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Introduction

Brown University engaged the Bratton Group, LLC of New York City to conduct a thorough assessment of the Brown University Police and Security Department and to prepare a plan of action for the department, detailing specific recommendations for improvement and change.

The University administration had already implemented a series of measures to counteract a upsurge in street crime around the campus during the Fall semester of the past academic year, including having its own police officers and security officers work overtime hours, retaining Sterling Investigations to provide additional security guards on the perimeter of the Brown campus, and funding overtime details for four Providence police officers to patrol the campus streets in the evening hours. Estimated to be costing the University approximately $1 million per year, these measures have proved effective in the short term, with the number of robbery incidents since their implementation declining sharply. There has not been a Brown-related robbery since February 12, 2002.

The goal of The Bratton Group study was to identify lasting, long-term solutions to safety problems at Brown while retaining the free and open character of the Brown campus and community. As an urban campus, Brown presents a considerable challenge in this regard because it is crossed or abutted by more than 20 city streets that are vehicle and pedestrian thoroughfares. Thayer Street, which runs through the campus for a distance of some 12 blocks, is itself an entertainment and dining destination for people from throughout Providence and beyond. Consequently, there are always strangers moving on these streets and on the campus. In effect, the perimeter of the Brown campus
is everywhere. Effective police and security work in this environment must exhibit a high tolerance for outsiders and diversity while maintaining alertness for dangerous disorderly behavior and for individuals who would perpetrate crimes.

The Bratton Group approached this study from two different vantage points. First, we examined closely the operations of the Brown Police and Security Department. This effort included interviews with most employees of the department and all but one of the actively serving police officers. Second, we sampled a wide variety of campus and off-campus opinion in interviews, focus groups, and open forums to identify important issue areas and to learn about campus perspectives on crime, safety, and police service. The views expressed in these meetings are briefly summarized in Appendix A: Summary of Interviews and Meetings.

This report is divided into two parts. Part I presents A Plan of Action for Improving the Brown University Police and Security Department and Safety-Related Services on the Brown Campus. Part II discusses The Pros and Cons of Arming the Brown Police and makes recommendations for a staged arming of Brown police officers. The recommendations in Part I are not contingent upon the arming recommendations and could be adopted whether the University decides to go forward with arming or not. Yet, the Bratton Group believes that some of these recommendations, especially the recommendations designed to improve patrol and investigative responses to street crime, will not be nearly as effective if implemented using unarmed officers.

There are really three options open to Brown University if it wants to do a better job of controlling crime on surrounding streets:

1) Some variation on the status quo, with Brown paying for additional security and armed Providence Police overtime details.

2) Implementation of The Bratton Group Plan of Action for greater patrol presence, better tracking and investigation of crime patterns, better coordination of the Brown and Providence police departments, a foot patrol presence on Thayer Street, and improved transportation services. These
recommendations will help both to deter crime and assist the Providence Police to be more effective in responding to emerging crime patterns. Under this option, the Brown Police would not arm and would continue what The Bratton Group views as the unworkable policy of disengagement.

3) Arm the Brown Police and discontinue the policy of disengagement while implementing the Plan of Action. Authorize and equip Brown Police to manage the streets around Brown as well as the campus property. This option would necessitate arming because it would also require that Brown Police arrest armed perpetrators, pursue fleeing felons, make car stops, and perform other street policing functions.

The decision to arm or not to arm is, in effect, the choice between options 2 and 3. Either option moves toward more effective management and control of the streets around Brown, but option 2 leaves the University far more dependent on the Providence Police Department. Option 3 gives Brown greater control and a greater ability to suppress street crime with its own team of officers in cooperation with the Providence Police.

As police managers, The Bratton Group believes very strongly in the management and control of crime in geographic areas. Our recommendations for mapping and analyzing crime are designed to give police a better understanding of how a crime problem is developing in space and time and to prompt an effective police response, through patrol and investigative initiatives, to the problem as a whole. We would contend that if we cannot make the streets next to the campus safe, we cannot make the campus safe. Our team, including two non-police members, three attorneys (one of whom is the former president of Handgun Control), and former police executives with a wide range of experience in different law enforcement venues, voted unanimously for arming the Brown police to equip them for the broader role of policing College Hill and not just Brown property. But the choice is Brown’s: Does the University want a police department that takes on street policing responsibilities or not? And if it does not, how does it propose to manage street crime problems that develop in the future?
Part I

Plan of Action for

the Brown University Police and Security Department

and Safety-Related Services on the Brown Campus

The Bratton Group identified a range of recommendations for improvement in the operations of the Brown University Police and Security Department. Most of these recommendations concern internal department reforms but some involve better coordination among the Brown Police and Security Department, the Providence Police Department, and the Department of Public Safety at the Rhode Island School of Design, the three main entities providing police and security protection on College Hill. The consultants also made recommendations for improving the Shuttle, Escort, and Safewalk services and improving the climate on Thayer Street. The recommendations are grouped by category below.

Recommendations for Restructuring the Police and Security Department

To clarify roles, streamline operations, and fix accountability for results, The Bratton Group recommends the following reorganization of the Police and Security Department, which should be renamed the Brown University Department of Public Safety.

- Reduce the current line operation and administrative subdivisions from six to four: the Community Policing Bureau; the Operations Support Bureau; the Special Services Bureau; and the Parking Bureau (See proposed organizational chart on the following page).

- Rename the Line Operations Bureau the Community Policing Bureau. Assign two lieutenants to serve as tour commanders in charge of all operations and working flexible and overlapping tours.
• Assign a detective sergeant to manage the Investigative Unit. Crime analysis, the preparing of weekly incident reports, and the preparation of reports to the Brown community about crime should be handled by this unit.

• Combine the Access Control function and the Communications function in a single location. The preferred location for this new Communications Center would be the Brown University Police and Security Headquarters building, where Communications personnel can serve a third role of reception for inquiries from the broader community.

• Expand the responsibility of the lieutenant commanding the Operations Support Bureau to include oversight and accountability for the newly established Communications Center. (Utilization and specific duties of the current management team and support personnel should be reengineered and clearly articulated by a committee established and directed by the Chief of Police).

• Expand the Special Services Bureau to include a Special Victims Section to handle the especially sensitive issues of sexual assault and domestic violence on campus. The Special Services Bureau should be reengineered and managed by a supervisor, preferably a woman with a police investigative background. This unit should have the clearly defined role of providing advice and counsel to students who are victims of sexual assault or domestic violence. As an important component of community outreach, the Crime Prevention function should also be managed and expanded as part of the Special Services Bureau. Remaining in the Special Services Bureau, the Shuttle, Escort, and Safewalk programs should be reengineered, expanded, and managed by an experienced police supervisor.

• Appoint a supervisor whose primary assignment will be to provide and manage all aspects of training. This supervisor can function as a back-up patrol supervisor to maintain currency with patrol and provide extra coverage.
Recommendations for Management, Deployment, and Supervision of Patrol

These recommendations seek to achieve a more visible, active, approachable police patrol presence on the Brown campus and surrounding streets.

- Establish clear and explicit post descriptions that describe in detail the geographic area, the functions, and the responsibilities of each post. Current post and duties descriptions are sketchy or non-existent, leaving patrol patterns up to the discretion of the patrolling officer. Post designations are ambiguous: Some officers and reports use post numbers, e.g. 611, while others describe the same area using names, e.g. Alpha Post.

- Vary police patrol modes. Instead of doing mostly car patrol, as is currently the case, police officers should perform more foot patrol and bicycle patrol, especially during the day. Foot and bicycle patrol would create a more visible and accessible on-campus police presence. Security officers do the bulk of foot and bike patrol now.

