we are in the same organization, we can decide, within the law, how to manage them about whether to do de-escalation training or race bias training, the kind of calls that we do want them to

respond to, and the calls that we don't want them to get involved with. It sounds like the review is already digging in on what we want the Penn Police to get involved in.

We get to set the hiring standards. Because Penn is an attractive place to be a police officer, we get to choose who we want; even though, unfortunately, police departments generally struggle to recruit new, high-quality officers. Penn Police get to be very selective, and we can choose them.

I heard in the panel, I believe yesterday, the day before, from Doctor Gordon, the local principal, who described how Penn Police officers regularly check in so that they are not a nameless badge at the local high school. And that kind of community policing seems exactly what we want in modern policing. That sort of exemplifies the ideals for community policing.

So, while there are other major police departments that might incentivize things like arrests, we can have our Penn Police incentivize positive engagements. And that principal called out Officer Nikki Taylor, Officer David Dagger, and Captain Belisairo, by name, as these people are exemplary workers in Penn Police, and exemplify this community policing. It was great to hear someone from the local community pick out by name special people that we have at the Penn Police.

As Associate Vice Provost King highlighted, there is a complaint process. It is easy to file a complaint. There are numerous police departments that require an in-person, signed affidavit, and when you go, the person taking the complaint stands up with a badge and gun and warns the complainant about the risks of filing false police reports. At Penn, you can file a complaint online. You can go to the basement of McNeil, where I work, and you can fill out a form and file in there, in McNeil. It is easy to file complaints, and that is something special about the Penn Police Department.

The Penn Police are incredibly transparent. They post all the crimes that have happened yesterday. You can go to their site and see what is going on around Penn campus. The vandalism, theft—things are going on, and they are transparent about what those things are.

You can visit the Penn Police. Every year I bring my students to the Penn Police so they can see where it is. They can meet some officers. They learn how Penn Police is working to cut bicycle theft, and how they provide service to crime victims.

So, finally, my last point is, I feel really fortunate to have the Superintendent of Penn Police, Maureen Rush, as my police chief. She has a great vision for Penn Police; I have seen her visibly pained when police fail to uphold their values. I have seen her constantly work to improve. She embraces my kind of data analysis for identifying problems and solutions. She listens to students, faculty, staff, patients, community members. She has actually inspired several of our students to pursue policing careers if they could take their Penn education and values and improve policing from the inside.

So, I will stop there and happy to take questions.

[01:11:51] **Dorothy Roberts**

Thank you both for your remarks. Doctor Bachman, Dean Bachman, it is good to meet you and welcome to Penn! [Thank you.] We appreciate you giving us your insights so early in your time here. It probably seems like a long time by now, though, right.

So, I was very interested in what you were saying about the permeable division between social services and law enforcement. It happens to be something I am working on right now with the family policing system and the way in which law enforcement and child protective services work so closely together, and the way in which it is applied according to a caste system. The families are not treated the same way. And you gave some really poignant examples of that.

So, I wondered if you could say more about how that might apply on Penn's campus, and I think that follows directly from what the Associate Vice Provosts were saying, especially AVP Smith, about her work with Special Services in the case of mental health issues that come up. But also, you began to focus on the broader community and Penn's obligations to the broader West Philadelphia community. And so, do you have some more concrete recommendations about how we might pursue that as well?

[01:13:37] **Sara Bachman**

Yes, I do. Thank you for the question. I appreciated Ms. Wilkerson's framing of the moral obligation for people who are in a high-value level of a caste system to address the indignities of, and that is a very powerful word. And when I read that word, I wondered how she chose that particular word because it carries so much with it in power,

shame, oppression, indignities. And I think that it is clear that Penn is in the top level of a high-value caste system. And we have been given gifts and privileges that folks who are not that far from our campus have not been given. And because of our caste system, have suffered, are continuing to suffer indignities. And I believe strongly that it is our responsibility to engage with this disparity, inequity.

