

**University of Pennsylvania
Public Safety Review and Outreach Initiative
Hearing 1: Thursday, August 13, 2020, 2 pm EDT**

Advisors:

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Dorothy Roberts | Penn Integrates Knowledge Professor of Africana Studies, Law, and Sociology |
| Reverend Chaz Howard | Vice President for Social Equity and Community |

Panelists:

| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| Maureen Rush | Vice President for Public Safety Superintendent, Penn Police |
| Dennis Culhane | Dana and Andrew Stone Chair in Social Policy Chair, Penn Division of Public Safety Advisory Board |
| Benoit Dubé | Associate Provost and Penn Chief Wellness Officer Associate Professor of Clinical Psychiatry |
| Regina Austin | William A. Schnader Professor of Law |
| Haley Pilgrim | Ph.D. Student, Sociology 2018 – 2019 President, Graduate and Professional Student Assembly |
| Kaitlin Best | Postdoctoral Fellow, Perelman School of Medicine |

[00:00:00]

[00:02:38] **Dorothy Roberts**

Welcome to the first 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 and

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 that we will present to President Amy Gutmann, Executive Vice President Craig Carnaroli, and 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 Department 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. I will now turn the floor to my Co-Presidential Advisor, Reverend Chaz Howard.

[00:05:51] **Chaz Howard**

Thanks, Professor Roberts. And I will only add very briefly so we can get to hearing from our guests today.

I think I just want to echo and say thank you to everyone who is tuned in this afternoon, and thank you to the many, many, many people on and around our university who care deeply about these issues. This is deeply important to a whole lot of us. And it's

important for us to name the fact that we take this very seriously. There is a lot of distrust for institutions in the world right now, understandably, and rightly so. And I think Professor Roberts and I do want to communicate that the university takes this very seriously. This is not meant to be just a committee for show or anything at all like that, and that we are committed to hearing from a range of voices representing faculty, staff, students, alumni in many cases, and several voices from the surrounding community who are more than neighbors, but we consider to be a part of our family, and folks who are also wrestling with this hard issue of contemporary policing in America.

We want to make sure the whole process is fair and open. And one of the important things to us as we've planned for this has been transparency. And so, we are grateful for, even in difficult times where we can't be together physically, a technology that allows for this process to be as open as can be from all around the area.

Finally, I want to thank the Quattrone Center, who has done a lot of the hard, heavy lift early on in kind of pulling this together. And thank you to all of our guests who will be sharing and have made themselves available to some hard questions. And I turn it over to Doctor John Hollway to get us started. Thank you.

[00:07:49] **John Hollway**

Thanks, Professor Roberts and Reverend Howard, much appreciated for those remarks. My name is John Hollway; I am the Executive Director of the Quattrone Center for the Fair Administration of Justice at the University of Pennsylvania Carey Law School. We have been asked to facilitate this public safety review and outreach initiative, and it is our great honor, pleasure, and privilege to participate with the two of you, with all of the people that are about to speak with the Department of Public Safety, who has provided us with a lot of documentary information, and really with the Penn and West Philadelphia communities and having these really important conversations at this pivotal time.

My role here today is really just to explain the ground rules for what we are doing today and in the hearings to follow. I think, at the outset, I want to make sure everybody is reminded in aware that we are recording this. We will post the recording and, separately, a transcript of the recording on the Public Safety Review and Outreach

Initiative website, which is www.pennpublicsafetyreview.org. That is all one word, pennpublicsafetyreview.org.

This is the first in a series of virtual webinar hearings that are designed to provide perspectives from throughout Penn and our larger West Philadelphia community so that this process can assess Penn's success in creating both a physically and emotionally safe environment for all of our colleagues, our visitors, and our neighbors in which every person is treated with dignity and respect, and in a way that prioritizes and promotes anti-racism, racial equality, and justice.

We will have additional hearings throughout the next month or so, gathering a wide diversity of viewpoints and perspectives. The next hearing is going to be Tuesday, August 18th at 2:00 PM. We will be providing additional information on that at the end of this session, and again, on the website at pennpublicsafetyreview.org.

Anyone who wishes to provide additional information, thoughts, ideas, suggestions, or perspectives on this initiative, on the Department of Public Safety, or on the University of Pennsylvania Police Department, can also do that on the website. That information can be provided in an anonymous fashion if you would choose to do so.

We also are accepting voice messages at (215) 746-4572. I'll say that one more time. (215) 746-4572.

For today, we have six invited speakers. To ensure clear conversations, we are going to ask the speakers to go one at a time while others are muted. We're going to start with the first three speakers, Vice President Rush, Doctor, Culhane, and Doctor Dubé, providing their statements in turn, and then an opportunity for that group to do a brief question and answer with Professor Roberts and Reverend Howard. And then we will go to the second group of speakers in the same way. Professor Austin, Ms. Pilgrim, and Doctor Best.

Members of the audience are encouraged to submit questions at any time through the Q and A feature that's found at the ribbon at the bottom of the window. We are actively monitoring that Q and A, but given the number of speakers and the time we have, we can't promise that we will be able to answer every question here in this session. The questions are being recorded and stored, and we will do our best to answer those questions to the extent possible going forward.

We recognize that the topics that we are going to be discussing are deeply felt throughout our community and may be emotional. We'd ask that members of the audience, please keep your questions topical and appropriate, and reserve the ability to remove any member of the audience who makes the Q and A difficult for us to sift through for those reasons.

With that, I'd like to turn it back to Professor Roberts, Reverend Howard, and our first speaker, Maureen Rush, the Vice President for Public Safety at Penn, and the Superintendent of the Penn Police.

Thanks very much. And we really appreciated your assistance here, and we thank you, Vice President Rush, for being willing to appear.

[00:11:45] **Maureen Rush**

Thank you, John. I want to thank the Quattrone Center, Executive Director John Holloway, Academic Director Paul Heaton, as well as the Presidential Advisers, Penn Law Professor Dorothy Roberts, and Vice President for Social Equity and Community Reverend Chaz Howard for all of their efforts.

The Penn Public Safety ... I need to stop this. Excuse me one second...//

[00:12:12]

I want to first acknowledge the hurt, rage, and pain we are feeling around policing and race. I was horrified and deeply saddened at the deaths of Mr. George Floyd and Ms. Breonna Taylor at the hands of the police. I am a police officer, and I have dedicated forty-four years of my life providing safety and security to communities. The actions of these police officers tarnish the reputation of all law enforcement officers.

George Floyd and Breonna Taylor's deaths, and the deaths of numerous people of color, were and are preventable; there were numerous points of failure. Best practices in policing dictate that police officers must be well trained, receive discipline when they violate state and federal laws, for when they disregard their departments' policies and procedures. Furthermore, there must be checks and balances to ensure that every officer is abiding by the laws and their policies and procedures. And these practices must be held accountable, and when they are not, discipline must occur.

In the Division of Public Safety at Penn, we do this within a context of structural ... excuse me ... structural racism that exists at every level in our society. Every day when we come to work, we endeavor to provide an environment in which every community member feels physically and emotionally safe and welcome, and is treated with dignity and respect at all times in ways that prioritize and promote racial equality and justice.

When I entered Law Enforcement in 1976, I was a 22-year-old closeted lesbian. I was hired by the Philadelphia Police Department as one of the first one hundred women to work street patrol. Then Mayor Frank Rizzo fought the Department of Justice but finally was forced under a court decree to hire one hundred women for a two-year pilot program.

I learned a lot about prejudice, racism, sexism, and homophobia as a targeted and unwelcomed minority police officer. I also witnessed extreme racism directed at my black colleagues, both on and off duty. I was deeply affected by watching the overt racism that my friends and colleagues endured. This informed my ideas about how to supervise and lead in a police department. My last three years there, in the Philadelphia Police, I was a Lieutenant and trainer in the Philadelphia Police Advanced Training Bureau. I became deeply committed to the value of training in creating best practices, and I brought this love of training to our Penn Police Department in 1994.

So, allow me to give you an overview of the Penn Division of Public Safety. Policing is one aspect of our Division, and we have six other departments who work 24/7, 365 days a year, to promote safety in our community. These include Special Services, our Victim Advocacy Program, Fire and Emergency Preparedness, PennComm Emergency Communication Center, Information and Security Technology, Security Services Department, which manages our Allied Universal Security Officer program, and the Finance and Administration Department.

Let me also share the Mission Statement of the Division of Public Safety.

The Mission of the University of Pennsylvania's Division of Public Safety is to enhance the quality of life, safety, and security of our community. The Division accomplishes its mission through the delivery of a comprehensive and integrated safety and security program in partnership with the community that we serve.

The members of the Division of Public Safety reflect the diversity of our community. We pledge to deliver professional safety and security services that value and respect the rights and differences of all members of the Division, as well as those of the University of Pennsylvania and the University City communities that we are all proudly serving

We are committed to the professional and personal development of all members of the Division of Public Safety, and in turn, we expect all of our employees to be models of excellence. Ultimately, we strive each and every day to earn the trust, confidence, and respect of our community.

We live our Mission Statement. Diversity is hugely important to us, and in partnership with the Division of Human Resources and the Office of Affirmative Action, I am proud to report that almost forty percent of Penn Police officers identify as minorities, and forty-eight percent of our entire division identify as minorities. Ten percent of Public Safety members live in West Philadelphia. Our goal for inclusion extends to the safety partner, Allied Universal, where forty-seven percent of our security officers on the Penn account live in six West Philadelphia zip codes.

We make every effort to partner with our Penn and West Philadelphia communities. We have many outreach programs. These programs match Penn Police Supervisors, Special Services advocates, Detectives, Fire and Emergency Preparedness specialists with Cultural Center Directors and College House Directors here at Penn. We also attend monthly West Philadelphia Community Meetings, such as First Thursday, Spruce Hill, Garden Court, Cedar Park Neighbors, and Walnut Hill Community Association, and we are on a first-name basis with our community members.

Our motto, which is embraced throughout our Division, is “It’s all about relationships.” This philosophy became my mantra back in 1976, as I walked foot beats and learned the value of relationships within the community I served. This philosophy enables us to partner and serve with our Penn and West Philadelphia communities. I am enormously proud of the members of the Division of Public Safety and for the relationships we have built within these communities.

