Re-Imagining Public Safety: Recommendations for the Harvard University Community & Police Department

21CP Solutions

December 2020

Table of Contents

About 21CP Solutions

21CP Solutions helps cities and communities effectively tackle the challenges of delivering safe, effective, and constitutional public safety services in the 21st Century. We empower communities across the country to develop and implement equitable, just, and integrity-driven public safety.

21CP is a collective of national experts, from veteran police chiefs and public officials to civil rights lawyers and social scientists – all united behind a common goal of furthering a new, shared vision of public safety that works for everyone.

In addition to making recommendations about improvements or reforms to policies, practices, or procedures, 21CP actively works with communities across the country to provide ongoing technical assistance and translate broad public safety objectives to on-the-ground realities.

Executive Summary

Harvard University ("Harvard" or "the University") engaged 21CP Solutions ("21CP") to conduct a review of the Harvard University Police Department ("HUPD" or "the Department") and to make recommendations about public safety at the University. Specifically, the University asked 21CP to address:

(1) HUPD's internal policies, organizational procedures, and culture; and
(2) The Department's interaction and engagement with the Harvard community.

Between July and September 2020, 21CP reviewed an array of written materials and information about and relating to HUPD's internal operations. 21CP conducted 24 community conversations and focus groups with over 110 members of the Harvard community – including undergraduate and graduate students, faculty, staff, leaders, and administrators, as well as HUPD sworn and civilian personnel, and Harvard security personnel. The report provides greater detail about the scope and approach of the work, as well as the complexities and opportunities inherent in engaging in such an enterprise during an important and ongoing national conversation about race and policing.

The report makes two primary recommendations, referred to as "pillars," to the University based on our review and engagement with the Harvard community:

Primary Recommendation 1: The University should engage in a community-driven, stakeholder-informed process of defining what "public safety" is at Harvard and re-imagining how it can best be achieved – comprehensively evaluating and reappraising how the University seeks to provide community safety and well-being.

Primary Recommendation 2: As Harvard University explores new approaches to public safety and community well-being, the HUPD and the University should consider more immediate-term changes to better serve the University community. More specific recommendations, detailed in the report, are centered on five key areas: (1) strategic management, (2) policies and procedures, (3) information sharing, communication and transparency, (4) strategic human resource management, and (5) supporting community relationships through administration and management.

Fully detailed in the following pages, this report seeks to provide a roadmap to the University for fundamentally and comprehensively re-imagining how public safety is defined and provided, and how community well-being is promoted, at Harvard. At the same time, it recommends some potential, specific solutions that could more immediately address some community needs and concerns even as the stakeholder-driven process of reconceiving public safety is underway. This effort will require participation and ownership from across the University. As many community stakeholders indicated,

Harvard has the capacity not only to transform the community's experience but to serve as a model for other communities across the country about how to make public safety work better for everyone.

Scope and Approach

Scope

Harvard University engaged 21CP Solutions to conduct a review of the Harvard University Police Department and to make recommendations about public safety at the University. Specifically, the University asked 21CP to address: (1) HUPD's internal policies, organizational procedures, and culture; and (2) the Department's interaction and engagement with the Harvard community.

This report does two primary things. First, it provides a roadmap to the University for fundamentally and comprehensively re-imagining how public safety is defined and provided, and how community well-being is promoted, at Harvard. The primary recommendation is that the University construct, for itself, a process of unpacking premises, examining assumptions, and visioning structures and mechanisms that might more effectively provide the type of community well-being that Harvard wants. The report describes why this process of re-imagining public safety is necessary and how, generally, it may be accomplished – based on the views, experiences, and insights of Harvard community members, including HUPD.

Second, the report provides a set of specific recommendations for improving the performance and internal operations of HUPD. It focuses on a set of significant recommendations that can be effectively and relatively rapidly implemented to drive improvements in how the Department operates.

These two things – imagining new systems, on the one hand, and making changes to the existing system, on the other – could, at first glance, appear incompatible, contradictory, or at cross purposes. However, it is not a matter of choosing one of these broad areas, which the report calls "pillars," to address while discarding the others. The second pillar focuses on things that HUPD and the University can do *now* and into the intermediate-term to ensure that HUPD better serves the University community. They are practical, tangible things that the Department can do within the structure of policing and public safety *as it exists today* to change outcomes, dynamics, experiences, and relationships for the better. In contrast, the first pillar, which emphasizes the need for community-driven collaboration on re-imagining public safety, focuses on the Harvard community thoughtfully, intentionally, and deliberatively *re-evaluating* and possibly *transforming* the basic structures of policing and public safety in order to drive potentially deeper, more dramatic, and more sustainable changes in outcomes, dynamics, experiences, and relationships.

For Harvard to be a model among University campuses and communities nationwide, the re-imagining process must be inclusive of community voices and individual stakeholder experiences. It will take some critical amount of time to rigorously diagnose challenges, consider causes, explore potential solutions, and secure community buy-in for implementing those changes. As this report inventories, however, the University, across stakeholder groups, seems to want to see some dynamics with respect to policing and public safety change quickly. The building of new structures should not prevent the University community from shoring up the structural integrity of the current public safety system. Indeed, because

HUPD is a campus police department, and not a municipal police force, the roles and practices of the Department are different and can be adjusted differently than they might be in a city.

Thus, even though the report's two pillars correspond roughly to the major areas that 21CP was tasked with exploring, we believe that they are complementary – providing the University with a blueprint for long-term, significant, and systemic change while identifying concrete things that HUPD and the University can do to improve outcomes right now, even as the University looks to conduct the hard work of re-imagining public safety.

It is also important to note, at the outset, what this report is *not*. It is not a comprehensive assessment of HUPD. That type of evaluation would consider a host of data, information, and issue areas that 21CP was not tasked with conducting. For example, a top-to-bottom assessment might evaluate use of force and stop data for any evidence of racial disparities, independently review misconduct investigations to examine the quality and integrity of internal accountability mechanisms, inventory and audit a department's data and information technology systems for quality and security, and/or involve a detailed workload analysis to determine whether existing resources are most effectively and efficiently deployed. Although these are all extremely worthwhile avenues of inquiry, this review, per the University's charge, focuses primarily on the relationship between HUPD and the Harvard community and on HUPD's internal dynamics and operations. This report is therefore neither definitive nor exhaustive with respect to all of the ways that HUPD could or should change.

Finally, we note something about this report's use of the term "resources." We use this term throughout the report to refer to the Harvard community's structures, organizations, programs, initiatives, associations, or individuals – any skills, services, and opportunities that any individual or group can provide to others. Thus, when we talk about resources that might address specific community problems, needs, or issues, we speak holistically and broadly about all of the community's assets that can be invested toward community well-being.

Approach

The raw "data" of this evaluation took two primary forms: paper and people. First, 21CP requested and received an array of written materials and information about and relating to HUPD's internal operations – including the Department's administration, supervision, recruitment and hiring practices, promotional processes, training, and internal accountability processes (such as internal affairs). This included policies, procedures, protocols, written reports, files, and some aggregate information or data (such as overall demographic information for applicants to HUPD). These materials were evaluated in light of an array of emerging and best practices and national standards. We detail or reference the specific HUPD-related materials, and the particular emerging and best practices through which we considered those materials, throughout the report.

We separately reviewed the work of the HUPD Working Group, which was established in early spring 2020 to conduct a review of HUPD operations. The Working Group's final report indicates that HUPD

Chief Riley assembled the Group to evaluate and improve HUPD's operations to ensure that the Department can effectuate its public safety mission for the Harvard community. The report notes that the Working Group conducted a review of prior HUPD assessments and reports, engaged with internal and external stakeholders, and assessed internal efforts regarding recruiting, hiring, retention, and leadership development efforts.

Our report is separate and independent from the Working Group's process. 21CP met once with Working Group members to learn more about their process, inquiry, and findings. We refer to various Working Group recommendations as appropriate in this report. We separately reference or discuss a series of prior reviews that Harvard commissioned relating to police and public safety over the last number of years where relevant.

Second, 21CP conducted 24 community conversations and focus groups to capture experiences, insights, and feedback about HUPD and public safety at Harvard. Between July and September 2020, 21CP met with over 110 members of the Harvard University community, including undergraduate and graduate students, faculty, staff, leaders, and administrators from Harvard's various schools. This also included conversations with HUPD sworn and civilian personnel and Harvard security personnel. As this report addresses elsewhere, conducting this work in the summer of 2020 meant that these community conversations occurred in the immediate aftermath of the killing of George Floyd and the national protests and conversations that his death inspired.

Some caveats and cautions are necessary. We selected an initial set of groups, organizations, and individuals with whom to speak – wanting to have conversations with people from diverse backgrounds, across an array of roles at the University, and with varying experiences. Among the 110 participants were BIPOC students, faculty, and staff; members of the LGBTQ+ community; individuals originating from both the United States and throughout the globe; HUPD personnel and staff; individuals with long and relatively short University tenures; and individuals articulating membership or affiliation with any of a number of identities and groups. In most conversations, we asked participating stakeholders about whether there were other individuals or organizations with whom we should speak. Speaking with many of those community referrals helped expand the scope of the diversity of participating stakeholders through the process.

In most instances, individuals wanted to speak with us, making participation voluntary and self-selecting. Consequently, participants were not randomly selected, and the views of participants in our community conversations may or may not be reflective of Harvard as a whole. Additionally, the sample size was not statistically significant. Ultimately, it is fair to say that we know that some important views did not surface simply because only a relatively small number of individuals spoke with us during our process. Nevertheless, small-group discussions, semi-structured interviews, and focus groups are – as countless Harvard scholars can no doubt attest – valid methods of qualitative research:[1]

---

[1] *See, e.g.*, Steven J. Taylor, et al, *Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods* (4th ed. 2015) (describing various modes and standards of qualitative inquiry); Pranee Liamputtong, *Focus Group Methodology: Principles and Practice* (2011) (outlining parameters for focus group research); Gisela Bichler and Larry Gaines, "An Examination

> [Q]ualitative research . . . allows you to identify issues from the perspective of your study participants, and understand the meanings and interpretations that they give to behaviour, events, or objects . . . . Qualitative research is useful for exploring new topics or understanding complex issues; for explaining people's beliefs and behaviour; and for identifying the social or cultural norms of a culture or society.[2]

Sometimes the best way of figuring out what people think about something is to ask them – and the best way of understanding what a community thinks or what it values is to ask members of that community what they think or value. In the same way that a doctor typically begins the process of diagnosing problems by asking the patient to identify and describe what they are experiencing, we – tasked by the University with identifying areas for improvement in public safety – asked members of the Harvard community to identify and describe what they are experiencing.

Although a set of another 24 conversations with community stakeholders might yield different insights or surface different concerns, we are confident in saying that, because we heard substantial enough overlap and common themes across the conversations that we did have, our report reflects the outlook of at least some material part of the University community. As this report addresses in some detail, the process of re-imagining public safety and community well-being must be far more inclusive and comprehensive than the scope of our engagement, and this report, can be.

Throughout the report, we cite, characterize, and sometimes quote stakeholder participants. To ensure candid discussions and to preserve the confidentiality of participants who sometimes shared sensitive or traumatic experiences, we did not log the identities of who said what during our stakeholder engagement – only their general Harvard community affiliations for context and the contents of what they said. Accordingly, this report refers to specific stakeholders only as "a faculty member," "a graduate student," or the like.

Finally, this report does not have all of the answers. We do not have all of the answers. For that matter, it is unlikely that any one of Harvard's many stakeholders alone has all of the answers. Instead, based on our conversations with the Harvard community, understanding of emerging and best practices, and professional experiences addressing public safety in communities across the country, this report highlights some specific, possible solutions that could immediately address at least some community needs and concerns while providing a framework for the community leveraging its own experiences and expertise to re-envision how public safety works at Harvard.

---

of Police Officers' Insights into Problem Identification and Problem Solving," 51 *Crime & Delinquency* 53 (2005) (applying focus group or group interview techniques among police officers).
[2] Monique Hennink, et al, *Qualitative Research Methods* 9–10 (2011).

Pillar 1: Re-Imagining Public Safety & Community Well-Being at Harvard

Key Findings

- **Community members – from students and faculty to staff and HUPD personnel – recognized that the University, like the nation, is at a critical moment relative to issues around policing, law enforcement, and public safety.**

- **Stakeholder views of HUPD are informed by personal or direct interactions with HUPD, through the conveyed experiences of friends or colleagues, in light of prior experiences with law enforcement or experiences with other agencies, and in light of national conversations about policing.**

This review was conducted in the context of a national conversation about race and policing. In the wake of the murder of George Floyd, communities across the country are re-examining prior assumptions about policing and searching for solutions that might enhance justice, equity, safety, and community trust. The Harvard community's views about its police department, and even the views of HUPD personnel themselves, are inextricably connected to the continuing, national dialogues and debates.

