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[00:00:00]

[00:00:04] Dorothy Roberts

Welcome to the second virtual hearing of the Penn Public Safety Review and Outreach Initiative. I am Dorothy Roberts; a Penn Integrates Knowledge Professor of Africana Studies, Law, and Sociology. And I, along with Reverend Chaz Howard, are leading this initiative as appointed advisors to Penn President Amy Gutmann. Reverend Howard will introduce himself and welcome you in a minute. We are working with the Law School's Quattrone Center for the Fair Administration of Justice, and you will hear from its Executive Director, John Hollway, after Reverend Howard.
The Public Safety Review and Outreach Initiative is conducting a comprehensive review of public safety at Penn. The goal of the review is to assess Penn’s success in creating a physically and emotionally safe environment on campus and in the surrounding community while treating every person with equal dignity and respect, and in a way that prioritizes and promotes anti-racism, racial equality, and justice.

The outcome of the initiative will be a report and recommendations that we will present to President Amy Gutmann, Executive Vice President Craig Carnaroli, and Vice President 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 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.

[00:03:01] **Chaz Howard**

Good afternoon, everyone. Thank you so much for tuning in and caring about this process. I only wanted to add to Professor Roberts' remarks that we are committed to openness in two different ways. And openness to a range of voices from students, faculty,
staff members, administrators, and members of our community here in West Philadelphia and the Greater Philadelphia Area.

We have worked really hard to make sure that a whole lot of different types of people are contributing on the record to this journey. Likewise, we are committed to an openness and being as transparent as we can be, which is why these conversations aren't being held behind closed doors or in closed meetings, but, instead, are being offered here for just anybody to log into and they are recorded and shared later as well. And if you are interested in seeing some of the remarks and the questions and answers that were shared last week, you can find information on how to do that.

Lastly, I want to offer gratitude to the many, many people who care about this on our campus. We have received emails and questions, had phone calls, a lot of people have asked to sort of be a part of this conversation here. And it means a lot. And together, I think we are going to make a difference. Together, I think we will move the needle, not only for our campus but, in some ways, maybe even for our whole country.

Lastly, I want to offer gratitude to the Quattrone Center, who has done a lot of the heavy lift behind the scenes in making this happen technologically, and [to really] as well.

And on that note, I would like to turn it over to the Director of the Center, Professor John Holloway.

[00:04:39] **John Hollway**

Thanks, Professor Roberts. Thanks, Reverend Howard; I appreciate the kind words. And thanks to all of our panelists, my colleagues at the Quattrone Center who are supporting this initiative, and to all the people who are participating and observing.

I am John Hollway; I am the Executive Director of the Quattrone Center for the Fair Administration of Justice here at the University of Pennsylvania Carey Law School. I want to just sort of set out some guide rules and introduce our panelists to get things started today. As we conduct the second in our series of public hearings in the Public Safety Review and Outreach Initiative, we are soliciting input from our community on very important issues about how Penn's Division of Public Safety interacts with our community to create the kind of environment that we all want to see.
Last week's hearing included conversations with Regina Austin from Penn Law, Doctor Kaitlin Best from the Perelman School of Medicine, Dennis Culhane from the School of Social Policy and Practice, Benoit Dubé, Penn's Chief Wellness Officer, Haley Pilgrim, a Ph.D. candidate and former President of our Graduate and Professional Students Assembly, and Maureen Rush, the Vice President of the Division of Public Safety.

As was referenced, that hearing has been recorded. The video of it is posted online in its entirety at www.pennpublicsafetyreview.org. We are in the process of creating a written transcript of that, and we will post that alongside the video as soon as it is available.

Today, we are going to hear from a number of Penn and West Philadelphia Community representatives who have advocated for changes to the structure of public safety at Penn, as well as officers with the Penn Police Department, and other members of the Penn community with a detailed knowledge of the Division of Public Safety.

Our speakers include:

Rick Krajewski, an organizer for Mass Liberation and the Democratic Nominee of Pennsylvania State Representative for the 188th District, which serves West and Southwest Philadelphia.

Jessica Gooding, a student in Penn's College of Arts and Sciences and the Secretary of the Terrance Lewis Liberation Foundation.

Amelia Carter, the Assistant Director at Penn's South Asia Center.

Jeffrey Rowland, Penn's Executive Director for Staff and Labor and Relations in the Division of Human Resources.

Captain Michael Belisairo, the Commanding Officer of Patrol Operations for the Penn Police Department.

Officer Nickol Taylor, a patrol officer in the Penn Police Department.

Lewis Petrecco, the Director of Security Services within the Division of Public Safety.

The ground rules for this hearing are the same as for our prior hearing, but I would like to briefly restate them. As was said, we are recording the webinar. We will post this recording and transcription on the Public Safety and Review Initiative website,
We will provide more information about hearing number three at the end of this, but mark your calendars for Thursday, August 20, at 2 pm; that is the day after tomorrow at the same time as today.

We have seven invited speakers today. To ensure clear conversations, we have asked the speakers to go one at a time, and the others will be muted while one is speaking. We will ask the first three speakers, Mr. Krajewski, Ms. Gooding, and Ms. Carter, to provide their statements in turn, and then we will have an opportunity for Q and A with Professor Roberts and Reverend Howard.

We will then turn to Mr. Rowland and Captain Belisairo the same way, and then to Officer Taylor and Mr. Petrecco.

We would encourage any of you in the audience to submit questions at any time through the Q and A feature on the ribbon at the bottom of the window. We are monitoring that Q and A, but we can't promise what we will be able to address every question today as we want to make sure that each speaker has the full opportunity to speak within the time allotted. We will keep a record of your questions, and we will strive to answer them to the extent possible.

We recognize that the topics we will discuss are deeply felt throughout our community and may be emotional, and we would ask that members of the audience to please keep your questions topical and appropriate in consideration of that fact.

With that, I will turn it back to Professor Roberts, Reverend Howard, and our first speaker, Mr. Krajewski. Thanks very much.

[00:08:53]  **Rick Krajewski**

Okay, thank you. Thank you for the time. Thank you to everyone for your time today. My name is Rick Krajewski. I am a community organizer with Reclaim Philadelphia. I am the Democratic nominee for the State Representative in the 188th District, which includes West and Southwest Philadelphia, and also the entirety of the University of Pennsylvania's campus. And, I am also a Penn alum, class of 2013 from the Schools of Engineering and Applied Science.

I am here today to speak on this issue because, as a UPenn graduate, undergraduate, the division between our campus and the surrounding community was
immediately clear when I came to Penn's campus in 2009. Incoming freshmen were instructed not to stray too far beyond university lines. And when I was a freshman, the boundary that I was often told was 40th and Market. You weren't supposed to go past 40th and Market. However, as Penn acquired more property and exerted more influence, that line was pushed westward. And now, we have five separate police forces patrolling the area surrounding Penn's campus. It is the most policed area in the entirety of Philadelphia, producing a climate of surveillance that has negatively impacted our surrounding neighborhood, and had led West Philadelphians to feel like they are inhabitants of Penn's community, not the other way around.

When I was an undergraduate, I can remember on several occasions, fellow students telling me they felt safer walking around West Philadelphia with me. As a black man, I hope I don't have to elaborate on the racial sentiments behind a statement like that and the perception held on campus by our students and faculty about our surrounding community.

When I ventured past 40th and Market, what I found was a vibrant community ready to share its parks, its restaurants, its events, and its culture. West Philadelphia is where I became an adult. It is where I grew into myself and became the person I am today. And it breaks my heart to know that my alma mater is responsible for a climate of insularity that prevents others from truly being in a relationship with their community. Students are often told it is for their own safety. But it also serves a purpose of shielding them from the divestments, some of the mass policing, and the hyper-focused developments that Penn has partially responsible for in West and Southwest Philadelphia.

This dynamic of occupation and policing was on full display during the events that transpired on 52nd Street on May 31. In response to protests and justifiable anger, I witnessed [some neighbors], and residents were waylaid with military warfare, including SWAT tactical units launching tear gas and rubber bullets onto porches and opened windows. Penn Police was implicit in this response as many officers were on the scene, responding to the chaos, and must be held accountable to its actions.

I implore Penn's administration to truly investigate why, when West Philadelphia is already under the jurisdiction of multiple police departments, it must maintain its own private force, and whether this force is to protect the students or to protect the university's
investments. In a time where national uprisings are occurring in response to unchecked police brutality, our university must do more than cease contributions to the Police Foundation.

I am here, speaking here today to raise this issue, to also [lift up] the demands of groups like Police Free Penn and Penn Community for Justice, and to call on Penn to really examine and seriously consider the demand of defunding the current police force and reallocating those dollars towards investing in West and Southwest Philadelphia. I would enthusiastically welcome the opportunity to connect the university with community leaders that would have plenty of ideas on how to use this money.

And those are the ends of my comments. Thank you.

[00:13:29] John Hollway

Thank you, Mr. Krajewski; I appreciate it very much. We turn now to Jessica Gooding, please.

[00:13:39] Jessica Gooding

Good afternoon everyone. My name is Jessica Gooding. I am a rising senior studying History and English at Penn. I appreciate being given the opportunity to contribute my voice towards the Penn Public Safety Review and Outreach Initiative.

As a Philadelphian, I have long been exposed to the varying ways in which state violence impacts Philadelphia communities. I have witnessed the structural racism that undeniably exists in every police system across the nation, in my own community. At Penn, it is rare to see anyone that is not a member of the Penn community on our campus. This is because of the unwelcoming culture that exists towards non-Penn community members. That culture's foundation is supported and enforced by the Penn Police Department. This unwelcoming culture often extends to black and brown members of the Penn community. To combat problematic and unsafe interactions, students wear Penn gear to shield and protect themselves from unnecessary interactions with the Penn Police. Black Professors are watched as they walk on campus. The ideology of white supremacy is entrenched in policing. These daily happenings are not physically or emotionally safe for members of the Penn community.
Philadelphia community members do not feel physically or emotionally safe on our campus. If they did, they would engage with our campus. We would see them inside the "Penn bubble." We do not see them there.

Last year I was fundraising for a student organization on Locust Walk. I interacted with one non-Penn community member that day. She quickly approached the table because she was hungry. She took one of the baked goods from the table and ate it in a hurry. She did not pay for it. As soon as I realized what she was doing, I was frightened. I looked around, scoping the area for police officers. I was scared that her behavior was witnessed and would be deemed unacceptable on campus. I was nervous that she was going to be swiftly approached by officers. I was fearful that my best explanation would not be enough to save her from being arrested and/or possibly brutalized. I instinctively knew those were plausible outcomes for a black woman on campus that was not a member of the Penn community. No officers were around at that moment. No one came to apprehend her. This brought me relief. The way I felt at that moment made me realize that our current policing system is a burden at all times, even when we least expect it.