I look forward to responding to your questions. Thank you so much for allowing me to participate.

[00:18:25] **Chaz Howard**

Thank you, VP Rush, for your remarks and for your leadership as well.

[00:18:33] **Maureen Rush**

Thank you.

[00:18:34] **Chaz Howard**

John, just process-wise, we will be engaging each speaker, or did you want to run through all the...?

[00:18:39] **John Hollway**

I think what we will do now is we will turn to Doctor Culhane, if that's okay. And we will do Doctor Culhane and Doctor Dubé, and then we will do questions for the group of three.

[00:18:47] **Chaz Howard**

Okay.

[00:18:50] **John Hollway**

So, the next to speak is Doctor Dennis Culhane, the Dana and Andrew Stone Chair in Social Policy and the Chair of Penn Division of Public Safety Advisory Board. Doctor Culhane, thank you very much.

[00:19:01] **Dennis Culhane**

Thank you, and good afternoon. As you said, I am Dennis Culhane; I am a Professor of Social Policy in the School of Social Policy and Practice. I have been a member of the Public Safety Advisory Board since it was established in 2000. The board is strictly advisory in function and does not have a formal charter or charge or policy-

making role. Participation is voluntary and by invitation from the VP for Public Safety in consultation with the Board Member Chair, which is currently my role.

At present, all members are either students, faculty, or staff of the university. They are invited based on their roles as representatives of various administrative units on campus, as faculty with relevant domain expertise, or as student government or student organization leaders or staff affiliated with VPUL. For example, some of the administrative units represented would include the Transportation and Parking Office, Facilities and Real Estate Services, the General Counsel's office, Business Services, Intergovernmental Relations, Alumni Relations, Risk Management, et cetera. Transportation and parking office facilities and real estate services, the general counsel's office, uh, business services, intergovernmental relations, alumni relations, risk management, et cetera.

Some faculty are involved who have expertise in criminology, domestic violence, or homelessness, student government or organization representatives include leadership from GAPSA and the Undergraduate Assembly, and University Life representatives from the LGBTQ Center, International House, Student Housing, and the Chaplain's Office.

The advisory board meets four times a year during the academic year; twice in the fall semester and twice in the spring semester. The agenda typically involves a presentation by the VP providing an update on crime statistics, which can involve presentations by various division leaders, and presentations on other current topics of attention. For example, this could include a briefing on the deployment of body cameras, or about recent trainings that have been held for staff, or about any recent crime incidents or trends. Each meeting also includes an open forum for board members to raise issues of concern that they may have. About half of the two-hour meeting is usually devoted to the open forum.

The fourth and final meeting of the year, usually held in April, is the only one that comes with a specific agenda item, which is to review the year's statistics on bias-based profiling, customer and citizen satisfaction survey results, and complaints against the police. This yearly review was one of the recommendations from the ad hoc committee on bias-based profiling that issued its report in 2004. Because of the union contract does not permit a civilian complaint review process, complaints are reviewed internally by

police department leadership. The details of each incident, without identifying information, are described to the board, as is the disposition from the internal investigation. The advisory board members have an opportunity to ask questions and to discuss the incidents and whatever sanctions or actions had been taken.

From my vantage point, the board has provided a valuable space for discussion of public safety issues and policies among a fairly diverse set of stakeholders from a broad set of university constituents. It has enabled the university community to provide input to DPS policies and procedures, to speak directly on a regular basis to leadership of the division about their concerns, and for DPS to have regular communication with the various groups represented. It has also provided a valuable personal connection among the people and groups on campus with DPS so that more immediate issues of concern can be taken up in between meetings directly with key points of contact.

Thank you for inviting me to participate today, and I am glad to respond to any questions you have.

[00:23:29] **John Hollway**

Thank you, Doctor Culhane. At this point, we would turn to Doctor Benoit Dubé, an Associate Professor of Clinical Psychiatry, but also the Associate Provost and Penn's Chief Wellness Officer. Doctor Dubé...

[00:23:40] **Benoit Dubé,**

Thank you very much. Professor Roberts, Reverend Howard, members of the committee; good afternoon. And I'd like to start by expressing my gratitude for being able to share thoughts and perspectives on the Penn Public Safety system.

In my capacity as Chief Wellness Officer for the university, I oversee the delivery of clinical services for students' physical and emotional health. I am referring here to Student Health Service and CAPS, our counseling and psychological services center, or clinic. I also oversee programs pertaining to disease prevention, health education, and wellbeing promotion that are managed by Campus Health, our public health department for the entire student body.

When it comes to the mental health of our students, Penn's Department of Public Safety and its officers have been trusted partners and allies with CAPS, or counseling center, in times of crisis. It is readily apparent, and has become increasingly so over the past two years, since I became the Chief Wellness Officer, that DPS provides training in dealing with mental health issues to its officers. In times of crisis, officers have demonstrated the ability to patiently deescalate situations, preventing unfortunate outcomes.

I should also mention that despite the often unpleasant and stressful circumstances of such interactions, seldom have students filed complaints about officers' interventions during these times of crisis. Such examples include intoxicated behaviors, threatening behaviors, threats of self-harm, or suicide attempts. In these situations, officers have predictably shown the ability to modulate their own emotional response in these times, putting the students' needs above their own, and often over time, officers developed somewhat of a therapeutic alliance with students who required repeated interventions. This goes back to, and really supports what we heard from Vice President Rush; it is about relationships.

Officers have also shown the ability to work with our after-hours service for mental health crises. This type of therapeutic alliance is unheard of in typical police forces. To its credit, Penn Police has been able to tailor the training of its officers to the specific needs of our campus population. This is also evident in the call center staff who answer our campus helpline as they are able to not only identify the right resource for callers, but also provide reassurances to parents who may be calling with concerns about their students, for example.

I'd also like to add that the opinion I expressed about the unique ability of Penn Police to provide much-needed assistance in times of crisis is also formed in comparison to direct observations I had made when Philadelphia police officers were involved in addressing the suicidality of patients under my direct and personal care as a psychiatrist.

As members of the university's Public Safety Review and Outreach Initiative conduct their comprehensive review of public safety at Penn to assess Penn's success in creating a physically and emotionally safe environment on campus, I hope to remind the

committee of the strengths that DPS brings to our ability to address the students' ever-present mental health concerns. Thank you.

[00:27:15] **John Hollway**

Thanks, Doctor Dubé. Professor Roberts, Reverend Howard, the floor is yours.

[00:27:23] **Chaz Howard**

And thank you, everybody, for your prepared remarks and your openness to hearing a few questions. We will be asking our questions in turn, first for Vice President Rush, then Professor Culhane, then Doctor Dubé.

Vice President Rush, my first question, and, again, thank you for your remarks and for sharing part of your personal story. My first question is, is there anything, in your view, that needs improvement or modification or overhaul, broadly in the division, but specifically in regard to Penn Police. What needs to get better, do you think?

[00:28:07] **Maureen Rush**

So, Chaz, we have never stopped improving and looking for ways to improve the entire Division of Public Safety. Penn Police, obviously, are on the front lines day and night and have opportunities to—for points of failure. So, we're always looking at that. And so, a good example of how we are able to constantly review the landscape of policing with best practices is through our accreditation process through CALEA, C-A-L-A-A, and we have been accredited since 2001, and I'd have to say that because of that accreditation process and, and we were up for reaccreditation every three years, they just changed it; now, next time it will be four years. But we have improved our policies and procedures, and we did best practices.

I think, beyond the nuts and bolts, if you will, of policing with policies and procedures, which your commission has free access to, and to review, I think—I think these are emotionally difficult times. I recently met with every minority police officer on all three shifts, and I wanted to hear how life was for them. And I was reminded by several of them who, none of my officers are shy, and they're very forthcoming, and some of the black officers have had their own personal experiences, even in the midst

COVID. Wearing a mask is a difficult thing for some folks, particularly black men. And so, I feel that we need to do more support mechanisms for our minority officers, and also just, in general, to make sure that the officers feel supported. And I will be the first one to separate an officer who is not going to—not going to follow our rules, regulations, state, and federal law, because that person would be a handicap to the reputation of not only the Penn Police and the Division of Public Safety, but the University of Pennsylvania.

So in short, I would say that I think it's more emotional of what, what can we do to—and they've had a lot of training around that, and as Benoit mentioned, we have gotten specific training or mental health response from CAPS and from him and meetings with our supervisors. And so, I would be very open, especially in your world, Chaz, to find out how we can feed the souls of the police officers so they can, in turn, be even more empathetic during this very difficult time in our society.

[00:31:02] **Dorothy Roberts**

Thank you, Vice President Rush, for your statement and for being willing to answer our questions. You stated in your original statement that you recognize and understand the hurt and anger surrounding the killing of George Floyd and the protests that arose surrounding that. You probably know that some protesters, including organizations at Penn, like Police Free Penn, are calling for defunding the police or even disbanding the police, including the University of Pennsylvania Police Department. And I wondered what you think about those calls, how you place them in your understanding of the protests against the killing of George Floyd, which was, of course, protest against broader concerns about police conduct and the role of police in our society. And we could extend that to [*unintelligible*] at Penn. So, but I just would like to hear your response to that.

[00:32:20] **Maureen Rush**

Right. I have to tell you, Doctor Roberts, when I saw the video of that killing of Mr. Ford, it was a killing of Mr. Floyd, and it had brought up two things. It brought up at first, and we all have talked about this in the news, we have talked about it internally here in Penn Police, that number one, there was—when I talk about failure points, that was a

case study. You had a gentleman; you had a person who was masquerading as a police officer, who basically murdered a man, over an extended period of time, in broad daylight, being filmed. And number two, that his department had, in spite of 17 or 18 complaints against police that were substantiated, he continued to serve. And more importantly, that they put them in the position as a field training officer for those other three officers. And at least two of those officers who were on the sidelines had like three days on the job, and they were not strong enough to persist in the bystander response that we teach here at Penn Police.