Within this context, the relationship between community views about law enforcement generally and about HUPD more specifically is an especially complicated one. As one officer summarized, "we have new community coming in each year, and leaving each year, so we are constantly starting over." This means that some significant portion of the community will always have little to no prior experience with HUPD – and will have views and experiences about public safety formed elsewhere. One student indicated that Harvard has not appropriately recognized the discrepancy that exists for some between how they understood the police before arriving on campus and how the University "wants people to view the police once they're here" as community-focused law enforcement.

Consequently, as several students indicated, negative views about HUPD may be just as much about generally negative views or past negative experiences with other law enforcement agencies as it is about what the police at Harvard specifically have or have not done. A number of students indicated that, while they had never experienced negative interactions specifically with HUPD, they have concerns with policing's role, and therefore HUPD's role, in perpetuating systemic racism, inequity, and disparate treatment.

At the same time, issues more directly related to the Harvard community and to HUPD have clearly heightened community concern. One event cited by a number of students, faculty, and staff was an April 13, 2018 incident involving a Black Harvard student, who was exhibiting signs of behavioral distress, and four Cambridge Police Department ("CPD") officers during which officers "hit the student once in the

head" and "approximately five times" in the abdomen.[3] Although it did not involve HUPD personnel, community members raised concerns about Harvard University Health Services referring callers concerned about the subject's mental health to the CPD.[4] The incident was cited by a number of stakeholders as a "turning point" with respect to views about campus safety and racial inequities surrounding policing at Harvard. As one faculty member recounted:

> The common feedback from [a] broader [part of the] University is that all of the interactions that I've had has been great; that when I met with officers, it was great; or when I filed this report, it was great . . . But after what happened on April 13 . . . , my attitudes shifted.

More recently, a January 2020 *Harvard Crimson* investigation highlighted issues around racism, sexism, and favoritism within HUPD.[5] A March 2020 *Crimson* story addressed criticisms surrounding an HUPD officer's use of force in three incidents.[6] One student, echoing the comments of several others, observed that "those sorts of reports breed justified mistrust" in HUPD. Some community members expressly wondered how a department with internal issues related to race and gender could be expected to police with the type of equity and fairness that the Harvard community demands. The presence of HUPD personnel at demonstrations in Boston in June 2020 after the murder of George Floyd was also cited by several community members as problematic.[7]

Ultimately, as one faculty member summarized, many community members' specific concerns about HUPD have been heightened and underscored by broader concerns about policing:

> A lot of people have had a lot of issues over the years [with HUPD] that have been percolating. It ratcheted up with the April 13 incident, which had to do with the Cambridge PD but was framed within a larger policing dynamic. And now there is the dynamic that we see in George Floyd.

Within this context, there appears to be broad agreement among many stakeholders that policing at Harvard, as it is within the United States generally, is at a critical juncture in which changes and new

---

[3] Memorandum from Roderick L. Ireland to Dr. Branville G. Bard re: Incident Involving Harvard Student and Cambridge Police on April 13, 2018 (April 17, 2019), https://www.cambridgema.gov/~/media/Files/policedepartment/SpecialReports/ChiefJusticeIrelandCPDReport2019.ashx.

[4] Harvard Black Law Students Association, "Police Brutality at Harvard, April 13, 2018" (Apr. 14, 2018), https://orgs.law.harvard.edu/blsa/media-gallery/police-brutality-at-harvard-april-13-2018/.

[5] Ema R. Schumer, "The Old Boys' Network: Racism, Sexism, and Alleged Favoritism in Havard's Police Department," *Harvard Crimson* (Jan. 31, 2020), https://www.thecrimson.com/article/2020/1/31/hupd-investigation/.

[6] Ema R. Schumer and Charles Xu, " HUPD Officer Involved in February Smith Center Arrest Criticized for Use of Force in Two Prior Incidents," *Harvard Crimson* (March 8, 2020), https://www.thecrimson.com/article/2020/3/8/harvard-police-officer-force-criticism/.

[7] Ema R. Schumer, "Presence of Harvard Police at Police Brutality Protest Reignites Student Calls for Abolition of HUPD," *Harvard Crimson* (June 4, 2020), https://www.thecrimson.com/article/2020/6/4/hupd-boston-floyd-protests/.

solutions are necessary. For some, dramatic change is necessary in order to stop the systemic racism that policing can perpetuate. As one faculty member noted, others believe that changes are needed "not because everything is bad, but because times change and people need different things from" HUPD now than they did previously. One officer summarized the views of several other officers, noting, "The old-school approach of policing just doesn't work right now. The University is our customer, so we have to be attentive to what they want."

- **"Community policing" may have been an appropriate approach for HUPD at a previous point in time. However, ideas about public safety are changing, and new ways and possibilities about how to think about safety, security, and well-being are emerging. Harvard University and HUPD must examine assumptions around how policing can, or cannot, contribute to 21st Century community safety and well-being.**

The term "community policing" has "suffered from conceptual confusion in both research and practice."[8] The term has tended to "mean different things to different people,"[9] with "[s]o many analysts hav[ing] commented on the difficulties of defining community policing that it is now a cliché among the cognoscenti . . . . "[10] Although "[t]he concept of community policing took hold in the early 1990s" and has purported to have been "adopted by hundreds of departments . . . , community policing programs vary widely in their approach."[11]

In many law enforcement agencies, "community policing" is an umbrella under which various types of outreach and relationship-building efforts fall. In these departments, "community policing" is, practically, a synonym for "community engagement." Officers are seen as conducting their core law enforcement work and then, separately, participating in community policing initiatives as the volume of calls for service permits.

Many members of HUPD speak about community policing in terms of assorted formal departmental initiatives and informal officer efforts aimed at establishing and fostering relationships with community members. Presentations at new student orientations, educational programs on how to report sexual assaults, and bike registration initiatives were cited as examples of HUPD's community policing efforts. Discussions with officers about areas where HUPD could improve or strengthen its current "community policing" approach often cited HUPD's lack of social media presence as a significant barrier to the Department "telling its story" – suggesting a view of community policing as tied to a matter of better one-way communication to the Harvard community about what the police are already doing.

---

[8] A. Gersamos Ginakis, et al, "Reinventing or Repackaging Public Services? The Case of Community-Oriented Policing," 58 *Public Administration Review* 485 (1998).

[9] Susan Cheurprakobkit, "Community Policing: Training, Definitions and Policy Implications," 25 *Policing* 709, 712 (2002).

[10] Edward R. Maguire & Stephen D. Mastrofski, "Patterns of Community Policing in the United States," 3 *Police Quarterly* 4, 5 (2000).

[11] The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, *New Era for Public Safety: A Guide to Fair Safe and Effective Community Policing* 9 (2019).

In conversations with students, faculty, and staff, many indicated that this type of community policing is not working. As one graduate student summarized, "[st]udents don't buy the community policing framework." One primary issue seems to be that HUPD has used the concept too imprecisely. To this end, a number of students voiced concerns that "community policing" is too vague and seen as a kind of "magic pill" or "talismanic notion" that can address all community concerns about policing. As one student noted, "it feels like . . . [there is] this sense of if we do this community policing right, then everything should be fixed," even though "the transparency and accountability piece" is necessary for "build[ing] any sort of trust."

Another issue is with *how* the community engagement efforts that HUPD has undertaken under the banner of "community policing" have proceeded. Many faculty, staff, and students suggested that community policing efforts – including HUPD's formal outreach and visibility initiatives – are seen as superficial and perfunctory. Interactions with HUPD have not been, in the views of many, characterized by officers genuinely listening to the community to understand their concerns, needs, or experiences. One staff member recounted that police conversations with the Harvard community have appeared to be superficial – with the police "telling you what is, rather than listening, taking your concerns into account, and then looking at solutions." A graduate student went so far as to suggest that, in community engagement interactions with HUPD, "community policing" is a way of shifting blame on to the community such that, if there are problems, they can be explained in terms of the community not doing enough to welcome or partner with the police. "Students do not buy it that the police are friends," explained one stakeholder. "They don't see it that way."

A further issue is that many stakeholders do not see a connection between the Department's purported commitment to "community policing" and the outcomes of its policing. One faculty member noted that HUPD "sometimes feels like an external force rather than a part of the community." A student similarly observed that it does not feel like HUPD is "present with respect to serving students" but, instead, is there "just for enforcement" or doing what it believes to be in "the students' best interests." Time and again, from students, faculty, and staff alike, we heard, in various ways, that HUPD polices in a manner *apart from* the community rather than *as a part of* it.

Even many HUPD officers concede that "community policing" is not working – that, as one officer put it, "maybe [it] has gotten stale or something." In HUPD's 2019 Annual Report, the term "community policing" appears once and only in the discussion of the Department's "community outreach" initiatives.[12] Many HUPD personnel say that HUPD leadership needs to be, as one individual told us, "more up-to-date and in-touch with what community policing is in 2020."

As President Obama's Task Force on 21st Century Policing observed, real "community policing" is not a standalone activity or a set of outreach initiatives but rather a core approach that "should be infused throughout the culture and organizational structure of law enforcement agencies."[13] "Community

---

[12] Harvard University Police Department, *Annual Security Report 2019* 8 (2019).
[13] *Final Report of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing* 92 (2015).

policing" is a "philosophy that promotes organizational strategies that support the systematic use of partnerships and problem-solving techniques to proactively address the immediate conditions that give rise to public safety issues such as crime, social disorder, and fear of crime."[14] That philosophy applies to all agency personnel and activities and is grounded in dynamic police-community collaboration, on a minute-by-minute and shift-to-shift basis, through which the community identifies problems and works with police to solve them.

Many made clear that the adoption of this broader conception of "community policing" may not align with how many within the University community want to be policed going forward. A police department that comprehensively implements community policing "embraces a broad view of the police function rather than a narrow focus on crime fighting or law enforcement."[15] Community policing asks law enforcement to do more than just enforce laws. It asks police to help to identify and address community concerns that may go far beyond issues of whether laws or regulations have been violated. Consequently, though not required by the concept, community policing has often been used to support the hiring and deployment of greater number of officers. Even if more officers are not strictly necessary to implement a community policing approach, community policing at the least requires substantially enhanced visibility[16] – with community members interacting with police not simply when they have an issue but, instead, in an ongoing, sustained, and collaborative way.

A critical part of the national dialogue around policing is whether communities actually want ongoing, sustained interaction with police.[17] Indeed, at Harvard, some students are clear that, as one put it, "safety is not the presence of police."

Issues surrounding police presence surfaced repeatedly in community stakeholder conversations in a specific way: the issue of HUPD officers eating at campus dining halls while armed. While there is also an issue among some stakeholders about why HUPD is armed at all, an even more sizable group of student stakeholders are concerned about why HUPD personnel are inhabiting student spaces and the potential effects that the presence of an armed police officer could have on students with particular experiences or of specific group identities. A faculty member noted that the presence of armed officers in student spaces would be akin to armed officers inviting themselves, unannounced, to a family's dinner in a private residence: "For students, the University is their home. They live, work, learn, study, and socialize [here]," and the feelings about the presence of police in spaces generally reserved or associated with one domain do not automatically translate to another domain. One student shared that a peer had

---

[14] COPS Office, U.S. Dept. of Justice, "Community Policing Defined" at 1 (2014), *available at* http://www.cops.usdoj.gov/pdf/vets-to-cops/e030917193-CP-Defined.pdf.

[15] Gary W. Cordner, "Community Policing: Elements and Effects," 5 *Police Forum* 1, 2 (1995).

[16] *See, e.g.*, Wesley G. Skogan, "Concern About Crime and Confidence in the Police," 12 *Police Quarterly* 301 (2009) (discussing the connection between community policing, public confidence, and visibility); James Hawdon & John Ryan, "Police-Resident Interactions and Satisfaction with Police: An Empirical Test of Community Policing Assertions," 14 *Crim. Justice Policy Rev.* 1 (2003) (same).

[17] Terrel Jermaine Starr, "Community Policing is Not the Solution to Police Brutality. It Makes It Worse," *Washington Post* (Nov. 3, 2015), https://www.washingtonpost.com/posteverything/wp/2015/11/03/community-policing-is-not-the-solution-to-police-brutality-it-makes-it-worse/.

been particularly traumatized by an encounter with an HUPD officer in a dining hall and declined to return to the dining hall after the incident. Other students said that, although they had not interacted with officers in dining halls, their presence was intimidating and unnecessary – emphasizing the extent to which Harvard is "over-policed." At minimum, few students with whom we spoke identified any benefits of the practice, with one student dismissing the practice as, at most, "a PR move."

The presence of armed officers at dining halls appears to be an example of HUPD engagement efforts being identified not only as failing to further positive community relationships but as harmful and damaging to the HUPD-community dynamic. Indeed, HUPD personnel indicate that officers going to dining halls began as what the Department saw as a small way to make themselves more approachable to students and to have opportunities to engage in informal conversations aimed at building relationships.[18] However, where the Department sees well-intentioned attempts to build community relationships, students see the assertion of power or authority and the militarization of their personal spaces.