- Staff an overlapping shift. Study the distribution of calls for service and crime occurrences by time of day and day of week and seek to provide a swing shift, perhaps between 7:00 p.m. and 3:00 a.m., instead of nearly equal distribution of personnel over three shifts, as is done now.

- Require shift supervisors (sergeants) to spend the majority of their time on patrol. They should be responding to calls, directing the performance of police and security officers, and as much as possible, providing an additional visible patrol presence.

- Require police and security officers to maintain activity logs of daily patrol activities that can be reviewed by supervisors patrolling in the field.

- Establish a simple Field Interview form that police officers and security officers will prepare each time they stop an individual or make an ID check. The information should be entered into a database, and a supervisor designated by the chief should conduct a periodic, documented review of the data.

- Discontinue regular security-officer patrol through student residence halls, directing foot patrol to outside areas and public building areas instead. Although these patrols were established as a well-intentioned community policing initiative, most students interviewed consider residence hall patrol to be unnecessary and overly intrusive into student life. The Bratton Group observes that regular residence hall patrol is also no longer needed to protect against intruders in residence halls because the electronic card access systems now protecting these buildings have cut dramatically both the number of intruders in residence halls and the number of thefts from residence halls.
Formalize relations between police and security personnel and the graduate student community directors who live and have supervisory functions in many residence halls. These formalized relations can serve as an alternative to residence hall patrol for keeping police and security informed about and connected to residence hall life. Assign Police Officer/Security Officer teams on each shift to each residence hall to maintain ongoing relations, meeting frequently with the graduate student community directors and undergraduates and responding to incidents in the residence halls requiring police or security action. The community directors report that they sometimes need police authority to back them up in resolving situations and disputes.

Review the practice of having police and security officers lock up buildings in the evening hours and unlock them for special events. Could Facilities Management personnel perform these functions more efficiently, freeing security officers for visible outdoor patrol? Review and improve the protocols under which buildings are unlocked at night for special functions and relocked when the function is over. Staff and faculty members report great confusion about how this is done and considerable lapses in security, including buildings left open and unguarded for hours at a time.

Construct attractive, well-lit, well-marked, heated Police and Security booths on each of the three major foot posts on the university campus where foot patrol officers can go to make out a report, use the telephone, and briefly get out of the weather. These facilities should include exterior mounted emergency phones connecting to the communication center. These facilities might also be equipped with a green roof light that is illuminated when the booth is occupied.

**Recommendations for the Management of Detective Investigations**

Effective investigations are a critically important part of an overall strategy for responding to street crime conditions and to waves of street crime caused by pattern criminals. It is a tenet of law enforcement expressed in the phrase “modus operandi” that street criminals often commit robberies in the same manner, using the same weapon(s) and sometimes the exact same words, until they are arrested in the act, identified and apprehended, or become aware that they are being sought by investigators. Staff and faculty members who have been around the University for some time report that crime at Brown tends to come in waves, with a series of car break-ins in one year or series of robberies in another. This is probably because a relative handful of individuals have somehow learned about the ripe opportunities for crime on College Hill and are taking advantage of those opportunities. Good investigative work can often identify and
apprehend these one- and two-man crime waves before they do too much damage to community life.

Significant changes are necessary to bring effective detective work to College Hill. Under the current practice, the Providence Police Department assigns one detective to investigate crimes on the East Side of Providence, including the violent crimes occurring near the Brown and RISD campuses. This detective is also called upon to perform other, higher priority duties such as investigating homicides and shootings in other parts of the East Side and the rest of the city.

The detective unit at the Brown University Police and Security Department consists of two detectives. One has been an investigator for more than four years and the other for less than one year. Both impressed The Bratton Group as dedicated employees who are eager to perform the role of detective and equally enthusiastic about their professional development. These detectives have a good working relationship with the Providence Police Department and are able to access criminal records, photos, and other investigative resources. However, the responsibility and control for the investigation of most street crimes, and all violent street crimes, lies solely with the Providence Police Department. Brown detectives depend on good will and the availability of the designated Providence detective to follow up on the street crime cases on College Hill.

Under the current practice, the Brown detectives do not systematically receive all follow-up investigative reports for crimes occurring on College Hill. Brown detectives also depend on notifications from the Providence Police Department to learn about crimes committed on College Hill that have been reported to a Providence police officer. Although this ad hoc system works reasonably well most of the time, important crime-solving information sometimes falls between the cracks, leaving Brown detectives with an incomplete picture of emerging crime patterns.

Formerly supervised by a captain who retired recently, Brown detectives now report directly to the Chief. Many of the following recommendations have already been
communicated to the Chief, who recognizes the need for enhancing the investigative function.

- Introduce an Investigative Case Assignment and Management system that allows supervisors to discern immediately how many cases are being investigated, broken down by category, including a category of cases that are being investigated primarily by the Providence Police Department. The system will allow supervisors to immediately discern how many cases, involving what types of crime, are assigned to each investigator, as well as the status of all active investigations and closed cases. A copy of this proposed Investigative Tracking and Case Management System will be provided to the Chief. Although a new computerized record management system may be developed sometime in the near future, effective case management should be implemented immediately, with or without computerization.

- Request the Providence Police Department to assign a designated investigator to work exclusively on all reported crimes in the College Hill area with proposed boundaries of North Main Street on the West; Lloyd Avenue on the North; Governor Street on the East; and John Street on the South. This investigator would work cooperatively with Brown detectives in following up on all past crimes. The investigator would be the conduit for providing timely accurate information about conditions in the rest of Providence to the Brown Police and RISD security.

- Negotiate a memorandum of understanding with the Providence Police Department designating Brown detectives as having primary responsibility for the investigation of specific categories of crimes from start to finish. Under this procedure all follow-up investigative reports would be shared between the two departments. A change in policy and practice in this area will prevent duplicative investigative efforts while allowing the Brown University detectives to function as a full-fledged investigative unit.

- Instruct Brown detectives and the designated Providence detective to conduct documented debriefing interviews of people arrested by uniformed officers for crimes committed in the College Hill area. For example a bike thief, a trespasser, or a breaking-and-entering suspect would be debriefed about where stolen property can be fenced, any knowledge he may have about other people committing crimes on College Hill, and other crimes the arrestee may have committed himself.

- Hire a Detective Sergeant, preferably a person with an investigative supervisory background in a municipal police agency. This investigative supervisor could perform other duties, including ensuring that all crime incident data is received in a systematic and timely way, preparing weekly crime statistics reports, overseeing
crime analysis, and taking responsibility for the dissemination of crime alert information through the Brown e-mail system.

- In cooperation with the Providence Police Department, connect the Brown University Police and Security Department detective office by computer link (with restricted access) to Providence Police Department databases, including all crime reporting files, criminal identification files, and digital photo files. This would allow Brown detectives to research criminal suspects directly from their office and to show victims and witnesses digital photo arrays to identify perpetrators.

- If arming all Brown police officers is not adopted as a matter of policy, authorize Brown detectives to carry firearms on certain special assignments such as executing search warrants and making apprehensions off campus.

**Recommendations for Crime and Incident Reporting and Analysis**

Two critical elements in an effective response to street crime are accurate and complete reporting of crime incidents and intensive analysis of these incidents to identify emerging crime patterns. For the Brown Police and Security Department to perform these functions effectively, officers must to be trained to take more complete and thorough crime reports, and systems must be put in place to ensure that all relevant crime data is captured and displayed on weekly crime reports and computer pin maps.