The rhetoric around policing and state violence is mostly defensive. Police systems are infused with fear. Fear protects the use of violence. We must have a transformation around the way we think about policing. We cannot continue to grapple with the aggressive and often deadly outcomes of policing. We must be proactive. An attack on the foundation of the racist and troublesome structure of policing is not a personal attack on any single person or department. It is an attack on a system that was created to control bodies. It is an acknowledgment that something is horribly wrong. Everyone, including all police system members and creators, must concede to the irregularity of policing. That is the only way forward. That is the only way to ensure safety and justice for all community members. That is the only way to uphold true equality. We do not need a policing structure in our society that advances selfishness and individualism. It is complex for us to envision what society looks like without the policing system that we know. Generations of American's have inherited the weight of this policing system as a normality, something we think of as second nature. That is an injustice. The era of accepting this system of policing as a "natural" aspect of our society
has passed. We know the truth about it. It is not a secret. The system of policing that we know can no longer exist in our communities as a way for officers to engage in criminal activity and racial discrimination.

Penn students want their university to have a positive impact on the greater Philadelphia community. We want Penn to stop funding the Philadelphia Police. We do not want Penn to be entangled in the continuous militarization of the Philadelphia Police. Penn should not be proudly supplying money for SWAT weapons. We want an emphasis on wellness. We want our campus to be safe for everyone. The ideas around policing, the ones that excuse and sweep detrimental behaviors under the rug, must be condemned. That is the only path forward. Policing is the face of mass incarceration. We need superior social systems to address the issues that prevail in our society. We do not need inequitable interactions that lead to brutality and punishment.

Ultimately, we cannot solely make assumptions about the Penn Police by the ways in which they engage with most Penn community members. That proximity is irrelevant. We must acknowledge the ways they engage with the non-Penn community. We need to base our thoughts on interactions like that. It is obvious that our campus is not safe and welcoming to everyone.

What makes Philadelphians not engage with Penn? What are we ignoring? And what needs to be done?

[00:19:28] **John Hollway**

Thank you, Ms. Gooding. I appreciate your remarks. We will turn now to Amelia Carter, please.

[00:19:35] **Amelia Carter**

Hi! Can you guys hear me? Okay.

Thank you for having me here today. I am going to read an extended version of a speech I gave outside of Amy Gutmann's house earlier this summer. I don't believe she was home that day, so I am reading it again in the hopes that she will finally be able to hear me.
I came to work at Penn as an administrative assistant a few months after graduating from Temple University in 2012. I had a lot of house insecurity growing up in [Chile] due to my father's opioid addiction, but also gentrification, which kept us apartment-hopping on the tails of development.

Like many staff people at Penn, I came to work here because it was the only way I knew I could afford graduate school. Craving a safe and affordable place to live, I also dreamed of using Penn's Housing Assistance Program. Despite my many hurdles along my eight-year journey here, I have slowly climbed the corporate ladder, rung by rung, getting my Master's in 2015, getting my current position as Assistant Director of the South Asia Center in 2016, and my home at 52nd and Chancellor Street later that year.

After my father died of a drug overdose in Kensington in 2017, I thought I could finally settle into this aspirational life I had created for myself. I couldn't say I was happy with the classist and elitist culture within this institution, but I was surviving, and I still had hope I could find fulfillment in the future here.

Then 2020 came and changed everything. On May 31, on 52nd Street, the police swarmed my community. In the several hours of their occupation, which started before the looting occurred, I didn't witness police helping residents or rescuing anyone from harm. What I saw was police officers instigating a riot. They certainly did not prevent the destruction of property. The only people who did that were neighbors who stood shoulder to shoulder, asking the crowd to calm.

What I did see, and can't forget, however, were elders being shot in the face by rubber bullets, and neighbors being pepper-sprayed at point-blank range. I heard the cries of mothers who screamed, "Kids live here; please don't shoot." As tanks rolled down residential streets, launching teargas indiscriminately. I was gassed, at close range, one on 52nd Street, once on Chancellor Street, and, again, as I attempted to flee the scene into my home, and found it was full of this chemical weapon, which is banned or use in war.

After cleaning up the quarter the next morning, many of my neighbors went to work, cooked dinner for their families, and moved on. I kept waiting for the city to care. I kept waiting for someone to notice that the police didn't protect anything or anyone. But those conversations never came. Instead, what I heard was, we deserved it, and it was for our own good.
I have always had a passion for social justice activism, and have spent a lot of time calling attention to human rights abuses around the world, not dissimilar to what we saw that day. I realize that, especially when I entered into Penn's campus culture, I had a lot of shame about speaking too loudly on the systemic injustices that shaped my own life experience. While it was okay to criticize institutional failures and social dysfunction in other countries, I was viewed as too angry and cynical if I pointed out the same maladies here. After all, it was I who needed Penn, this resource-hoarding giant in our city, to lift me up from the instability that was chasing at my heels. If I could just make myself small enough, agreeable enough, grateful enough, I may be able to keep what the institution had so graciously given me, respectability.

Then, I heard from neighbors that Penn and Drexel University Police were present on 52nd Street that day. A wave of anger, sadness, and outrage washed over me. How could this be? Penn's campus is a 40-minute walk from my house. Why would this be? Campus police are only meant to serve students and the campus community, or so I thought. Then, I started to understand that Penn's Police force, one of the largest campus police in the nation, is a part of a disturbing trend in the United States where campus police, with funds derived from student tuition, have been developed into full-blown militarized police departments with all of the weaponry, power, and jurisdiction of municipal police, but none of the oversight.

At the last session, Maureen Rush insisted that Penn Police are among the most trained and well-equipped in the country. The problem is that this nation in mourning has made it clear that we don't want or need police for assistance. We understand very deeply that police, arriving in riot gear before a riot has begun, will never prevent violence. It will only provoke it. It turns out we don't need brute force to stave our storefronts. We need fully funded public schools. We need more affordable housing. We need access to affordable and effective drug treatment programs. We need jobs that pay us appropriately for our labor. And an end to the modern enslavement known as mass incarceration. These are the makings of creating a safe community, not police.

What May 31 made me realize is that Penn's violence, Penn's white supremacy, is quiet and invisible. It hides in plain sight through the widely accepted choice of the institution intentionally depriving its city of resources in what amounts to tax evasion.
while making millions off its back in inflated rents, all while calling itself a non-profit. It is the kind of violence in which campus police, emphasis on campus, can travel almost ten blocks outside of their patrol zone to assist the municipal police in blanketing a neighborhood in teargas, and say it was for our own protection. When this violence is dressed up in non-profit donations and strongly-worded emails about how Penn loves justice and is a fierce ally to the black community, this white supremacy almost seems reasonable. We deserved it, after all. It was for our own good, after all.

The problem is that the normalization of this kind of violence and the fear we carry in being seen as too angry numbs us. Suddenly, we are complacent in these systems. Suddenly, while we are choking on teargas at the threshold of our front doors, with campus police staring blankly through their riot gear, we realize that in the name of comfort, in the name of being grateful, we have allowed this violence to consume our work, our places of learning, our streets, and our homes.

Today, I am no longer ashamed of anger because it is waking us up from our slumber to let us know the exploitation perpetuated by this institution has spiraled out of control and must be stopped. Regardless of the bridges that may be burned by standing to be counted, I must honor my anger and tell Penn; you can't hide anymore. We see you. I am not here to only live in what is wrong and dwell in the trauma of what's been done because my community deserves more. I deserve more. We deserve to look out into a world where people in crisis receive help, where struggling communities receive support, not white supremacists' ideas about safety and justice rooted in violence.

Penn, which represents many of the brightest minds in America, holds steadfast to the idea that policing is the best we can do. I, as a resident of Philadelphia, as an alum, as a staff person, as a member of Penn Community for Justice, reject this notion and demand that the administration work harder to create and fund a world that fosters police free alternatives to public safety. Instead of lobbying to do less for the public good, we demand that Penn defund and disband Penn Police, make payments in lieu of taxes, and end its parasitic behavior in our city.

Thank you.

Thank you, Ms. Carter. Much appreciated. Reverend Howard and Professor Roberts, we will turn to Q and A for the first three speakers now.

[00:28:24] **Chaz Howard**

Thank you to the three of you. Thank you so much for your heartfelt and very insightful and very helpful comments. Truly, we take it very, very seriously. The first question is for soon to be Representative Krajewski. I have sort of a smaller question, then a bigger one. The first one is, in your comments, you talked about some people told you not to cross certain borders of campus. You referenced 40th and Market. You were not the first person to say that during these hearings. From where is that instruction coming, do you think? From some of the places?

[00:29:01] **Rick Krajewski**

Yeah, to be frank, it's from the culture. There is this, I think, I can't claim to say that it came one person or another. I can remember hearing it from students; I can remember hearing it from people in my dorm. I can remember hearing it from other faculty members around just like don't go too far across campus, you know. Just generally, I think that there was an air of staying within the bubble, staying within the safety of Penn's bubble. And that bubble being clearly delineated by the security force that the university employs.

And so, to me, that has been one of the harmful effects of having a police force that has been adding this extra layer of surveillance in "protection" is that the students use that as a crutch to really reinforce narratives around what is safe and what isn't.

So, I think that is why the change that needs to be implemented is structural because I don't think it's a reform; you don't reform culture, you have to transform culture,

[00:30:19] **Chaz Howard**

I think you are right that the perceptions and the messages coming out about West Philadelphia, on campus, are very often unhealthy. What do you think about the perceptions of Penn Police and the Penn's Division of Public Safety from the community?
And I qualify that by saying, I think—could you distill the difference between broader perceptions of police, in general, or Philly police. Are there sort of discreet perceptions of Penn Police and Penn's Public Safety from the district you are about to represent?

[00:30:57] **Rick Krajewski**

Yeah, I would say, to be frank, I think that the general perception does run the spectrum the same way that the perception of police runs the spectrum. You have some people who are like; I love it; I think it's great. I think it makes me feel safe. And you have other people on the other end of that spectrum who feel like they have an extra pair of eyes watching them as they try to walk around their communities.

I think, particularly when it comes to how Penn Police and the Division of Safety is viewed by the surrounding community—the community, I think, is an extension of how Penn is perceived by the surrounding community, which is that, particularly over the last 10, 20, 30 years, that it has become an institution whose footprint and whose influence has been more and more felt by the surrounding neighborhood and the surrounding community. And residents of this neighborhood are not clear about what they have received in exchange for that loss of feeling of control or agency in their neighborhood.

When I talk to a lot of people about Penn, often the conversations and the tenor around change, around gentrification, around the fact that their neighborhood has changed, their property taxes have gone up. And there you have that on one end, but I think what also compounds it is that often times, residents do not feel like their communities have been invested in as part of this change in West and Southwest Philadelphia.

So, I think that when it comes to the presence of the university, we have to address that power dynamic where resident and neighbors and community members feel as though it is this big brother that is just omnipresent throughout West and Southwest Philly and, instead, have a conversation about what is a more equitable and more partnership-looking relationship like between the university and its residents. And I think that can come in the form of things that have been mentioned already, like PILOTS, like thinking about what would it mean to actually take some of the resources that could be
released from a defund initiative and could actually be put towards community benefit agreements so that folks are actually feeling empowered about the direction of their neighborhood.

[00:33:29] **Chaz Howard**

Thank you very much.

[00:33:29] **Rick Krajewski**

Mm-hmm, thank you.