Ultimately, the issue with HUPD in dining halls speaks to the larger desire among many for a far more minimal presence of police at Harvard. Among many stakeholders, the belief appears to be that fewer interactions between police and community members will result in fewer negative outcomes, less trauma for some students, and, in fact, a greater sense of community safety. Some stakeholders say that the way to address issues with police presence is simply to eliminate police, as this report discusses in greater detail below.

At the same time, some stakeholders who articulated a vision of public safety at Harvard involving the HUPD doing less still saw potential need for the Department to assist in some core law enforcement and violent crime response functions. For instance, one stakeholder recounted that a number of faculty members have received threats of serious harm, including some who have received a series of them. HUPD employs personnel to focus on threat assessment backgrounds and provide consultation with the faculty member and their school to ensure the member's safety, sometimes providing extra patrols or additional support. HUPD similarly provides security when high-profile dignitaries and officials visit Harvard's campus. 21CP also heard about efforts that HUPD has made in the past to address potential hate crimes against certain University organizations. Another faculty member observed that HUPD provides presentations – as many as 100 per year – on active shooter situations to groups across campus and helps to coordinate institutional and facility preparation for such a situation. HUPD personnel have also been directly involved in situations involving violent crime. For example, in 2013, HUPD members were recognized in the greater Boston community for rendering life-saving aide to a Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority Police officer shot in an exchange of gunfire with the Boston Marathon

---

[18] It should be noted that some HUPD personnel appeared to discount the issue of armed officers in student-oriented dining halls, with one member contending that "the fear of weapons is because of outside stuff that has dribbled into us."

bombing suspects.[19]   More recently, in January 2020, HUPD officers, working with Cambridge Police Department officers, apprehended an armed man and woman near the Smith Campus Center, which resulted in a "shelter-in-place" advisory on campus.[20] For some, then, HUPD could do less and be smaller as a result, but the University may continue to benefit from having some police presence available to address significant violent threats if and when they arise.

The issue of police at dining halls, and the larger issue of the extent and visibility of police presence, emphasizes the extent to which the Harvard community's views about public safety have changed and are, like views nationally, continuing to evolve. Twenty years ago, a *Crimson* article spoke of Harvard relying on HUPD "to protect it from outsiders," indicating without disapproval or questioning that "[i]nstead of the security guards found at many colleges, Harvard's police department rivals any city's in its training and powers."[21] It is doubtful that many of the stakeholders interviewed in connection with this review would agree. Times, understandings, awareness, and values evolve. Especially "as an educational institution, [Harvard] is vibrant – there's always change," as one administrator observed.

Just as, if not more, importantly, the composition of the Harvard community has changed. One faculty member observed that the student body is "increasingly diverse, on many dimensions, which is different from what it was 10 or 20 years ago." In particular, the University is more racially and socio-economically diverse by a number of measures than it was even a decade ago. Consequently, the community itself is different – and people with distinct backgrounds, new viewpoints, and particular experiences may very well need different things from the University to feel safe and secure.

Therefore, even if a "community policing" approach appeared best in the past, it has not been sufficient to engender confidence and trust within the Harvard community today. A new path toward a new approach is necessary. As one Harvard stakeholder summarized, there was a time "when public safety problems could be solved personally, but they must now be solved structurally."

- **A number of community members called for the University to revisit the meaning of public safety and to support a dialogue that meaningfully addresses issues of power, race, systemic racism, fear, and social justice in relation to interactions between the police and the community.**

The protests and social activism that intensified after George Floyd's murder have led many within the Harvard community to see the discussion about policing and public safety as part of a larger conversation about race and racism. As an HUPD stakeholder noted, "The issue is about black and brown people and

---

[19] Matthew Q. Clarida, "HUPD Officers Honored as 'Heroes' by Celtics for Role in Marathon Bombing Manhunt," *Harvard Crimson* (Apr. 28, 2013), https://www.thecrimson.com/article/2013/4/26/hupd-officers-honored-celtics/.

[20] Melissa Buja and Marc Fortier, "After Lockdown at Harvard Over Report of Gun, 2 Arrested on Gun Charges," *NBCBoston.com* (Jan. 16, 2020), https://www.nbcboston.com/news/local/police-responding-to-report-of-male-with-gun-near-harvard-university-campus/2063319/.

[21] Garrett M. Graff, "24 Hours with HUPD," *Harvard Crimson* (Sept. 15, 2000), https://www.thecrimson.com/article/2000/9/15/24-hours-with-hupd-pthe-public/.

systemic racism and how people of color have been treated, including by police departments in this society." A faculty member observed:

> Students are frustrated with the current definition of public safety. What is safety, and for whom? There is no feeling of safety for black students.

Several BIPOC students shared their own experiences, or the experience of peers, of discrimination and racism at Harvard. Indeed, stakeholders shared direct experiences, or the experiences of others who they know, regarding the intersection of race and policing at Harvard. As just one example, a stakeholder related the experience of a faculty member who said they were regularly profiled because of their race, with HUPD or security personnel regularly having them identify themselves when entering campus buildings. Not believing that the University or HUPD would take complaints seriously, the faculty member silently "steamed" about it. Part of the problem appears to be that BIPOC on campus do not see that there are mechanisms, at least with respect to issues relating to policing and public safety, where issues implicating race can be meaningfully addressed.

Many say that, for any positive changes to occur with respect to public safety at Harvard, the institution must address issues relating to race in a direct, meaningful, and substantive way. One staff member told us:

> No one wants to have a direct conversation about race . . . . If Harvard University had a town hall and named race as a factor that affects all of us and [considers] how to we come together as a community, that has value . . . . This is the time to have a serious conversation on race and equity. You have to take a leap of faith and create a forum for people to engage on issues of race.

A faculty member agreed:

> The University is uncomfortable talking about race. Harvard has been around a really long time . . . [The University doesn't] like things that separate people in any way. There is a feeling that once you're at Harvard, you're all equal, but people don't feel like they're treated that way. And the response of the University is to create bureaucracy to address problems rather than to create more shared responsibility and ownership over issues of race.

What is required to begin talking about race is to begin talking about race. Even as community members acknowledged that conversations could be traumatic for some participants, difficult for others, and uncomfortable for still others, many shared a clear hunger for conversations that confront race directly and meaningfully.

To this end, the Harvard community would appear to have some built-in resources and advantages that other communities do not: a cadre of some of the nation's finest scholars, thinkers, and researchers on

issues relating to race. As a faculty member observed, "a lot of insights on race and the relationship of race and policing and law enforcement have been generated by deep research from faculty at the Law School, College of Arts & Science, in public health, etcetera." However, at least to date, "we don't implement our own research," according to an administrator. Indeed, there has been hesitation on the part of some faculty who have engaged on safety issues previously but have not seen meaningful follow-through or tangible changes. Going forward, Harvard's leading experts can help vision, structure, guide, and facilitate discussions that might address racial inequities and racism in the context of public safety if there is clear commitment to following through on change.

Ultimately, any discussions about policing and public safety at Harvard needs to incorporate, and take part in the larger context of, discussions about race, systemic racism, and racial disparity – and how public safety can actively assist in reducing the experience of racism.

- **HUPD and University policies have, in the past, seemed to essentially require that HUPD serve as the main point of contact and the primary responders to a myriad of community concerns and needs. Likewise, students are formally and informally conditioned to view HUPD as primary responders and problem-solvers. HUPD personnel themselves recognize and affirm that they are not infrequently called to address problems that they are not ideally suited to address – and that it is some of these types of interactions that may be causing tension between HUPD and community members.**

- **Among many stakeholders whose feelings about HUPD are less strong, there appears to be support for the idea of re-evaluating how the HUPD engages on campus and address community member problems.**

- **Many community members want Harvard University leadership to facilitate a process that re-imagines public safety. This should be a collaborative, participatory process. Many called for University administration and leadership to lead a community process that is transparent and results in concrete change. Communication should be at the heart of this process and is critical to building legitimacy of process and results.**

Many Americans are re-evaluating the role that police play in the criminal justice system and in our systems of well-being. A July 2020 survey found that nearly six out of ten Americans believe that "major changes" are needed in policing.[22] A June 2020 poll similarly found that nearly seven out of ten (69 percent) Americans think the criminal justice system needs either "major changes" or "a complete overhaul."[23]

---

[22] Steve Crabtree, Gallup, "Most Americans Say Policing Needs 'Major Changes,'" (July 22, 2020), https://news.gallup.com/poll/315962/americans-say-policing-needs-major-changes.aspx.
[23] Associated Press, "Only 5% of Americans say police reform is unnecessary," (June 23, 2020), https://fortune.com/2020/06/23/american-support-police-reform-black-lives-matter/.

With respect to the role of police – what police do and how they do it – many say that our society over-relies on police to address social issues that have little to do with the enforcement of laws. Police officers themselves have increasingly maintained that "[w]e're asking cops to do too much in this country."[24]

Although specific information is not broadly available across the country's 18,000 law enforcement agencies, available data suggests that officers spend comparatively little of their time addressing violent crime. A *New York Times* analysis of officer activity in New Orleans, Sacramento, and Montgomery County, Maryland found that officers "spent roughly 4 percent of their time" addressing "serious violent crimes."[25] This is largely because "[s]erious violent crimes have made up around 1 percent of all calls for service in these police departments."[26] "The vast majority of calls [to police] have nothing to do with crime," instead "involv[ing] disorderly crowds, domestic disputes, traffic accidents, minor disturbances, and a whole array of . . . calls where the officer arrived on the scene only to discover nothing was happening."[27]

With law enforcement officers spending a comparatively small proportion of their time enforcing the serious violations of law, they spend a vast majority of their time addressing a variety of "social problems – substance abuse, mental illness, homelessness, domestic disputes, even civil unrest."[28] Police officers in many jurisdictions take vehicle accident reports, enforce basic traffic laws, respond to alarms, perform welfare checks, mediate domestic or neighbor disputes, address noise complaints, provide medical assistance, and respond to individuals experiencing behavioral crisis. Even where officers enforce laws, they are typically non-violent misdemeanors or related to non-violent narcotics possession.[29]

Additionally, officers actually spend a significant portion of their time not directly addressing any of the social issues described above. "Numerous academic studies . . . find that patrol officers – even in suburban and rural communities for which public data is often lacking – spend the overwhelming majority of their time writing reports, driving around neighborhoods" and engaging in activities not squarely related to enforcing laws.[30]

---

[24] Clarence Page, "Are We Asking Too Much of Police?," *Chicago Tribune* (Sep. 4, 2020), https://www.chicagotribune.com/columns/clarence-page/ct-column-daniel-prude-police-david-brown-page-20200904-bmps6mdxzrcmlbipai6s6achau-story.html (quoting Chicago Police Department Superintendent David Brown).

[25] Jeff Asher and Ben Horwitz, "How Do the Police Actually Spend Their Time," *New York Times* (June 19, 2020), https://www.nytimes.com/2020/06/19/upshot/unrest-police-time-violent-crime.html.

[26] *Id.*

[27] Roge Karma, "We Train Police to be Warriors — and Then Send Them Out to be Social Workers," *Vox* (Jul. 31, 2020), https://www.vox.com/2020/7/31/21334190/what-police-do-defund-abolish-police-reform-training.

[28] Barry Friedman, "Amid Calls to 'Defund,' How to Rethink Policing," *Wall Street Journal* (June 13, 2020), https://www.wsj.com/articles/amid-calls-to-defund-how-to-rethink-policing-11592020861?mod=searchresults&page=1&pos=1.

[29] Barry Friedman, "Disaggregating the Policing Function," *NYU School of Law, Public Law Research Paper No. 20-326* (Apr. 6, 2020).

[30] Roge Karma, "We train police to be warriors — and then send them out to be social workers," *Vox* (Jul. 31, 2020), https://www.vox.com/2020/7/31/21334190/what-police-do-defund-abolish-police-reform-training (citing studies).

These general dynamics appear particularly acute at Harvard. As one student summarized, "Harvard doesn't have a serious violent crime presence on campus. It's mostly petty theft and property crime." HUPD reports "[t]he vast majority of crime on campus is property crime (95%)," with most of that crime consisting of the theft of property "left unattended in public areas or in unlocked rooms or offices."[31] Indeed, in 2016, 2017, and 2018, burglary was the most frequent major criminal offense on the Cambridge Campus reported by HUPD.[32] One faculty member noted that, because "the clearance rate on these [property crimes] is very low, [HUPD's role] is more like logging an incident than it is in actually solving something."

Calls for service data underscore that the HUPD's primary focus is not on addressing violent crime. A June 2020 HUPD report analyzed incoming calls for service from 2015 through 2019. Figure 1 reprints an HUPD chart detailing the 15 most common types of calls to police at Harvard. None of the these most-frequent call types – which account for a substantial majority of calls to police – typically involve violence. Some categories, like "directed patrol," the "add[ing of] visible patrols – whether in vehicles or on foot – when and where more crime is expected"[33]; "alarms"; "suspicious activity"; and "unwanted guests" could potentially involve some instances where the presence of an armed police officer is useful or necessary, but the nature of the call itself does not immediately or necessarily implicate that the response of a law enforcement officer is required.