The increase of violent crimes, specifically robbery and aggravated assaults, occurring on or near the campus at the start of the academic semester in September of 2001 was originally reported to have been dramatic; from 2 to 21 or a 900 percent increase compared to the same period in the previous year. Subsequent further analysis showed that that actual increase was significantly less, from 9 to 19 for the entire calendar year 2001. This mistaken analysis highlights the need for complete and accurate information delivered in a systematic and timely fashion. Brown police should have a copy of every crime report being reported to the Providence Police Department for crimes occurring in the College Hill area. Ideally, the transfer of this data would be done electronically. Until that is possible, the Providence Police Department should be requested to allow a Brown officer to review all incident reports received every day and to secure copies of all reports covering a defined area on College Hill.
• Establish a new standard crime and incident report form to be carried by all police and security officers on duty. Train police officers in debriefing victims and witnesses, in gathering as much information as possible, and in writing complete reports of all crime incidents.

• With the approval of the Providence Police Department, authorize Brown Police to take crime reports and traffic accident reports on the forms used by Providence Police Department. Negotiate a detailed memorandum of understanding between Brown University and the Providence Police Department on how these reports will be taken and forwarded to the Providence Police, preventing unnecessary duplication of police effort, sparing victims inconvenience, and making it more likely that victims will report crimes.

• Develop a weekly crime and incident report that displays all crime incidents and other important incidents. Draw on Providence and RISD data about all crimes and important incidents on College Hill, not just those reported to Brown University Police and Security. Incidents, arrests, and other activities should be reported by category in a table format showing current week and previous week; last four-week period and previous four-week period (starts 8 weeks back) and percentage change. The table should also display the data year-to-date (YTD) current year, year-to-date previous year, and the percentage change (See sample format for this report on the following page).

• Working with geo-coding experts at Brown, computer map all crime and incident data and other relevant data for the entire College Hill area. When pin-mapping categories of crimes, each crime category should have a separate symbol. For example, circles might represent all robberies, squares might represent all assaults, and bikes icons might represent all bike thefts. Time of occurrence should also be standardized. For example, all day tour incidents might be blue symbols, incidents occurring between 3:00 PM and 11:00 PM might be red symbols, and incidents occurring between 11:00 PM and 7:00 AM might be green symbols. Maps of this type are extremely useful in identifying crime patterns.

**Recommendations for Coordination with Providence Police Department and the Public Safety Department at the Rhode Island School of Design**

Once timely, accurate crime and incident data and computer maps of this data are available, they should be used to drive bi-weekly strategy sessions that bring together the three police and security departments operating on College Hill: the Providence Police Department, the Brown Police and Security Department, and the RISD Public Safety Department. Both the Colonel in charge of the Providence Police Department and the
Public Safety Director at RISD have expressed an interest in having their organizations participate in these strategy sessions.

Crime strategy meetings of this type are modeled on the NYPD’s COMPSTAT process that helped to cut crime in New York City by more than 60 percent. Strategy meetings for College Hill would be run by the Brown Chief, the RISD Public Safety Director, and a Providence Police Department area commander.

- Convene regular biweekly planning and strategy meetings attended by the chief of Brown Police and Security, the captain (when this job is filled), the Brown tour commanders, the Brown investigative sergeant, the Director of Public Safety and other personnel from RISD, and, with concurrence of the Providence Police Chief, the designated captain, area patrol supervisor, investigative supervisor, and detective assigned to College Hill.

- At the meetings, review incident reports and mapped data, identify patterns and problem areas, and make plans for adjusting patrol assignments and engaging in other problem solving activities. Maintain a record of action items assigned to team members for review at the next biweekly meeting.

- Have pin map projections of current crime information available for discussion, with the capability to move from crime category to crime category and from location to location on projected maps. The necessary sophisticated geo-coding and computer mapping technology and capability are available at the University. All that is required is a systematic method for importing accurate and timely crime and incident data into existing Arc View mapping programs. The pin maps serve as an aid to focus discussions from the general to the specific. The focus of discussion at the meetings should be on current, unsolved crimes or police conditions, including the specific details of individual crimes.

- Tour commanders should be able to report in detail on crimes occurring on their respective tours, other conditions, and strategies and plans to deal with problems.

- The detective supervisor should discuss specific details of what has been done in the investigation of active cases, especially those that may be part of a pattern.

- Other participants should be encouraged to make recommendations or share information that they may have.
Recommendations for Improvements in the Management of Sex Assault and Domestic Violence Cases

Student counselors and other activists at the Brown Women’s Center urged significant improvements to the management of services for victims of sexual assault and domestic violence at Brown. It was their strongly held view that the real threats to the physical safety of Brown students do not come from street crime but from the unrestrained and sometimes violent behavior of fellow students in sexual and personal relationships. They reported that the services now available for victims of sexual assault and domestic violence are poorly coordinated, resulting in the “re-victimization” of some victims as they are asked to repeat the story of their experience to multiple officials and counselors.

None of the student counselors at the Women’s Center has a close working relationship with the Brown Police. Some do advocacy work off-campus for victims of domestic violence in the Providence community. They complimented the relationships that have developed between the Providence Police Department and victim advocates at local shelters and expressed the hope that they could work with the Brown Police in similar ways on campus.

All Brown police recruit officers receive training in domestic violence and sexual assault in required police academy curricula and all have completed a recent two-hour domestic violence training session. There is a clear procedure for immediate police notification of Psychological Services in cases of domestic violence and sex crimes.

Some Student Life staff members observed that the police have taken on more responsibility in recent years in sexual assault and domestic violence cases and in other areas of student life. The Brown Police and Security Department is not currently structured to manage this growing set of responsibilities. Nobody in the department “owns” domestic violence or sex crime cases. They are handled by first responders and followed up by detectives in the same manner as other crimes.

- Designate a manager and investigator in the Brown University Police and Security Department as the Special Victims Coordinator responsible for all police contact (after first responders) with victims and all follow-up investigations of sex assaults and domestic violence cases. This Special Victims Coordinator would operate separately from the Brown detective unit. While qualified to conduct investigations (and perhaps a retired detective), the Special Victims Coordinator would not be a uniformed member of the Police and Security Department.

- Expand the Brown Police and Security Department Special Services Bureau, which now manages department community outreach and the student-run Shuttle and Escorts Services. The Special Services Bureau would now include the Special Victims Section as a sub-unit. The Special Victims Coordinator would be in command of this unit.

- Review and reform current procedures for assisting victims of sexual assault and domestic violence at Brown University. The Brown Police and Security Special
Victims Coordinator should work in concert with Student Life, Psychological Services, Health Services, and the Women’s Center to develop a better structured, easier-to-understand, and more sensitive set of procedures for reporting an assault, receiving needed counseling, and making choices about how and whether to proceed with legal sanctions. Prepare and widely circulate a clear diagram or flow-chart depicting the reporting, service, and legal options available to victims of sexual assault and domestic violence.

- Evaluate Brown University procedures to reconcile the Rhode Island criminal process with Brown student disciplinary policies. The Brown Police and Security Special Victims Coordinator should again work closely with other entities providing response or service in cases of sexual assault and domestic violence to ensure that criminal laws are not circumvented or disregarded by processing a complaint administratively rather than criminally.

- Establish on-going training and interaction between Police and Security, Student Life staff, and student counselors who wish to participate. The Police and Security Special Victims Coordinator should organize these sessions in which police officers and security officers would learn from the insights of staff and student counselors and visa versa.