I think that a key step that needs to happen is the slow and difficult and messy process of building trust. Building trust between Penn and its neighbors. And that is a process that has already begun. But the level of the indignities and the power of the caste system makes Penn, in certain ways, untrustworthy because of its high-value status.

So, I think continuing that work to try to build trust, to do authentic listening, to look with humility for what I call win-win, situations where we, as the high-value participant in the conversations, are ensuring that we are authentically looking for solutions that work for everyone, and that we are open to the idea that we may not see the insidious power of caste. That we need our neighbors and people who are not in our high value to point it out to us, and we need to humbly listen to that.

I think that Penn has many initiatives already in place to try to move further on this path. And I also think that we can do more. We can commit to doing more and more and starting with a commitment, a deep and authentic and abiding commitment to do better. And it almost doesn't matter which step we take first, but to take that first step, to do it authentically and with meaning, and as we move further and further down that path, it will be impossible, or I should say, more difficult to go backward.

[01:17:01] **Dorothy Roberts**

Thank you.

[01:17:04] **Chaz Howard**

Thank you so much to both of you for your really helpful, enlightening remarks. Professor Ridgeway, I had a question and a half for you. I really appreciated your remarks. I feel like you both were, obviously, worthy of another three hours of remarks. Every panelist who has spoken before us, five minutes doesn't give you nearly enough time to cover all that you could share.

But I had a question around over-policing because it is something that has also come up several times in these hearings as well as some of the messages we have gotten. People talk about there are several different forces between us, Drexel, that cover the precinct further, West Philly. A number of people in West Philadelphia have said they feel like they are over-policed. But thinking about your remarks where you talk about crime being expensive, and yet every extra officer sort of decreases those expenses, and maybe I am making an unfair presumption, but the presumption that if there are more costs today, the cost of crime goes down, and in theory, crime may go down with an increase in the number of police officers.

So, I wanted your thoughts on when do you get to the over-policed line? Two, is there a cost? You talk about these sorts of intangible costs, and you refer to the intangible cost of sexual violence. Is there a cost for those who feel nervous, traumatized by policing of there are just more and more and more and more and more cops?

Over-policing the first question. The second question is kind of a more philosophical one, but what is the point of policing? Is it peacekeeping? Is it crime-fighting? Is it protecting an institution? On the philosophical level, what is the point of a police force?

[01:18:55] **Greg Ridgeway**

All right. Let me start with the last one. I mean the police are the—we have authorized them, this aspect of our government, to do law enforcement. So, we allocated to them the rights, the governmental powers to enforce laws. And up to including using physical force when necessary. Plenty of legal constraints around all of these things, but that is essentially, police are law enforcement.

Now, leading into your second question. There are various ways to go about that. When you get to over-policing, when you add more and more officers, they don't necessarily have to do the same thing. And, in fact, you heard, when you talk about community policing, that is not the typical TV kind of policing where they are driving fast cars, trying to push people to the curb and frisking them. Right? They can start doing other things. They can be on foot, and wander a smaller area and get to know people. Spend time at, was it, Doctor Gordon's high school. When you have more police officers,

they can start doing different—they can start policing differently and do more community policing. So, when community policing was greatly expanded in the late nineties, those new officers that were added to police departments, they were added not to expand detective services or to expand traffic enforcement. It was to expand the police abilities to conduct community policing, do problem-solving, identify public safety issues, and address them.

So, I am not sure you can get to a point where just that the number of officers gets you to over-policing. It is a combination of really the number and style of policing. So, if you have one bad-ass officer that's just knocking everyone to the curb, that's too much. IF you have five officers who are integrated with the community, they recognize people; they work in the school, they know people, that might feel like less policing than the one officer that's the knucklehead.

[01:21:33] **Chaz Howard**

Very helpful, thank you.