At least some portion of HUPD personnel recognize that the Department does not simply, or even primarily, prevent and address crime. One officer asserted that "the longer you're at Harvard, the more you realize that being a college cop is different from being a city cop." One officer, similar to comments by several others, noted that the particular issues and needs of the Harvard community mean that HUPD is fundamentally different from Cambridge PD and other municipal organizations. As one HUPD member put it, HUPD is "not an enforcement agency" from the perspective of someone who has worked with other city agencies. It addresses a different population with different needs and problems than a municipality. Given the critical dimensions of distinction between campus and general municipal policing, it is, as one faculty member argued, "unclear if the traditional police function is necessary" to address all of the campus issues that HUPD has traditionally been asked to provide.

---

[31] Harvard University Police Department, FAQ, "What's the Most Common Crime That Happens on Campus," https://www.hupd.harvard.edu/faq/whats-most-common-crime-happens-campus (last visited Oct. 21, 2020).

[32] Harvard University Police Department, *Annual Security Report 2019* 56. These criminal offenses, per federal Clery Act and FBI definitions, include: murder, manslaughter, rape, fondling, incest, statutory rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, motor vehicle theft, arson, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking. This included crime classified as campus crime, non-campus crime, and public crime.

[33] RAND Corporation, Better Policing Toolkit, "Directed Patrolling," https://www.rand.org/pubs/tools/TL261/better-policing-toolkit/all-strategies/directed-patrolling.html (last visited Oct. 21, 2020).

Figure 1: HUPD Calls for Service Data, 2015–2019

Yearly Calls for Service by Type and Shift (Top 15)

- On average, the top 15 CFS accounted for approximately 82% of all CFS.

TOP 15 CFS Per Year					
Completed Code	**2300-0700**	**0700-1500**	**1500-2300**	**TOTAL**	**%**
DIRECTED PATROL	851	815	1,007	2,674	23%
ALARM-INTRUSION/OTHER	429	598	453	1,480	13%
FOUND/RECOVERED PROPERTY|	148	355	397	900	8%
MEDICAL CALL	309	256	298	863	7%
ALARM-FIRE	86	236	202	524	5%
THEFT REPORT	40	251	231	521	4%
SUSPICIOUS ACTIVITY	120	208	188	516	4%
LOCKOUT/LOCKIN	121	159	89	368	3%
COURTESY ESCORT	167	60	83	310	3%
ASSIST CAMBRIDGE POLICE	92	70	87	250	2%
MONEY ESCORT	1	229	13	244	2%
UNWANTED GUEST	36	146	62	243	2%
911 CALL ABANDONED	3	159	72	234	2%
ALARM-PANIC	16	88	58	162	1%
NOISE COMPLAINT	127	8	25	160	1%
Total	**2,546**	**3,638**	**3,264**	**9,448**	**82%**

Source: HUPD, "Workload Analysis: Phase II" (June 18, 2020).

Ultimately, then, aggregate data on crimes and calls for service, as well as the experiences of a number of Harvard community stakeholders and HUPD personnel, all indicate that HUPD currently does far more than respond to violent crime or enforce laws, regardless of whether violent or not. These activities – like assisting with a medical call or addressing found property – promote community well-being but may not require an armed police officer to perform. As a result, many at Harvard's campus are questioning why armed law enforcement officers ought to continue to be the first or primary responders to community problems that have little or nothing to do with crime, violence, or the enforcement of laws.

A number of Harvard stakeholders suggested that a vast array of community well-being responsibilities have devolved or defaulted to HUPD largely because the Department and its personnel are always available. Unlike other University resources or departments, someone is always staffing the Police Department. In the absence of alternatives, the only around-the-clock University resource for individuals in crisis is HUPD.

The Department appears to both formally and practically occupy the position of the first, or at least general, resource for community members who need help. One faculty member pointed out that two phone numbers appear on the back of Harvard's campus ID cards: HUPD's and a number for urgent medical care. An HUPD staff member noted that the university community "call[s] the police a lot – it's almost like it's a customer service number." Another agreed: "HUPD personnel have sort of become like 3-1-1 or a general help email."

Community stakeholders recounted some of the challenges with HUPD being the primary response for a host of community issues. A staff member recounted that "[p]olice are called because someone's music is too loud. That shouldn't be a call to the police but a call to a proctor a tutor because these situations can escalate" in the presence of law enforcement. A faculty member agreed that "[c]ommunity members [are] socialized to call police for things that really don't require a police response," for things like a noise complaint or interpersonal conflicts. Another staff member whose position involves significant student interaction indicated that many BIPOC students believe that "if I advocate for myself and people don't like how they're being treated, they'll call the police" – suggesting that the deployment of police to help mediate peer disputes may drive disparate treatment and outcomes with respect to BIPOC community members.

One HUPD member described, and expressed some frustration with, what they believe to be HUPD's challenge under these circumstances:

> There are things that the police do – does it make sense [to have] somebody who is an armed person . . . answer a particular type of call? No. But sometimes the reality is that there's nobody else to do it. At 3 o'clock in the morning, who are they going to call?

For some, the need to end a perceived over-reliance on police leads to, or underlies, calls to "defund" and/or "abolish the police." Different people use these terms in different ways. For some, "defunding" or "abolition" refer to aspirational goals but involve, in the immediate-term, the process of divesting from traditional expenditures on policing and reinvesting those resources in other social and community services that might respond to community needs better or differently.[34] For others, the concepts are more literal and focus on eliminating funding to, or the very existence of, police.[35]

Some community members and organizations at Harvard say that the University should defund or abolish HUPD. The *Harvard Crimson*, citing prior actions from groups such as the Harvard Prison Divestment Campaign and Harvard Ethnic Studies Coalition, "called for the elimination of HUPD" in a

---

[34] *See, e.g.*, Christy E. Lopez, "Defund the Police? Here's What That Really Means," *Washington Post* (June 7, 2020), https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2020/06/07/defund-police-heres-what-that-really-means/.

[35] *See, e.g.,* Amelia Thomson-DeVeaux and Maggie Koerth, "Is Police Reform a Fundamentally Flawed Idea?," *FiveThirtyEight.com* (June 22, 2020), https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/is-police-reform-a-fundamentally-flawed-idea/; Derecka Purnell and Marbre Stahly-Butts, "The Police Can't Solve the Problem. They Are the Problem," *N.Y. Times* (Sept. 26, 2019), https://www.nytimes.com/2019/09/26/opinion/the-police-cant-solve-the-problem-they-are-the-problem.html?.

June 2020 editorial.[36] More than one-third (35 percent) of respondents to a survey that the newspaper conducted said they "favored proposals to abolish or defund HUPD."[37] We heard from some students who echoed the *Crimson* editorial's view that HUPD's "institutional rot goes too deep" to think that specific reforms to the Department will fundamentally change outcomes.[38] Proponents of defunding say that "reduc[ing] the size and scope of police . . . limit[s] their opportunities to come into contact with civilians" and therefore restricts harmful outcomes.[39]

Other community members articulated concerns about these approaches. As one graduate student summarized, "having HUPD go away potentially puts our students in more danger" because the Cambridge Police Department would be the law enforcement jurisdiction addressing Harvard. Another student noted, "I would rather have HUPD than Cambridge Police. There's a lot that happens to insulate our students to avoid having them deal with other elements of their police force." A civilian employee of HUPD indicated that, based on their experience of observing interactions between the Department and the community, HUPD is able to be much more "caring" and sensitive to the specific needs, challenges, and experiences of students than the Cambridge Police Department would be. An administrator noted that "Cambridge PD can't support Harvard because the University is a city in itself," with a defined community, specific needs, and particular values.

At the core of conceptions around "defunding" or "abolishing" the police is a demand to re-examine longstanding assumptions about policing and to consider fundamental, significant changes to how communities provide for the well-being and safety of its members. As the *Crimson* editorial advocating for abolishing HUPD notes, communities must "explore and promote alternative ways to keep our communities safe."[40]

This broader objective or interest is where 21CP identified much potential for common ground: the desire to systematically explore what Harvard needs to do to provide for the safety and well-being of its community, who the right people or what the right resources are to meet those needs, and how the University can establish systems and structures necessary to ensure that community members receive the best response possible. This report refers to the objective and process of systematically examining and considering transformation to the ways that a community provides for its security and well-being as "re-imagining public safety" – even as this term itself is increasingly becoming just as capable of meaning dramatically different things to different people as "community policing" or "defunding police."

---

[36] "Abolish HUPD," *Harvard Crimson* (June 11, 2020), https://www.thecrimson.com/article/2020/6/11/editorial-abolish-hupd/.
[37] Juliet E. Isselbacher & Amanda Y. Su, "Nearly One Third of Harvard Undergrads Favor Proposals to Abolish or Defund HUPD," *Harvard Crimson* (Oct. 23, 2020), https://www.thecrimson.com/article/2020/10/23/college-survey-hupd/.
[38] "Abolish HUPD," *Harvard Crimson* (June 11, 2020), https://www.thecrimson.com/article/2020/6/11/editorial-abolish-hupd/.
[39] Derecka Purnell, "How I Became a Police Abolitionist," *The Atlantic* (July 6, 2020), https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2020/07/how-i-became-police-abolitionist/613540/.
[40] "Abolish HUPD," *Harvard Crimson* (June 11, 2020), https://www.thecrimson.com/article/2020/6/11/editorial-abolish-hupd/.

Re-imagining public safety involves challenging path dependence – the notion that a system, process, or institution is indefinitely constrained by prior decisions or views about what it should be.[41] The process of re-imagining public safety involves a comprehensive exploration of how public safety may be provided beyond the constraints of how it is provided now or has been in the past. It recognizes that no community need be what it has always been and that no solution for a problem will necessarily be indefinitely best.

In most communities, like Harvard, police have a monopoly on public safety response services. As summarized above, social problems and community issues that have nothing to do with law enforcement are often addressed by police. Therefore, a practical process of re-imagining public safety can proceed by considering what the police do, whether they are best situated to do it, and, if not, what other services either exist or need to be built to do it instead. Depending on a community's specific needs, the overall framework for how community concerns and problems are addressed may be different from place to place. In this way, the re-imagining process is responsive to the particular experiences, histories, values, concerns, and issues of local communities. However, common to any comprehensive re-imagination process should be the consideration of whether the involvement of an armed, sworn law enforcement agent is the best or desired response to particular community problems and needs.

As the process outlined in the recommendations below proposes, the process of re-imagining public safety should consider whether particular community needs currently being served via the response of HUPD could be addressed differently – through some other resource, program, office, or structure. Community stakeholders in our discussions identified several classes of community issues that may not require the response of an armed law enforcement officer, such as:

- **Responding to individuals experiencing a behavioral health crisis.** A number of students suggested that, rather than HUPD interacting with individuals experiencing mental health, substance abuse, or other behavioral health challenges, mental health professionals might be best situated to take the lead in responding. Some jurisdictions are adopting programs that provide alternatives to police response for individuals experiencing behavioral health issues. For instance, the City of Eugene, Oregon has for three decades dispatched "two-person teams consisting of a medic and a crisis worker who has substantial training and experience in the mental health field," rather than immediately sending police, to "deal with a wide range of mental health-related crisis, including conflict resolution, welfare checks, suicide threats, and more . . . , " which has been associated with positive outcomes and significant cost savings to the City.[42] Given the size and nature of the Harvard community, another University resource or program could take the lead to responding to calls involving behavioral health issues.

---

[41] *See, e.g.*, James Majhoney, "Path Dependence in Historical Sociology," 29 *Theory and Society* 507 (2000); Paul A. David, "Path Dependence, Its Critics and the Quest for 'Historical Economics," *Evolution and Path Dependence in Economic Ideas: Past and Present* 15 (2001); Raghu Garud and Peter Karnøe, "Path Creation as a Process of Mindful Deviation," *in* R. Garud and P. Karnøe (eds.), *Path Dependence and Creation* 1 (2012).
[42] White Bird Clinic, *What is Cahoots?* (Sept. 29, 2020), https://whitebirdclinic.org/what-is-cahoots/.

- **Student welfare checks.** Faculty and staff in particular indicated that welfare checks typically originate not with concern or indication that a student is violent or threatening but, instead, with concern for the individual's health and overall well-being. For instance, we heard from stakeholders the view that the most typical reason for welfare checks relates to concerns about health in the wake of alcohol consumption. These stakeholders suggested that other, unarmed University staff, available 24/7, could be primary responders in such situations.