And so, that's number one, the number one issue here is the lack of discipline, training, I could go into a whole lot around police arbitration processes that, you know, even when best practices are followed, people can try to get their job back, and the whole issue of, you know, moving from one department to another. So, they are the real meat and potatoes of a lot of problems around police departments.

Number two, I think, you know, this—we have seen, unfortunately, other police brutality cases that resulted in the murder of an innocent person across the country. The thing that made this so different, I think, is first off, it was on film, and it was just the most brutal killing regardless of who was kneeling on Mr. Floyd's neck. But also, in a time of COVID, there is so much pent up frustration, and people have more time to really have their voice come out. So, I think this was a recipe for everybody needs to stop, and we need to look at every police department across the country. And we as police, and internally, as a police law enforcement official for 44 years, I am absolutely devastated when I see police actions like that. And I'm angry, and it's time for all the police chiefs across the country to take on the hard issues around unionization and arbitration and ways in which things, our discipline is held up.

So, you know, I could go on for another hour on this issue because it's really personal to me, and it is really destructive to our society.

[00:35:27] **Dorothy Roberts**

If I could just follow up a bit. I was also asking about the particular demands to defund... [Yes.] ...and/or disband the police. And there are calls for that directed

specifically at the University of Pennsylvania Police by Police Free Penn, for example. [Yes.] So, I wondered if you would respond to that as well.

[00:35:54] **Maureen Rush**

So, I have been here now, this is my twenty-seventh year, and the Public Safety Division, including the 121 members of the Penn Police Department today, and that has grown over the years. And the University City, West Philadelphia, went through some very, very difficult crime challenges during the—well, in the eighties, but from my vantage point, ninety-six through ninety-nine, and then, again, in 2006 and 2007, where more resources were given to Public Safety's budget. More officers were hired, more Allied officers were placed on the streets, and better technology was put into our Penn Comm Center. All of this was in support of what the requests were coming from, from parents, from current students, from graduate students, from alums. And we were at a cross-point where people, you know, it's the Maslow Theory, if people don't feel safe, they are going to maybe not choose to come to Penn personally, or to send their children.

So, all of that was done from a crime prevention issue. But I have to say that that's way expanded, and just like hearing about the mental health systems. I was part of both mental health task forces, and the development, for example, of the helpline was done in the first mental health task force. And it was decided that it would rest in Public Safety's Communication Center because we're 24/7. And as all of those systems evolved. And working with CAPS, and now with Doctor Dubé; organization, that has continued to develop because that issue became actually more important than crime because we were doing well with crime, but then we saw mental health really ratcheting up and also alcohol issues where students were getting themselves hurt.

The long story here is that I don't believe by defunding Penn Police, that this would be of any service to the members of this community, both Penn community, and University City, and West Philadelphia community. We don't just patrol Penn. We go out to 43rd Street, we can go further, but that's where we chose many years ago due to personnel numbers, et cetera. But, but the point is, is that we do way more than what normal police departments do because we are part of an ecosystem that not only stays in Public Safety Division, but we work with student wellness. We work with the student

intervention services out of VPUL. We work with the College House systems. We work with the cultural resource centers. And all of these people, they don't have to call, you know, 5-1-1 from their desk phone, or 5-7-3-3-3-3. They pick up the phone, and they talk to their liaison. It could be a detective; it could be a police supervisor; they call me.

So, if we want to defund Penn Police, I think we just need to say, all right, well, what do they really do? Because it's like any, it's like any organization; it doesn't stay static, and it grows, and it handles situations that are the hot situation, the hot problem. So, I'm, you know, I'm not saying that policing can't evolve into another pattern, another—maybe it's time. But the social service agency issues that all police departments, all police departments have to handle, such as child abuse, working with, in the city. And when I was in Philadelphia police, I would see the most horrendous elder abuse and child abuse, and at three in the morning, when I've called DHS, the Department of Human Services, they often couldn't come out.

Fortunately, at Penn, we call our partners here, whether it's VPUL, or CAPS, or HUP Psychiatry, and we get help immediately. So, we're fortunate. We're very fortunate. But again, nothing that we do here at Penn is just about what Penn Police do. It's the division, and it's us as a community.

So I am willing to look at anything, and I am willing to see what, which way this could go, but we need to remember what, what is being served right now for not only Penn community, but the West Philly community, and who will do that if it's not the Penn Police or Penn Com or Allied?

[00:40:43] **Chaz Howard**

VP, my question is related to that. On the website it describes UPPD as "the largest private police department in the Commonwealth... [Yes.] ...and the second largest number of full-time sworn police officers amongst all private universities in the U.S., and the third-largest number of sworn officers for all universities nationwide, public and private.

I think, ultimately, the question I want to ask is, could it be possible to reduce the size of UPPD, in your view, and still maintain a safe environment on and around Penn's campus?

[00:41:16] **Maureen Rush**

So, Chaz, I will take us back to, again, the ninety-eight era when Judy Rodin was president, and then, again, in 2006 and 2007 with Doctor Amy Gutmann as president. The reason that the growth of the Penn Police occurred, because when I first came here in 1994, I was actually the Director of Victim Support, which is Pat Brennan's position now. And there were probably only about 78 sworn police officers. But there were a lot of issues. There was a lot of crime. There was a lot of, a lot of—any time there was an uptick in crime, you know, we had to set up hotlines for parents to call in, and others. So, the growth of the police department happened in large part to the growth of Penn. Because when you look at what Penn was like in ninety-four, and you look at what Penn is like today with the growth, you know, beds, dorm space, third party development, retail, restaurants; this is a whole different environment than it was when there were 78 officers.

So, could we reduce? I know there are some folks who feel that you don't need police, that you can use Allied Security officers, and they could and do all of these things. I don't agree with that. I think that we have put together a program that is a national model, where you have police doing what police need to do, and you have security having security duties that took away a lot of the old duties that the security—the police used to do, like unlocking doors, and things like that. So, now, the other thing is, people want to see uniforms on the street. And I know again, and I would love to learn more that people of color may feel threatened by seeing uniforms on the street. We have to hear that voice, but the voices that have been very loud over the many, many years I have been here have been more; they want more, more, more. More lighting, more police, more Allied, and that's where we are today.

So if we were to peel the onion, as we just talked about with Doctor Roberts, and changed what the Penn Police do, and change what their liaisons are going to be and not be, and have them be more of a model of what a municipal police department does, because I'll tell you, if you call 911, and you have—you're, you're the Dean of one of our schools, and you're getting threatening letters and things like that. You call 911 for that resource and for help with that. Forget it. You're not going to get no—they're not going to

handle that. So, Philadelphia police went from 8,000 to 6,600 over the last 40 years. And they're—they've had to cut back on what services they give to the Philadelphia community. But I will tell you; they're not—Penn—the community of Penn has become accustomed to and loves the additional services, which I could put, you know, a PowerPoint together, and it would be about 20 pages long with all of the what are—people would say why are the police doing that? There's a lot of reasons. There was demand for it.

So, could we? Yeah, we could. But then, we—again, just like all the other issues, we'd have to say, well, who handles this? Who handles that? Who is here at three in the morning? Are we going to have VPUL work around the clock? Are we going to have psychiatry work around the clock? They're the questions and probably above my pay grade to make those decisions.

[00:45:06] **Dorothy Roberts**

Thanks. So, let me ask you a question that's sort of related that came up in your answer. So, we have been talking about, and you've been expanding on the various functions that Penn Police do that are beyond what we think about perhaps traditional police officers doing. But I want to ask about what Penn Police do that is part of what we think about traditional police officers doing, which is the power to arrest members of the public. And the surrounding neighborhood around Penn is policed by at least five different police agencies. And all have this power to arrest. Penn has sworn officers, right? [Yes.] So, but on the other hand, unlike the Philadelphia Police Department, there isn't the same accountability that Penn police have to the people of the broader public who could be arrested by Penn Police. And I wondered if you would speak to us about that broad power to arrest and whether that's necessary. Because you've talked about other kinds of services the police do, the Penn Police do that we can think about are they necessary. But what about this power to arrest and its implications for people who are not necessarily part of the Penn community or on campus? This is outside of campus, even.

[00:46:50] **Maureen Rush**

So again, predominantly, we will be from 30th to 43rd Street, up to Presbyterian Hospital now with the trauma center, so a little bit above Market and then to Baltimore Avenue. We do arrest people who do not—are not part of the Penn community, but have committed a crime on Penn's campus. Luckily, well, just this week, we had to put out—in the last two weeks, two UPenn alerts for gunpoint robberies. Unfortunately, in both instances, the suspects were not apprehended.

But let's say they were. We would follow the same systems that the Philadelphia police, the same preliminary arraignment system. We would have to have the district attorney's office review and approve the charges. We don't decide what the charges are. The district attorney could say I am not charging at all. The offender would then go into the same system if they were arrested by the Philadelphia, and all of the due processes, starting arraignment court, all the way to the conclusion of a trial, we would participate as would any other police department in Philadelphia.

We are—our goal here is to have a safe community. Luckily, we are, at the moment, we have not been challenged by homicides. But I am concerned about the uptick in armed robbery, and I am very concerned about when I see what is going on in the City of Philadelphia with the thirty-five percent increase in homicides and shootings. And we know that because we also cover, and have an officer assigned around the clock at Presbyterian Trauma Center. So, we are intimately aware of the violence that is going on around us.

Our police department is patrolling in a two and a half square mile area. And we have probably more supervision on everything our police officers do, whether it's through our CCTV network, where if they are making a car stop or a pedestrian stop or making an arrest, the camera, if there is a camera in the area, they're on camera. They also wear body-worn cameras. But more importantly, on any situation, like I just described, if there had been an arrest—out this past week, when I sent the UPenn alert out, the supervisor would be on the scene, and they would ensure that all of the processes were being—were legal and appropriate for the mission of our department.

[00:49:47] **Dorothy Roberts**

Okay. Let me follow up on that because this obviously has a lot of implications for members of the West Philadelphia community who aren't Penn students or faculty or staff who could be arrested, stopped, arrested by the Penn Police. Because one possibility would be that because there are so many agencies already patrolling this area, there isn't a need for Penn Police to do it as well. And so, but Penn Police are, as you described, able to stop, frisk, arrest members of the West Philadelphia community, even if they're not on campus at the time.