[01:21:38] **Dorothy Roberts**

Let me just follow up with your answer, Doctor Ridgeway. Are you taking into account in your calculations, the harms to people of over-policing... [No, no...no.] and were you address—right, and Reverend Howard's question saying there are harms to over-policing. So, if there are harms, then it cannot be that adding more and more and more police ends up with the right balance. If you were increasing harms that are also—

[01:22:26] **Greg Ridgeway**

Yeah, I didn't get it, so I put in the one line in my comments that we want to minimize negative externalities. The scientific way of getting the benefits, that is the crime prevention benefits, without—and reducing the fear of crime, in that aspect, without getting the negative externalities like increasing fear of police, inappropriate use of force, things like that.

[01:22:58] **Dorothy Roberts**

Okay, so we would have to take that into account as well, when we are thinking about are too many police, or what is over-policing. The other question, just as a follow-up I have is, if police are doing other things, is it possible that some of those other things—you said they could do a variety of things. So, we could add more police, but just have them do different things. Could some of those things be done by people who aren't police? Why do they have to be police? To do the things—to check in on the school?

[01:23:34] **Greg Ridgeway**

So, the fundamental theory behind community policing is that police, on their own, cannot achieve public safety without the full participation of the community. So, police on their own can't do it. So, how do you get the community connected and co-participating in the production of public safety? There has to be this relationship between the community and the police. And it is unclear what that is. But we sort of know some aspects of it, such as when community members know the police officer by sight or by name. They have that connection so that they are willing to come forward to report victimization. They are willing to come forward as a witness. They are willing to come to that police officer and point out a public safety hazard. They are willing to report in advance; I think something is going to go wrong at this time at this location.

When you get the community with the level of trust in the police, you can prevent—the community policing idea that you can prevent it. So, having the police officers with the time and the capacity to invest in those community policing activities, there is some benefit.

Could it be done by some intermediary? And there are like the interrupter ideas that are—that try to get other parties involved in it. And it is possible, a lot of the interrupter initiatives have not—there hasn't been uniform success with the crime interrupters' model to date.

[01:25:15] **Dorothy Roberts**

Okay, thank you very much.

[01:25:20] **John Hollway**



This is where I have to be the interrupter to make sure that we can stay on schedule. So, I thank you, Dean Bachman. Thank you, Professor Ridgeway. And we would like to pivot now to the last two speakers and start with Professor David Rudovsky, pleas.

[01:25:36] **David Rudovsky**

Okay, thank you. And thank you for the invitation to comment. David Abrams and I will do that.

My experience, I teach at the Law School. I have had a law practice in Philadelphia for 50 years. Much of that practice has been criminal defense and civil rights work, and of the civil rights work, most of it has involved police misconduct litigation. So, I bring some experience on the question of policing generally. I have some thoughts that I want to share about reforms and policing in these very, very difficult times.

On the other hand, I don't have much experience with the Penn Police. I have had, over the years, some complaints from people who had complaints about them. But have no working knowledge of that department. I can't comment on its current practices or training and how they perform in the community. I simply don't have that kind of firsthand knowledge that other people will be able to provide.

I think I can provide, however, some framework for thinking about how this kind of police department, which is a large police department, over a hundred officers. Larger than police departments in many towns and communities in Pennsylvania and across the county that should operate. And I think there are emerging some basic principles with respect to policing as we see incident after incident of misconduct, of serious misconduct with people being killed when they should not have been shot. Of protesters' rights being violated by design, but police departments, and so on. We have seen that. And putting aside for the moment of the debate about defunding, and so on, or I think we could learn something from that about the question about who should be performing some of the things that the police currently perform. I would make three basic points about how we should go about thinking about a good police department, whether it be in Philadelphia, whether it be state police, whether it be the Penn Police or the Drexel Police.

First, they ought to be engaged in what I will call best practices. We have learned over the years that certain practices work, certain don't, whether it is use of force, whether it is certain methods of police investigation into criminal conduct, whether it is stop and frisk practices, whatever it might be, that some actually work better—fewer of what Professor Ridgeway referred to as the cause of externalities. Maybe we get some benefits, but we try to reduce the harm that is caused.