- **Noise complaints.** Many stakeholders suggested that police being called to address disputes about noise represents a breakdown in community mediation and collective problem-solving capabilities. Harvard already maintains a system of Residential Deans, Proctors, and Tutors who can provide primary assistance and become more involved in helping to mediate and resolve these situations. Even if they cannot address the issue, the University might expressly empower another University authority, rather than armed police personnel, to respond and help resolve the situation.

- **Alarms.** Law enforcement infrequently identify individuals engaging in criminal activity when they respond to alarms.[43] Harvard might ensure the uniform delegation of initial alarm response to Securitas, Harvard's existing building security personnel.

- **Medical aid.** Some stakeholders cited examples of police arriving when the help that was requested was expressly medical in nature. It may be possible for Harvard to develop more precise rules and protocols for when police respond to medical emergencies, or to eliminate police response to medical issues altogether. If the potential lack of police dispatch might be associated with longer response times, the staffing of medical services could be supplemented.

Stakeholders identified many other specific community problems that, they proposed, may not always require a police officer to address. The potential mechanisms, systems, structures, or solutions that might facilitate an alternative response are likely to vary across the various community problems and issues. At the same time, the re-examination of responses to various problems may lead the Harvard community to conclude that HUPD, whether through existing or new mechanisms, are best equipped to provide the response. This consideration of community issues, possible solutions, and new approaches, and the role of HUPD within that constellation of problem-solving approaches, must be driven by the Harvard itself. This report's specific recommendations, below, provide a framework or roadmap for a community-involved and community-driven process of considering how public safety at Harvard may be re-imagined to include new, different, or renewed solutions to community problems.

---

[43] U.S. Department of Justice, Community Oriented Policing Services Office, *False Burglar Alarms* (2d ed. 2011), https://cops.usdoj.gov/RIC/Publications/cops-p014-pub.pdf.

We note that this report was conducted amidst a global pandemic – one that has quickly and significantly reshaped a number of foundational elements of our personal and social lives. As with so many other spheres of life, universities and colleges have needed to substantially alter the way that they operate and fulfill their core missions.[44] The enduring use of online learning may provide real alternatives to the traditional, residential college model.[45] To continue to attract a diverse student and faculty body to participate in the traditional, campus-based Harvard experience, the University will need to ensure – at the least as a matter of economics and, even more, as a matter of concern for all needs of its diverse communities – that it can provide the type and scope of public safety that potential community members want. The transformation that has occurred in higher education, and the long-term structural changes that may result, make this moment particularly well-suited to Harvard to stepping back and thoughtfully considering how community well-being can be best provided in the University's next chapter.

- **Harvard's current, decentralized structure for delivering services relating to safety and security across University may allow for a tailored approach given the interests and contexts across the University. However, this same decentralized approach creates inconsistent practices, when not explained or communicated adequately to the community, which can foster beliefs and assumptions about disparate services. Part of re-imagining public safety at Harvard would involve thinking about existing University resources differently, and empowering them and resourcing them to serve as the formal, primary problem-solvers and providers of well-being.**

- **Community members recognize that any process of re-evaluating or re-imagining issues relating to community safety and well-being requires wide participation – and should not reside solely with HUPD.**

A number of additional insights from Harvard community stakeholders underscore the promise of a structured process for comprehensively re-thinking how public safety is provided at Harvard. First, we heard from a number of stakeholders that, even as the University as a whole is a defined community, Harvard is significantly decentralized. "Every school operates differently, and the population" among schools and affiliations "is different," which means, according to one administrator, that "there's no one-size-fits-all" solution. As another stakeholder explained, "Harvard bureaucracy is diffuse and very decentralized. Every school has its own governance structure and own policies." Although this can engender "confusion," per one stakeholder, it also provides the University with opportunities to provide specific types of solutions for particular populations.

---

[44] *See, e.g.*, Sean Gallagher and Jason Palmer, "The Pandemic Pushed Universities Online. The Change Was Long Overdue," *Harvard Business Review* (Sept. 29, 2020), https://hbr.org/2020/09/the-pandemic-pushed-universities-online-the-change-was-long-overdue; Alexandra Witze, "Universities Will Never Be the Same After the Coronavirus Crisis," *Nature* (June 1, 2020), https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-020-01518-y.

[45] *See* Hari Sreenivasan and Cat Wise, "As the Pandemic Upends Higher Education, Is Residential College Worth the Cost?," *PBS News Hour* (Jul. 28, 2020), https://www.pbs.org/newshour/show/as-the-pandemic-upends-higher-education-is-residential-college-worth-the-cost.

Second, there appears to be some broad-based agreement – from those who have strongly negative opinions about HUPD to those who expressed predominantly positive views of the Department – that neither the authority nor the responsibility of addressing, or of remaking, public safety at Harvard can fall solely on HUPD. In the same way that many stakeholders are suspicious of internal review or oversight processes as "the police policing themselves," many do not have confidence or trust in the Department identifying, for itself, the appropriate mechanisms for the Harvard University community to receive the type of public safety and community services that it needs. In contrast, broad-based community participation can help lead to a truly shared, credible vision for public safety at Harvard.

Community members also appear to recognize what many HUPD personnel themselves said: that "cops like to keep the status quo," such that "resistance to change" is a continual challenge within police organizations.[46] The type of "comprehensive," "transformational," and "systemic" change that a number of community members said is necessary is unlikely, in their view, to originate from the police themselves.

At the same time, HUPD officers did express what appeared to be a genuine appetite for being a part of change and new solutions – and appear to recognize that the Department's participation in advancing such transformation must be grounded in a renewed humility. One officer recounted:

> I came to Harvard not thinking I'd be a long-timer. I was interested in getting a degree for not much money. I loved the effect that I could have on people's lives doing what I was doing . . . Now, we're in a time and space where you can't get the ear from people to even talk to them. It's overwhelmingly sad to think that way. That's the biggest challenge: Getting to the table to talk with people. We as a Department shy away from tough conversations because of the liability that comes with that. . . . How bad could this go and what will the reaction be? We don't sit down to talk with the community because of what could happen in that conversation. The hardest part is getting a seat at the table again.

Ultimately, any consideration of what HUPD should do to promote public safety in alignment with community values and needs will be most impactful if it involves HUPD. However, providing HUPD with "a seat at the table" is different than seating the Department at the head of it. Among many Harvard stakeholders, for any process that looks at public safety and policing issues at Harvard to have acceptance and stakeholder buy-in, all community members affected by public safety must be able to participate equally in the process.[47]

---

[46] *See, e.g.*, Barbara Armacost, "The Organizational Reasons Departments Don't Change," *Harvard Business Review* (Apr. 19, 2016), https://hbr.org/2016/08/the-organizational-reasons-police-departments-dont-change; Ryan Cohen, "The Force and the Resistance: Why Changing the Police Force Is Neither Inevitable, Nor Impossible," 20 *University of Pennsylvania Journal of Law and Social Change* 105 (2017), https://scholarship.law.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1207&context=jlasc.

[47] In this way, many Harvard stakeholders appear to embrace implicitly at least some elements of a "purely procedural" conception of democratic legitimacy – in which something is legitimate, and worthy of following or obeying, if "everyone affected by or subject to a decision" is "able to participate" in the process of making the

At the same time, community members believe that any successful efforts toward addressing issues relating to HUPD cannot assume that the hiring of external experts or consultants will adequately address the needs, visions, and values of the Harvard community. As Pillar II of this report details, Harvard and HUPD have previously engaged outsiders to examine the Department and to make recommendations for improvement. Some, though not all, of the recommendations were adopted. Some faculty and staff suggested that these prior efforts lacked credibility, even to the extent that the recommendations were appropriate and well-supported, because stakeholders viewed the efforts as insufficiently independent and too removed from the Harvard community. Instead of "the HUPD knowing best" or "Harvard knowing best," it was simply "the outside consultants who HUPD or Harvard picked knowing best."

The authors of this report are outside consultants who are not members of the Harvard community. As previously noted, we do not assume to know best about the particular system of public safety that will best provide for community well-being at Harvard. Consequently, the following recommendations rely substantially on the insights, experiences, and feedback provided by members of the Harvard community themselves – and, in turn, address the process by which the Harvard community can determine, for itself, what public safety and policing should be at the University going forward.

Recommendations

Primary Recommendation 1: The University should engage in a community-driven, stakeholder-informed process of defining what "public safety" is at Harvard and re-imagining how it can best be achieved – comprehensively evaluating and reappraising how the University seeks to provide community safety and well-being.

As introduced above, Harvard should engage in a comprehensive process of re-imagining public safety at the University. That process should be community-driven and community-informed. It should be structured and deliberative. It should systematically consider what public safety means to the community, how it is currently provided, and who or what structures may be best equipped to provide it in the future. In particular, it should consider what community problems currently are addressed by police, whether someone or something else should instead be the first or primary responder or problem-solver, and, if an alternative is desired, what needs to happen to ensure that an alternative can respond or solve the particular problem.

As one stakeholder told us, if Harvard was serious about transforming dynamics relating to policing and public safety on its campus, it would engage in a comprehensive process that is "generative, would push against old paradigms, would be leading rather than following, and would be cross-disciplinary." Our recommendation is that Harvard do precisely that. As another faculty member told us, "This is Harvard," and the University has the resources capacity not only to transform the community's experience but to

decision. Ludvig Beckman, "Deciding the Demos: Three Conceptions of Democratic Legitimacy," 22 *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy* 412, 415 (2019).

serve as a model for other communities across the country about how to make public safety work better for everyone.

This may be a particularly opportune time for the University to embrace such a process. The University is currently conducting a search for a new HUPD Chief. Within that context, it can ensure that potential candidates are comfortable with being one part of providing public safety in a context that could, depending on the outcome of Harvard's process, be different or pioneering in some critical respects.

There are no easy fixes or quick cures when it comes to fashioning a new system of public safety that provides better outcomes for all of a community's diverse members. It is typically easier and faster to demolish than build, to close than open, and to deconstruct than construct. To have a chance of driving new outcomes, however, a process of re-imagining public safety must diagnose, design, and implement. Any commitment to doing this while also committing to hearing diverse voices and incorporating diverse experiences is a necessary commitment to something significant and involved. To be inclusive and comprehensive, this likely cannot be a quick process.

At the same time, we are mindful that, as one faculty member wryly observed, Harvard's "cultural response is to do 'further study.'" Consequently, our recommendations are an attempt to outline a process that is inclusive, thoughtful, and community-driven while, at the same time, geared toward concrete action and transformation. These recommendations are not to consider merely how theories around race, policing, inequality, and the criminal justice system may be manifest or impactful at Harvard. Instead, they are to structure and channel the significant histories and real experiences of Harvard's community – whether personal, professional, academic, or otherwise – in service of designing a workable system or process of public safety that can produce community well-being. In short, these recommendations are geared toward ensuring that Harvard can determine what should change, how it should change, and how such change should be effectuated.

What we outline here is a proposed process. The framework for re-imagining policy attempts to balance the needs of inclusion and participation with the desire that we heard among many stakeholders that change be tangible, impactful, and not take forever as a result of being overly mired down in "Harvard process." Although that may require delicate balancing, our conversations with stakeholders convinced us that the Harvard community has the resources and will to do so.

The recommendations below do not prescribe particular outcomes. We do not know, after the end of a process of substantial community input and substantive deliberation, what the Harvard community may determine about what public safety looks like at the University in the future. We do not know what role HUPD or any other existing campus service may play. We cannot say what lines of inquiry may be most fruitful or what problems may be best addressed by different structures or changes.

What we do believe, however, is that Harvard, like any community, must define for itself how public safety and community well-being is realized and preserved. The following recommendations are a procedural roadmap for how such a definition might be inclusively and concretely developed.

Recommendation 1.1. **The process should be formally facilitated and overseen by a diverse University stakeholder group (the "Facilitating Group"). HUPD should be engaged as one of numerous, diverse institutional stakeholders from across the University community.**

We recommend that the process of re-imagining public safety be led by a diverse group of University stakeholders – including students, faculty, staff, and other personnel. We can imagine, and are aware of, a number of ways that such a group could be determined or selected. What matters most for the process, however, is that individuals of different affiliations, experiences, and views – and who can help represent the voices and experiences of others within the University – help to guide the process.

Specifically, the Facilitating Group should be diverse in terms of including representation across various University affiliations (students, faculty, staff), race, ethnicity, gender identity, LGBTQ+ status, religion, socioeconomic backgrounds, and other relevant demographic characteristics and identities.

The Facilitating Group should be those tasked with taking the lead on the process of re-imagining public safety. The empaneling of such a Group does not imply the Group taking over any formal management responsibilities or assuming express decision-making authority. What it must involve, however, is a serious commitment from the University to meaningfully consider the input of the community and the insights and analysis that the Facilitating Group steers.

HUPD, as discussed previously, should be engaged with the process as one of many diverse, institutional stakeholders. It may be useful to have a Department representative included in a kind of "ex-officio" capacity so that it can be present to provide information about the public safety services that it has previously, and currently, performs. To the extent that HUPD is so represented, representatives of additional University stakeholders who engage in the current provision of public safety and community well-being – such as Securitas, Harvard's security personnel contractor; Harvard Counseling and Mental Health Services; and Harvard University Health Services – should also be included as "ex-officio" members.