So, let me ask together a couple of questions about that. One is, what do you think is the relationship between the West Philadelphia community and the Penn Police? And, for the sake of time, I'll just ask another question, which was an example of where there were protests by West Philadelphia community members about Penn Police action in their neighborhood, and that was the incident at 52nd Street on May 31st, where Penn Police were involved in an incident where there was use of tear gas. And members of the community have said that they felt they were assaulted by police officers, which included the Penn Police.

So, I would like you to—I know this is a lot, at once, a lot to cover, but many people are focusing on that incident... [Yeah,] ...as a reflection of the Penn Police. So, and its relationship to the West Philadelphia community. So, can you just say a little bit, you know, about the relationship with the community, but also focusing on the specific incident of when Penn Police would come to the assistance of Philadelphia police officers or other officers. Is it in your discretion to decide whether to do it? And what do you think about the way in which the Philadelphia police reacted or acted? I saw an image of, it looked like a tank going down the street dispersing tear gas randomly on the street, affecting people who lived in that neighborhood. So, what—how do you—what did you think about that? What do you think? And what does that—does that tell us anything about the relationship between Penn Police and the broader West Philadelphia neighborhoods.

[00:52:57] **Maureen Rush**

So, let me go from the macro to the micro. [Okay.] We have—our powers of—the police powers, if you will, are through the state of Pennsylvania. And as such, we, you

know, boundary wise, we go where we need to go when needed. How does that work? Well, we have a memorandum of understanding, an MOU with the Philadelphia police, the commissioner, and I sign that, and it basically points out the jurisdiction issues about our detectives versus their detectives handling investigations. And we answer about 250 911 calls that are called in, by anyone that—but in our patrol zone. And we answered about two-fifty a month that takes that workload off of the 18th District, which is where we reside and the 16th District, where Presbyterian is located. And so, we don't answer that call, get to the scene, and say, Oh, it's an auto accident. Oh, you're not a Penn community member. We can't handle this. We handle it. Same thing if anyone is a victim of crime. And so, the MOU lays all of that out.

And in effect, it's a mutual aid agreement, as well, with the understanding that if we were having an issue here on Penn's campus, as we've had in the nineties, and we could ask for assistance.

Before the 52nd Street incident, we had something very similar, and you might recall after you hear me talk about this, but there was a man who tried to assassinate a black female Sergeant, a Philadelphia Police Sergeant, who was parked her patrol car at 52nd and Sansom right next to 52nd and Market. And there was what was called an assist officer called, and there was a second assist officer, and a third—and the reason there were so many assist officer calls because they didn't have enough police personnel to handle the situation. And after he shot into the woman's patrol car, 16 times, he proceeded to go East on Sansom where he killed another innocent woman who was sitting in her car, getting dropped off from work, shot, her boyfriend, shot another person, and ultimately shot a Penn police officer, who was one of my officers responding to the assist call. Thankfully, our officer—was shot three times and thankfully, is here today and survived. That's an example of how, and many in between where we have gone out to assist another jurisdiction. Same thing would happen for Drexel if they had a problem.

The day of the 52nd and Market situation, there were multiple assist officer calls that were coming in. And then, I was getting phone calls from high-level police officials at the deputy commissioner level who were overwhelmed and were, you know, were having police cars burned, were having officers hit in the head with bricks. There were

explosions of propane tanks. And, you know, it wasn't my first choice, really, to send my officers out to a scene that I knew people were going to get hurt.

A\and so, we did a very strategic number of officers, under the command of my deputy chief of emergency preparedness. And these officers are trained, you know, at a higher level for response to emergencies and tactical issues. The did proceed to go out, and they started calling assist officer calls because it continued to be very, very violent. Our officers, A, we don't have gas, we've never had gas. We don't have pepper balls. We do have, you know, we do have regular pepper spray. But at that—when they went out there, their job ended being to stop more people from coming in and attacking the rear of the police officers that were kind of pushed into a situation where they were like against the wall. And this was pre-Philadelphia SWAT coming in with the pepper spray.

What they were doing is they were also helping. The Philadelphia Fire Department was calling for assist officers, too, because they were trying to put out fires in various places in that area where the rioting was occurring. And police cars were being burnt; other things were being burnt. They were getting thrown—they were having things thrown at them. So, our officers specifically shielded them so they could put out fires, assisted some of the store owners who needed to get out of their stores that were tapped, and a couple other elderly people who were trying to get to a safe place. They never used force, they didn't make any arrests, and that was their role. And that sort of was my agreement with the deputy commissioner who called, and I said, they're going to be together; they're going to be under the command of my deputy chief, and we're going to be auxiliary to help with these issues. And I have three police officers that are still injured from that incident on May 31st with serious injuries.

You're on mute, Dorothy.

[00:58:34] **Dorothy Roberts**

Thank you. The Penn Police were not involved in the tank or whatever; I don't know how to describe it, going down the street with, it looked like tear gas or pepper spray or something coming out of it, where there were no people who were doing anything violent on the sidewalks. It looked to me as if they were spraying residences

without provocation at that point. And so that was a Philadelphia Police Department equipment.

[00:59:10] **Maureen Rush**

Right, and there are three investigations ongoing from various parts of the city. So, you know, I don't know the answer to that question; I wasn't there, but I am sure that will be one of the focal points of the investigation.

[00:59:24] **Dorothy Roberts**

Okay, thank you.

[00:59:26] **Maureen Rush**

Yeah, sure.

[00:59:27] **Chaz Howard**

And, VP, I just have one more question, then Doctor Dubé and Doctor Culhane, thanks for your patience. [Yeah.]

My final question is around transparency, and I think a broader question around openness to transparency around internal directives and budget and different things like that. But specifically, one of the questions that came up in the Q and A was around transparency around accountability of officers who make mistakes. Officers who have credible accusations. How open are you, and how open is DPS to greater transparency, one, around what happens when a cop does something bad? And so, it may [*beginning*] that, sort of, flesh that out a little bit, like who investigates the officer? What does that process look like? Is the rest of the university involved? Is the community that is policed involved? And I sort of qualify this saying I know when officers are being interviewed, DPS is actually very open, and you all seem to invite different partners to be a part of the interview process and to sort of sign off when a new officer is coming. And I think if, and to sort of target—I had two questions here. When officers are interviewing, do we accept officers who have terminated from other departments? Who has been disciplined there? So, like I see you are nodding your head no on that one. Could you say a little bit more

about when officers get in trouble... [Yeah.] ...what does look like, and is there room for greater transparency there?

[01:01:00] **Maureen Rush**

So, I think you bring up a great point that I'd love to tell people about, and that is the hiring process for Penn Police. We created the Community Hiring Board about 15 years ago. And we put together volunteers who are people, maybe HR, affirmative action, resource center directors, our chaplain's office has, I don't know you, but Steve has sat on it. And the panels that recruits—first off, even before anyone would receive an interview in person their background, you know, their resume, do they have the qualifications? All of that is vetted. That's not at the point where you do the internal review because of HR issues; you have to have a signed offer. But these people come in, and they sit in front of our community members and Penn Police supervisors, and we have one question, in particular, that is always asked, and it is asked by the community member, and it is around diversity.

And we, we have, uh, one question in particular that is always asked, and it's asked by the community member, and it's around diversity. And we have had, you know, I review, then, the interviews, they are written, and also talk to our colleagues across Penn who serve on the community board. And if they say this person probably doesn't have the ability to understand diversity in the way that Penn Police need to; I'm done. I don't need to have any other part of the process.

Secondly, the very end of the process, they call it the "Chief's Board." It is me, and generally one or two of my deputies. And I also ask a diversity question that's about what do you, you know, what do you do? And how do you treat a person who was stopped by you? Because there was a description of a robbery. The person looked like they fit that description. It turns out that the person was not the individual. How do you respond to the pain and hurt of the individual you stopped? And if they go down the line of I'm doing my job, I'm doing my job. I will stop them, and I will say, I got that. But this person was just walking around. How do you tend to their fear? That was a fearful thing, and it was also an embarrassing thing because people may have watched that stop.

People that get hired say, I will apologize for this bad experience and the timeliness that I maybe had taken, and ask them, A, can I drop you off somewhere? B, if you would like to make a complaint against the police, I will call my supervisor. They are the people that get hired, Chaz. The other ones don't, But even to that point, they still go through a very rigid background check, not just calling, if they were in another department, calling that department to check to see if they have any, you know, discipline, where they terminated? And also, we do interviews in their neighborhood, their families, people in the neighborhood. And that has proven to be very useful. And there were times where I did not hire someone who looked terrific during the interview, but we found out he was a domestic violence perpetrator by his neighbors.

So, we go to great lengths to do that. And as I always say to the finalists, before we hire them and then, during their orientation where I meet with them. And I look them in the eye, and I say, if anything is going to happen that is going to affect me at three in the morning, or at 9 AM when I get a phone call, it is going to be you doing something wrong on the street. And we are going to make sure that doesn't happen. And that is the level of detail that we go into. Because, really, police departments, the first part is the hiring. The second part is retention. I have fired numerous police officers for either, you know, nothing criminal, but around criminal to other people who were at the other end of this where, you know, the way in which they had complaints or the way they talked to someone of the way they were, just didn't fit our environment. And through progressive discipline, working with human resources, they were terminated.

So, to your point about the transparency, we don't just do it in Public Safety. We work with labor relations, with human resources and labor relations, with affirmative action, if it's a sexual harassment issue. Where I fired an officer a couple of years ago who thought he was, you know, I don't know, a catch, I guess, and, you know, started texting a person he had just helped. And he was terminated.

So, the transparency goes there, but more importantly, and as Dennis, Culhane, Doctor Culhane just talked about, at the Advisory Board in April, all of the issues of the complaints are put on the table. The board is allowed to ask questions, to get, you know, is this a person who is a frequent flyer? And I will tell you; we don't have frequent flyers. Because if you are going to be a frequent flyer, I am not going to have you here because

we see what happens. We saw what happened in Minneapolis with the frequent flyer. Nobody wants that person in this department.