And part of that best practices movement and development is based on empirical data. We know a lot more through data collection. David Abrams and I working together—we've worked in the past ten years on stop and frisk practices in Philadelphia. We've learned a lot, and we put that into a summary form, and stop and first, while it is still a significant problem in Philadelphia, is less of a problem today as it was ten years ago, and part of that is that analysis and forming policies based on what I will call best practices.

The second essential element is transparency. That also relates to data. That is for the community to be able to have insight into how the department works. Information, for example, about police—civilian complaints. Certainly, in Philadelphia, we have debated for years the problems with internal affairs, that is the unit that investigates civilian complaints against the police. Who is in that unit? What kind of independence they have? What kind of investigations they conduct? What kind of information about officers who are charged should be made public? What about the arbitration system, and so on and so forth? So, full transparency with respect to the practices of the department, I think are essential, particularly in a department like this, which is focused in an educational community, and has its effects—a ripple effect on the outside community, outside of the university, essential that there be transparency in the way they conduct business.

And the third point, and I will stop here because I will invite questions on this, and ask David to comment as well, is the question of accountability. There is one of the huge failings, huge failings in police departments around the country, and no department has really done this well, is holding officers accountable. And there are two sides to that coin. It is both holding officers accountable when they have done something wrong, and it is also trying to incentivize good conduct. You know, we often focus on the question of discipline and investigations and what we do with officers, whether you call them bad

apples, or we think [*the officers or the system*] has corrupted it in one way or the other. All that is essential that there be accountability. There is something ironic about the fact that police officers nationally, through their unions, while their position on crime is, you know, you do the crime; you do the time. Fewer rights for those who are suspects. And yet, they demand and get super due process rights that they are able to get through their political power. More rights than any other employees in this country.

And so, I don't want to strip them of their union rights; I don't want to strip them of their processes. But we have to understand, again, some of the negative consequences of that.

And so, accountability, fair investigations, giving management the right to really manage a police department, to hold people accountable, And also, as I say, to incentivize good behavior, I think, ultimately, is essential for fair policing, whether it be the Penn Police Department or any department.

So, with that, I will stop; I know we are limited in time. I'd be certainly happy to answer any questions.

[01:32:17] **John Hollway**

Thank you, Professor Rudovsky. And I will turn to our final speaker, Professor Abrams, please.

[01:32:29] **David Abrams**

Thank you to my friends and colleagues, Professors Roberts and Howard, John Hollway, and Paul Heaton, for coordinating this initiative and for inviting me to participate.

So, like Professor Rudovsky, I don't have particular specific expertise in university or private police departments, so the thoughts I am going to share today come from my knowledge of policing more broadly.

A brief background. I am an economist who has been researching criminal justice topics for about two decades, and in the past decade, have served as an expert on policing matters in Los Angeles, Seattle, Milwaukee, and other locations, including Philadelphia. I have worked with the Department of Justice as well as other organizations.

The recommendations I am going to put forth are based on my research and that of others, as well as this personal experience. So, what I would like to do is talk about, like David, we think alike, three key ingredients that are essential to successful and race-neutral policing.

So, the first is incentives. It is crucial to have proper incentives for officers, just as it is for any employee. People respond to incentives. When you make pay and promotion dependent on grants, people will get grants. If publications are more important, professors are going to write more papers. If teaching ratings are key, teaching will get better. The same is true for police. If arrests are what is counted, that's going to be the focus for officers. If the focus is Terry stops, as it had been for quite some time in Philadelphia and elsewhere, you will see a large number of stops.