This Group should be well-supported, with staff, affiliated researchers, specialists, and/or consultants. It may be particularly useful to have outside experts on public safety, race, and community well-being in the context of a University available alongside internal, Harvard experts on the same.

Recommendation 1.2. **The first focus of the Facilitating Group should be on engaging in an initial, comprehensive, community-wide discussion about what public safety means and should look like at Harvard.**

The purpose of the Facilitating Group is to structure and guide the re-imagining process. The Facilitating Group are coordinators but are anything but sole participants in the process. Instead, the very first effort of the group should be on conducting a large-scale, community-wide discussion about

what public safety means to Harvard's diverse communities and what the systems, processes, and structures for providing for safety and well-being at Harvard should look like going forward.

This major community outreach should not focus on "policing." Instead, it must focus on public safety and community well-being. This will necessarily involve some discussion of traditional law enforcement and policing, but it should also encompass issues relating to mental health, physical health, and general well-being. The discussion must be about how the University helps and empowers the community to keep itself safe and thriving in all respects. This is, emphatically, not to minimize the importance of discussing police or HUPD. Instead, this broader scope of conversation recognizes that far more than simply the operation of police may contribute significantly to a community member's sense of well-being and safety.

During this community-wide discussion, a true diversity of stakeholders must be engaged, from formal organizations to individuals. To effectuate productive conversations and environments conducive to affirmation and respect, the Facilitating Group should consider engaging elements of the University community that are skilled in group facilitation and community engagement. Such facilitators will need to nimbly build bridges, mediate, negotiate, and facilitate so as to respect and face the wide range of views and experiences of Harvard's diverse communities.[48]

The form and formats of engagement must allow for equal voice and accommodate differing stakeholder levels of comfort and/or trauma regarding law enforcement and policing issues. In many communities, "community input," especially on matters relating to police and public safety, has become synonymous with holding "open-mic" forums. Although large gatherings may have their place, "open-mic" sessions frequently minimize the voices of those who are less comfortable speaking or providing opinions in front of large groups and those who are uncomfortable sharing stories of personal trauma in front of such groups. To ensure broad-based participation in which all participants have equal access to giving voice and being heard, small-group discussions or larger meetings that "break out" into small-group environments are likely to be more inclusive. At the least, they will allow for Harvard community participants to spend more time conversing with one another about issues of public safety. Facilitators must foster space to recognize and respect the inherent diversity of views, experiences, and desire of community members that are almost certain to be present. We suspect that Harvard faculty and students have training, experience, and insight on other forms and formats of discussion that can promote or supplement inclusive conversations.[49]

The Facilitating Group should ensure that the community listening sessions are as comprehensive and exhaustive as possible while also adhering to clear timetables – so that everyone at Harvard knows when and how their voices may be heard.

---

[48] *See* John Forrester, *The Deliberative Practitioner: Encouraging Participatory Planning Processes* (1999).
[49] *Id.*

Recommendation 1.3. **The Facilitating Group should provide a report to the University community that summarizes findings, insights, and learnings from the community-wide discussions.**

The Facilitating Group should work to distill themes, values, issues, concerns, feedback, and ideas generated and discussed in the community-wide discussion and engagement on public safety. These findings, insights, and learnings should be summarized in a public report. The report should, as best as possible, inventory and describe specific comments and experiences while also synthesizing areas of common concern and shared experiences.

The purpose of the report is, first and foremost, to distill areas of common group with respect to what the goals of systems and structures of public safety and well-being should be going forward. Where the community-wide discussions identified disagreements, competing values, contradictory ideas, or divergent views, the report should describe this. Where views are harmonious, complementary, or build off each other, the report should also describe this.

Recommendation 1.4. **The Facilitating Group, working with University resources (including skilled faculty, staff, and students), should analyze available data about the role that HUPD and non-HUPD entities (such as mental health services, proctors and tutors, campus security, student centers and organizations, and others) currently play with respect to public safety and community well-being. The Group should specifically identify what activities or types of responses currently provided primarily by HUPD that could potentially be exclusively or primarily provided by non-HUPD university resources. As throughout this report, "resources" refer to structures, organizations, programs, initiatives, associations, or individuals – any skills, services, and opportunities that any individual or group can provide to others.**

Armed with values, experiences, input, and ideas from Harvard's diverse communities, the Facilitating Group, collaborating with University resources and outside experts as appropriate, should methodically consider the ways that current safety and well-being issues are addressed on campus and whether there may be better alternatives for the future. Again, because HUPD has been traditionally tasked with addressing any of a host of public safety and community issues, some relevant part of the inquiry should focus on considering what the Department does and whether some other resource, service, entity, or part of the University is or could be made better equipped to serve as primary or first response to the issue going forward. This will necessarily involve an exploration of current and potential structures, systems, and resources – in the broad sense defined above – to determine how they might meet the University community's needs.

This inquiry can be structured around exploring, with specificity, the following questions:

- What are the community's issues, problems, and needs when it comes to safety and well-being?

- What are the nature of calls for service that are received?
- What does HUPD currently do? What role do they play in responding to community issues, problems, and needs?
- What other entities at Harvard address community issues with respect to safety and well-being? When and how are they involved?
- What are the potential activities and types of responses that HUPD currently conducts that could be suitable for a non-HUPD and/or non-law-enforcement-based response? What University issues that have previously been addressed by HUPD that may possibly be addressed by other University resources, whether existing or potential?
- How would new, alternative, or re-imagined systems or processes specifically function to meet the needs of the community?

Recommendation 1.5. The Facilitating Group should deliberate and provide the University with a report on potential avenues for re-thinking how various public safety and community well-being issues, concerns, and problems are addressed at the University.

Based on the discussions, facts, specifics, and details identified in the processes outlined in Recommendations 1.4, the Facilitating Group can be equipped to discuss and deliberate on how various public safety and community well-being issues, concerns, and problems are addressed at Harvard.

The goal of the Facilitating Group's deliberation should be to develop, and to outline in a public report, the options and opportunities that the Group has learned about and/or developed from the analysis and collaboration outlined in Recommendation 1.4. It should be geared toward fostering community education and inspiring community dialogue.

In this way, the Facilitating Group will have a significant role to play in synthesizing and narrowing those areas in which a non-police response is possible and where other University responses may be possible in the future. The goal should be to outline major opportunities and options rather than to catalogue all possibilities. This is why an engaged, diverse, and well-supported Facilitating Group is critical, and we are confident that Harvard, as a world-class institution with the world's leading scholars and a body of extraordinarily gifted students, can help empower such a Group to outline tangible proposals for transformation that are responsive to community concerns and input.

Recommendation 1.6. The Facilitating Group should engage in a comprehensive, community-wide discussion about the specific proposals outlined in Recommendation 1.5.

Recommendation 1.7. After revising and refining proposals based on community input and participation in Recommendation 1.5, the Facilitating Group should make formal recommendations to the University President regarding the potential program of proposals to be implemented.

As part of this process, the whole of the Harvard community should have an opportunity to review the Facilitating Group's detailed inquiry and the proposals that are generated from it and provide comment, feedback, and additional insights. It may be useful for the Group to engage in a community-wide conversation initiative similar to the sort that began its work – so that as many voices and experiences may be heard, accounted for, and reflected as possible.

After the Harvard community has enjoyed an opportunity to provide feedback, the Facilitating Group should revise, refine, rethink, or add to its proposals and recommendations to account for what was learned during community engagement. After doing so, the Group should provide formal recommendations to the University President. Together, those recommendations should provide a systematic accounting for how public safety should work going forward at Harvard.

Recommendation 1.8. The University should identify a mechanism to ensure transparency in its consideration of the formal recommendations.

In our stakeholder discussions, one issue that surfaced repeatedly was around transparency in the public safety space. In connection with HUPD, many called for "greater transparency" in terms of what the Department does. Typically, this concept was invoked to signal the desire to have more comprehensive information about what HUPD is doing and why it is doing it.

For the re-imagining public safety process to be successful, there will also need to be transparency from the University as an institution on how it will act on the Facilitating Group's recommendations. Especially to the extent that the community is asked to participate in the process of charting out a potentially new and different course for campus safety and well-being, the community will need to understand what of the approaches that the Facilitating Group outlines may be implemented, when such changes may take place, and how this might occur. Although Harvard is not a municipal government, transparency should be promoted as an institutional value.[50]

---

[50] *See, e.g.*, Erick Berggren and Rob Bernshteyn, "Organizational Transparency Drives Company Performance," 26 *Journal of Management Development* 411 (2007); Denise Linda Parris, et al, "Exploring Transparency: A New Framework for Responsible Business Management," 54 *Management Decision* 222 (2016).

Pillar 2:   Short-Term Areas for HUPD Improvement

Recommendations

As we observed in Pillar 1, the process of re-imagining public safety will take some time – and as long as it takes to complete an inclusive, deliberative process. For the process of identifying potential new pathways to providing safety to be inclusive and stakeholder-driven, and for the University to potentially invest the resources necessary to empower and build those new pathways, much meaningful dialogue will need to occur. Especially in the midst of ongoing public health realities, this will require patience, participation, and diligence.

Even as the University engages in a process of discussing the scope, reach, and activities of the Department with respect to public safety and community well-being, there are a number of ways that HUPD can improve right now to better serve the Harvard community. HUPD should proactively be thinking about how its operations can better meet the University community's current and evolving needs.

Primary Recommendation 2: As Harvard University explores new approaches to public safety and community well-being, the HUPD and the University should consider some more immediate-term changes to better serve the University community. These changes will enhance how the HUPD currently operates, interacts with the community and delivers public safety to the community. To ensure progress and accountability, HUPD should adopt a plan for fully implementing these recommendations within, at most, two years and as rapidly as possible within those two years. A two-year plan would allow for immediate changes as the HUPD crafts and transitions to a contemporary community safety model provided in the re-imagining process.

The following recommendations are centered on five key areas: (1) strategic management, (2) policies and procedures, (3) information sharing, communication, and transparency, (4) strategic human resource management, and (5) supporting community relationships through administration and management. The recommendations are geared toward things that Harvard can do more immediately to improve and strengthen HUPD even as community-wide conversations and deliberations are occurring on what the future of public safety should be. The findings animating the recommendations are discussed throughout.

With HUPD currently searching for its next Chief, the following recommendations are specific initiatives and steps that the chosen candidate can take more immediately, even as such an executive can embody and embrace the commitment to re-imagining how public safety works at Harvard in the longer-term.

Area 1: **Strategic Management**

Background

HUPD serves as the primary public safety service provider on the Harvard University campus, albeit supported across the many schools by Securitas personnel. Even as HUPD's community policing approach has been recognized as fundamental to its service, there is broad-based recognition that it must be updated to reflect evolving community needs as well as changes in the profession.

As this report discusses above, community policing may have been an appropriate public safety approach at a previous point in time, but ideas around public safety and Harvard are changing, and there are new ways of thinking about safety and security. Consequently, Harvard and HUPD must revisit their way of thinking about community policing and update their approaches to reflect 21st century community safety.

HUPD would benefit from a formal and systematic process that includes ongoing planning review, monitoring assessment, and revision of administrative and operational efforts in support of HUPD and the University's goals and objectives. Implementation of this process would be assured through an enduring, formalized mechanism to ensure that its activities are aligning with the goals and needs of the Harvard community.

Our conversations with HUPD personnel revealed a group who are outwardly committed to serving the Harvard University community. Members of the HUPD expressed their commitment to the institution and their work. The also expressed an appreciation of HUPD's need to change and evolve in support of the University's mission. The Working Group observed something similar, observing the pride the personnel have in serving the Harvard community and an expressed recognition of the need to engage in continuous improvement.

Recommendations

Recommendation 2.1.1. HUPD should consider creating a diverse, active and engaged Advisory Board or Oversight Committee in support of HUPD strategic management. Adoption of this sort of support structure would allow for a diverse group of community stakeholders to provide guidance, direction, and feedback relative to how well it is serving the community. Such a group should serve as an accountability mechanism as well.
Across policing and communities, there are increased calls for accountability mechanisms to ensure that police agencies are efficient, effective, and transparent in their efforts. As the University moves towards the selection and onboarding of a new HUPD leader, it should consider the creation of a diverse and engaged advisory board. Such a board would allow for a diverse group of community stakeholders to serve as a sounding board and provide feedback relative to community safety and policing on campus.

Notably, there have been previous attempts to create some form of an Advisory Board. For instance, the 2009 Report on Improved University Policing Efforts, led by Ralph Martin, and submitted to former Harvard University President Drew Faust, spoke of the creation of a University Safety Advisory Committee.[51] The charge at that time was for this new Committee to collaborate with an existing College Safety Committee to provide input around policies, and to use campus safety data and general policing information to improve campus safety. The 2020 Working Group Report noted that this committee was never formally realized.