[00:33:48] **Dorothy Roberts**

I would also like to thank all three speakers for your very compelling statements. Thank you for being here and for all that you shared already. Mr. Krajewski, you were just speaking with Reverend Howard about how Penn Police, in particular, are viewed in the West Philadelphia community. And I wanted to ask you more about its relationship with – that is the relationship of the Penn Police with the Philadelphia Police Department. You suggested that West Philly feels over-policed, in fact, like an occupied area. And I wondered if you would say more about the relationship between the two police forces, and respond to this argument that we heard from, I think, Vice President Rush and a couple of others last week that, actually, the Penn Police are maybe a gentler force – that's my wording – than the Penn Police and, so, if the Penn Police were disbanded, then there would be more reliance on the Philadelphia Police. So, can you respond to that concern and also, more generally, how the two forces work together to create this sense that you described of over-policing,

[00:35:16] **Rick Krajewski**

Yeah, and, so, just the feel around over-policing, I mean, you can be someone that walks ten, fifteen blocks from campus, and in your walk, you encounter Penn Police, University City Police, and, then, the Philadelphia Police Department in the span of 20 minutes. And I don't understand why anyone would believe that that much police presence is necessary in a residential neighborhood. I think it creates an environment of
tension. I think it creates an environment of discomfort. And I think it can create conditions that honestly can be conducive towards more crime versus less crime because you create these kinds of agitations where people feel distrust, they feel a concern, they feel scared. And so, I think that is what is part of what really contributes to that feeling that people don't feel safe or feel comfortable in their own neighborhood.

When it comes to the relationship between the police department and the Penn Police Department, to me, from what I can understand, and even from what I was seeing on 52nd Street, there is a clear collaboration and partnership between both departments. I don't believe that taking away the Penn Police would necessarily make—well, that would cause a harsher response or a harsher response to crime or safety in the community because to me, that creates a false either/or it's, it is, in fact, the two departments are overlaying on top of each other. It is not one or the other. So, if anything, removing one more police force from an already severely over-policed area will, that to me, that is what alleviates the opportunities for a harsher response or even more of—more responses that can go more soft.

So, when it comes to that, I think that it is not either/or; I think that we have to be thinking about how do we actually have people feeling safe. And then, also, what would it mean to think about a community-guided safety and police force. Or what even community policing could be. Or even a form of safety or protection that doesn't involve police as you think about it right now.

I think that more neighbors and community members should be in the conversation when it comes to that. Oftentimes, I think, when we talk about these kinds of things, the leaders and members of the institution are part of these conversations, but the actual neighbors and the community leaders are not. And I think that reflects how these initiatives also play out where we are just thinking about how to reorganize things that are still in the purview of Penn but aren't necessarily under the purview of community members and leaders and residents of this neighborhood.

[00:38:32] **Dorothy Roberts**

Thank you.
[00:38:32] **Rick Krajewski**

Thank you.

[00:38:35] **Chaz Howard**

A question about accountability: one of the interesting things that has come up is that we have a, essentially, Penn Police force that is for our campus, and, yet, their watch zone, the kind of catch of an area, extends well off-campus in just about every direction. Part of that is because students, faculty, and staff live in the extended forties of campus and toward Market and toward *south*. Yet, the oversight of the department, the advising, predominantly, of the department, the accountability for the division, I should say, comes from Penn, and not really from the community. Even the community that we police. What do you think are some ways that we could sort of improve this? What are some ways that the community help to keep DPS, or our Penn Police more accountable?

[00:39:35] **Rick Krajewski**

Yeah, I am happy to answer that. I don't if that was directed toward me or just the panel generally, but I would also love to hear Jessica and Amelia's thoughts on that.

But in terms of what I think that could look like from a—but it is the first step is bringing more of the community associations that are in the community. So, registered community organizations are a significant part of the culture and community here in West and Southwest Philly. Organizations like the Walnut Hill Community Association, and Spruce Hill, Cedar Park, Cobbs Creek – these are all community associations that are having meetings about the very exact same things around safety, around police, that I think if you were to have a real conversation about bringing input, those are the kind of people that should be in those kinds of conversations.

There are neighborhood leaders in the form of block captains, committee people, you know, ward leaders, people that are part of the local political kind of community structure here in West and Southwest Philly. Having conversations with business owners on the 52nd corridor, I think that there are plenty of places that we can look to find community leadership when it comes to input. I think the question is just about are we actually willing to do that? Are we actually willing to have those people at the table? And
to take their advice when it may disagree with what the institution or the university wants?

[00:41:13] **Dorothy Roberts**

Thank you. So, you have made it really clear, I think, that a big part of what Penn should do is not only listen to but incorporate the views of members of the surrounding community that Penn Police encounter and whose lives they affect. [Mm-hmm.] You have also suggested in your response to me that that would help with reimagining the meaning of public safety. Perhaps public safety doesn't rely on police at all. And I wondered if you could say some more about that and give us any concrete suggestions you might have, besides the ones you have already given us, as to what Penn could do to work toward a different vision of public safety.

[00:42:19] **Rick Krajewski**

Yeah, so I would reiterate some of what I said to Reverend Howard around; I think the first step could be bringing some of these RCOs and community leaders into real conversation from where we are upholding their agency and their perspective about what does safety mean in West and Southwest Philadelphia. Do they feel like the Penn Police Department has been the appropriate agent of community safety? What would it mean to have a version of safety that is more about, you know, first responding to what is often not crimes, maybe they are interpersonal conflicts, maybe they are mental health episodes, and maybe someone who is trained in the current way of policing, as we think about it, is not the appropriate responder for that. Maybe it is the community leader. Maybe it is an elder.

And so, if we are going to have a presence in the surrounding area, I think that that is the first step is actually having those real listening sessions and asking these people what would it look like for them? And I believe it will be a drastically different version of what the police and safety department is right now.

So, I think going from there would be a significant—and also, focusing on youth. So, something that our councilwoman, Jamie Gauthier, has done has been having real conversations with black youth in West and Southwest Philadelphia. There are
organizations like YEAH Philly and UrbEd, Inc. are working with young, black youth to have a conversation, and to youth who have been impacted on it from both ways, both from over-policing but also from gun violence. And having these real conversations about what is a response to this that actually looks different? Because if you look at the data, and now I am blowing in stuff to just include policing generally, we have seen time and time again that that funding to police departments have increased without a corresponding increase in safety.

So, I think, at this point, we have to really, really reimaging conversation, like reimagine these kinds of solutions. And I think the first step will be bringing young people, bringing elders, bringing community leaders into conversation about it, and really taking their suggestions to heart.

[00:44:56] Dorothy Roberts

Thank you.

[00:44:58] Chaz Howard

[Thanks so] much, Mr. Krajewski, I think we will turn to Ms. Gooding now for a few questions, and then, after that, we will end the first section with Ms. Carter. Professor Roberts?

[00:45:09] Dorothy Roberts

I will jump in then. Thank you so much, Ms. Gooding, for your very powerful statement. I thought that your story about encountering a black woman at a table on Locust Walk was very compelling. And I wondered if you would say some more about what gave you the sense that she might be arrested on campus? And if you are saying that having campus police helps to create that feeling of not being welcomed, and if we could conclude from that that we should not have campus police because they are creating an environment that is so unwelcoming to the neighbors of University of Pennsylvania. I am not trying to put words in your mouth; I am trying to understand what you are arguing that we should do.
Jessica Gooding

Yes, and thank you for having me and inviting me. So, just to go back to the interaction that I had that day. The feeling that came to me initially; it just was instinctive. Like I said in my statement, I think that when we have a system like the Penn Police having the presence like they do on campus, I think that when we are on campus, we don't necessarily acknowledge the burden of how that feels. The way that that imposes on how we communicate with each other. I said in my statement that it is very rare to have a person that is not from the Penn community be on campus. But when I interacted with that woman, it made me acknowledge that her presence would get her in trouble. Like she could automatically get in trouble for being on campus because she was an outsider, but then it was also this element of when she did something that ultimately went against the social Penn bubble rules, I knew that she was possibly going to be in danger and it made me feel like I didn't know if I would be able to protect her. I didn't know if I would be able to be a voice for her. And that made me nervous for her. I think that that interaction itself really illuminates that people that aren't part of the Penn community do not have a safe position on campus.

And I think that in terms of acknowledging whether there should be Penn Police or not, you have to think about the ways that everyone feels emotionally and physically safe. At that moment, when that interaction happened between her and I, I knew that she could possibly not be physically safe. And I think that that highlights the fact that having Penn Police have the type of impact and culture and influence that they do on campus is not necessarily a good thing. I know that it does provide some safety, some safer feelings to some community members.

And just to touch base on what Superintendent Rush mentioned last week, she mentioned that Penn wanted more police on campus. That there was an emphasis that we needed more. And in an article that she had, she did an op-ed for the Daily Pennsylvanian a few years ago, she talked about how Penn itself is the Penn Police's friend in terms of doubling their funding, in terms of being supportive to them.

So, I think that when we think about how we feel on campus with people that are not part of the Penn community feeling safe as well, that it is pretty obvious that they are
not safe, and that goes against the safety of not only Penn community members, but just the Philadelphia community members in general.

[00:49:29] **Dorothy Roberts**

Thanks.

[00:49:31] **Chaz Howard**

Two follow up questions. It sounds like a part of the situation was when the non-student staff member came to your table and took a baked good – were you all selling the baked goods or giving them out or something? What should the response to crime be on campus? If it's whether it is that or whether someone steals a bike or a laptop, what should our response be? What can we do to prevent crimes? If not for Penn Police? That is the first question. And the second question would be, I really do appreciate your vision for what we could be around policing. What are some of the barriers to get there, in your perspective?

[00:50:22] **Jessica Gooding**

So, in terms of crime on campus, I think that it is not necessarily about not acknowledging crime. I think that crime has to be acknowledged so that people can not have their things stolen, so that laptops aren't stolen, so that bikes aren't stolen. The problem comes in when we think about the way policing is structured. That is where the problem lies. So, although that women did steal – or, she took a baked good off of the table, you know, I think that it is important to emphasize that my feelings toward it would not have necessarily been relevant to a police officer because the structure of policing is so embedded on punishment.

So, with that being the case, it is hard to understand how we can really talk about crime and combat crime without thinking of the punishment aspect of it that also is connected to the brutality and possible harm to a person. So, I think that it is a conversation that has to be based around thinking about ways that we can transform the way that we have been interacting with communities in terms of crime and how we can
address things in a way that does not necessarily involve the structure of policing that we know.

And could you just follow up on your second question really quick?

[00:51:49] **Chaz Howard**

Oh, absolutely, I mean I think, in your writing and in your responses here, I think you have communicated a desire that I think is shared by a number of people in our community around turning the corner somehow on policing, whether that is the defunding of Penn Police or an abolishment of Penn Police or some type of restorative justice, reconciliation, replacing the crim and punishment sort of motif. What are some of the things that are blocking us from getting there, do you think?

[00:52:18] **Jessica Gooding**

So, I think that we are being blocked from addressing real ways that we can handle the disparities in communities because of the structures that we have in place that do not provide justice for everyone. So, and until we have a system that doesn't rely on the system that we have known, that does not work for everyone, until we transform that particular way of thinking, and until we have everyone on board that there even is a problem, we are not going to be able to address the problem itself.