- Discontinue the practice of transporting sex crime victims to the hospital by ambulance, which exposes the victim to more unwelcome attention. If there is no physically disabling injury and the victim does not want to travel by ambulance, other transport should be arranged by the Special Victims Coordinator.

**Recommendations for Police and Security Training**

The Brown University Police are mandated to attend the Rhode Island Municipal Police Training Academy for sixteen weeks where they receive the same training as other municipal police departments. They train with firearms and are required to retrain and re-qualify annually. There is a formal and comprehensive field-training program for Brown University Police and Security officers. Designated field training officers, at either the police officer or security officer level, provide the training to new officers. New officers are rated on 20 dimensions, including all the appropriate areas of conduct, attitude, and performance. Field training seems to be a strong element in the department’s overall training program.

Campus police officers are required to participate in other areas of training on an annual basis: use of force, intermediate force (baton), pepper spray, and domestic
violence training. One supervisor who provides training cited the need for better training facilities and for the commitment of a full-time training officer. Another supervisor suggested the department could benefit from training in report writing.

There is inadequate specialized training, especially for detectives who have had little formalized investigative instruction. The absence of a training budget makes it difficult to arrange for outside training opportunities.

- Establish a comprehensive training program for newly hired security officers, with a curriculum designed to cover all important topics, including legal rights and responsibilities, departmental and university policies, self defense skills, interviewing skills, and first aid.

- Designate a training officer with part-time responsibility for training and part-time patrol responsibilities.

- Establish a training budget to allow for enhancing the internal training function and to allow for outside training at authorized academies for detectives and others.

- Allocate space for a training room in a building adjacent to or near police headquarters.

**Recommendations for Review of Standing Orders and Policies**

The Department has been accredited by the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA) and meets fairly stringent requirements for written documentation of procedures. Except as noted elsewhere in this report, the department’s General Orders appear to be comprehensive and well done. There are 158 General Orders covering a broad range of police topics. Grouped topics are differentiated by numerical designation. For instance, all personnel matters are under Section 5 sub 1 to Section 5 sub 26. The policies and procedures are also available on CD-Rom.

- Prepare index tabs for the text version, showing the procedures covered in each section.

- Prepare a master index for the CD-Rom version, allowing a researcher to query the CD-Rom by topic heading.
Recommendations for Managing Communications and Security Technology

- Establish a University-wide master plan for expanded use of security technology, including updating and expanding the use of card access systems, alarms, and CCTV.

- Combine the communications center with the alarm monitoring functions in the same facility. Develop a chronic alarm abuser protocol to deal with certain locations on campus that trigger numerous false alarms, generating numerous unnecessary responses by police and security officers.

- Acquire a computer-aided dispatch system for the communications center

Recommendations for the Management of Officer Discipline and Complaints Against Officers

The Brown University Police and Security Department procedures for civilian complaint and officer discipline should be improved, especially if the decision is made to arm the Brown Police. The recommendations below cover how complaints are filed, how and by whom investigations are conducted, and how and by whom the disposition of these cases is reviewed in the department and in the University Administration.

- Expand and more widely publicize the methods by which complaints can be filed against police and security officers, including postings on the Brown website, the Police and Security website, appropriate student websites, and in the student handbook.

- Designate a single Internal Affairs officer who is not a line supervisor to be responsible for investigating and reporting on all complaints. The chief would retain ultimate responsibility for ensuring that all complaints are investigated appropriately and, in certain serious cases, may take charge of the investigation.

- End the practice of asking for written submissions from officers who are the subject of a complaint. In place of written submissions, the investigator should interview separately each officer and complainant involved in an incident. To the degree possible, these interviews should be conducted back-to-back.

- Train the designated Internal Affairs officer and those superior officers who are likely to be called upon to conduct investigations of disciplinary complaints in Internal Affairs investigative techniques.
• Discontinue the practice of automatically dismissing cases in which the complainant is not available or expresses an interest to discontinue the case. If there is still sufficient evidence of wrongdoing, the matter should proceed, as a way to monitor and improve police behavior.

• Maintain an investigative assignment index and central database of all disciplinary cases, closed and pending. Regular reports should be generated from this database showing year-to-date dispositions of disciplinary cases. Use this database to establish an early warning system, identifying officers in need of increased supervision and in-house training.

• Require the Executive Vice President of Finance and Administration of Brown University to review each major disciplinary case. The vice president should review the thoroughness of the investigation and indicate his or her approval of the outcome. Final approval of the disposition of any major case should reside with this official.

**Recommendations for Shuttle, Escort, and Safewalk Services**

One of the most promising ways to enhance public safety in and around Brown University would be improvements to and better management of the Brown University Shuttle Service, Escort Service, and Safewalk Service. The Shuttle and Escort Services, which transported nearly 100,000 students in the past academic year, should be more fully supported and developed by both the Police and Security Department and the University administration. The Safewalk program, which is under separate student management, should be integrated with the Shuttle and Escort Services.

In the view of The Bratton Group, the key to the fuller development and integration of these services would be more vigorous and experienced management of the entire program. The students who coordinate the program do an excellent job under difficult conditions, but they need assistance from an experienced manager who can help advance the program on multiple fronts. The Bratton Group views this area as one in which a reasonable additional expenditure would make a substantial difference to the both the perception and reality of safety at Brown, with more people traveling by shuttle and escort in the evening hours, more Shuttle, Escort, and Safewalk personnel in touch with the police, and more visible, official-looking vehicles in frequent circulation.
The Shuttle Service provides transportation to Brown and RISD students and staff between the hours of 5:00 p.m. and 3:00 a.m. on days when the school is in session. Three shuttle vans run on designated routes, which follow a fifteen-minute loop around campus. Students must show valid ID to board the shuttle.

The Escort Service serves students who reside off campus within a designated area. Students requesting this service must be registered with Brown University Police and Security. This service’s availability is limited. It is not intended to be used as a taxi service, but to aid students with some special and exigent need.

Safewalk provides “point-to-point walking escorts” to Brown students and staff who are going walkable distances and would like an escort. This is currently a volunteer program. The volunteers walk in pairs and carry two-way radios on the same frequency as the Shuttle and Escort Services but not the same frequency as the Brown Police.

- Incorporate Safewalk into the over-all Shuttle and Escort program, paying Safewalk workers the same rate of compensation paid to workers in the Shuttle and Escort Services and bringing them under the same student managerial system, i.e. coordinators, supervisors, and workers.

- Bring the management of the integrated services under a police sergeant who would be responsible for making the transportation function more of a partner of Police and Security and better at delivering customer service.

- Use security officers for Safewalk if a sufficient number of students is unavailable.

- Evaluate the costs and benefits of expanding the routes and frequency of the Shuttle Bus Service and extending the range of the Escort Service and the feasibility of a two-direction shuttle route rather the current one-way loop. Increase the number of vans used for the Shuttle and Escort programs as needed to support the expansion.

- Evaluate all shuttle stops, and upgrade signage and lighting as necessary.

- Upgrade the vans used in these programs. As with any fleet of vehicles constantly used by multiple drivers, these vans experience an appreciable amount of wear and tear, and some vehicles reportedly have poor brakes or other serious deficiencies. Review the existing maintenance program to ensure that regular maintenance of these vehicles is performed. Maintain a sufficient fleet so that vehicles can be taken out of service for regular maintenance. Equip all vans with power locks. Clearly mark all vans as Public Safety vehicles.