[01:06:45] **Dorothy Roberts**

Well, thank you, Vice President Rush, for your statement and for your answer to our questions.

[01:06:51] **Maureen Rush**

Thank you, Doctor Roberts.

[01:06:52] **Dorothy Roberts**

I am now going to move on to our next panelist, Doctor Dennis Culhane. Thank you for your statement as well, and your willingness to speak with us today.

My first question to you is, what, in your view, would it mean for Penn to do the right thing in response to the ongoing and powerful movements in favor of serious change in our concept of public safety and policing?

[01:07:28] **Dennis Culhane**

It's a good question. I'm not an expert in the area of public safety and policing, but, you know, observing a lot of what's been happening and reading about various proposals, I think a lot of the social service-oriented activities that Public Safety has to get involved, you know, could be handled, but, you know, I'm in a school with a, you know, MSWs, Master's in Social Work Program. You know, people who are in a social work background are, I think, in some cases, more equipped to deal with many of the issues that are put on police departments. And I think that it is time to rethink whether we should have, within Public Safety, people who were not police, but who are providing social work assistance and are available to do so in the same kind of emergency response situation. You know, the department has to deal, for example, with homelessness issues. Obviously, we've heard about the student mental health issues. There are, you know, student to student kind of stalking situations. I mean, you can imagine the whole range of

issues that, you know, would not necessarily and certainly would not call for an armed officer to have to intervene.

So, I think that this could be something that we could help model that, you know, thinking about how to bring the social service emergency service capacity in a way that, right now, just falls to the police by default. So, I think there's a number of things like that.

I would say, I think the division at the department has actually modeled how to look at the bias-based profiling issue. I think that we got, we had a most unfortunate incident that led to the ad hoc committee, but as a result of that, it sort of fast-forwarded us in terms of, you know, making sure that the division had a much better, stronger statistical approach. So, we have brought sort of the social science perspective, and there are criminologists on the advisory board who helped to interpret some of the data. You know, we have officer level and sector level review of stops, and the, I believe, you know, we were among the first to actually be recording the pedestrian stops, in terms the race of people on pedestrian stops, which, of course, is a big issue. That's one thing I have heard from people in the community is they don't like being stopped because they fit the description. And too often in West Philadelphia, I mean, the description could describe almost anyone on the street, practically.

So, I think that you know, we had put, we put some accountability around that – well we didn't, the advisory board and the ad hoc committee recommended these things. So, but I think we do have other social science perspectives that we could bring to this that could help refine ways things are done, and I think we could become a model, and I think that would be great. Let's use this process that you are undertaking as a way to bring fresh eyes to this and imagine different forms that Public Safety could take. And I think that would be a welcome conversation.

[01:11:09] **Chaz Howard**

That's very helpful, Doctor Culhane, thank you. You have served at the helm of the advisory board for a number of years now, do you think that the advisory board is sufficient oversight for the Division of Public Safety?

[01:11:23] **Dennis Culhane**

It is not oversight. So, it definitely, to be clear, it does not have an oversight function; it has just an advisory function. And as I mentioned at the beginning of my remarks, we don't have a formal charter or charge. There is within the university council, a safety and security committee that does have basically a more formal charter and charge that advises, you know, the university council on various public safety issues. So, we don't have that. So, I would say it would not be appropriate to look to the advisory board as oversight because we are not oversight in that same way.

[01:12:04] **Chaz Howard**

Could I ask just a quick follow up question then? Do you think there needs to be non-DPS oversight over the division?

[01:12:14] **Dennis Culhane**

Well, I presume that, like every division within the university, they report, so I, you know, Public Safety reports to the EVP's office, and the EVP could have its own approach to oversight if it wants to go beyond what it has currently. I don't really know what that is. I think what, a lot of times, when people talk about oversight, they're talking about complaints against police and they would like to have civilian review of complaints against police. And I don't think that the leadership would necessarily disagree with that. We've not, I've not asked that question directly of Maureen or others, but it's the union contract that prohibits them from having civilian review. And around the country, we're hearing people call for changes in these union contracts. And so, I think that that's another opportunity where next time that contract is renegotiated, if we want to have civilian review of complaints against police or some role in that process, I think that would also be welcome.

I think that as an advisory board, as part of this process is unfolded, Maureen mentioned that there are community meetings that are held the first Thursday in West Philadelphia in collaboration with intergovernmental relations. And there is also the meetings with the local community associations. But, you know, there are some people I know, but I don't know them personally, but I know that there are a few people who have

been really committed, dedicated, go to all of those things. They are, you know, basically, untitled leaders in the community who are really engaged in these conversations and care a lot about what is going on. And I think it would be an interesting idea of whether we could have some of those community reps attend these advisory meetings so that the community had a seat at the table.

I think in the past, when we've just, when we first were forming, the idea was to try to find among the faculty and staff, people who lived in West Philadelphia. So that's, I know the reason that I was involved because I've been living in West Philadelphia for 30 years, had two sons who have been arrested by the DPS and, you know, so I have, you know, I think that that's an idea that could be welcomed, that we could add some community membership to the table. And I know there are people who would be eager and willing to participate.

[01:14:59] **Dorothy Roberts**

Well, you just stole my next question out of my mouth because as you were talking about, and Vice President Rush talked about meetings in West Philadelphia, and as you were mentioning leaders there, who are very engaged, my question was, and it was whether there were members of the West Philadelphia community, representative leaders like those, on the advisory board. So, I take it that there are not at this point. Maybe you could just share a little bit about the membership of the board. I mean not every single person, but who makes up this board and, I take from what you just said that you would recommend that there be members of or representatives from the broader West Philly community on the advisory board.

[01:16:06] **Dennis Culhane**

Yes, I think that it was originally envisioned as a way to provide feedback to the Vice President of Public Safety, the perspectives from the different administrative units on campus and some of the VPUL units on campus, which I sort of think of separately from the what I, quote/unquote, administrative. And then there have been faculty who have been invited because they have some expertise specifically, for example, in domestic violence, and in criminal justice.

But I think there is, probably at least 15, or 10—12 to 15 of the administrative units. So, Business Services, Facilities and Real Estate, Transportation and Parking, Risk Management. I don't know the whole list, but, and, obviously, General Counsel's office, and then on the VPUL side, you have Chaplains, you have Housing, International House, LGBTQ Center, and then there is Grad Student/Undergraduate Student Reps. We have had, at some points, a student who was asked attend to either observe or to actually to come on a regular basis. We have had that in the past, and we have gladly accepted them.

But it's been internal facing. And because the purpose was really to try to make sure there was communication internally about what was going on, troubleshooting things, getting ahead of issues before they were there. You know, being able to talk to us about how we would feel. I mean, one of the big, big controversies we dealt with initially was around the closed-circuit television cameras. And, again, we became a national leader as a result of that. We put together, not Public Safety, and not the advisory board, but a safety and security committee from university council with all these stakeholders, put together this incredibly comprehensive policy about where cameras could be, where they couldn't be, what they could be used for, what they could not be used for, and you know, it was really, I think, a really well-informed document that has now been used by places all over the country. So, in that regard, I think that we've been, you know, able to innovate. So, I don't—hopefully, I have answered your question.

[01:18:27] **Dorothy Roberts**

Thanks.

[01:18:29] **Reverend Howard**

Dennis, thank you so much. Anything else you would like to add before we move to Doctor Dubé?

[01:18:34] **Dennis Culhane**

No, I share, I think, everyone in this review committee and what Maureen said, share the concerns that we have. I am so glad, actually, that we are having these conversations about systemic racism, as someone who works in social science research

and has been studying aspects of systemic racism for years, it is just a welcome conversation, we need to have it, we have to have the hard conversations, and we have to be willing to take on change where it is needed where we can find better ideas. And we can't be afraid of those or defensive about it. We have to be open to these conversations and, especially as a university, keep modeling the best and the best policy, the best behavior, the best connection to research, and education.

And I also would just say, I have had several—I have known several, the VP, the Vice Presidents for Public Safety, and I really say, you know, Maureen is an incredible manager. Just the way she provides leadership and oversight and works with her team, it has been something I have just admired over the years because just the passion and concern she brings, the ethics, you know, her deep concern for ethics. Her always wanting to improve, being ahead of the curve in terms of adapting the best latest technologies for monitoring, working against bias, et cetera. So, I know that is a time for criticism and reflection and critique of what is happening with police departments, but I don't want to get lost in that process the fact that, you know, we have been lucky to have the leadership, I think, of Maureen. I can't imagine, I have seen other people, I have worked for my whole career with the public sector, administratives, and leaders, and she is among the best. So, I just want to acknowledge that as well.

[01:20:35] **Chaz Howard**

Thank you, Dennis...

[01:20:36] **Dorothy Roberts**

Thanks. So, Doctor Dubé, thank you so much for joining us as well. This question about the role of the police in what might be considered non-traditional policing matters, especially the Penn Police, seem to be involved in lots of different things. It was something raised in your statement because you mentioned that police officers provide assistance in dealing with students' crises. And it now seems from our discussion that we should be questioning that. So. I want to ask you, do you think the police are the best people to provide this kind of assistance? Or might there be alternatives that Penn could examine, Doctor Culhane just raised this as well, to assist students facing emotional or

psychological distress that doesn't involve armed officers. I'll just leave it there. What's your, what are your thoughts about that?

[01:21:52] **Benoit Dubé**

I think I should clarify that while Penn police officers are involved in times of crisis, they are not always involved in times of crisis. They are not the go-to. We have multiple systems, so they are one of many available resources. And the purpose of my statement was to highlight how effective, and surprisingly so Penn police officers have been. Because if we walked back the question a little bit, do I think that all police officers should be involved in crisis management in the context of a mental health decompensation? The answer is no. Do I think that Penn Police have the training and the skills to do so? Then, the answer is yes. Demonstratively so. So, in my mind, I make a distinction, right, between should police be involved in public mental health matters? It depends on which police force we're talking about. And as I have mentioned, I can attest to the effectiveness of our officers who really have received training that is tailored to our campus, our students specifically.