So, at this particular state, I think it is really important to think about the ways in which everyone feels and the ways in which everyone interacts so that we can then think of a system that doesn't involve policing as we know it.

[00:53:14] **Chaz Howard**

Thank you.

[00:53:16] **Dorothy Roberts**

Thanks. Should we move on to Amelia Carter? I think you were going to ask her the first question, Chaz.

[00:53:36] **Chaz Howard**
Ms. Carter, thank you again for your remarks too. I had one first question, I really [unintelligible] in a very firsthand account of what happened on 52nd Street, which just sounded horrible for everyone involved. How else could that have played out? [If A.] had no Philly, Penn, and Drexel police showed up on the scene, how could that have played out? Or, B, how could they have policed that scene differently? If we could go back and kind of do it again, what do you think?

[00:54:14] **Amelia Carter**

So, I think that it's hard to—for me, it's like it's hard to go back and think about how things could have been different because I feel like it is important to move forward from that, like, trauma of the past to think about like how things will be different and should be different in the future.

But what I can speak to is—what became clear to me is that they didn't have the ability to address the situation in a way that wouldn't have made situations worse. There was just no skill set; there was no—they didn't even come close to making the situation better. So that, to me, indicates that there is nothing that they could have done to change what they did to make it not have turned out the way that it did. Because they came armed with tear gas, they came like with full shields and helmets and rubber bullets, ready to use those things.

So, if you come into a situation with that mindset, that's kind of like the energy that you are drawing in. Not to mention that there were several reports, including what I witnessed, of police actively attacking residents who weren't doing anything. So, when I say that there was like an inciting of a riot, it wasn't just because they came in the riot gear and then were being really nice, I mean, like, hey guys, we're just trying to stop a riot. There was actually throwing of like objects at children; there was actually point-blank pepper-spraying people in the face who were not looting, who were just speaking to them, asking them like, you know, why are you here? What is going on? Why is there so many SWAT cars here? And like all of these police officers here when nothing is happening? Because people felt unsafe because they felt like they were about to be attacked, which is what happens,
In the areas that we were in, as the, you know, the cops were going back and forth. They were like receding up and down 52nd Street. And whenever they weren't in a space, residents were not hurting each other. Like it was actually a pretty neutral experience in terms of what was happening one-on-one with the residents. That is not to romanticize, you know, violence is an issue in Philadelphia, of course. But I am just telling the truth of the situation, which is that the only violence perpetrated during that dune was from the police to the residents.

So, yeah, for me, the whole situation, there was no way of rectifying that or doing it differently. The only people, as I mentioned, who successfully stopped the destruction of businesses were community residents who banded together and blocked businesses with their bodies and asked people to like calm down, tried to get some the youth who were getting involved in things to fall back, and having actual dialogue with community members.

So, yeah, I think that we need to focus on developing and funding the research and the community labor to allow community members to come up with mechanisms that do work. I think that that should be funded, and that is key, and I think it should involve and really come from the community members themselves. So, yeah, that's that I think.

[00:58:00] Chaz Howard

Thank you.

[00:58:02] Dorothy Roberts

Thank you. And I agree that your description of your experience as a resident at the 52nd Street incident was very, very powerful, and thank you for that.

So, what do you think, then, Penn should do about this relationship with the Philadelphia Police and about its own force? You said you learned afterward that Penn Police had been supporting the Philadelphia Police Department that day. What, in general, would be the right thing for Penn to do? And maybe in answering that, you can reflect on what the position is of the Penn Community for Justice and its views on this to give us a sense of what we can recommend that President Gutmann and Executive Vice President Carnaroli and Provost Pritchett do about the situation?
[00:59:18] **Amelia Carter**

Yeah, I feel that, and something that we have kind of come to a consensus to in our group, PCJ, is that—and many groups across the city have the same platform that we need to start defunding the police and move to, within a few year range, a dismantling of the policing system as we know it today, to be able to develop police-free alternatives to public safety.

We don't have the answers to exactly what that looks like. Because we are just now—we, as in the bigger, greater public, there is like small groups of people who have been working on these issues for a long time, and they, you know, are rightfully experts, and they can definitely guide us in that. Although I don't think that experts should determine what communities should do. I think public safety is a very local question. People should figure out what is the right strategy for them, locally, and the funding that we give to Penn Police, through that defunding process, can be redirected at this so that slowly, over time, funds are transferred to community members to develop these alternative forms. So, by the time we get to that five-year marker, those forms are well developed, they are strong enough to stand on their own, and we can safely shutter policing agencies as we know them today.

So, we want to do this in a way that actually promotes safety, actually promotes community participation, and we are comfortable with saying we don't have the answers. All we know is that this doesn't work. This has been proven to not work. This is actively causing harm, and it needs to be stopped as soon as possible. And we need to fund and make time, space, and energy for finding out what the appropriate solution would be.

[01:01:32] **Dorothy Roberts**

It sounds like two key steps; I understand your answer that we can't predict the future; this is a process; this is a struggle. [Mm-hmm.] But it sounds like two key steps are community input—real community input, and defunding and transfer of funds to community networks and efforts. [Mm-hmm.] If I hear you correctly.

[01:02:03] **Amelia Carter**
Yeah, and just like research what the possibilities are. Exploring those possibilities, testing those possibilities, and like funding those possibilities.

[01:02:14] Dorothy Roberts

Thank you.

[01:02:15] Amelia Carter

Thanks.

[01:02:17] Chaz Howard.

Thanks so much to all three of our first guests. Thank you for your generosity of time today. John, I will hand it back over to you for our second group.

[01:02:29] John Hollway

Thank you. So, at this point, we will have Mr. Jeffrey Rowland, from the Penn Division of Human Resources, and following him, Captain Belisairo of the Penn Police Department. So, we will turn first to Mr. Rowland, please.

[01:02:43] Jeffrey Rowland

Well, thank you, and good afternoon! Before I start, I would just like to thank the Quattrone Center for the opportunity just to present today. And to all the panelists and the folks who have participated and who are participating in this very important endeavor.

So, like you know, my name is Jeffrey Rowland; I work in the Division of Human Resources, and I am the Executive Director of Human Resources for Staff and Labor Relations, Recruitment Services, and Economic Inclusion. I have worked at the university, in the Division of Resources, for my entire 13-year tenure here. And in my role, and I have been in my current role as the Executive Director for roughly about two and a half years. Prior to becoming the Executive Director, I have held three roles with increasing responsibility within Human Resources. My first role was as the Manager of Staff and Labor Relations. Then, I was promoted to the Associate Director of Staff and Labor Relations. And now, currently, as the Executive Director of Human Resources for
Staff and Labor Relations. And like I said, Recruitment Services and Economic Inclusion.

In all my roles with the university's Division of Human Resources, I have held the responsibility of managing and developing the employee relations and labor relations policies and practices for the university. And Currently, as the Executive Director of Human Resources, I lead the development, implementation, and administration of the university's comprehensive employee and labor relations program. I provide strategic guidance and consultation to senior leadership and managers throughout the university on a wide range of human resources issues. I am also responsible for the oversight and management of the respective human resource professionals in the individual schools and centers throughout Penn. And also, in my role, I represent the university as its chief labor negotiator.

I would like to offer some insight into the staff and labor relations department before I discuss what our role with the Division of Public Safety.

My office acts as a neutral, independent office when investigating matters of staff and management misconduct, including allegations of failure to adhere to university policy, federal, stated, or local laws. During my tenure with Penn, my department has independently investigated numerous allegations of employee performance issues and employee misconduct throughout the university. In all cases, my department's responsibility is to recommend remedies and/or discipline, but not to mandate.

My office does not have the authority to implement discipline, but only to advise and inform departments across the university of possible ramifications if they do not follow our recommendations.

During my tenure at Penn, I have always been responsible, in some capacity, with employee labor relations matters with the Division of Public Safety. I work closely with the Division on the human resources matters to ensure they are following university policy and procedures. I have led, or co-led contract negotiations for all contracts the university has had with the Penn Police associations since my arrival at Penn. I work closely with the administrative and financial officer, advising him and giving him guidance on human resources matters.
My department also acts as a neutral third-party hearing officer for all third step hearing grievances that are filed by the union membership if they believe their contractual rights have been violated under the collective bargaining agreement.

The decision my department makes at a third-level hearing is not binding. However, in most cases, both parties typically accept and respect the hearing officer's decision. In circumstances where the union does not agree with the decision given third step hearing, they have the right to request an arbitration hearing by a third party not affiliated with the university. If a case is filed for arbitration, my office then works with the office of general counsel in preparing and representing the university at that hearing. The arbitrator's decision is final and binding. This ruling [just means] that my office could rule one way in the third step hearing; if the union does not agree at all, it will file for arbitration, and potentially have that third step hearing decision that was granted by my office overturned.

I would just like to end with my career in human resources has given me the opportunity to work for and with great people across many industries. I really do cherish the work that I do here at the university, and I find it rewarding. My work as the Executive Director of Human Resources keeps the university's most important assets, its employees, engaged, productive, and I am really appreciative of the many relationships, resources, and benefits that are available to all at Penn. Penn's commitment to its employees, with the support of the Division of Human Resources, and my department, Staff and Labor Relations, contributes to the employment longevity of so many staff that work within the Division of Public Safety and the university at large really enjoy.

I just want to, once again, thank you for having the opportunity to present. And I am just glad to be included on this panel, and I welcome your questions.

[01:08:21] **John Hollway**

Thanks, Mr. Rowland; we appreciate your time and your thoughtful remarks.

Captain Belisairo.

[01:08:27] **Michael Belisairo**
Good afternoon, everyone! Thank you for this opportunity to speak today. A much different forum that I am used to speaking; I am used to a lot of public speaking, seeing people in person, having that personal contact. So, hopefully, it conveys today as well as it would normally.

As I was introduced, my name is Michael Belisairo, and since 2017, I have served as the Captain of Patrol for the Penn Police Department. I started with the Penn Police Department in 2007 as a police officer, and was promoted through the ranks to sergeant first, and then lieutenant. During my time as a sergeant and lieutenant, I also served as the department's accreditation manager for seven years.

The Penn Police Department is an accredited agency, and it is accredited through the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies, also known as CALEA. As an accredited agency, we must continually maintain compliance with over 450 nationally recognized standards.

In my current role, I am responsible for the day-to-day operation of the patrol shifts, the Police Athletic League program, and the community relations program. There are numerous reports, policies, and procedures that must be submitted from the patrol unit to ensure we maintain our accredited status, which are related to all those programs.

We host the various PAL events throughout the year, such as PAL skating at the Penn Ice Rink, PAL Citywide Basketball Championship at the Palestra, and our PAL holiday party. We have a PAL officer assigned to our local PAL center, who is a full-time officer and has been there for a substantial amount of time.

As a department, we also attend a number of monthly community meetings. One of the biggest is the Frist Thursday meeting, which is held at the Free Library at 40th and Walnut, every month. We have also held a number Coffee with a Cop events over the past few years. We had one in the center of Locust Walk with a table set up and portable coffee, carafes, and also at our local Starbucks locations.