- Consider increasing the pay scale for workers, supervisors, and coordinators working for the three transportation services.
• Provide staff with ID Cards to be worn on their outermost garments as well as uniform polo shirts and windbreakers that would identify workers in the Shuttle, Escort, and Safewalk programs as staff and part of Brown University Police and Security.

• Replace outdated walkie-talkie radios used in the transportation programs, upgrading to equipment that can access the frequency used by the Brown University Police and Security Department. Currently the transportation programs share a radio frequency with Food Services that has no direct link to the Brown Police. A transmission from a driver in the field to the police currently goes to the Escort dispatcher and then is relayed to the police dispatcher for transmission to the patrol force. Direct communications would be preferable, providing an extra measure of security for transportation personnel and equipping them to function more effectively as eyes and ears for the police.

• Improve telephone communications for the program. The current inadequate system results in frequent busy signals for callers trying to reach the program. Equip the phones with a call-waiting feature to advise callers to hold and to advise the person taking calls that someone else is on the line. Evaluate the feasibility of a cue system that could hold multiple calls.

• Replace and upgrade the computer in the Shuttle and Escort Service office.

• Evaluate the feasibility of Police and Security operating a stripped-down version of the Shuttle Service during vacations and summers when most student participants in the program are gone. Evaluate using some combination of security officers and students to provide the service for staff and students who remain on campus.

Recommendations for Security Improvements on Thayer Street

Thayer Street is an important center of life for the Brown University Community and the East Side of Providence. It is often bustling with neighborhood residents, visitors, students, faculty, and staff. The sidewalks are crowded, and the street traffic is congested, night and day. Finding a parking spot is difficult at best, and a constant aggravation. Merchants and users of the street interviewed by The Bratton Group generally agree that they have observed an overall decline in cleanliness, civility, and safety over the past few years. Today, many users of Thayer Street, whether frequent or infrequent users, are uncomfortable with the surroundings. Many have reported that they are sometimes frightened by what they confront on the street.

Thayer Street seems to suffer from general neglect. A beautiful and vibrant street, always busy, is full of graffiti and litter. Lighting is inadequate, overhead utility lines clutter the street, sidewalks are narrow and congested with planters, newspaper boxes,
poles, and benches. Panhandlers frequently approach pedestrians for handouts. Uniformed police officers do not walk the street on a regular basis.

There are credible reports of ongoing drug dealing in the alleys off the street as well as reports of underage drinking both on the street and in the restaurants along Thayer. The presence of a uniformed overtime detail of police officers from the Providence Police Department in the evening hours, paid for by Brown University, appears to have had a deterrent effect on street crime in the area, but it is not an especially effective tactic for improving feelings of safety and comfort on the street. Regular police foot patrol, with the same officers assigned to the same tours of duty each evening, would be far more likely to accomplish lasting changes and improvements on Thayer Street over time. At present, Brown officers only patrol Thayer Street by car. There is confusion about whether their jurisdiction extends to certain blocks on Thayer where Brown does not own property. The Bratton Group recommends a strong foot patrol presence on Thayer, using a combination of Providence and Brown police.

- Negotiate with Providence Police Department for the assignment of a permanent foot post on Thayer Street and surrounding streets to be covered on two tours, seven days a week in the afternoon, evening, and early morning hours.

- Request undercover operations by the Providence Police Department to target chronic narcotics dealing and underage drinking on Thayer Street.

- Revise Brown guidelines on Brown Police jurisdiction, allowing Brown police officers to exercise police powers on all parts of Thayer Street passing through the Brown campus. Pursue plans to have the Providence Police Department designate Brown police officers as Providence “Reserve Officers” to further clarify their powers in areas of overlapping jurisdiction.

- Ensure that all police operations on Thayer target behavior not persons or types of persons.

These police and security recommendations are made in conjunction with recommendations of Mr. Dan Biederman for capital, maintenance, and management improvements on Thayer Street.
Part II
The Pros and Cons of Arming the Brown Police

The Bratton Group has reviewed in detail the issue of authorizing the Brown Police to carry firearms. The members of the Bratton Group team for this project, from various police and public service backgrounds, voted unanimously to recommend arming the Brown Police over the next one to two years. Yet, we understand that our recommendation, while it may carry some professional weight, is in no way decisive, and we do not think that it should be. Our role should be to lay out the alternatives that the University community can chose from in making this decision and to describe, to the best of our ability, what we see as the consequences of each alternative.

The opponents of arming make the following points:

1) Arming police will not make the campus safer but more dangerous because it will introduce the element of deadly force with unforeseen, irretrievable, and possibly calamitous consequences such as the wounding or killing of a student, mistaken by the campus police for a criminal.

2) Police with weapons will behave more aggressively in encounters with students and feel empowered to abuse their authority.

3) The presence of guns and the awesome power of life and death that they impart will only worsen what some perceive as institutional racism in the police department and harden the attitudes of individual racists in the organization, increasing their tendency to target and harass students of color and other people of color.

4) Not sufficiently trained or skilled in the use of weapons, Brown police officers may lose their guns to others in struggles or mishandle their weapons, resulting in accidental misfires and shootings.
5) Arming the Brown Police will result in the equivalent of an arms race, forcing the young men who frequent the areas around the campus to carry weapons in self-defense, thereby escalating the overall level of violence.

6) Arming the Brown Police would not have any impact on the street crime problem because the police arrive too late to intercede in these incidents. There is no empirical evidence that arming police officers reduces crime.

7) The disengagement policy, which instructs Brown police officers who encounter a violent crime or a weapon to disengage and notify the Providence Police, is a workable compromise. It allows Brown police officers to do most kinds of police work and to call in the Providence Police to protect both Brown officers and potential victims when violent crimes occur.

8) Although Brown police officers have been endangered in a few situations when they confronted individuals armed with deadly weapons, their being armed would not have made a difference in these situations.

9) Brown police are unaccountable for their actions and are not subject to appropriate checks in the use of weapons.

10) There are no imaginable circumstances in which the presence of guns would add to the overall safety of the campus population.

The proponents of arming counter with the following arguments which the Bratton Group, based on our study, supports:

1) Armed campus police at other college campuses have no history of shooting students and have fired their weapons very few times in past decade. (See survey results in Appendix B)

2) Armed campus police at other colleges have no history of abusing their power or mishandling or misusing their weapons (see survey results in Appendix B).

3) Armed campus police officers patrol in far larger numbers at many other schools, including the University of Pennsylvania, Yale University, and Harvard University without engaging in egregious racial profiling supposedly engendered by the presence of the gun. The Brown University Police and Security Department, which has a number of Black and Latino members and
supervisors, shows no signs of institutional racism, and Black, Latino and White officers attest to the fact that there are no racists among them.

4) Brown police are trained to use firearms and qualify each year with firearms at police firing ranges. Trained at the Rhode Island Municipal Police Academy, they are qualified to serve as armed officers with any police department in Rhode Island. Loss of police firearms to others in struggles has not been a problem on college campuses where police are armed.

5) No evidence has ever been advanced that street criminals arm themselves to protect themselves from armed police, sparking off an arms race. They arm to protect themselves from each other and to intimidate their victims.

6) Arming Brown officers, in conjunction with improvements in crime analysis and investigative work, will have a significant impact on street crime around the campus in the intermediate and long term. The presence of armed Providence police officers on overtime details in the Thayer Street area has certainly been one factor in reducing street crime in the current academic year. To be truly effective against street crime, the Brown Police would have to take on additional policing roles, including arresting armed perpetrators, pursuing fleeing suspects, and making car stops, all of which functions would necessitate their being armed.