So, I would suggest that the most important thing this initiative can do is work with the Penn Police to determine specific performance measures for officers of all ranks, and then, incentives, both positive and negative, to help achieve those goals. This could include things like vacation days, promotion, public recognition—I'd love to see an officer of the month featured in the *Penn Almanac*, not just crime statistics, bonuses, but also warnings, reassignment, or dismissal, when appropriate.

The details of the criteria should be determined by a joint committee of students, faculty, staff, and police, and ideally put in place by the end of the year. I would suggest, at a minimum, they should include automatic review of officers and their superiors with a certain number of complaints, unfounded stops, or any shooting incidents.

So, I am trying to give some specific thoughts as this committee is moving from gaining testimony to action.

The second key ingredient is data. I am a data guy. I think data is essential to a well-functioning organization. You have to be able to measure progress in order to reach your goals. Systematic and thorough data collection is essential to any successful enterprise, and that includes policing. So, I am very excited that Data Review is the first tab on the website for this initiative, and I am really looking forward to seeing the initial results there.

Because police departments are responsible to those being policed, this data should be publicly disseminated as frequently as possible. Many major cities, including

Philadelphia, now make crime statistics available in almost real-time. I know this because I have collected them for research this summer, and if you are interested, they are all available at [citycrimestats.com](http://citycrimestats.com) and available for anyone to use.

The Penn Police has reported crimes in the *Penn Almanac* weekly for at least a decade and probably well beyond that, disseminates real-time crime incident data to anyone who wants to sign up for it, and makes crime data available online in a very timely way. And this is all excellent and to be commended, but I think now is the time to push further and expand on the data reporting beyond just crime. In addition to crime statistics, the police should report data on: pedestrian stops, frisks, searches; vehicle stops, searches; contraband discovery, and arrests ensuing from these stops. This should include demographic information on those detained, including race. All of this data is available publicly from the City of Philadelphia and a number of other large cities, and should be at Penn, if it is not already available. I couldn't find it, but in case it is already there, it's great.

Data on compliments or complaints against officers should be available. And when there are complaints, the stage of investigation, whether they were upheld. Other misconduct investigations should also be available.

Any discharge of firearms should be reported regularly with details of the encounter. And asset forfeitures, to the extent it is relevant for the Penn Police.

This data should be available publicly online and updated at least weekly. Any video or other data should be audited at least quarterly by an independent auditor, and analysis should be made public and compared to Philadelphia and, if possible, other large university police forces.

There are a large number of other improvements that can help police ensure that their policies and practices are aligned with that of the public that they police. So, I am going to list a few here, keep it short so we don't go over time, But these include:

Better training, especially on duty to intervene, de-escalation, and interactions with individuals of a different race. Less use of lethal weapons. Recruitment from a broader pool that better represents the policed population. I'd love to see even more collaboration with Penn faculty. I know a lot of it already happens, especially with Professor Ridgeway, and others in the Criminology Department, and some colleagues in

the Law School as well. I'd love to see even more with colleagues interested in crime across the university, including at Wharton, the Med School, SSP Nursing.

It would be great to use this moment of focus and examination as an opportunity to learn about the many aspects of policing that are hard to study. We are a university, and we do research. Let's use this as changes are contemplated or being made; let's implement them in a way that could be studied. And I think that can be best done with the collaboration with our faculty who have expertise and study design so that as changes are made, they can be made in a way that can be cleanly evaluated.

I also had a couple thoughts about officers who are potentially interested and qualified taking Criminal Law or Procedure classes at the Law School or other classes at the university, as interested. And also, maybe greater collaboration on the teaching end as well. I know some of my classes would benefit from having Penn Police participate.

And then, the DPS Advisory Board, which I don't know very much about at this point, I would love to see that, or another entity, have real power, including input into discipline and dismissals.

The final point I wanted to make is ongoing university involvement. This is something that is crucial that there be ongoing input and collaboration with the university at the highest levels. We know from history, and we have heard from several of the panelists today that this is not the first moment of national focus on policing and race. These moments have come before, and attention always dissipates. The university and the public, in general, must maintain their responsibility of oversight and guidance of public safety on this campus and in this community. This is the moment to ensure that structures are in place to ensure continued vigilance and cooperation between the university and the police.