We have a store log program, where officers visit each of the retail establishments, the restaurants, and all the businesses in our patrol zone, multiple times a day. Our officers check in with the employees, the managers, and the customers, and sign the logbooks that we place there.
We also have officers assigned to foot beat assignments twice a day at various intersections where they are there to help with traffic and to assist pedestrians across the street.

We also have a building administrator liaison program, where we are in continuous communication with the various schools on campus, the hospitals, and the private landlords throughout our patrol zone.

Administratively, I am responsible for reviewing and investigating any complaints submitted against members of the patrol unit. We allow for complaints to be submitted to through our website, over the phone, in person, at any of the resource centers on campus, and we even accept and investigate anonymous complaints.

Also, on a monthly basis, I review all of the citizen contact data for all of our pedestrian and traffic investigations and monitor all of our officers' activity using an early warning system that we use to track any complaints, subject management reports, and pursuits.

All pedestrian investigations are reviewed, and everyone who provides a telephone number is contacted by a police supervisor. And they are asked a series of questions regarding their opinion of the contact with the officers. Were you satisfied with the interaction? We asked them were you provided a reason for the stop. And we ask if there were any issues with the stop. We call this our Community Interaction Survey, which is also done monthly. If there were any concerns as a result of the survey, a formal complaint process is initiated.

And annually, our department presents to the Division of Public Safety Advisory Board, and we detail all the complaints against our police officers and their outcomes. We also present all pedestrian and traffic data as well as the results of the community interaction surveys for the years.

It has been my pleasure to have been a part of the Division of Public Safety and the Penn Police Department for these past 13 years, and I look forward to any question that you may need me to answer today.

Thank you, Captain, we appreciate it. Professor Roberts and Reverend Howard, we will turn to Q and A for Mr. Rowland and Captain Belisairo.

[01:13:08] **Dorothy Roberts**

Thanks. Thank you both for taking the time to speak with us today. Mr. Rowland, you clearly work very closely with the Division of Public Safety in a number of ways. You have a really vast experience covering collective bargaining, disciplinary proceedings, and grievances. And I would like to initially focus on the Penn Police Association and Collective Bargaining agreements with Penn.

In your opinion, have you seen any way in which the union or the collective bargaining agreements have posed a barrier to disciplining or firing officers who violate the Division of Public Safety policies or accountability to the community? And, in particular, if you would focus on whether they have ever shielded officers who have been engaged in activity that violates policies, including excessive force or racially biased policing?

[01:14:26] **Jeffrey Rowland**

That's an excellent question. I can say in my years in working here at Penn, and dealing with the collective bargaining agreement, and dealing with the Penn Police Association, they have not engaged in that type of activity, and it's if an officer has been brought up on those types of charges. And just let me backtrack for one minute when I talk about that the grievance procedure is. The grievance procedure is a three-step—or actually a four-step process. My office gets involved at the third step, which is the final step before arbitration. Prior to that, you know, prior to that step happening, the third step happening, the first two steps happen within the Division of Public Safety. But I am also involved, just reviewing things and everything else.

I can say that very rarely anything that comes to the third step, as I look at things, they are usually handled internally before it gets to me, and I can say that the Penn Police Association has not participated in any sort of cover-up or trying to shield officers when things of that nature have arisen.
[01:15:43] Dorothy Roberts

Thank you.

[01:15:46] Chaz Howard

Thank you, I really appreciate your time and your being here. I have a question about the collective bargaining agreement, the last one, at least. In the agreement, it says that after a certain amount of time, different warnings and different things are removed from people's files. [Yeah.] After oral warnings are removed after six months. Written warnings after nine months. And even suspensions are removed out of one's file after a year. I'm curious, your thoughts on that. I don't think that is true in any other part of the university when people sort of get in trouble. Does that mean that DPS, that Penn in general, couldn't consider a suspension from like two years ago when thinking about discipline? Does that seem like—do those periods of six, nine, do those seem like short periods to you? Why or why not? And then, the final question is, do you think that our community's trust in DPS could be improved if the records looked back further in time? And if it didn't feel like there was some sort of like, I don't want to use the term, but like a hookup for officers who make a mistake that there is this eraser. Do you think that the trust could be restored if there was greater accountability around that?

[01:17:04] Jeffrey Rowland

That's a great question, Chaz. I can say that I will start at the macro and then whittle my way down.

Under collective bargaining, it is not unusual, and this goes with all contracts, that there is a period where discipline stays on file. And then, after that period of time, the discipline does go away from being to be used against that particular person if something else were to happen.

But we do have a clause; we do have a way of operating. If it is a serious infraction, we don't have to worry about past infractions. If it something that is serious, that can automatically, what we call a serious misconduct, that can lead to immediate termination without looking at any past history.
So, you talk about a written warning being removed because what you are talking about really there is progressive discipline. And then, after a period of time, it may drop off so it can't be used against that staff member or that police officer. So, that is there. That is something that is normal in collective bargaining agreements.

The one thing that we want to look at here also is that the majority of our police forces are municipalities, and they fall under what we call state labor relations law. This, Penn Police, is a private, and, so, they fall under what we call the National Labor Relations Act. So, what happens with that is that they do follow some of the normal labor laws that are out there. Not saying that you can't increase those, or decrease those time limits. But those time limits are in there for that discipline to drop off. But like I said, if it something of a serious infraction, I think we go immediately to termination if need be. And the termination—I mean, the determination on if it is a serious infraction, falls on us as management to determine what that infraction is and if it is serious enough to go all the way without going through progressive discipline and moving right to termination.

[01:19:25] **Chaz Howard**

If I could ask two quick follow-ups. Allow me to press you, but your personal thoughts on those pretty brief time limits for erasure. And then, the second one, is there data for the complaints and investigations? Is that publicly available? Do you think it should be publicly available? Or the reason why it is not?

[01:19:45] **Jeffrey Rowland**

I can't tell you the reason why it is not. When we do our grievance hearings and we have them, and the complaints come through, and I will throw some data that is out there over the past, and I am going back a few years, maybe back to 2013, we only had once incident where a police officer did something, and we terminated that police officer right away. Everything else that's in there had nothing to do—and I mean, I think we had ten third step hearings, only one dealt with any sort of misconduct, everything else had to deal with things such as paperwork and administrative things. But that member of Public Safety, the police officer was terminated and didn't even go to any sort of third—it didn't go to arbitration or anything else. It was just done.
My thoughts on the timelines. A great question. If you ask me from a management standpoint, you would always like timelines to be longer. But because the caveat that we have the ability to really move, if it is a serious misconduct, directly to termination, I think that gives us the necessary out that we need. If that answers your question sufficiently, Reverend.

[01:21:16] **Chaz Howard**

Thank you.

[01:21:19] **Dorothy Roberts**

Well, let me follow up on something that you said in your answer to me and also to Reverend Howard about the grievance procedures and arbitration procedures related to disciplinary decisions. And it sounds like you are saying that it is rare that the procedure would get to, I think you called it the third step, [the third step] in a grievance or arbitration. And in most cases, these are sort of petty administrative oversights or something like that, that the officer did, and not anything very serious.

And so, I just—let me know if that is the case so that, it sounds as if you are saying there aren't that many disciplinary matters that go through the entire disciplinary and grievance procedure that would overturn a disciplinary decision. And even in those cases, they are not really cases involving serious misconduct.

So, first, I want to confirm that that is the case here. And then, secondly, why is that? Is it because the Penn Police don't ever engage in misconduct? Or is it because something happens to avoid a disciplinary procedure?

[01:22:54] **Jeffrey Rowland**

I can answer from my level, from the third step [hearing]... [Yeah.] It doesn't get to, you know, my level, at the third step hearing, whether it's myself that hears it, or someone on my staff that hears it. My feelings are that when it comes to the first or second step, then it is handled and handled appropriately. I don't think, from what I have seen from my level, any time we are dealing with any sort of discipline, [unintelligible] and Penn Police are not from this; they file a grievance. From where I see, from my
vantage point, there isn't a lot of police misconduct because terminations will happen, and
that would be an automatically filed grievance right to the third step for my office to hear
it. And, like I said, over the past seven years—five, seven years, that just has not been the
case, from what I see, from my vantage point.

Dorothy Roberts

But it is, so, you are saying that from your vantage point, at this upper level,
[Mm-hmm.] I think you mentioned you've seen one termination, [One termination.] am I
correct? And so, but it could be that these disciplinary actions have happened prior to
getting to you. In other words, the officer didn't proceed with the full phase of the
arbitration or grievance proceeding where it would get to your level.

Jeffrey Rowland

You know, that could happen. [Mm-hmm.] I would say nine times out of ten, if
not ten times out of ten, when discipline is issued, a grievance goes in not shortly
afterward. And when that grievance goes in, it ends up, typically, moving somewhere,
you know, up into the chain of events where I would get involved at some level. And it
just hasn't happened since I have been operating here, since 2007.

Dorothy Roberts

Okay. I don't mean to prolong this. I am just trying to understand how we would
get to what's happening to, in terms of discipline of officers, why so few are getting up to
you, and what that in between range is. Is there someone else you think we should hear
from?

Jeffrey Rowland

I think we have Captain Belisairo here, who can quite possibly answer some of
those questions.

Dorothy Roberts

Okay ... okay, perfect timing, then. Thank you.
[01:25:44] **Chaz Howard**  
Let me just ask one more follow-up question. This is sort of a broad question, but I think that you do bring a very unique perspective on American policing. And I don't mean for this to sound like a leading question, but, if anything, what do you think is wrong with American policing? Sort of transcending DPS, what is wrong with American policing?

[01:26:07] **Jeffrey Rowland**  
If you were to, and that's a big—I think maybe we need to talk about American policing is that, if I... Probably that you have jurisdictions that all operate in certain areas. And I believe, policing, they operate under the same guise, but I don't know if there is something wrong with American policing. I think what the issue is, is that we do see some things that may need to change. I don't have an issue with police—I can say, 95 to 98 percent of police are good folks, right. I can say that you have a few bad actors, and those bad actors bring necessary conversation, like we are having today because those are the ones who make all the other good police officers look bad.

But I can say that I feel that, and I don't know this for sure, so, but as far as uniformity goes, across all of America policing because, you know, every district – and I am going outside of Penn, but I am speaking on all of policing – every district or every municipality, they would have their own collective bargaining agreement, they would have their own set of—so, I think there is a standard that is there, but I don't if it covers every—that is the only thing I could think of.

But all in all, I don't know if there is a bad issue with American policing, or are there things that need to be fixed? Of course. And I think, you know, doing things like this are great because you get to hear from a wide range of folks. You get to hear from people such as myself who handle some of the backend administrative things. You get to hear from the community and people who are actually being policed, you know, by the force. Even folks like myself who get policed by the force. And the important thing is, you get an opportunity to hear from the police themselves to talk about what they do and
what they have done and how. And I don't think it falls on deaf ears. And I think that's a great thing.

But, you know, American policing, Reverend, some things probably do need to be repaired, but I do not think it is a broken system.

[01:28:56] Chaz Howard

I think we will pivot to Captain Belisairo now. Thank you again, Captain; I know you all stay busy over there on Chestnut Street, and we do appreciate your taking the time to engage with us and share this afternoon.