Models for university campus safety advisory boards exist across a number of institutions. Examples from other institutions, including Brown University, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and the University of Chicago.[52]

We note that an advisory board could be established even as Harvard endeavors to re-imagine public safety, as HUPD should be able to benefit from a formalized assembly of diverse community perspectives to help it best serve the Harvard community even as larger conversations about public safety are ongoing.

Recommendation 2.1.2. **Harvard and HUPD should update mutual aid agreements to ensure that they reflect the goals and values of the University.**

Many community conversations raised issues relating to the relationships between the HUPD and external law enforcement agencies. Several stakeholders raised concerns about the appropriateness of mutual aid arrangements – particularly as these arrangements pertain to recent events surrounding recent protests in the wake of George Floyd.

Some concerns specifically centered on the lack of information about the nature of mutual aid arrangements and why the HUPD provides support to surrounding municipalities. Others recognized that Harvard University benefits from these arrangements because they can, and do, call upon external agencies to support and staff various larger events and campus functions.

Given community focus on issues relating to mutual aid, Harvard and HUPD should update mutual aid agreements to ensure that they reflect the goals and values of the University. Arrangements should allow for the HUPD to decline support if a request is determined to be in conflict with University goals, values, policies, or protocols.

---

[51] *Committee Report on Improved University Policing Efforts in Response to the September 2008 Charge from Harvard University President Drew Faust* 9 (Apr. 2009).

[52] Brown University, *Police Transparency & Accountability*, https://www.brown.edu/about/administration/public-safety/police-transparency-accountability (last visited Oct. 28, 2020); University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, *Campus Safety Commission*, https://csc.unc.edu/ (last visited Oct. 28, 2020); Independent Review Committee for the University of Chicago Police Department (UCPD), *Independent Review Committee for the University of Chicago Police Department (UCPD)*, https://d3qi0qp55mx5f5.cloudfront.net/safety-security/uploads/files/IRC.Charge.February.2018.pdf?mtime=1560978496 (last visited Oct. 28, 2020).

We also recommend that the University be as transparent about mutual aid agreements as possible so that the larger community understands the reasons for, and circumstances surrounding, mutual aid generally. Without proactive and transparent communications and information-sharing, community stakeholders are left to make assumptions and share potentially inaccurate rumors. HUPD and the University must be particularly proactive on this front.

Area 2:   Policies and Procedures

Background

Policies and procedures, directives, and/or general orders serve as the guide for a police department's personnel in guiding their performance and fulfilling their obligations and responsibilities to the community. These organizational documents reflect the values and beliefs of the unit and the institution. As a general matter, policies and protocols relative to internal and external practices should be grounded in industry best practices, reflect a consistent set of expectations across requirements, and provide clear and concise guidelines for HUPD performance, including collaboration with community and external partners. These guidelines should be used in training and supervision of personnel, as well as in training and collaboration with key community stakeholders.

Recommendation

Recommendation 2.2.1.   HUPD should update its Policies & Guidelines Manual.   It is possible that an initial update would address updates to core operational practices to ensure consistency with best practices.   It is likely that the Policies & Guidelines Manual will need to be substantially revised in light of the final results of the Re-Imagining Public Safety process outlined in Pillar 1.

The HUPD Policies & Guidelines Manual provided to 21CP is dated March 2003. We recommend that the Manual be updated into a more structured and comprehensive organizational manual.

Many of the supplemental documents provided to the 21CP Review Team (e.g., position descriptions, training, promotional processes) were not formally part of the Manual. In revising the Manual, these kinds of material should be considered for inclusion. The Manual content should include all current practices, as well as all policy revisions and updates, with most recent version dates noted. Additionally, policies, procedures, and guidelines should be updated and expressly discuss HUPD's commitments to equity, inclusion and belonging and, critically, how they translate and relate to specific operational expectations.

This recommendation for HUPD to update its policy manual is not new. A 2015 review by Dr. Brenda Bond, one of the present report's authors, noted the need for a comprehensive policy review and updating of HUPD's manual.[53]

Recently, the HUPD Working Group indicated that, in response to the 2015 call to update the manual, "the Department performed a review of all departmental policies and guidelines, and updated them as needed. The Department submitted the policies and guidelines to HUPA [the Harvard University Police Association] leadership in January 2020 for their review, to solicit feedback and discuss changes." It is unclear why a manual revision took five years. Separately, it does not appear, based on our review, that any updates or changes to the Manual have become effective. If it is the case that some material has been changed since 2003, the Manual – like those of most police departments – needs to reflect the dates of the most-recent revisions.

In considering revisions and updates to its Manual, HUPD needs to ensure alignment with emerging and best practices for campus police agency administration, management, operations, and performance. Some insights may be obtained from directly speaking to campus police agencies, while others may offer insights into public safety practices and reforms. The HUPD would benefit from a review of what is working in other agencies and promising practices with respect to the types of issues that the Harvard community is facing.

While we are intentionally not making an explicit recommendation that the Harvard University Police Department seek accreditation through the International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators ("IACLEA"), we nonetheless encourage Harvard University and the HUPD to review, compare, and update HUPD policies and practices in light of various IACLEA standards. IACLEA can be one helpful resource and serve as a starting or jumping off point for further review and deliberation. In our experience, seeking accreditation itself is a resource-intensive process, and being accredited does not always translate into outcomes that communities want.

Area 3:   Communication, Information-Sharing & Transparency

Background

Our stakeholder conversations revealed that there is a strong interest in improving communication, information-sharing, and transparency, within the HUPD. These terms can have different meanings and value across a range of individuals and groups. Communication speaks to consistent, timely, and problem-solving discussions between HUPD and their stakeholders on matters of campus safety and well-being. Information-sharing facilitates awareness and understanding of matters of campus safety and well-being. Transparency speaks to stakeholder groups accessing and understanding accurate and timely information and data on HUPD efforts, operations, outputs, and outcomes. Communication, information-sharing, and transparency all help to facilitate trust and legitimacy.

---

[53] B.J. Bond & S. Marek, S, *A Review of the Harvard University Police Department's Community Policing Program: Final Report* 5 (2015).

Recommendations

Recommendation 2.3.1. HUPD's Annual Security Report should be less descriptive of the general nature of services provided and include more specific data on the services provided in the previous reporting period.

We recommend that the HUPD's Annual Security report be revised. It should be less descriptive of the general nature of services provided and include more specific data on the services provided in the previous reporting period. Specifically, sharing information about the number and nature of community engagements, partnerships, programs, and calls for service would go a long way with the community in terms of awareness and transparency. The current form is more of a description of policies, practices, and a collection of resources. It is likely that the provision of specific data to the community may be considered as part of the Re-Imagining Public Safety process described in Pillar I.

Recommendation 2.3.2. HUPD should revisit and update school-specific communications and engagement efforts.

Some members of the community remain unaware or uncertain about HUPD services to their specific schools. Although there are inherent challenges of maintaining and sustaining communications across a diverse, decentralized, and dynamic institution like Harvard – including a dynamic and ever-changing population and a diverse, and sometimes conflicting, set of demands and priorities – HUPD should revisit and update school-specific plans and related communications, including protocols for school-specific HUPD and Securitas engagement, along with planned activities through each academic and summer session. As noted previously, the somewhat decentralized nature of Harvard's structure can allow the Department to use the University's various, formal units to tailor specific communications about concerns and issues particularly relevant to the school.

Recommendation 2.3.3. HUPD should consider creating and sharing a data and performance improvement dashboard.

Dashboards are common tools for sharing and communicating performance to audiences of interest. While the HUPD could utilize their main webpage as a source of communicating and sharing information about the HUPD to the public, their efforts should move beyond what is currently available on their webpage to include a performance dashboard.

Such a dashboard can support and affirm transparency in ways that a number of community stakeholders appear to desire. As one stakeholder summarized, if "you cannot access records," there "is no transparency or accountability." Community members expressed concerns about the lack of data and information currently available to the community, which many say appears restricted to the statistics required for Clery Act compliance.

A dashboard can include frequent and timely updates on key performance indicators. The dashboard would ideally present HUPD performance indicators vis-à-vis important time periods (e.g., weekly, monthly, yearly), comparing indicators over time. It will be important for HUPD to identify what the key performance indicators are, perhaps in concert with community stakeholders. Suggestions from the community for other data that should be made publicly available and updated regularly include calls for service, traffic stops, field interviews, and incidents.

Recommendation 2.3.4.   HUPD should work to ensure better and timely internal communication, information-sharing, and transparency.

Communications, information-sharing, and transparency are equally important to the internal operations and success of the HUPD. As noted in the Dexter Report,[54] as well as in the 2020 Working Group Report, there appears to be a significant need for more timely, consistent, and open communications and information-sharing within the HUPD itself.

In conversations with HUPD personnel, we heard that recent changes in human resource practices have contributed to a streamlining and restructuring of internal workings for improved communication and coordination. As one stakeholder indicated, these changes have been positive: "Things like seeing your staff meetings . . . be consistent and transparent around discussions and decision making, including performance calibration meetings, . . . allow for dialogue and trust building."

We recommend that the HUPD build on this progress by remaining committed to full implementation of the following recommendations, as suggested by the Working Group (2020), but updated to reflect HUPD practice going forward:

- HUPD should create and adopt a formal process for how all new policies and practices will be shared with members of the HUPD, and how officers receive training on new expectations.
- Policies, when possible, should be disseminated with background information or an explanation of a new policy/general order so as to avoid confusion or speculation about the policy/order.
- Maintain weekly Senior Staff meetings to ensure timely communication and open dialogue. As noted in the Working Group Report (2020), these meetings allow for guests, including a rotation of the Sergeants and other University stakeholders as necessary to collaborate and provide input on various topic.
- As noted in the Working Group Report (2020), department heads (Administration, Support Services, Operations, etc.,) should regularly meet with their staff on a regular basis.

---

[54] A. Dexter, *Workplace Review of the Harvard University Police Department: Final Report* 26 (2008).

Area 4: Strategic Human Resource Management

Background

The most important asset of the HUPD are the employees that serve in various roles in support of campus safety and well-being. Organizations, in general, look for the fit between employees and the organization's mission, investing in practices that equip and motivate employees to do their best.[55]

Conversations with HUPD personnel indicated a strong commitment among employees to their jobs, the University, and the community. One member recounted, "[w]e take it on ourselves, regardless of the leadership provided to us, to provide safety to everybody else at Harvard," and we heard many officers express what appeared to be genuine concerns about the notion that some parts of the Harvard community do not believe that they have their best interests in mind during their day-to-day operations. Many HUPD employees spend a substantial part of their careers at Harvard and/or with the HUPD.

Best practices in human resource management emphasize six principles: (1) build and implement an HR strategy; (2) hire the right people; (3) keep them; (4) invest in them; (5) empower them; and (6) promote diversity.[56] Many improvements have been introduced in recent years, particularly the formal introduction of a link between HUPD and the centralized human resource system. The HUPD Working Group's report took note of the hiring of an administrator from the University's human resources function to step into a dedicated human resources role at HUPD – with the goal of assessing and improving HUPD's HR practices.

This section highlights a number of areas for improvement within the broader organizational domain of strategic human resource management. We offer suggestions to continue to diversify HUPD, foster an inclusive and equitable workplace for all HUPD employees, and ensure that all aspects of HUPD's human resource management embody and live up to the principles of fairness, equity, transparency, and accountability.

Recommendations

Recommendation 2.4.1. HUPD should create and adopt a formalized Diversity and Inclusion Plan.

HUPD, in concert with appropriate campus community partners, should create and implement a Diversity and Inclusion Plan that guides all aspects of recruitment, hiring, training, professional development, promotion – across all levels of the department, including sworn and civilian personnel. The Plan should also address how HUPD, through its operations and interactions, will help to promote the diversity and inclusion of different voices and experiences throughout the larger University community.

---

[55] *See* L.G. Bolman & T.E. Deal, T.E, *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice and Leadership* (6th ed. 2017).
[56] L.G. Bolman & T.E. Deal, *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice and Leadership* (6th ed. 2017).

21CP heard that there have been sustained attempts to advertise for and hire a more diverse pool of candidates for HUPD positions in terms of race, ethnicity, gender, and identity, and we commend HUPD and the University for this commitment. A formalized Diversity and Inclusion Plan specific to HUPD would further guide this work, especially as it relates to recruitment of diverse candidates to work in sworn and civilian positions across all levels of HUPD.

The need to recruit diverse employees was identified in the 2020 Working Group Report, and we suggest building off that report's recommendations to partner with non-law enforcement entities to recruit diverse staff. In particular, establishing relationships with academic institutions and diverse disciplines may introduce strong candidates to the concept of careers in public safety in a campus environment. A codified Plan can operationalize these efforts.