But it is also important to remember that they operate as part of a system. Students have access to a clinician 24/7, and that was instituted two years ago, by calling the same number they would call during regular business hours, whatever time of the day it is, and I would say, wherever they are in the world, someone will answer the phone, and they have access to crisis intervention by a licensed clinician. Furthermore, when police officers are called because of a tip they receive, or for whatever reason, if an armed officer appears in a student apartment, that officer will also call that number to contribute to the intervention. So, it never rests exclusively on the shoulders of the officers. The officers know that there is a clinician who is just a phone call away. And very often, if a higher level of care is needed, then the officers will transport the student to the nearest crisis response center where another clinician can take over the evaluation.

[01:24:13] **Chaz Howard**

Thank you, Benoit. I just have one question. One of the things that VP Rush said earlier was around the, over the years, the cry from students and parents around a desire

or to increase in policing and presence. And she inferred the psychological relief that an increased, you know, a strong, robust, and police asked for it for some people. Could you speak to the inverse of that, though? Because I think there has been a lot said and written about the sort of challenging psychological effect that the presence, particularly of clothed police officers, clothed or armed police officers can have, especially on people of color, but really anybody. Could you speak a little bit about that on our campus or in general, and what do you think could or should be done about that?

[01:25:06] **Benoit Dubé**

So this, the need to address the triggering effect, if you will, or the re-traumatizing effect of armed police officers on our campus rose to the surface because of recent events and was addressed and tackled by our counseling center staff who had focus groups to find solutions and antidotes or support mechanisms for students who are impacted in that way. We have a student advisory board in our counseling center that helps us guide our programming and identify unmet needs and shows us the way as we try to craft and develop new programs or group treatments. And that is one of the topics that has come up over the past few months because of all of this social unrest and this reaction and this awakening to issues of systemic racism.

I hope I am addressing the question that you're putting forth, but that's where my mind went when I heard your, your question.

[01:26:20] **Chaz Howard**

Thank you.

[01:26:26] **Dorothy Roberts**

Yeah, thank you. I think, John, we are going to move on to the next set of panels. Thank you so much, all three of you who spoke with us. We really appreciate your input and your time and your work.

[01:26:45] **John Hollway**

Yes, all of the above. Thanks so much to VP Rush and Doctor Dubé and Doctor Culhane for your experience, your wisdom, and your perspective, and, most of all, your time and participation in this process.

We are going to move to the second half of the panelists. So, I also want to thank our audience who have asked many great questions, some of which we have answered, and, as suspected, some of which we were not able to get to at this moment. But I wanted to say again, for those of you whose questions we did not answer, please know that we have saved the questions, we are going to continue to take them into consideration as our review continues. And, again, if there are other thoughts or information you want to provide, the information tab on pennpublicsafetyreviews.org is available.

The second half of the panel will include Professor Regina Austin, Haley Pilgrim, and Kaitlin Best. We will turn first to Professor Austin, the William A. Schnader Professor of Law at the University of Pennsylvania Carey Law School.

[01:27:56] Regina, you are on mute.

[01:27:59] **Regina Austin**

Oh... I want to thank Professor Roberts and Reverend Howard for inviting me to speak. I have submitted a written statement, which is supposed to be posted. And I want to devote my time to just giving you a summary of what my thoughts were with regard to this initiative.

I thought that I would analyze an account of a student campus police officer encounter that occurred not at Penn, but at Yale. I'm a law professor. We talk about hypotheticals, and it's sometimes easier to talk about something that happened someplace else.

This encounter was extensively covered in the *New York Times*. The events speak to the universal predicament of maintaining public safety at a predominantly white, elite, urban university, surrounded by minority communities, undergoing substantial stress. And we know what the stressors are; gentrification, environmental injustice for schools, healthcare inequities, et cetera.

Charles Blow is a Black *New York Times* Op-Ed columnist and the father of three kids. In an article entitled “Library Visit, Then Held at Gunpoint,” published in January of 2015, Blow describes how his son, a 21-year-old junior at Yale, was stopped by a campus police officer, gun drawn and forced to lie on the ground. The officer had concluded that the child matched the description of a burglary suspect: 'tall black male' wearing a 'black coat,' a 'red and white hat' and 'shoes with orange detailing.'

The child, and he was someone's precious child, was six-foot-one and was wearing a burgundy, gray, and red hat, and a navy-blue pea coat. His shoes were not described, but the description, I guess, was thought to be close enough. The student and the officer disagreed about whether the gun was pointed at the student or the ground. Ultimately, officers got around to asking the young man for his ID, and they explained why they had forced him to the ground.

The dad got apologies from the Dean and the chief of police. An internal police investigation eventually cleared the officer.

I don't want to criticize what Blow had to say in the articles that I want to discuss. But I do want to push a bit and test the limits of his position in light of calls across campuses for defunding, the police. I am doing what law professors do.

First, apart from the use of the gun, Blow found no problem with the stop itself. The school, Yale, was his son's community, his home away from home. And he would be, the son would have appreciated reasonable efforts to keep it safe.

Perhaps there is something amiss here. Black and brown students on white campuses, like Yale's or Penn's, pay a higher physical and emotional price for public safety than white students do by black students being subject to reasonable stops. The black and brown students, and any black or brown person who happens to be on campus, lawfully and innocently, bear a larger share of the costs associated with securing such universities as relatively safe oases amid minority inequality, if not deprivation.

Therefore, shouldn't the question be, what can we do to stop the stops? Or to deal with the spillover effects of inequality and deprivation that we cannot keep at bay with police officers?

Second point; Blow was happy that he had had "the talk" with his son. For those of you who don't know what "the talk" is, it is about surviving encounters with armed police officers or police officers without arms. "The talk" is one which minority parents see as a way to protect their children from disaster. Unfortunately, it is viewed as a way to protect the police. "The talk" is treated as an admission that the onus is on the minority young person to control her or his emotions and to refrain from asserting his or her rights. Do white people have "the talk" with their children? Probably not. So here again is another cost borne by minority, young people and their parents that are not shared by whites.

And finally, Blow concludes that there is no way for young black people to earn their way out of such situations. There is no amount of respectability that can bend a gun's barrel. All of our boys are bound together. It may be that the institution and its officers are trying to get young black people to demonstrate their respectability so as to set themselves apart from the black criminal element. Doing so would make the officers' job of policing easier, but it would impose a cultural and economic and political burden on the young black people, or the young brown people that whites do not bear.

And that's not all. The burden falls on females, as well as males. Blow underestimates the threat to black girl children and brown girl children whose sassy ways; some would say nasty ways, can land them in trouble with the police. So, what am I concerned with? That black kids and white kids are not being treated the same and that the black kids and the brown kids are bearing a burden that comes from the effort to turn the university into, not only an oasis, but also a fort that gets built on the backs of young minority people, both those who are part of the Penn community and those who live adjacent thereto. The idea of the university being a benign oasis has to be questioned and deconstructed. And that is what the notion of defunding campus police is about.

A university ought to have more ambitious, ethical goals for its policing than a local government entity. The university police ought to be held to a higher standard when it comes to diversity and pluralism. And that's why I admire our advisors for articulating a goal for the university that takes seriously the issues of, and I will quote them, or "that prioritizes and promotes anti-racism, racial equality, and justice."

Still, past studies and assessments of campus security measures suggest that those values are likely to remain more aspirational than operational when this iteration of review is done. A cynic would say that if the children of the university's wealthiest donors were treated the way Blow's child was, the university would find a way to eliminate the burdens I have described because of erroneous stops, and it would do so fast. It would be worth its while.

So, therefore, the task for this review would be, in this cynic's view, can you conceive of any scenario in which every guilty until proven innocent black or brown child, student or non-student alike, who comes into contact with campus police were treated like the kids of the wealthiest donors. I want to hear the answer...thank you.

[01:37:52] **Chaz Howard**

Professor Austin, thank you so much.

[01:37:54] **John Hollway**

We would turn now to Haley Pilgrim, A Ph.D. student in Sociology and a past President of the Graduate and Professional Student Assembly. Ms. Pilgrim...

[01:38:04] **Haley Pilgrim**

Hi everyone! Thank you for having me. I want to echo Regina in thanking Dorothy and Chaz for hosting this and their insightful question so far.

My name is Haley Pilgrim, and I sat on the CCTV Monitoring Committee as GAPSA President in 2018 and met with Penn Police as BGAPSA President in 2017. But the hat I am wearing for you now is as a GA where I have worked for Penn Police going on six years. I am reading for you a statement written by a group of RAs and GAs.

As former and current resident advisors, spanning across all of Penn's schools, including undergraduate and graduate programs, we are writing to support students, alumni, and organizers who are advocating for the funding of public education and the divestment of funding from the Philadelphia Police Department. We support Police Free Penn and Drexel Community for Justice in their calls to redirect funding away from policing and toward education and social services.

As resident advisors, we received monthly "briefings" from a representative of the PPD that were racialized and biased against people of color living in the community outside Penn's campus. These tended to assume a fear-based narrative, providing basic, superficial data about the number of petty crimes, assurances that the police were "on it," and, frequently, anecdotes about the Penn Police's impressive shows of prowess in responding to petty crimes through surveillance, particularly Black youth, and what might arguably be seen as setting people up to get caught.

One GA reports that the detective said that "they could tell who was a criminal as opposed to a student," and when asked "how he could tell," started describing young black culture, for instance, baggy pants.

As students and student leaders tasked with creating a safe and inclusive environment for young scholars, and working together to provide programming and other means of community in individual mental health, we constantly receive text message alerts warning us about the climate of criminality surrounding and permeating Penn due to "outsider" activity.

Police briefers did not respond to our continual request for information about the danger of sexual violence, racism, and hazing in largely white fraternities on campus.

When out-of-state white supremacists targeted black, first-year UPenn students in 2016 with racist messaging and threats of violence, students and resident advisors protested. We marched with signs and a megaphones to the football field where hundreds of Penn supporters were gathered to watch a game. The intent was to make a showing of support for black students across the university and to inform Penn fans and alums about threats to the community. As students approached, Penn Police and stadium security forcibly locked the entry gates to the stadium, with an officer grabbing a student to prevent her from entering through the gates as they were being closed. The police repeatedly blocked black students' entry into the game, even after we were told that they could enter with tickets, which is usually not required, Penn students can enter with an ID, but in the moment, it was an effort to diffuse the protest. Refusing to give information to protestors but informing other students who didn't look like they were protesters.