I have sort of a broad question here to start with. What could UPPD do better? I think I have sort of seen up close and personal a lot of the good stories at your accommodation ceremonies and all that. But where, and every institution can improve, but are there some specific spaces that you think UPPD can improve? And, again, I will qualify it for you. I know it is hard to get ahead of the people we work for, but just in your opinion, what do you think?

[01:29:45] Michael Belisairo

That's a really difficult question. And I will back out a little bit and work my way back in. There are so many different people, different organizations within the Department of Public Safety, and we don’t operate within silos. We all operate as a team in the building, under the direction of Vice President Rush, and she is our Chief of Police for the uniformed police. And there are a lot of things that we do right, but it is never that we want to sit and enjoy a status quo. Chief Rush is always tasking us with that can we do better, and why do we do something that way? Is there a better way to do it? And we do it across the division. And we collaborate between, you know, whether it is fire safety, the security services, the technology, and the police, and we all collaborate and try and see if there is anything that we are lacking in, anything that we can definitely improve. But we are always trying to grow. I am not going to put anything specific on the table that I can think of that we really have something that is a black eye for us. But we are always trying to improve. We are always trying to be on the right side of growing.
So, not trying to evade your question, but we do this a lot. We meet daily, weekly, monthly, with all of our partners in the division and the university. So, we are always open to input and change.

[01:31:22] Chaz Howard

I appreciate that.

[01:31:24] Dorothy Roberts

Thank you for being with us today. Let me ask you a question about a specific area where you heard the first three speakers, and all of them mentioned that the West Philadelphia community residents, many of them, anyway, feel over-policed. I mean, it is certainly the case that Penn has the second largest number of full-time sworn police officers among all private universities across the United States. The third-largest number for all universities nationwide, both public and private, and there are at least give policing agencies in West Philadelphia. Is that necessary? Could at least one point of change be reducing the force that exists in these communities, which we have heard today, feel as if they are over-policed?

[01:32:36] Michael Belisairo

I can understand their perspective on it, absolutely. But every department, they do have their own area of responsibilities and assignments. And there is some overlap, even though there may not be direct overlap if we speak about that there is SEPTA police, who are, you know, obviously, charged with all the transportation hubs and working through that and Amtrak police at 30th Street Station. And Drexel, as well as us.

And, also, our sheer numbers don’t always tell the true story. There's shift coverage for assignments is 24-hours a day, seven days a week. So, it may seem like a large number if you just look at the entirety of the department. But it is spread out over days and weeks and different hours. And different responsibilities. We have a lot of our officers are assigned to help with traffic in the health system. When we have, you know, thousands of patients coming through, we assist them to make sure that the traffic flows
and it doesn’t cause gridlock in the area and inhibit ambulances from getting to the ER, or patients from getting to the ER.

So, we are spread out a lot, even though our numbers show that much. But I can’t speak for the other departments as to exactly what their responsibilities are, but it may be more narrow than it seems, even though we all do operate in the same area of the city and in the same communities.

[01:34:11] Dorothy Roberts

What about just the overlap of the Philadelphia Police, then, and the Penn Police [Right.] in West Philadelphia?

[01:34:20] Michael Belisairo

Yes, we do overlap with the 18th Police District, and they also have some officers assigned to the University City District as well. We actually communicate often. We work well with one another, and, primarily, you know, from our patrol zone, our officers are the ones that are first to respond. The City of Philadelphia is not as well staffed as—most of their city is not well staffed with officers, they are spread very thin with calls for service, so they may not have as large a footprint in the University City area as it seems. They do have areas that are just adjacent to us that we do not patrol, that are outside of our patrol zone, such as the University of the Sciences, which is, it touches right on the edge of our border, and also through Drexel University area, which we do not patrol in as well.

[01:35:22] Dorothy Roberts

Thank you. [Okay.]

[01:35:23] Chaz Howard

I got two quick questions about discipline and complaints. And this one came from one of the attendees.

Is the progressive discipline procedure for Penn Police, is this different, or is it better than other campuses or other precincts or other unions? And if so, why is that? And
if Penn supports the strongest possible progressive discipline, can we commit to voluntarily strengthen our progressive discipline across the board for all of its workers. That is a broader question for Penn, too, but what do you think about us compared to other campuses and other precincts. And then, I have another follow up after that.

[01:36:03] Michael Belisairo

I really don’t know the answer to that question in regard to what other places do specifically. I know that it is not an abnormality to have progressive discipline, that is usually in all polices. And in the Penn Police, there are individuals and officers that are covered under the collective bargaining agreement, and there are other supervisors who are not, which falls to university policy. And university policy and the collective bargaining agreement are very similar. And that is where we always, we collaborate with Jeff on questions of anything along those lines.

[01:36:45] Chaz Howard

I think the other question is, is one, I think, again, that, in some sense, it transcends our division and to policing in general in America. But it is around a lot of people's hesitation around the complaint and discipline process where it, from the outside, it looks like after a complaint is made, you have cops investigating cops. And in many cases, cops investigating their friends in a process that is actually not particularly transparent. And if it is transparent, it ends up being kind of transparent to like Jeff and a few other people there, and you all end up being sort of judge and jury for yourselves. Could you speak to that kind of real hesitation that builds a real distrust in our community? And, again, I think that transcends us, but our process looks similar to that. Why is that? How do you feel about that? Or is there something we can improve with that? And is there a way to involve non-cops or non-division members in that process?

[01:37:48] Michael Belisairo

Well, there are a lot of layers to that, and I do understand it's—most people that we encounter, they don't want to complain about a service. They are, you know, they are not necessarily afraid, but I just—I haven't encountered, even some of the people that do
actually make complaints, whether it is through the phone or whether it is in person, most people just, you know, they are not complaining about serious misconduct. It just may be how they felt they may have been treated. Not saying that they were treated poorly or illegally, but we try and take that into account and speak for them. I mean, as for most complaints in the field, on every pedestrian stop and every traffic stop, we have a supervisor response. And we make sure at the conclusion of those contacts that our supervisor talks to the person, makes sure they are comfortable with it, gives them a business card, and says, please, if there are any concerns, we are willing to hear. If you change your mind, if you want to talk another time, they provide an email address. Usually, they provide their cell phone number on the back of the card. So, we do our best to try to make people feel very comfortable if they had any bit of discomfort with any interaction with our officer, to go and file a complaint, and do it in a way that they feel like they are not being intrusive. That they could contact the same supervisor and say, hey, we did talk, and I changed my mind.

As for, I understand that internally that we do investigate the complaints, and it does not just stay at one level. It goes through the entire chain of command for the patrol division right up to the chief of police. And we do review it; we do review it thoroughly, and the chief does follow up with every one of the complainants as well with an outcome of the investigation, and a contact again is provided if there is anything further that we could do. But that is currently—and that is how we do it with our current CBA and through our current policies, so I think that is kind of a bigger level question if we were to change the process. But, you know, we do our best to make sure that we fully investigate it because I certainly don’t want to have anyone working with me in a department where they have serious issues with misconduct. I take it very seriously whenever a complaint comes through. We investigate it fully, and we speak about it internally. It is transparent, and I do understand that it is maybe not as transparent to the outside, but we do publish—keep on our website, on the DPS website, a three-year rolling list of how many complaints were filed against our police officers, and we list the outcome. Now, we don’t provide specifics other than whether it was sustained, not sustained, you know, exonerated, unfounded. But we do publish that and keep that number rolling time.
[01:41:03] **Chaz Howard**

Thank you...thank you.

[01:41:07] **Dorothy Roberts**

So, if I could follow up on that, it sounds as if the procedure for dealing with complaints is entirely within the Division of Public Safety, and there is no external supervision or investigation of it. When I was speaking with Mr. Rowland, he mentioned that there aren't that many that come to him or his level because there aren't grievances filed against the disciplinary procedures. So, one impression that you might get from that is that the Penn Police Department does not discipline its officers. You mentioned speaking with them, but I am just not getting a sense of what kind of discipline happens when there is a complaint against a Penn Police officer. So, can you say more about that, please?

[01:42:19] **Michael Belisairo**

Sure. And quite honestly, we do not get a lot of complaints that are even a little bit serious. Most of our complaints are, whether it's internal, whether an officer was tardy, you know, a lot of our complaints are very minor infractions and not serious misconduct issues.

We do get complaints from people if someone had received a parking ticket and they felt that it was unfair that they received it. We investigate it. We look into every aspect of the complaint. But we do not get serious complaints, at least not in the past three years that I have been in this position; I have not seen some serious misconduct. And if anything is even a bit questionable, we do contact Jeff, it's through our chief of police, and we discuss it, and we will make sure that it is handled appropriately, but we have not had instances of that. And the complaints that we do get are very, very minor.

[01:43:28] **Dorothy Roberts**
So, you, in the last three years, you haven’t gotten a single complaint about excessive force, about racial profiling, about racial bias, about harassment – nothing like that?

[01:43:42] Michael Belisairo

Well, nothing of serious misconduct to that extent. There are things that it may be rolled into where harassment may have been used by someone who made a complaint. But, in the context of the interviews with the complainant, the interviews with the officer, and looking through it, it may not have been exactly classified as that. But, again, it was as a result of the investigation, and ninety percent of it is when the complainant is asked to relay the story and say, explain to us, specifically, what happened, and spell it out. And it clarifies a lot.

[01:44:23] Dorothy Roberts

I see, so, the complaint is then interpreted by the police as to whether or not it qualifies as a legitimate complaint.

[01:44:33] Michael Belisairo

Interpreted is maybe a little bit strong. It is more of we actually, verbatim, take a person's statement and spell it out and spell out exactly what was said. Because sometimes, people do use a term that may not exactly fit that they meant. Maybe somebody was rude where it was not harassment, but they said I was being harassed, but they clarified and said, no, the officer was, I felt, was rude. So, it is not that we are covering it up or interpreting it, we pull it out, and we go through it. And our investigations don't take days; they usually take weeks for us to go over them.

[01:45:15] Dorothy Roberts

Okay, thank you.

[01:45:17] Chaz Howard

Thank you so much, Captain. Thank you so much, Jeff. Turn it back to John...
[01:45:24] **John Hollway**

Thanks to all. So, for the last segment of today, we will turn to Officer Nickol Taylor and Mr. Louis Petrecco. We will start with Officer Taylor, if you can unmute and give us your statement, please.

[01:45:38] **Nickol Taylor**

Good morning, panel. I am Officer Nickol Taylor. I am a patrol officer for the University of Pennsylvania Police Department.

I have been working in the university area for 25 years, and I have lived my entire adult life in the University City – West Philadelphia – Overbrook area. Prior to becoming a police officer, I worked for Spectaguard, currently known as Allied Universal. I worked for them for two years.

I patrol the area of 40th and Chestnut to 43rd and Baltimore Street, being the eyes and ears for the University of Pennsylvania Police Department, and reporting back any instances of concerns from the public.