Thanks very much for the opportunity to speak today, and I look forward to questions for whatever there is time for

[01:41:14] **Chaz Howard**

Thank you both so much for your really, really helpful remarks. My first question is for Professor Rudovsky. Professor, you mentioned, and I think rightly, the need for police departments to examine the kind of transparency and accountability within their

internal affairs investigations of other police departments. Could you just speak a little more specifically with some specific recommendations of ways to improve that when internal affairs are investigating their own officers? How can we make that better? Specifically, at Penn, how can we make that better?

[01:41:54] **David Rudovsky**

Well, you know, it's [*unintelligible*] problem, you know, policing the police is internal affairs that is done by officers in the department. There have been more recently calls for oversight civilian review, right, instead of internal affairs. I actually believe while civilian review is critical, civilian oversight is critical for good policing, for democratic policing; the police have to own that problem. If internal affairs doesn't do it properly, all the oversight in the world is not going to really deal with that problem of lack of discipline or unfair investigations and cover-ups and improper or unfair discipline. They, like any other institution, whether it is University of Pennsylvania, whether it is a corporation, have got to recognize their own problems and have got to—they've got to develop a system internally to deal with it. Some departments have done that better. You need independence, right? You need investigators who are credible. There is a transparency; you would want to see their rules and regulations. What types of processes do they have for an investigation? Which witnesses have to be talked to? How is evidence gathered? There are crucial questions about when the officer is questioned. I think part of the problem has been with the union contracts; the police have been able to set up a system where they are not questioned until every civilian is questioned. I mean, that is completely contrary to good investigative practices. Again, what the relationship is between the police department at Penn and those managerial prerogatives, and what the union has demanded. I don't know all the details.

So, aside from that process, right, and how that is done, as Dave has mentioned, you need to report it. The complaints ought to be public. The results ought to be public. The data analysis—how many cases are founded, what kind of discipline is actually imposed? What happens if it goes up to arbitration? All of that ought to be disclosed to the public so that we have a better sense, as an institution, as to whether that is really working. You can analyze that. You see some departments where one percent are

founded, and you see other departments where ten, twelve percent are founded. You know something different is going between those departments. And those, I think, are some of the essentials I would say when you are looking at something about internal affairs and what I will call civilian or student complaints with a university police department.

[01:44:35] **Chaz Howard**

Thank you.

[01:44:37] **Dorothy Roberts**

Thank you so much for these very concrete suggestions; even though you said you don't have much experience with the Penn Police, you still gave us some great suggestions that apply to any police department.

I just wanted to follow up with a couple things. One is both you and Professor Abrams mentioned complaints as being one of the types of data that should be made public. I wondered if there was any other aspect of transparency that you thought was important? Other kinds of data or even non-data; anything that goes into making the police more transparent to the public.

And then, I just wanted to also follow up; you said that you really didn't have much experience with the Penn Police. I know that you have done so much work with the Philadelphia Police, the class action lawsuits, working on task forces, and things like that. Do you have any insights about the relationship between the Penn Police and the Philadelphia Police, or the West Philadelphia community more broadly? Maybe not, but I just thought I'd ask a little bit more about that.

[01:46:08] **David Rudovsky**

Yeah, so I appreciate that. On the data question, let me give you one other example of the transparency and data that ought to be provided. David and I, as I mentioned, have been working together on the stop and frisk litigation, a class action litigation in Philadelphia. And aside from the ability now, with electronic database, we have information as to every stop that's made by the Philadelphia police officers,



biographical data, the reason for the stop, whether it was a good stop or a bad stop. And so, all of that ought to be public, right, as David mentioned. Stop data, use of force data, arrest data; all of that ought to be made public.