7) The disengagement policy, which instructs Brown police officers who encounter a violent crime or a weapon to disengage and notify the Providence Police is unworkable in practice:
   a. Officers will not, in most cases, retreat from a situation where another person is in grave danger, thereby endangering themselves.
   b. Officers are often unable to determine if a suspicious person they are approaching is armed or not.
   c. Brown police will be the first responders to most violent crimes near the campus. The Providence Police response time to the Brown campus is often too slow to realistically expect them to be called to a scene in time to replace Brown police officers after a crime in progress is discovered to be violent or to involve a weapon.
8) Although Brown officers have survived their encounters with armed felons in the past they have been in genuine danger several times, and the University is fortunate that at least one of them was not killed. Armed police would have made a difference in a number of these circumstances by equipping the police to pursue fleeing suspects or by intimidating perpetrators into more reasonable and less violent behavior.

9) Brown police officers are subject to accountability processes both when they are appointed and when they take questionable actions. They are carefully screened in an exacting hiring process that evaluates them for character and temperament suited to campus policing, including an oral presentation in front of a panel that has both a faculty and a student representative. The Bratton Group recommends that rigorous review processes be established if the Brown police officers are armed, assessing every instance when a police weapon is withdrawn from the holster, pointed, or discharged.

10) The scenario of the active shooter on campus unfortunately is no longer a hypothetical one for American schools and colleges. Armed, emotionally disturbed people with homicidal agendas have wreaked havoc at a number of U.S. high schools and have taken hostages and committed homicides on some college campuses. Arming campus police provides an extra margin of safety in these circumstances, pending the arrival of municipal police specialty teams.

The Bratton Group team sees many problems in maintaining an unarmed police force. They look like police, they wear police uniforms, they drive up in police cars, but in one important respect, they are not police, at least as far as many criminals and disorderly individuals are concerned. Brown officers can tell stories about being mocked by passersby in cars, who know they can’t stop cars, and taunted in confrontations by adversaries who simply don’t believe that they have arrest powers because they are unarmed. If this were just a matter of the police officers’ pride it would be of little consequence, but unfortunately it is not. The reality is that some perpetrators do challenge Brown officers and resist arrest.
Knowing that Brown officers cannot stop cars, the more knowledgeable criminals on College Hill operate on the principle that if they can get to their own cars after committing a crime, they are home free. This is because, as a Brown Police supervisor explains: “It takes three minutes to get out of the Brown area and onto a major highway. It takes five minutes for the Providence Police to respond to a call on College Hill. And don’t think the criminals don’t know that.”

College Hill is a low-crime area compared to many neighborhoods in Providence and therefore not a priority beat for the Providence Police. They divide the city into 29 car post beats citywide, and their required minimum staffing is 21 cars in the daytime and 27 cars in the evening. The College Hill area is one of the first in the city to go unstaffed if the department is short staffed or other priorities make demands upon its resources, partly because the Providence Police rely on the Brown Police to take up the slack. This provisional arrangement leaves open a critical question: who is responsible to suppress and prevent violent crime on the streets around Brown? The Providence Police prioritize their use of personnel based on calls for service and do not make the College Hill neighborhood a priority. The Brown Police cannot make violent crime a priority because they lack the tools to fight it.

There is no simple causal relationship between arming police and reducing crime, but faced with a mounting crime problem, Brown hired armed Providence Police officers to work extra security details to protect the Brown community. Whether the area is safer because of the presence of these officers, the fact that they are armed, or both is impossible to know for certain. But two things are clear. First, it is highly unlikely that these officers would work a detail guarding against armed robbers if they were not armed. Second, almost no one, including many who are opposed to arming the Brown Police, has strongly objected to these Providence officers carrying guns.

The disengagement policy places Brown police officers in an extremely difficult set of ethical and practical circumstances. By training, instinct, and character, they want to help victims and protect people. By policy, they are supposed to stand back when they
are needed most. Knowing the proclivities of his fellow officers, one Brown officer jokes that the disengagement policy could easily transform into the “human shield policy,” when an unarmed Brown police officer intercedes between an armed felon and prospective victim. For Brown police officers, repealing the disengagement policy and arming the campus police would result in their being taken seriously by would-be criminals, a deterrent effect that they believe would benefit the entire Brown community.

To continue the disengagement policy, the Brown community will have to assume that the next time a man points a fully loaded gun at a police officer and pulls the trigger the gun will misfire, as it did in 1992; or the next time a person is seen on campus with a rifle it will only be a pellet gun, as it proved to be in a recent incident. The community will also have to assume that for the foreseeable future a Brown officer will never be placed in the position of confronting an armed robber, be the first to respond to an ongoing shooting, or the first to confront an armed intruder during the break-ins to which Brown police sometimes respond. And all of these assumptions will have to be made with the full knowledge that Brown has already concluded that its police officers encounter sufficient danger to require them to wear bullet proof vests.

Recognizing that there are strong and emotional arguments against arming, the Bratton Group sought statistical evidence about the consequences of arming on other campuses. Our survey results, while hardly the last word, offer encouragement that arming is not the giant step into a violent future that some have portrayed it to be. Of 14 armed campus responding to our survey, only one could cite a negative consequence of arming, and this was a misfire that did no damage (See Appendix B for a full account of survey findings and a copy of the survey instrument).

Likewise, a review of the use of force by Brown Police and Security Officers, who are armed with non-lethal pepper spray and PR 24 batons, revealed that these officers show considerable restraint in the exercise of their duties. Since 1996, the earliest date for which records are available, there has not been a single allegation that a Brown police officer inappropriately pointed pepper spray or a baton at anyone. In fact,
although there have been ten cases of pepper spray use since 1996, not one use of force case has involved the use of the baton.

For those concerned that Brown Police engage in racial profiling and would be more inclined to do so if armed, the use of force data is also encouraging. Of the suspects subject to use of force by Brown Police since 1996, 21 were White, nine were Black, and four were Latino. In addition, since 1992, only two complaints of racial profiling have been lodged by Brown students against Brown officers, and both of those complaints concern the same incident and were filed within the last ninety days. The Bratton Group understands that subsequent review determined that these complaints were unfounded.

Questions have also been raised about whether an unarmed university police force could possibly be sufficiently trained to be authorized to carry firearms. In fact, Brown police officers are already authorized to carry firearms by state law; it is University policy that forbids them to do so. Campus police officers have the same authority as Rhode Island police officers to perform all law enforcement functions and duties, which include initiating arrests and carrying firearms. They train at the Rhode Island Municipal Police Academy, where they receive full firearm training. This training allows them to work in any Rhode Island municipal police department and to carry a sidearm when not on campus. The national Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA) accredits the Brown University Police and Security Department, making Brown University Police the first Ivy League police department to achieve accreditation. As part of accreditation, campus police officers are required to qualify and train with firearms on an annual basis.

Many in the Brown community raised questions about non-lethal weapons as possible alternative to firearms. The Bratton Group does not believe that any these alternatives currently provide sufficient stopping power and reliability to replace firearms as a police tool. Some of these non-lethal weapons are useful for crowd control situations and others for controlling emotionally disturbed people who may pose a danger to themselves and others. But, in our view, they are not yet sufficient for stopping a
determined armed felon intent on wounding or killing his adversary (See Appendix D for an account of the latest developments in non-lethal weaponry).