There was a pilot program between Spectaguard and the University of Pennsylvania Police Department, and I had applied to transition from a security guard to a police officer. I applied, I got the interview, and before I know it, I was sent to a six-month training at the Philadelphia Police Academy. After graduating the Philadelphia Police Academy, I returned to the University of Pennsylvania as a police officer, where I have proudly served for 23 years.

I am currently assigned to the 40th Street beat, and patrol the areas of Market, 40th and Market to 40th and Baltimore Avenue, with my partner, who is a Philadelphia police officer. Our details consist of community engagement, banks, business, store checks, and attempting to prevent crime. Possible problem solving, and I attend five of the community meetings that are located in the West Philadelphia area.

Thank you for allowing me to participate in the panel, and I will be ready for any questions. Thanks.

[01:47:19] **John Hollway**
Thank you, Officer Taylor. Mr. Petrecco...

[01:47:26] Louis Petrecco

Good afternoon, Executive Director Hollway, Professor Roberts, Vice President Howard, other panelists, and those who are joining from elsewhere. I am Louis Petrecco, the Director of Security Services within the Division of Public Safety.

I started in my current role and with Penn a little over two years ago. Before coming to Penn, I spent most of my professional career working in the security services industry, and a lot of that time working in the higher education security.

After graduating from Penn State University with a Bachelor's Degree in Crime Law and Justice, where I also worked as a full-time campus security officer, I was hired by Penn State's Department of Public Safety for a new position, responsible for securing the government research labs on campus. I relocated back to the Philadelphia area in 2008, when I accepted a position with then AlliedBarton Security Services to be a nighttime supervisor for the bike patrol team on Penn's campus. This is when I first became acquainted with Penn, the University City community, and the Division of Public Safety.

I would spend close to ten years with AlliedBarton Security, now called Allied Universal, with almost half of that time being assigned to Penn's campus working in various positions.

My last few years with Allied were spent working in the Corporate Learning and Development Department, where we supported the rest of the company by developing training programs for both security officers and managers. In 2017, I left Allied to become a security operations manager for another university. And then, in mid-2018, I was invited to rejoin the Penn community I had grown so fondly of over time, as the Director of Security Services.

As the Director, I spend most of my time overseeing the administration and consistent implementation of the services provided by Public Safety and Allied to the community. Allied Universal provides the university with over 600 security officers, led by a team of Allied Universal managers and support staff, who operate out of an office in
University City. Of the Allied Security officers assigned to the Penn account, roughly 47 percent of them, or 295, live in West Philadelphia.

I work closely with the Allied management team to ensure they are providing consistent, high-quality services to Penn and the surrounding community. In many locations across our campus, other university stakeholders, such as building administrators, are responsible for giving direction to Allied Universal for security-related processes for specific buildings. I work with these stakeholders and the Allied Universal management and support team to ensure we are providing the security officers with the necessary training, resources, and equipment to be successful.

The Allied Universal security officers assigned to Penn provide various types of services to the university and the surrounding community. Among them, including providing security to college houses, some healthcare facilities, cultural property security at our museums and galleries, traffic control right alongside our University of Penn Police Department, helping patients get to the hospital complex for their appointments on time, concierge services, and bike patrol. You see us around campus in the lime green and blue. Just to name a few.

As you can tell, the role of a security officer on campus varies greatly. Depending upon the position and location in which the officer has been assigned. So, it is extremely important that the right people be placed in the right positions to give them the best chance of success.

When a person is hired by Allied Universal to be a security officer at Penn, they go through a training program that helps them integrate into the Penn community and the site in which they will be assigned. Every security officer at Penn attends a Penn-specific orientation program that was developed in partnership with the Division of Public Safety and Allied Universal. This Penn orientation program aims to introduce the new security officer to Penn and the University City community. This is also where they learn about our new methodology that creating a safe and more secure environment is a byproduct of providing excellent customer service. Our goal is not only for them to be the best security professional, but also to be the best representative of the university and the Division of Public Safety to the entire community.
This can be challenging, which is why, over the last year and a half, and at Penn's request, Allied created a quality assurance team that helps us pursue this goal. The charge of this team is to review trainings, policies, and procedures, and make recommendations for how we can become more effective and efficient in supporting our security professionals and the community in which they serve.

This team is also integral in researching complaints received about our security officers and supervisors, in addition to tracking compliments and accolades regarding the same group.

The most visible security group on campus is our security bike patrol team. This group patrols the campus and surrounding areas and provides a variety of services to the community. In 2019, the Penn Security Bike Patrol Team completed 12,187 calls for service to Penn and the University City community. These included 2,388 calls to assist motorists for things such as jumpstarts and lockouts, and 6,008 walking or vehicle escorts. All of which are free services provided to anybody within our service area. And this is just a small glimpse into how the overall security service team tries to support the community around us.

When I accepted my position, I was excited about the opportunity to join the Division of Public Safety team. And at first, this position appeared a bit daunting as I had experienced the extremely high standards Vice President Rush has for her team and the entire Public Safety Program. Two years in, I am so honored to be working alongside so many wonderful and caring people. And like any good team, we are always looking for ways to improve. And I am incredibly thankful for the hard work and dedication shown by the members of the security services team every single day.

I appreciate you inviting me to talk about my department today, and look forward to answering your questions.

[01:53:24] Dorothy Roberts

Well, thanks to both of you for your statements and for your willingness to answer our questions. So, I will start with you, Officer Taylor. You serve as a liaison to the West Philadelphia community, to a number of groups you mentioned, such as the First Thursday group. And I wondered if you would tell us a little bit more about what the
meetings are like, what you hear from West Philadelphia residents about what they think about the Penn Police. And just in general, whether you think the perceptions are in line with some of what we heard today and if there are any problems that are ever voiced at these hearings, and how you respond. I should say meetings, I have hearing on my head, but meetings.

[01:54:27] **Nickol Taylor**

They may voice questions about crime and crime prevention. So, usually, my role at the meetings is to talk about crime and crime prevention. But since I pretty much deal with the members, and, I guess, the presidents of the meetings, off-duty as well, they may ask other questions. So, they may ask questions about their response time in the Walnut Hill area that they live in, or the Garden Court area that they live in. Or maybe theft from autos or theft from vehicles, and who should they call. And basically, what to do to prevent that.

So, they may not get the answers that they need from maybe their community relations officer for their district. And then, I will get maybe pamphlets that I have received from SEPTA or Philadelphia and give to them to give them the additional tools to help them kind of figure out what they need to do that suits their area.

[01:55:24] **Dorothy Roberts**

So, maybe I should have asked first who comes to these meetings. And before I asked about what their perspective is, who comes to the meetings? What kind of information are they looking for? And it is interesting, when I said problems, I was thinking of whether they voice problems they have with the police. But it sounds as if this is a different kind of community group that is really interested in asking you questions about how to get access to the police. It sounds like, from what you said.

[01:56:04] **Nickol Taylor**

For assistance with crime prevention or information like that. So, Walnut Hill meetings are for the community, and the community goes to those meetings. It is open for the community of Walnut Hill. But Garden Court goes to their meetings – they come all
across in meetings to share information. They are trying to beautify their neighborhoods and prevent crime. They talk about stakeholder things, property buying and values, and things like that. So, during the community meetings, those are the things that they are talking about, these five meetings that I go to.

The community college meetings; they are talking more about human resources and children issues. So, they are looking for information about that. I come with the information from a law enforcement perspective, but they also want me, as the female law enforcement officer, who is also a person, they want that perspective as well. So, they also like getting that information.

[01:57:11] **Dorothy Roberts**

So, you know, are there any meetings that the Penn Division of Public Safety or the Penn Police, in particular, hold to hear grievances from community members about issues they have with the police?

[01:57:25] **Nickol Taylor**

I have no knowledge of that.

[01:57:27] **Dorothy Roberts**

Okay, thank you.

[01:57:28] **Nickol Taylor**

We have different avenues, as the captain said, that they can submit any questions or concerns, but I have no knowledge of meetings.

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

Okay, thank you.

[01:57:37] **Nickol Taylor**

You’re welcome.
[01:57:39] **Chaz Howard**  
My question is a semi-personal one in the sense of it is a unique journey, I think, to the force, coming up through Allied. I am not sure how many people started in security services and then end up as a sworn officer. Can I ask why you wanted to be a police officer? And then I can broaden the question around, I don’t want to make any presumptions, but a lot of us who grew up in predominantly black neighborhoods, Baltimore, Maryland here, grow up with a certain perspective of the police. And it is overwhelmingly negative in my experience of the way that we have been policed and the reputation of the cops and stuff. And so, very often we are surprised when people who have come up through black neighborhoods want to be a police officer policing a black neighborhood. Why did you want to be a cop? And have your perspectives on policing changed over the years? Or have they always been whatever?

[01:58:44] **Nickol Taylor**  
Or, I have always felt the same. The reason I became a police officer is because I wanted to help people. I am like a nurturer. I want to help them; I want to make things better. And if I have a way to do it, I am going to attempt to do it. That is prior to policing, prior to security, that is just how I am.  
And the way that things are now, I am not going to let it change who I am as a person. People may give me, I guess, like negative feedback, you know, based on what is going on in society. But it is; still, I don’t let change me as a person, and I continue to do I could. I continue to offer to help people. If they don’t want my help, I offered. And that's just who I am.

[01:59:25] **Chaz Howard**  
Thank you. Can I ask a quick follow up question? You are on the inside there; how can the Division of Public Safety improve, particularly around community relations? And then, broadly speaking, it feels like we are having a hard time as a county around policing, particularly policing and violence against black bodies by police. What can we do better there? How can we make that better? How can we not have any more George
Floyds or Breonna Taylors, and those are different situations, but how can we have no more of these hashtag names?

[02:00:00] **Nickol Taylor**

Well, I believe that accountability is an issue. People need to be held accountable for their actions. As in Baltimore, when they had the issue with riding around, you know, in the wagon, riding around the males in the wagon. Other departments are to learn from that. We are supposed to learn from the misconduct of other people. And it is just as a person, as a whole. If someone does something, and it has a negative outcome, I should learn from that, I believe. So, I wouldn't continue to do it. I feel like there needs to be a consequence, and people need to be held accountable for their actions, on both ends, from the public as well as in policing. Everybody is not the same. And everybody shouldn’t be held to the same standard as the other person.

When I take my uniform off, I am officer with it on, I am Officer Taylor, with them off, I am Nickie Taylor. I live in this area; I interact with all these people, all the time. And I am glad that they know the difference with me, that I am not that officer. But the moment you start to hold everybody at the same standard, then that's when the problem comes in. Because now, you are giving me negative feedback, and I am the positive one coming on location. And now, how am I perceive everyone else after that? I am not going to be as helpful, I think. Not me, per se, but another person. I am not going to allow the actions of other people to change who I am. I want to keep doing what I do and hope I can help the next person.

[02:01:33] **Chaz Howard**

Thank you, officer, I appreciated it.

[02:01:34] **Nickol Taylor**

You're welcome.

[02:01:37] **Dorothy Roberts**

Thanks.
[02:01:38] **Chaz Howard**

If we could, I think we are going to Pivot to Director Petrecco, at this point. Again, thank you, both of you, for your patience through this; the last couple of hours, but thank you for giving us of your time.