In an effort of social control, Penn Police then instructed all black students and allies to line up in silence and to prepare to have their bags checked in order to gain entry.

Even though all the students complied, they were still blocked from entering the stadium while entry was permitted for non-protesting, primarily white and Asian students.

Police broke up the mass of student protestors, claiming that they could enter on different sides of the stadium, but when they got to each stadium door, the doors were locked. These students who were just traumatized [*triggering a warning/unintelligible*] with calls for their lynching, and so they were looking to have their voice, and they were silenced by police and not treated with dignity and respect just hours later.

We, as RAs, have long supported and requested funding and programming in mental health services. We encourage the university to redirect funding to recruiting, hiring, and retaining a diverse staff of counselors and mental health professionals. Thank you.

[01:42:21] **John Hollway**

Thank you, Ms. Pilgrim, we appreciate it. Next is Doctor Kaitlin Vest, a Postdoctoral Fellow at the Perelman School of Medicine.

[01:42:33] **Kaitlin Best**

Good afternoon. I'd like to frame my remarks today by stating that I am speaking both for myself as a Postdoctoral Fellow with ten years of history at Penn, and on behalf of Penn Community for Justice, a platform for any Penn adjacent person to organize for economic and racial justice through collective action centered on an equitable vision of Penn's relationship with Philadelphia.

The stated purpose in this initiative is to evaluate Penn's public safety system – to be clear, its private police force -- in light of the university's commitment to ensuring that every community member, "is treated with dignity and respect, in ways that prioritize and promote racial equality and justice." If we are interpreting community to mean not just members of the university, but also the broader socio-cultural context of the city whose land Penn occupies, then Penn has already failed in this commitment. Like other university police forces, Penn's private police department was developed to protect university property and wealth, not people.

There is certainly plenty to protect: According to university archives, since moving to the West Philadelphia campus in 1872, Penn has expanded a hundred-fold. The history of those property acquisitions is tarnished by systematic disenfranchisement, from profiting off of redlining practices that discriminated against growing black communities to “urban renewal” necessitated, in part, by neglect of properties the university already owned.

Public policy initiatives were corrupted by conflicts of interest, since they were conveniently headed by Penn Trustees, presidents, and alumni. Penn consolidated its local power so effectively that when the Penn-led West Philadelphia Corporation destroyed the Black Bottom neighborhood, no one except community residents lifted a finger to stop them.

These acts of violence against West Philadelphia communities, alongside decades of public disinvestment, set the stage for the crime and the violence that took place along campus borders in the nineteen seventies through nineties, to which Superintendent Rush has referred so frequently today.

Rather than using its power and influence to effect positive change, Penn invested in an increasingly militarized private police force and blue light telephones to visually denote “our” territory. It is not a coincidence that today Penn holds \$3.2 billion in tax-exempt property, has a \$14.7 billion endowment, and has the second-largest university police force in the country while also residing in the poorest major city in the country.

I offer this history as an essential context for the remainder of my remarks because the Penn Police cannot be viewed in isolation from this ongoing, invisible violence. I am a cisgender white woman, so thankfully, I have had few interactions with the Penn Police Department. Even so, I have found their commitment to “public safety” to be severely lacking. Like many other students, my first experience of Penn Police was at New Student Orientation, when the Department of Public Safety scared the living daylights out of students and their parents with vivid descriptions of the terrors of the urban environment. Then there was the video testimonial of a student who had been shot near campus, followed by admonishments not to go further west than 42nd Street.

It’s not that new students shouldn’t be counseled to exercise caution in an unfamiliar city, but these sessions are undeniably psychological manipulation designed to

foster a sense of dependence on campus police. In fact, my experience of living all over this city over the past ten years has been one of comfort, and I have had the privilege of very rarely feeling threatened. I have felt unsafe on campus when I was almost hit by a car on my bike, while a Penn Police officer sat on his phone in a patrol car at the corner. This has happened on multiple occasions, and because the color of my skin enables me to challenge the police without fearing for my life, I've sometimes asked the officers whether they were going to do something. Their response? "Not my job."

My question to this panel: what is their job then? It certainly is not enforcing traffic safety, because I have witnessed other cyclists hit by Penn Medicine's valet drivers, and my partner has been verbally threatened by one driving recklessly through the parking deck. Not crime prevention, because research shows that community investment reduces crime, not policing. Not supporting people in mental health crises, because that's what CAPS is supposed to do.

I would like to conclude by lifting up the voices of those who have had the courage to share their experiences of racial discrimination by Penn Police through social media and published accounts. In one instance, the minority individual described being called a "stupid f***ing drunk" by a Penn Police officer while also being detained and having their belongings searched, probably illegally, as white students walked by, obviously inebriated but unhindered. Other students have shared similar experiences of racial profiling while studying late in the library, or, most poignantly to me as a Nursing alumna, in Fagin Hall. The black students in that particular incident noted that Maureen Rush defended the officers in question rather than their rights as students to be in a campus building, thereby delegitimizing the students' trauma. Philadelphia residents have filed excessive force complaints against Penn Police, and let's not forget the events that have already been discussed that happened on May 31st at 52nd Street, when Penn Police were several blocks outside of their patrol zone—participating in attacks on protestors that triggered an NAACP lawsuit.

The problem is best summed up by this final vignette: a Penn Police officer told a student working on a class project that before every shift, their supervisor would say, "It's a war out there, protect yourselves." Do we want armed police, campus police who operate with a military mindset, few mechanisms for accountability, and view the

community as the enemy? This is a socio-cultural problem that goes beyond empty platitudes and toothless solutions. Penn has had several public safety review committees and panels like this one, all of which recommended additional training and reforms, which have changed nothing. This time must be different. We should not be afraid of changing the status quo simply because it is difficult, especially when there is already research and alternative models to guide us.

Policing in the United States is an institution created for the purposes of racial and class control, even on college campuses, and organizations built from that history cannot be reformed. We demand that the university: pay PILOT contributions into an Education Equity Fund as actual, publicly controlled community investment; permanently divest from the prison industrial complex and organizations supporting militarized policing; provide transparent publication of financial records for Penn Police and their relationships with the Philadelphia Police Department; and commit to police-free strategies for campus safety. Then, and only then, will we start to believe in Penn's commitment to racial justice. Thank you for your time.

[01:49:20] **Dorothy Roberts**

Thank you.

[01:49:23] **Chaz Howard**

Thank you, all three of you, for very, very strong testimonies. It means a lot that you took of your time and that you shared of your experience and wisdom.

Professor Austin, you, if I may, if we may question you first, you have a long, wonderful history here at the university, and I think there are few people who understand Penn better than you. A big question here, if you became, if you were the president of Penn, if you were the head of our Board of Trustees, what is the right thing to do right now in regard to policing? // You're muted, professor...

[01:50:16] **Regina Austin**

Sorry ...

I think that the police force, at this point, needs to be honest about why it exists and undertake to provide a mission statement that incorporates many of the values that you articulated in your goals for this review. But also, to come clean about the way in which the police have contributed to the aggrandizement of the wealth and power of the university. And that it is part of an effort by the entire university to begin to reallocate those resources back to the persons from whom they were, in part, stolen, and in part, gained through what we consider to be "the market."

[01:51:45] **Chaz Howard**

Thank you.

[01:51:45] **Dorothy Roberts**

Thank you. Thanks for your statement, which was very powerful. You expressed some cynicism about the potential for meaningful change. You gave us a, one kind of standard we could apply. What would happen if a wealthy white donor's child were treated the way some students of color and community members have been treated. And you have had experience with this before. And I wonder if you could share some of your insights from your leading the 2000 to 2001 Council Committee on Safety and Security with us. We have noted that, that committee report indicated that the effort wasn't successful; was not successful. So, could you share with us why it wasn't successful? And if there are any lessons learned that we might take up to be more successful.

[01:53:03] **Regina Austin**

Because of the stay at home order, I have not been able to get into my office to find my files from that period.

But, I would say that one of the problems was that we were not able to acquire qualitative data with regard to diversity and the Public Safety Division. And what you are doing now with these hearings, is an effort to begin to collect the qualitative data.

We live in an environment as a university where quantitative data is prized over qualitative data, where statements, such as we have made, are likely to be dismissed as

less than qualitative data, as being political. So, I think that our effort to collect qualitative data was an important one. I do not believe that the mechanisms for reporting complaints is effective, in part, because you make the complaint to the very entity that is the employer of the person, and the person, very likely, was following a protocol. And so, you get the heart of the matter, and nobody wants to go there.

I also believe that quantitative data is impacted by the qualitative context and that you need to understand the quantitative data, and you can't really understand the quantitative data without understanding of the qualitative context. I mean, if you take into account, "the talk," if an interaction goes well, the credit is given to the police officer, but it could very well be the product of "the talk" because you have put the onus on the suspect to behave in a way that does not trigger a bad reaction on the part of the police officer. So, you can tell me all about the stops and how well they went and how they were based on some notion of reasonable suspicion, and you would still have a racist society underneath all of that.

So, we tried. We were much more successful in our effort to identify areas where women were vulnerable, particularly with regard to students who were involved in STEM activities, labs—going to labs at night, and such. But I suspect that there are probably also issues there that await an assault on campus, god forbid, before they will be investigated.

Periodically, and Professor Culhane can explain how, that cyclical, something happens. Someone gets assaulted. Something happens, and someone gets stopped, and something happens, et cetera, et cetera. So, here it is George Floyd and the fallout from that. And one would hope that we would get closer to the root of the problem. But it has to be done not only with quantitative data; it has to do also with collecting the stories and responding to people's hurt and also people's efforts to politically mobilize to bring about a change in a powerful institution that is capable of destroying their ability to lead a good life.