With the caveat of establishing a more rigorous disciplinary system recommended earlier in this report, in-depth and frequent training, and thorough review of any display or discharge of a weapon, it is the Bratton Group’s opinion that the balance should be struck in favor of arming the police. We believe that the increased level of public and police safety that would result from arming is a stronger consideration than the minimal chance of accident or misuse. Regular training regimens, strictly enforced guidelines, vigorous review of firearm withdrawal and discharge, and consistent crime and officer monitoring data can all mitigate against the possibility of escalating violence and provide the transparency necessary to engender trust between Brown students and the campus police officers trained to protect them.

**Recommendations for Arming Brown University Police Officers**

- Move toward arming the Brown University Police in a phased program that arms the entire department over a one- to two-year period in the following stages:
  - Supervisors and detectives
  - A second police officer, in addition to the supervisors, on each shift
  - All night shift police officers
  - All police officers

- Establish intensive training on deadly force policy, Shoot/Don’t Shoot scenarios, weapon retention, and firearm storage. Conduct regular drills and training to equip officers for a variety of situations. Establish and inculcate proper guidelines governing firearm withdrawal and discharge

- Establish strict in-depth review of all firearms incidents, including any incident in which a firearm is drawn, pointed, or discharged.
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This appendix summarizes the views expressed in one-on-one interviews, focus groups, and public forums by students, staff members, faculty members, neighbors of the Brown campus, and police and security personnel.

Student Perspectives

Brown Police and Security operate in a campus community that includes student groups and individual students who are distrustful and suspicious of police and police action. The Bratton Group held several meetings with minority student groups where the opinion was expressed, and generally endorsed by the group, that Brown students of color are more likely to be subject to Brown Police and Providence Police abuse of authority than they are to be endangered by street criminals. Although most of the participants in this group did not cite first-hand experience with officers who had acted improperly, many had stories of friends or acquaintances who had had such encounters. It is a widely held view among these students that Brown Police and Security engage in racial profiling as a matter of course in their regular duties, stopping people of color and asking them to produce student IDs far more often than they stop white students under similar circumstances. They also expressed the opinion that Brown students who serve as drivers on the Shuttle Service request people of color to produce IDs more often than they ask white students.

In addressing the most volatile issue of all – whether on not Brown Police Officers should be armed – the vast majority of these students were strongly opposed to the idea. Some said that officers would be more inclined to abuse their power if they were armed, others maintained that arming police officers would set off the equivalent of an arms race with the street criminals escalating the level of violence around the campus, and others cited the irretrievable consequences if an officer should mistakenly fire on and injure or kill a student. One student framed her perspective with the question: “Would making the police safe make a significant part of the Brown Community unsafe?” Many of these ideas were also expressed by White and Black students alike in the open forums.
held by the Bratton Group. It should noted that there were students encountered in various group meetings who expressed considerable concern about street crime and who did not fear the Brown Police more than criminals. There were also students, both White and Black, who said that they favored arming the Brown Police.

The three open forums scheduled for The Bratton Group to sample Brown community opinion were not well attended. Two of the three were attended by the same group of students for whom fear of crime was not an important issue and who were more concerned about police infringements on individual liberties. This group was opposed to the Bratton Group being hired by the University and strongly opposed to arming the Brown Police. These students expressed concern about the possibility that the Brown University Administration would seek to “wall off” the Brown campus from outsiders and the rest of the Providence Community. For them, the open nature of the Brown campus is one its most desirable characteristics, and they oppose any effort by Brown Police and Security or any other authority to deny access to anyone to the outdoor areas of the campus or to “clean up” Thayer Street by harassing panhandlers or other regulars on the street. They believe such efforts go on now, targeting young people of color and especially the students of nearby Hope High School. Some students also expressed the view that the street crime incidents around the campus might be a reaction or retaliation on the part of people excluded from Brown in the past.

In general, students at the group meetings and the open forums cited non-police measures as preferable solutions to street crime and street safety problems, especially enhancing after-hours student transportation services and improving lighting on many of the streets around the campus. They tended to the see the police as people who arrive on the scene after the fact and who can do little to prevent crime and victimization. Far more important than strengthening the police or increasing police powers and roles, they said, is increasing the frequency and range of late-night transportation services and providing better lighting on streets and at shuttle stops to reduce the likelihood of victimization in the first place. These transportation issues are particularly important, the students said, because so many Brown graduates and undergraduates live off campus and
are being pushed by high real estate values on College Hill to rental locations further from the campus. With more and more students living further from the campus, the students said, university services have not kept pace.

Staff Perspectives

Representatives of the Brown University non-teaching staff at a Staff Advisory Committee meeting expressed a very different view of the Brown Police and very different expectations for police service. These are year-round employees who work in various capacities providing the institution with a range of services, including the comptrollers office, human resources, technology services, facilities management, food services, alumni relations, summer studies, financial aid, library services and staffing of such programs as the Annenberg Institute, Environmental Studies, and the Center for Population Studies. As a group, the staff members were much more alarmed about the street crime incidents in the past year and much more concerned for their personal safety than were the students. They also have a very positive view of Brown Police and Security, many of whom they know personally. They expressed a strong preference for dealing with Brown Police and Security as opposed to the Providence Police Department on security and crime matters, saying that they would prefer to deal with “a colleague.” Pointedly asked if they could cite any instances of Brown police misbehavior or excessive force that they had witnessed themselves or had heard about, about 20 members at the Staff Advisory Committee meeting answered “no.”

The committee members also told The Bratton Group that they had voted 18 to 2 in favor of arming the Brown Police. Some staff members expressed resentment that the students exercise too much control of the Brown University public safety and arming debate, while the staff voice is minimal. “The students are here for four years and they are gone. We work here for 12 months a year for 20 years or more. We should be heard.”

Like the students, however, staff members raised many of the same concerns about transportation and lighting on the campus and surrounding streets. Many workers
work late hours and leave for their cars at remote parking lots or remote street parking spaces as late as 12:00 midnight. They expressed concern about police response time should they be accosted while walking to cars on the streets north of the campus. The staff pointed out that the Shuttle and Escort Services, which are student run, shut down over vacations and during the summer.

Wide concern was expressed about too-easy access to buildings, thefts from offices, and the general confusion about who is responsible to unlock and relock buildings opened in the evenings for special events. Noting the success of card access systems in reducing theft from residence halls, several staff members urged university-wide card access systems and other technological safeguards, like closed-circuit television cameras and panic buttons and other alarms in office spaces. Several complained that the budgets for their particular departments were too small and too committed to other priorities to fund these needed security features.

**Faculty Perspectives**

The faculty groups and representatives that The Bratton Group met with expressed a wide range of opinion on security issues and the performance of Brown Police and Security. Like many students, many faculty members remain skeptical about whether police actions or changes in police policies will have much impact on street crime problems. Some complained about the low visibility of police and security officers on campus, maintaining that they never see the officers patrolling. Others were wary of the campus police taking a more active role in policing the streets around the campus. Strong sentiment against arming was apparent among some faculty members, who suspect that the Brown officers are not adequately trained to carry weapons and who oppose bringing firearms on campus on general principles. As one put it: “We can say today that we never had a Brown police officer shoot anyone. Do we want to open the door to a future when we might not be able to say that?” In discussions, it became apparent that many faculty members did not know that Brown police officers are trained and certified by the Rhode Island State Police, that they are required to re-qualify with
firearms each year, and that they are fully empowered to make arrests on the Brown campus and adjacent streets.