And what you find from that, and let me just underline what that—and it something we didn't realize when we first set up this system of data keeping and analysis, is what the results can show. And I will just give you one good example of that. Stop and frisk was a practice where the police have to have some reasonable suspicion that somebody is involved in wrongdoing. And first, the law requires reasonable suspicion that the person is armed and dangerous.

So, what do we find on the data review? Quite incredibly in some ways? That for every hundred frisks by the Philadelphia police, where an officer says, I think this person is armed and dangerous. I'll throw it back to you—how many guns are found for every hundred frisks, right, under a standard that says I have reasonable suspicion this person is armed and dangerous. I see a bulge. I see him run away. I see him acting furtively, threateningly—what do you think we find?

[01:47:46] **Dorothy Roberts**

... guess, it is minuscule and that it is even less likely something will be found on a black person than on a white person.

[01:47:54] **David Rudovsky**

Well, you are right on both scores. It's fewer than one in a hundred, right? [Yeah.] But aside from what that shows is, there is information for a good department, right? What you are using as a predictive factor doesn't work. Maybe you ought to be looking at something else. Maybe some factors are more predictive than others. And that's where I think it says data is so important. So, whether it is disciplinary records, whether it is stop and frisk data, whether it is use of force data, all of that, one way or the other, ought to be made public.

On the second question, I don't have much on the relationship between the Philadelphia Police Department and the Penn Police. I know they divide up the jurisdictional areas; I have seen the rules on that. I think Superintendent Rush is very

good; I have had some dealings with her. I have dealt with her on panes and so on. I think she is an aggressive leader. I like her ideas. But I, unfortunately, don't have much of a sense of the relationship, or whatever that relationship is, how that could be improved in terms of policing in West Philadelphia, but I think it is an important question.

[01:49:10] **Chaz Howard**

I know we're getting down to the wire. I just want to ask a quick follow up question for Professor Abrams. In your remarks, you kind of had that series of ways to improve toward the end of your remarks. And one of the things that you said was less use of lethal weapons. I'm curious if you could elaborate on that. Are you referring to training around stunning and baton, other things like that? Your thoughts on policing without carrying lethal weapons, at least for certain officers to not carry lethal weapons.

[01:49:45] **David Abrams**

Yes, that is exactly what I am thinking. So, there is evidence from research that there are fewer, let's say, adverse outcomes when officers don't carry weapons as frequently. My understanding is that the Penn Police force is they are all armed. Typically, I think that is something that is absolutely worth considering whether that is necessary, especially those that are primarily on campus. And we can go back and look at the data and see are there incidents where we think lethal force is potentially necessary, or especially and for some officers, or whether alternatives like tasers or batons might be sufficient. So, that's what I mean specifically with less use of lethal weapons.

Again, this is something I think that should be considered by all police forces, but especially when we are talking about a campus police force and a campus environment. Granted, it is one in the middle of the city. I think it is absolutely worth considering whether everyone needs a firearm.

And by the way, Professor Roberts, I will just follow up on one of the questions you asked to David and just reiterate some of the specific data. And I said a lot in a short period of time, and I am going to send this to you all in written form, so you don't have to have heard everything that I said, but a few things that I think should be—and many of this may already be collected, but I don't think it is easily accessible publicly at the

moment, but everything on pedestrian stops and frisks, including searches, including [unintelligible] you just discussed, like discovery of contraband, discovery of firearms, and including information like race and other demographic information of those detained. I think all of that should be collected and disseminated and analyzed and compared with other similar jurisdictions as well as complaint data, investigations, misconduct, use of firearm—I don't know whether asset forfeiture is something that is relevant or the Penn Police Force, it certainly is for the Philadelphia police. But these were a few categories. And then, of course, video data, I think, to the extent that that is used by the Penn Police Force as well. That is something that probably can't be put online for public availability, but that is something I think that should be audited by an independent auditor to make sure that the other sources of information correspond with the video data that is collected. I think this is a best practice that modern police forces are moving to.