Director Petrecco, we have a really big Division of Public Safety, and a large sworn force, and a good number of Allied security officers who are all around our campus, and are even there today, even though there are not students there right now. I think the question I want to ask is, one of the things we have heard over the last few hearings has been that there is kind of an over-policing of West Philadelphia. They have talked about sort of the five different departments that are kind of broadly here with Penn, Drexel, a couple of different precincts, and on top of that, Allied Security here, and I presume at some of the other schools too. That's a lot of people who are doing policing-like activities and people who are policing,

What would it look like if we had either only cops and no Allied? Or if we actually had only Allied Security people and no cops at Penn, but surrounding forces, what would it look like? Why don’t we do that? And why are there both? Why are there so many?

[02:02:54] **Louis Petrecco**

Absolutely, Reverend Howard. So, it’s definitely a complicated question. And we do have a large both police force and security force across campus. The reason, I think, we have so many security officers on campus is really to focus on all of the other services that I mentioned before that without them, would fall to the other members of the Division of Public Safety. Twelve thousand calls a year for the bike patrol and other security officers is a lot of time that is, otherwise, would go to the police officers to respond and handle these incidents. And you don't necessarily—we like to distribute that as much as we can, so that way, they can focus their attention on patrolling, and then we can help out with the walking escorts, in the rest of the community and being the visible security services and focusing our emphasis on the services provider to the community and most of the buildings that we have across campus.
There are so many of us because, across Penn, each school and center almost operates as its own individual business, and they would like to have, and they have, their own individual customized security teams at their locations. And we try to customize that as much as possible, which can be challenging at times because we also want to make sure that we are consistent.

Without the security team, or without the police officers, and just having security, I think it would be concerning, and it would be challenging in the event that we do have crime. And we talked about the tips that we take to have crime prevention. We do a number of, I don’t know offhand, but a ton of safety fairs throughout the year, really just trying to get people to understand how their actions can help reduce crimes of opportunity from happening around campus. When crime does happen, especially if it is a violent crime, and you only have security on campus, then you still have to rely on a law enforcement organization responding to handle that incident. And in my opinion, it makes more sense to have the law enforcement agency responding be the agency that is trained in all the buildings, that is familiar with the community, and the community members across the campus, than others that are not, and only know the campus from the various times they have to respond there.

[02:05:20] **Chaz Howard**

Thank you.

[02:05:21] **Dorothy Roberts**

And so, just to be clear, which one were you referring to just then? The Penn Police? The Philadelphia Police? Or Allied? If you could clarify what re the roles – where does Allied fit in? You referred many times to customer service. It sounds as if you are saying Allied provides these services, whereas the Penn Police are more interested in stopping crime or responding to crime. Is that a fair distinction you are making?

[02:06:06] **Louis Petrecco**
No, and what I think is important is that the security officers on campus are unsworn security officers that are employed by Allied Universal. So, most of what we do across campus, and where we are most visible, is we are visible across campus as a bike patrol, providing the walking escorts, responding to some door alarms across campus, as well as doing other functions like the lockouts and jumpstarts I stated.

The other half of our officers are throughout the buildings across Penn, bring used in a variety of different ways. And so, when a crime does happen, or something happens off-campus, from the security's role, it is to try to observe, get as much information we can, and then report it to somebody and elevate it to the next level of individual who can respond. And then, that is where the Penn Police or whatever local law enforcement agency would come into play.

[02:07:03] Dorothy Roberts

Okay, so just to clarify some more points as to the distinction between the two. Allied officers are independent contractors, not employees of University of Pennsylvania. It sounds like that is one distinction with the police. Are Allied officers armed? Are they ever armed?

[02:07:26] Louis Petrecco

So, Allied officers are not armed on campus. And that's the way it has always been since even before me.

[02:07:35] Dorothy Roberts

Okay. Are they subject to the same policies as University of Pennsylvania police officers?

[02:07:43] Louis Petrecco

So, we are—so, keeping in mind that Allied is a separate employer of the security officers, a lot of time is navigating some of the risk that comes along with the co-employment relationship, such as the client-vendor relationship that we have. So, from a disciplinary standpoint, for security officers, they have their own internal policies and
procedures that are put in place by Allied and Allied human resources that they are held accountable to.

From an operational perspective, we work with the Allied management team in making sure they understand the services we would like them to provide and how we would like them to provide their services, and then it is up to that management team to execute that with their security officers.

[02:08:30] **Dorothy Roberts**

What happens if an Allied employee violates one of these rules that you told them about a Penn rule, Penn policy that you discussed with them. What is the enforcement for Penn to make sure that Allied is following Penn's rules?

[02:08:48] **Louis Petrecco**

Absolutely. So, in that regard, and Allied has their own disciplinary process that they go through that we kind of discussed already. If it is something that is brought to the attention of the Division of Public Safety or if it is a complaint, for instance, that is received by us, that complaint gets investigated fully. And then, once that gets investigated by Allied Universal, as being the employer of the security officer, we sit down, and we look at what happened. And if it is a minor infraction, like a tardy security officer who is late for their shift, we don't get involved with those. That is handled through the Allied management team, their human resource process. We are hands-off with that.

If it is something that is a little bit more broad, like a complaint, that quality assurance team that I mentioned that we put into place within the last year and a half, investigates what happens. They look at the circumstances surrounding the actual incident. They talk to the people involved. They look at the training, the policies, and the procedures that are in place for that location. And then, at the end of that, a decision is made to where was there a policy violation or a procedure violation on behalf of the security officer? If there was, Allied follows their appropriate plan of action, per disciplinary for that. And then, we look at what else needs to happen. Obviously, there
was a miscommunication, there was a misunderstanding on the officer's side about the policy or procedure, or on the person submitting the complaint, something was unclear.

So, what can we do to make sure that that doesn't happen again in the future? And sometimes, that comes in forms of just training and more additional training for security staff. Or it comes in the form of recommending policy and procedure changes either for Allied on campus or to a school or center.

[02:10:46] Dorothy Roberts

And where would that outcome – the whole investigation - the outcome, is that documented. And who – does Penn have that information? Is that part of the Division of Public Safety? Or would that be with Allied?

[02:11:02] Louis Petrecco

So, we review together, but that document is essentially an HR file and complaint on an Allied Universal employee. That sits with Allied.

[02:11:13] Dorothy Roberts

Okay, so we, as this initiative, if we are collecting documents from Penn's Division of Public Safety, we might not have access to those investigations? Documentation of it?

[02:11:31] Louis Petrecco

We have summary information about that information, but as far as the security officer involved and the detailed information about the actual security officer and the disciplinary action that happened, we don’t have files of that because that is kept with Allied and their human resource team.

[02:11:51] Dorothy Roberts

Well, that is very important to know, very illuminating. I just have one follow up question to that, and trying to get at this distinction between the Allied and the Penn
Police personnel. Do Allied employees have the authority to stop and detain someone? Or not?

[02:12:18] **Louis Petrecco**

Theo do not. [Okay, all right.] They do not. And just for the last point, also, regarding the disciplinary process and the course of action. That is discussed between Allied and the Division of Public Safety. So, we are fully aware of what action is happening with their employees. We just don’t keep that documentation because it is related to that – their employees' human resource file.

[02:12:43] **Dorothy Roberts**

I understand. Thank you so much.

[02:12:45] **Louis Petrecco**

Thank you very much.

[02:12:48] **Chaz Howard**

Thank you so much, Director. I had just a couple quick follow up questions there, too. I think this is part of what we were sort of discussing with Captain Belisairo around transparency. And I am curious about your thoughts on it. Again, it sounds like, in most cases, Allied investigates Allied, which, again, I think we understand because, in one sense, they are a separate company, and that makes sense, and yet, they are a part of the community security team here. And it doesn’t sound like there is a lot of community involvement in the, A) investigations, B) discipline of what is going on there. And I am curious; your thought about that. And then we also had a question come in around does Penn Police investigate—well, I will phrase it this way. Do the things that Allied respond to, are they counted in the same way that things that the police are responding to. Particularly sort of violent crimes and things like that. Is Allied reporting everything that they are investigating to DPS? So, two separate questions, but...

[02:13:59] **Louis Petrecco**
So, the first one, it is complicated and unique because of the client-vendor relationship and them not being actual Penn employees. So, that is where, it becomes complicated there. Allied, with us, has always been very open and honest in the actions that they take with that. They, just like we do on our side with the police, they also have bargaining units that they have to negotiate with and deal with also on the security officer side.

In regards to the incidents that Allied responds to, especially if it is a crime, violent crime, anything like that, yeah, so their procedure is once they are notified of something, they notify our communication center, Penn Comm, and talked about the elevation into the next responder, and they give whatever information they have, and if it would be a crime, especially a violent crime, something like that, that would then have a police response associated with it. And the police officer takes over once they get on scene.

[02:15:11] Chaz Howard
And just to follow up about your thoughts on this. Because I think this is one of the things that we have been hearing a lot is around we, as community members, allow certain people to police us. And yet, the community has no – has little say in the discipline and sort of the oversight of the—I think it is a little different for Penn because I think we do have different relationships with both Penn Police, Penn Division of Public Safety, and Allied. But Allied also affects the person who lives in West Philadelphia, or sort of comes through campus, and yet, it doesn’t sound like they have much engagement or much, sort of part of the process there. I know they are allowed to make complaints and things like that. Do you think there are ways we can improve that? Or do you think we should improve that? I don’t mean to hammer you on this one, but we are looking for your help...

[02:16:06] Louis Petrecco
Yeah...no. So, I definitely think community engagement is extremely important with different processes. And especially with how we are doing things and how we are approaching things like public safety and security. You know, Allied is a partner to us,
but I also know that they are partners elsewhere throughout the community and throughout the West Philadelphia area. So, we, again, from my mindset being as the Director and the operator, it is, you know, Allied has been a good partner with us in everything that we have done thus far on campus and is very open to different things. I do think community involvement and engagement is extremely important also.

    How to get around those co-employment contractual issues, is another thing that that is above me. I would not, yeah.

[02:17:04] **Chaz Howard**

    Appreciate your answer, and that is all I've got.

[02:17:07] **Dorothy Roberts**

    Yeah, the same here. Thank you to all of the speakers today. We really appreciate your contributions to this process. Thank you.

[02:17:21] **John Hollway**

    Thank you, Officer Taylor. Thanks, Mr. Petrecco. Thank you, Reverend Howard and Professor Roberts. And I want to thank our audience also for your questions. To the extent we didn’t answer them, we do have them on record, and we are going to follow up as our conversations continue as part of this process. And we appreciate the input.

    We are very much looking forward to continuing this process the day after tomorrow, Thursday, August 20, at 2 PM. The login with this will be on pennpublicsafetyreview.org. And we look forward to posting the unedited transcript of this hearing as soon as we can along—well, the unedited video as soon as we can, and the unedited transcript may take a few days longer, but both with will be posted in the same place.

    So, I guess we will wrap this up and draw it to a close today. I hope to see you on Thursday, and thanks again to all of our participants for your thoughtful remarks and your participation in this as members of the Penn community. The diversity of views is going to make us better. Thank you very much.
[02:18:24] End Hearing 2
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