[01:57:36] **Dorothy Roberts**

Thank you. Thank you for that. I feel with this second set of speakers, we have heard some of the aspects of public safety that you just mentioned, Professor Austin. So, thank you, thank you for highlighting that.

So, I am going to move now to Haley Pilgrim. Thank you, Haley, for the powerful statement that you read. I am continually amazed at all the roles you play at Penn. We were thinking of your past presidency of the Graduate and Professional Student Assembly, GAPSA, and your being a committee person for Ward 27, and came in with yet another role with the RA. So, I'm sure there are many others as well.

But let me ask you something from your perspective as the former president of GAPSA, and you already began that, but I wondered if you would share what you've learned in that capacity about students' experiences with Penn Public Safety, in general, and the police in particular.

[01:58:59] **Haley Pilgrim**

Yeah. Thank you for that. I would say with the police in general, and Penn Public Safety, our constituents that are from underrepresented groups, our black and brown people, feel the same way they do with police in the outside world, which is not safe. They feel like they have to wear Penn gear as armor from racist incidents to feel safe on their own campus like they belong here. Whether that's one student last year, was entering into the political science building, and the Allied guard was asking for his ID, but not the white person walking in past him. And so, there is this continual idea that it's like not their campus. And I think a lot of times, people may meet with the police, in echoing what Regina said, it doesn't feel like there is a lot of meaningful changes forward. Even the CCTV monitoring committee I sat on; we were kind of just rubber-stamping where people—where we were already going to put up surveillance measures. What one of the other panelists had said, like it—their advisory role, it's not, there is really no room to counteract and say, no, we shouldn't be increasing surveillance on campus.

My question was, in that committee, is the goal to ultimately have all of Penn surveilled? And that's the goal. And so, just every time the committee meets, we just rubber stamp more surveillance. And so, I think in that way, it feels like there is already

that plan to move forward, and there's not a lot as a GAPSA president or something I could do.

[02:00:47] **Dorothy Roberts**

Thank you.

[02:00:49] **Chaz Howard**

Thank you, Haley ... I like to follow up on the surveillance question. Not a lot of us have been on a surveillance committee. Your thoughts on it, broadly, on the kind of, the CCTV stuff, and how—are we too surveilled? Not enough? Your thoughts on that?

[02:01:11] **Haley Pilgrim**

Yeah, so, I will just say surveillance is a racist—it is an anti-black measure. There's no way to have surveillance, and it doesn't end up being anti-black, is my personal belief. I have one time wanted...out, like a person to walk with me somewhere for like safety. And they were able to send the person right to me because they could see where I was and the shirt I was wearing. Like, have I benefited as a light skin woman on campus from them being able to easily pinpoint me and send me someone? Yes. Is that worth an increase in surveillance? No. I think to have an institution that is safe for black and brown people is a not surveilled institution.

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

Thank you for that. I am going to ask you this question because you are a committee person from Ward 27, and so I feel as if you are a representative of part of the West Philly community, and we really haven't—we haven't had, I shouldn't say really haven't—we haven't had that input today. We will in future hearings.

But could you say a bit, I know you could go on for a long time on this, but could you say something about what you have learned as a committee person for Ward 27 about the Penn Police interaction with your community?

[02:02:54] **Haley Pilgrim**

Totally. And I will say that my district is primarily Penn's campus. However, I do talk to a lot of other committee members and the committee, or the West Philly community doesn't even feel like they can go on Penn's campus, which is technically available for them too. It is technically public, but they don't feel safe to walk on or even be present on the campus. And so, that we don't have a good relationship with our community, and I think we can make these strides forward by going to committee meetings, but, ultimately, that doesn't change the fact a lot about what Kaitlin said, just the history of us destroying black lives in West Philly. So, yeah, I think it is an intimidation for our West Philly community.

[02:03:43] **Dorothy Roberts**

Thank you. So, you mentioned Kaitlin and her very relevant statement about this question. So, let me move to you, Doctor Best.

You gave a really, again, strong and powerful statement about the broader issues that may, to many people, not seem connected to Penn's Public Safety policies, but you began to show how they absolutely are. And I wondered if you could expand on what that would mean, then, for what our committee should be looking at, your suggestions for our recommendations. You were pretty concrete, but I just want to give you an opportunity because you added that perspective, to elaborate some more about that.

[02:04:53] **Kaitlin Best**

Sure. I'd be happy to. So, yeah, as you mentioned, I listed the demands that are being put forward by Penn Community for Justice, as well as a lot of other organizations. And these aren't new demands. They are things that have been put forward by a lot of community organizations for a long time.

But fundamentally, I think that the question of policing, whether it's on a college campus or in the city more broadly, really can't be extricated from issues of racial and economic justice. There is just too much literature out there to show that violence doesn't happen in a vacuum. It happens as a result of disenfranchisement, of a loss of hope, of desperation and lack of resources and, you know, not to paint the West Philadelphia community into a box of desperation, but just to say that when it is so clear that we, as an

institution, are at least partially responsible for that. Then, I think it really does come down to—I mean, I personally believe that reparations are a conversation that we need to be having nationally. But, in terms of what Penn can do specifically around policing and our campus is, I think, something that Haley touched on. Like our campus was built with federal and state dollars, and as a nonprofit institution, we're supposed to be serving a public good. So, I think really reframing the language around our campus to be about it being an open campus, and one that we do invite the community into, to benefit from our learning so that it's not a one-sided, you know, our people go out and study West Philadelphians and, you know, bring in research dollars from that. But that we are actually giving something back to the community and not making them feel oppressed, frankly, by our police forces. And so, I think that is a piece of it.

I also find it really problematic, I mean, there is not a lot of clarity around how much money is spent on Penn Police, which is one reason why we're asking for transparency about financial records. But I, you know, if it's anything like the city itself, and many cities around the country, a huge portion of the operating budget is being put into policing our campus. And so, what money could that, or how could that money work differently in the community? And I am not talking about, you know, the tokenization of the Netter Center partnership, I'm talking about real contributions that enable, you know, the Philly School District to take asbestos out of schools and to do a lot of things.

And, and I think the final point I would make is that, you know, this is not about Penn deciding what the community needs. It's about the community saying this is what we need. And then, Penn footing the bill. Honestly,

[02:08:10] **Dorothy Roberts**

That's a powerful way to put it, thanks.

[02:08:14] **Chaz Howard**

I appreciate the way that you presented the interconnectedness of various systems and how it is all related. Thank you for that.

One of the questions I had for you was sort of asking for some advice. There have been voices that have called this whole process of this internal review, kind of vulnerable

to bias, understandably. And I think that this is one of the things we talk about, it's the complexity of institutions investigating themselves. Is there anything that this initiative could do, in your opinion, to assure, Penn, the broader Penn and West Philadelphia communities, of its institutional independence and its good faith and open-minded review? What type of review do you think is necessary and, you know, what can we do to address our own public safety system without itself conducting—without Public Safety itself conducting some type of review?

[02:09:13] **Kaitlin Best**

Yeah, that is a great question. And I will say, you know, within our organizing groups, there have been a lot of conversations around whether this is a true and genuine good faith process. And, you know, we made the decision to be here today because we felt like it was important to at least take a seat at the table and hear what was being said and evaluate for ourselves.

So, I think to address those concerns, you know, one avenue might be, if the university is unwilling to engage in a true external review, that there could be partnerships with organizations within Philadelphia that are committed to, you know, genuine work in this space. [*From mind/unintelligible*], and I am sure there are a number of other organizations that would similarly be very happy to provide feedback to Penn about, about things that have gone on over the years.

I also think that transparency is really, really essential. So, I think people are waiting to [*unintelligible*] this first round of hearings, you know, is the recording going to be posted unedited or, you know, what's the outcome of these things going to be. And so, I think it is really important to, to ensure that people see there is not behind the scenes machinations that end up coming out later.

I personally, actually, as personally, I think the group would agree with this as well. I think it's problematic that while the initial—I'm sorry, I don't really know the right term, but like the initiative members are, are getting sort of this documentation from Penn Police about things like funding and mutual aid agreements with the Philadelphia Police Department, and stuff like that. I think there are grounds to say that those are things that

should be released to the public in some form. And so, yeah, I think that would be my sort of off the cuff two cents.

[02:11:38] **Chaz Howard**

Very helpful. Thank you.

[02:11:41] **Dorothy Roberts**

Yeah. Thank you so much. I think we can wrap up, if that's okay with you, Reverend Howard. I feel like we've had such a full session today. I am really grateful to everybody who spoke and shared so much information with us. And thanks also to those who participated behind the scenes in listening to the hearings and sending questions. We are recording this, so it will be available to everybody, and we will have your questions that we can figure out how we will answer them and address all the information that you've given us either in the hearing today or in the questions and answers and comments that you sent. So, thanks to everybody for your participation.

[02:12:43] **John Hollway**

Thank you all. On behalf of everybody, I want to, again, sort of echo our appreciation and our gratitude for your thoughts and your insights.

Several of the questions that were asked pertained to how we intend to proceed from here. This was the first of what we anticipate will be an, as yet, undetermined number, but perhaps as many as even eight to ten additional hearings. And I think that is necessitated by the broad diversity of views in our community. And by that, I mean the larger Penn and West Philadelphia community on these issues, and the desire to have all of those views heard, recognized, and acknowledged.

And we also hope honestly that by providing the pennpublicsafetyreview.org website, we will achieve what Professor Austin described as gathering the qualitative data to go along with the quantitative data. Part of the way the Quattrone Center is structured is, we have an interdisciplinary blend of law professionals and social scientists, economists, statisticians, criminologists, sociologists. And so, we hope we're particularly

well-positioned to gather and use that data in thoughtful ways. And that's been a very intentional part of the process.

So, this is a first step of many in this process, but I think it's been an extraordinarily thought-provoking and useful one. And so, I want to thank everybody for that. And we look forward to continuing this process next Tuesday at two o'clock Eastern Time. And we will post the recording and a transcript as soon as possible at pennpublicsafetyreview.org. And it will not be edited for content.

Thank you very much to all of you for your time and your suggestions and be well,

[02:14:32] **Dorothy Roberts**

Bye, everybody, thank you!

[02:14:35] **End Hearing 1**

#####