Some stakeholders noted that concepts of diversity may go beyond the more "traditional" conceptions of diversity in terms of race, gender, and the like. In particular, a variety of stakeholders raised issues about what the best or most appropriate backgrounds or experiences might be for campus police officers given the relatively distinct duties and roles, to date, of policing on a university campus. As one stakeholder noted, the Department "looks for officers and others with law enforcement experience. But is that appropriate for Harvard University's campus?" This is an important question to explore as the University considers a new approach to campus safety and well-being.

We heard from some community members that, like other institutions in American life, HUPD needs to recognize and address issues relating to race and gender, fair treatment in hiring, and equity in training and promotional decisions. Internal conflicts, as discussed previously, have arisen from and continue to influence the workplace as a result of discrimination and bias. We heard from HUPD stakeholders that issues relating to race and bias linger in terms of workplace dynamics. Consequently, any Diversity and Inclusion Plan should focus on far more than the hiring and retention of diverse employees – which, while important, will not help to change the culture to the benefit of existing HUPD personnel and the University community at-large.

We are as dubious of superficial "diversity" and "inclusion" efforts as many.[57] Likewise, we are dubious of vague organizational plans that aim to appease through their existence but advance no progress in practice. Nevertheless, the Department needs a clear, codified roadmap that challenges it and its members to do more and go further, both within the Department and in relation to the community, to promote the values of inclusion, equity, respect, and justice. A meaningful, public plan with concrete action items, deliverables, and responsible parties can be an important way of ensuring that HUPD commits and follows through on tangible actions in this regard.

---

[57] *See, e.g.*, Frank Dobbin and Alexandra Kalev, "Why Diversity Programs Fail," *Harvard Business Review* (Jul./Aug. 2016), https://hbr.org/2016/07/why-diversity-programs-fail; Jonathan Capehart, "Diversity Training Fails Because Companies are Doing It Wrong," *Washington Post* (Nov. 19, 2019), https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2019/11/19/diversity-training-fails-because-companies-are-doing-it-wrong/.

<u>Recommendation 2.4.2.</u>   HUPD should develop a comprehensive Training and Development Strategy for all HUPD employees.

Employee training and professional development is multi-dimensional. Training and development efforts should be directed at the technical needs of different employees serving in different roles, while other training efforts should be more broadly implemented to support a culture of high performance in a diverse and dynamic environment. Here, we offer recommendations across these dimensions.

HUPD says that it has invested efforts in, and made some strides, with respect to training and professional development. The 2020 Working Group report indicates that the Department has made strides in employee participation in career development programs, which include a number of specifically-cited initiatives.

What is less clear, however, is whether the training is part of a coherent vision or strategy for professional development. For example, over the past several years, there has also been a focus on training across a number of community engagement efforts relative to fair and just policing, as the Working Group recounts. Some of the training in that area was provided a long time ago, while other programs may be seen as "one-off" or standalone training that was not part of a comprehensive, institutionalized training and development strategy for all HUPD staff. Ultimately, it seems that training is episodic and somewhat *ad hoc* rather than a part of a coherent approach or plan to professional development.

HUPD should develop a Training and Development Strategy that builds upon what has been established previously but, crucially, reflects a deliberate, comprehensive, and sophisticated roadmap that helps all members effectively and successfully contribute to organization and institutional goals. We recommend that, as part of this process, the "Career and Leadership Development" component of the Working Group Report (2020) be thoroughly reviewed to identify short and long-term actions and/or programs for implementation – although a comprehensive Training and Development Strategy will encompass a broader scope than solely this Working Group recommendation.

As suggested by Dr. Bond in her 2015 report, a formal Training and Development Strategy will serve as a way to help each HUPD employee contribute to organizational and community goals. It will account for common training needs, as well as function-specific needs. It is critical that such a Strategy be developed with an eye toward HUPD holistically and move beyond the technical aspects of training to embrace and support training that builds a culture in support of organizational goals.

The Training and Development Strategy should outline specific ways of leveraging the expertise and experience of the larger University community. Experts in workforce development, adult education, organizational change and management, public policy, social justice, law, and other fields may be available to help development, implement, and lead training. Indeed, such experts may be able to assist in the development of the Strategy itself so that it is grounded in research and best practices in workforce development, training and development, and organizational learning, not merely training for law enforcement.

One issue that should be meaningfully explored in developing a Training and Development Strategy is precisely what type of training both new and existing officers should receive. As we understand the current training approach, HUPD sworn personnel are trained in alignment with municipal police approaches. Although some level of basic law enforcement training is necessary to be a law enforcement officer, in our conversations with them, HUPD officers continually noted the differences between their roles and responsibilities and those of municipal police officers in nearby jurisdictions – and that their training could likely be more reflective of this reality.

For instance, officers might benefit from receiving training on the particular emotional needs and mental health challenges of young adults.[58] Several students also suggested that conversations around cultural competency in which members of the Harvard community themselves participate could be beneficial.

As discussed in Pillar 1 of this report, many Harvard stakeholders believe that community members bring with them different ideas, experiences, and beliefs relative to policing and the role of police in society than HUPD personnel have. Indeed, a shared sentiment was that, in the words of one stakeholder, "There is a profound disconnect of understanding of the experiences of students." Whether HUPD's role stays exactly as it has been in terms of the scope of community problems that it addresses or it changes, HUPD can work to drive better outcomes by affirmatively creating meaningful opportunities for HUPD officers to better understand the specific needs, backgrounds, and experiences of the people who they serve.

Recommendation 2.4.3. HUPD needs to regularly ensure consistency and transparency in promotional processes.

Consistent with the recommendations of prior reviews of HUPD, we reinforce the need for fairness, equity, transparency and accountability in HUPD promotional practices. The HUPD Working Group Report reports that the promotional processes for supervisors of the rank of Sergeant and above were reviewed and revised in 2013. Given that it has been seven years since this review, we recommend that HUPD, in concert with the centralized Human Resource staff, re-evaluate and reaffirm promotional processes that reflect the University's, and HUPD's, values.

Recommendation 2.4.4. HUPD should evaluate, in consultation and collaboration with community stakeholders, its accountability processes.

---

[58] *See, e.g.*, Sara B. Johnson, et al, "Adolescent Maturity and the Brain: The Promise and Pitfalls of Neuroscience Research in Adolescent Health Policy," 45 *Journal of Adolescent Health* 216, 216 (2009) ("Longitudinal neuroimaging studies demonstrate that the adolescent brain continues to mature well into the 20s."); Tammy Wyatt and Sara B. Oswalt, "Comparing Mental Health Issues Among Undergraduate and Graduate Students," 44 *American Journal of Health Education* 96 (2013) (describing emotional and mental health challenges of college students); Kara Zivin, et al, "Persistence of Mental Health Problems and Needs in a College Student Population," 117 *Journal of Affective disorders* 180 (2009) (reporting that "[m]ost mental health disorders have first onset by young adulthood").

On April 1, 2020, HUPD conducted a review and updated policies and guidelines related to misconduct investigations. These updates remain under review with the Harvard University Police Association. The HUPD Working Group Report references the updates and notes that upon approval, the policies and guidelines will be disseminated via department communications and training.

However, it does not appear that the revision process was subject to the kind of community involvement and involvement by rank and file officers necessary to engender trust and confidence in the accountability system both inside and outside the Department. In our conversations with Harvard students, faculty, and staff, we heard concerns about how officers are held accountable for following HUPD's performance expectations. Based on our review of the Working Group Report (2020), it appears that officers also have concerns about the misconduct system.

Accordingly, we recommend that HUPD revisit the entire complaint process from the views of internal and external stakeholders to ensure that the process is accessible, fair, transparent, and grounded in best practices. Any evaluation of accountability systems should be developed and implemented in concert with community members and staff and/or administrators from Harvard University's central human resource office.

Further, we recommend that HUPD identify appropriate data on community complaints and share such information via the newly created dashboard, available to the public via HUPD webpage.

Area 5: Supporting Community Relationships Through HUPD Administration & Management

Recommendations

Recommendation 2.5.1. The University should consider working closely with HUPD and HUPA to revisit the terms of appointment of members in their assignments (i.e., the bidding process) to allow for longer-term assignments.

Many HUPD stakeholders indicated that, while they personally know and have ongoing relationships with the Securitas security personnel posted at frequently-visited campus buildings, they do not have the same personal familiarity with HUPD personnel. As Pillar 1 notes, some community members do not appear to want that type of familiarity or relationship. However, others do or believe that members of the community would benefit to at least some extent if HUPD personnel were not functionally anonymous.

It appears that one reason why Harvard community members have tended to lack familiarity or relationships with HUPD is that the Department's assignments are frequently changed. According to one HUPD member, it:

> Used to be that the same HUPD personnel would attend the same events, etcetera at the same schools . . . [You knew] that's your area, you're going to be there. [It was] easier to be the face that people knew because it was consistent.

Another officer indicated that, when they started, they were "assigned to the same place for six years." Now, however, HUPD holds a twice-per-year "bidding process" in which officers indicate their selections for assignments in order of reverse seniority. One HUPD stakeholder called this bidding process a "total nightmare": "Community policing isn't happening because officers are moving around too much." Instead of being able to become acquainted with the same officers because they are in the same places and doing the same thing over an extended period, the relationship-building that community policing requires is impeded by the frequent shifts in personnel that the bidding process makes possible. Individuals and schools that have experienced HUPD personnel in more consistent, longer-term assignments indicate that they have had consistent and prolonged opportunities for relationship-building, which supports communication, problem-solving, and trust. One administrator noted that, for instance, "To build community, having the same officer at orientation, all the time, really works. I know it can work because it works at my school."

Even as the scope and nature of HUPD presence on campus is discussed more comprehensively through the Pillar 1 process described above, the Department can still benefit from interested community members at least having an opportunity to develop a longer-term relationship with its personnel. The University should work with HUPD and HUPA to move toward longer assignment periods.

Recommendation 2.5.2. HUPD should work to improve, and share information with the Harvard community, about deployment practices.

Harvard's decentralized structure, as this report discusses elsewhere, may allow for a tailored approach given the interests and contexts across the University. However, this same decentralized approach can create inconsistent practices and, when not explained or communicated adequately to the community, can foster beliefs and assumptions about disparate services.

Conversations with community stakeholders suggested a lack of awareness of personnel deployment practices within and across schools and revealed a perception, among some, that there are disparities with respect to the deployment of HUPD resources across schools.

In particular, several stakeholders brought up in our community conversations the view and concern that HUPD deployment plans appear to differ depending on the racial make-up of event participants. For example, some stakeholders expressed concern that HUPD staffing of the Black Student Graduation seemed to differ in terms of size and scope from the University's larger commencement ceremonies. We also heard about perceived differences in the nature and number of officers deployed at Harvard–Howard University events as compared to Harvard–Yale sports games. The sense that some have is that special event planning approaches differ when HUPD or the University believes that an event may draw more people of color.

HUPD should ensure that it has a consistent, codified protocol for making decisions about deploying resources to events – and it must ensure that the processes and principles established there help to further the University's commitment to equity, fairness, and transparency. Communicating and sharing this information about how the Department bases deployment decisions would benefit the community, as well.

Recommendation 2.5.3. **HUPD should consider how it might integrate existing campus community resources into its current deployment and response approaches.**

Even as the comprehensive process of re-imagining public safety proceeds in the way described in Pillar 1, HUPD can be in a position – right now – to partner with other, existing campus resources to serve as the primary or first response to particular issues or calls for service. In particular, the Department could collaborate more closely with Counseling and Mental Health Services on new ways of addressing calls involving individuals in behavioral health crisis and with Securitas on addressing alarms and building theft issues. We note here that enhanced collaboration and training among, and between, HUPD and Securitas would likely be beneficial across a host of functions.

Especially under the current public health circumstances, when the population of individuals actively present on Harvard's campuses is low, HUPD may have the opportunity and resources to examine more immediate-term changes in the way that it partners with other University resources to respond to community issues. Although this should not replace Pillar 1's community-driven process, we suspect that the Department can help drive renewed and closer collaboration with existing University structures to permit a broader array of first or primary response to community problems.

Recommendation 2.5.4. HUPD should develop tangible initiatives aimed at responses to external visitors or members of the surrounding community.

A number of stakeholders expressed particular concern about how HUPD interacts with individuals who interact with Harvard are not members of the University community (such as members of the homeless community, visitors to Harvard, and the like). One of our interviewees recounted that "[t]here have been observations of hostile encounters with outsiders, particularly around Harvard Square and HUPD makes students feel unsafe and make students more nervous about how police do their work in Harvard Square."

While the Working Group Report (2020) noted improvements in officer-community interactions (through the distribution of officer business cards, the provision of training for officers on asking for identification, and other initiatives), community concerns relative to HUPD's interaction with the community beyond Harvard have remained.   Incoming HUPD leadership, along with an interdisciplinary group of University stakeholders, should prioritize relationships between HUPD and the external community and identify ways in which these interactions are improved upon.

Matthew Barge
Brenda Bond-Fortier
Ronald L. Davis

21CP Solutions