So, those are some specifics, and I will happily send you my copies in writing, so you've got it.

[01:53:09] **Dorothy Roberts**

Well, we really appreciate the specific suggestions. I am going to try to slip in one more follow up question. I think we have about three minutes left. And that is this question that Reverend Howard asked David Rudovsky about the police policing themselves. This issue of complaints. Yes, you can make complaints. But what happens to the complaints? When we spoke with members of the Penn Police on an earlier hearing, it seems as if the complaints are investigated, they are talked about, but they don't go very far. In fact, the person from HR said he hardly ever gets—it hardly ever gets to him because they have been dismissed, and the explanation was that very often, the complaints aren't really as serious as the people complaining think they are in the eyes of the police.

So, what can be done about that? Is there any way to have a better system of accountability where the police are—you're conducting internal investigations?

[01:54:28] **David Rudovsky**

Let me just follow up a little bit on that. There is that, as I said, this debate that is going on. New York City, for example, has a civilian review board that does the investigation of civilian complaints. The theory was that the police department had not done it well. We need an outside agency with investigators and experts who know policing, but they shouldn't be tied to the agency itself, and we will get better results.

I am not sure that's turned out to be true. I mean, I am not an expert on the New York situation, but there are still complaints in New York about lack of fair discipline and lack of good investigations and what kind of resources there are.

For the Penn Police, my question would be back to you, and it is for Penn... [Yeah.] One of the problems with the Philadelphia Police Department on that is that whole process of arbitration and review that is built into the contract under Act 111, and then you have arbitration. And even when an officer is disciplined, they put back after arbitration. That's the real problem in Philadelphia.

I don't know what the details are between the contract between the University of Pennsylvania and the Penn Police, whether you run into the same kinds of issues. That's pretty critical to me, it seems to me because Penn could say, you know, as the employer of the Penn Police, yes, we are going to have this police department, but instead of an internal-internal affairs, we are going to have an outside kind of civilian review board – and review board that does those investigations.

It is easy to say that and say everybody says, oh, yeah, we are going to have much better results. I go back to my initial point, though, that my experience is that the police department doesn't buy into reforms and change. They'll get frustrated along the way, right, and it won't work. So, you need both. You need the kind of civilian or Penn review, but you also need that department to own the problem.

[01:56:23] **Dorothy Roberts**

Mm-hmm, thank you.

[01:56:25] **David Rudovsky**

I think I've got to go because I've got another call, actually.

[01:56:30] **Dorothy Roberts**

Yes, we are ending on time for you.

[01:56:34] **David Rudovsky**

Perfect time, thank you.

[01:56:35] **Dorothy Roberts**

Yes, yes. Thanks so much, both of you, for your insights.

[01:56:40] **David Rudovsky**

And thank you for doing this, and it's a big project. Thanks for doing that.

[01:56:46] **John Hollway**

Thank you, Professor Rudovsky; thank you, Professor Abrams. Again, thank you, Professor Roberts and Reverend Howard. And I want to thank our audience who observed and participated as well. And we will be posting this again on [www.pennpublicsafetyreview.org](http://www.pennpublicsafetyreview.org), as soon as we can. Probably tomorrow is the turnaround we have been averaging.

We are going to have our next hearing on Tuesday, October 1, 2 p.m. Eastern Time—

[01:57:19] **Dorothy Roberts**

September, not October.

[01:57:23] **John Hollway**

September 1, thank you, yes. I am charging ahead. The calvary is moving quickly. Sorry, September 1, next Tuesday, September 1, at 2 p.m. Eastern Time. There will be representatives from Penn's counseling and psychological services, the Vice Provost of Equity and Access, and representatives from a number of the university's cultural groups and associations.

So, thanks everybody, for an incredibly insightful and thought-provoking afternoon. We look forward to the next one and appreciate your time. Be well.

[01:58:02] **End Hearing 4**

#####