On the other hand, other faculty members were clearly in favor of a stronger police presence on the campus, supporting arming and arguing that Brown cannot expect the Brown Police to protect the Brown community without the tools to engage potentially violent criminals. Some faculty asked about providing more effective non-lethal weaponry to the police that would allow them to confront armed criminals without the risk of a mistaken shooting. In addition to the concerns about street robberies and assaults, faculty members raised concerns about thefts from offices, car thefts from Brown parking lots and from parking spaces on surrounding streets, and reckless driving on the streets around Thayer, often by drivers who seem to be cruising the area. Some faculty members expressed surprise that the Brown Police, because they are unarmed, cannot make car stops, and, therefore, cannot engage in traffic enforcement; several said that they would support arming the Brown Police and empowering them to do traffic enforcement around the campus. Concerns were expressed about unpleasant conditions on Thayer and the night scene that has developed there, but the view was also expressed that the University should not be “cleaning up” Thayer Street at the expense of either civil liberties or losing the lively character of the street. One faculty member pointed out an irony in the framing of the police vs. open campus debate. “We have an open campus. The only people who aren’t welcome here are the Providence Police.”

**Neighborhood Perspectives**

In phone interviews, members of the College Hill Neighborhood Association, including the president and the vice president, talked about living in proximity to the Brown Campus and their concerns about crime and disorder in the College Hill neighborhood. Most said that conditions have worsened on Thayer Street, which has become an unpleasant and at times frightening environment for them and their children. Over a twenty–year period, Thayer Street has been transformed from a busy neighborhood street to a night scene that draws people from all over Providence and beyond. Neighbors complain about the noise, litter, constant traffic, reckless driving and
accidents, drug dealing in alleys off the street, panhandling, underage drinking in the restaurants, the presence of too many restaurants with liquor licenses, and the late hours the establishments keep. They said they see police driving by on Thayer but rarely see them taking action to correct conditions.

Neighbors echoed student complaints about poor lighting on many streets and voiced concern that some individuals, attracted to Thayer Street, might learn about the vulnerability of the surrounding neighborhood and victimize people on College Hill. They feel that the Providence Police presence is inadequate, although several said that they understood the great demands on the department in policing other parts of Providence. They cited confusion in the overlapping jurisdictions of the Providence and Brown departments, especially in cases involving Brown students creating disturbances in off-campus housing. Providence police often do not respond to reports of minor matters involving Brown students; Brown police officers will sometimes say that rental off-campus housing owned by private owners is out of their jurisdiction. Neighbors, disturbed by parties far into the night, find it hard to get a satisfactory response. Reporting serious crime can also be a problem, with Brown police officers sometimes declining to take reports from non-Brown victims who were victimized several blocks away from the campus.

Most of the neighbors interviewed said that they would like to see the Brown police more involved in policing the neighborhood but split on the issue of arming. While several neighbors said that arming the Brown Police would be beneficial if it led to a more active Brown Police presence on College Hill, others said that they were philosophically opposed to the idea of a private employer maintaining an armed security force.

**Police and Security Perspectives**

In one-on-one interviews, Brown Police and Security personnel expressed their dismay that they are characterized by students as racial profilers or as abusers of police power. Black, Latino, and White officers alike say that there is not a trace of racism in
the organization. Some white officers acknowledged that they had experienced difficulty in establishing relations with many students of color, saying that these students seemed to resist friendly overtures. “I feel that I’m being profiled,” said one officer. “I’m a white guy in a uniform; therefore, I’m and a racist and homophobe. I’m not.”

Most police and security officers pride themselves on their ability to work in the University environment and to take account of the needs and sensitivities of students. A lot of their work is service work, like letting students who have mislaid their keys into their rooms at night. Brown police officers say that they frequently act as a buffer between students involved in minor illegal activities and the criminal justice system, sometimes preventing more precipitous legal action by the Providence Police. Students who, in all likelihood, would have been arrested by the Providence Police have been referred instead to the University for discipline.

Police and Security officers are much more conscious than other members of the Brown community of the strangers who come on campus with criminal intent. Most can tell stories about finding people in residence hall rooms or prowling the corridors in other buildings. Over the years, they have wrestled with thieves caught in the act, thwarted a rape in progress, and faced down armed felons, sometimes knowingly and sometimes unknowingly. Although officially governed by the University disengagement policy which instructs them to stand off and notify the Providence Police when they encounter a weapon or a violent crime in progress, most Brown Police officers probably would not disengage from a situation in which another person was in danger, judging both from their past actions and from what they say now about how they do their jobs. All the police officers and most of the security officers favor arming the Brown police. They see the current disengagement policy as a failure on the University’s part to face up to the realities of the police work that they are called upon to do. “The University has to make up its mind what kind of service they want,” said one officer. “Are we security guards or police?”
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Survey of Campus Police Departments’ Arming Policies and Experience

In association with The Bratton Group, The Kamber Group conducted a survey of campus police departments arming policies and procedures, polling sixty colleges and universities. The schools contacted included every major college and university in Rhode Island and Massachusetts, as well as all the Ivy League schools, and several state universities in New York. Twenty-eight schools responded to the survey, 14 armed and 14 unarmed. Each school’s police chief or public safety director received a twenty-five-question survey that invited comment on a number of issues pertaining to campus safety and the arming of campus police officers. Particular attention was focused on school policies and procedures as they pertained to withdrawing and discharging a weapon. The individual school data collected will remain strictly confidential as requested by the participating schools.

Survey Findings

- Half the schools responding have armed campus police officers. Many of these schools have maintained armed campus police departments as a matter of campus policy for several decades. Those schools that armed within the past ten years cited decisions made by the college president and supported by the board of trustees as the impetus for arming.
- The chief reason cited for arming other than “campus policy” was providing the necessary equipment for officers to operate in an open campus environment surrounded by an urban center.
- Nearly ninety percent of the schools that armed within the last decade made the decision in consultation with faculty, staff, student groups, and the local police. The schools that armed prior to the past decade made the decision as a solely administrative evaluation without community consultation.
- A large majority of the armed schools cited the decision to arm as “controversial at the time” with opponents expressing concern about the possibility of police “overreaction” resulting in the death of a student as well as general opposition to
guns on campus. The schools that cited the decision to arm as controversial were the schools that consulted with students, faculty, and staff. Several schools that armed without consultation responded that most students had never known whether or not the campus police were armed, and upon learning of the presence of armed campus police assumed that “it had always been this way.”

- Asked to cite any negative incidents related to firearms, including accidental shootings, improper displays of a gun, domestic violence situations involving officers, officer gun-related suicides, escalation of crime because of arming, off-campus incidents with a gun, racial harassment with a gun, or other negative incidents, the armed schools responding to the survey cited one “minor accidental discharge.” They reported only one shooting in an incident in which a police officer thwarted a robbery, several decades after the officers on that campus were first armed.

- Asked about positive incidents since arming, nearly every responding armed campus indicated that arming campus police led to “a greater sense of security on campus.” The large majority of the armed campus police departments cited “crimes thwarted” as a positive incident since arming.

- Asked about the changes in the levels of crime since the campus police department armed, over half stated that crime levels remained the same, about 25 percent said that crime levels had decreased, and one school indicated that crimes had increased. The remaining schools stated that no data were available about crimes before and after the campus police were armed.

- Schools that acknowledged that there was or still is a racial profiling problem on campus indicated either no change in the problem of racial profiling or an improved situation since arming their officers. Thirty percent of the armed schools and twenty percent of the unarmed schools indicated that racial profiling has presented or currently presents a problem. These schools reported using various measures to address racial profiling, including community forums, changes in police policies, small group meetings, use of outside consultants, and addressing each incident on a case-by-case basis.
• Of the responding armed schools, each and every school possesses written guidelines as to when officers can pull out, point, and discharge their weapons.

• More than ninety percent of the armed campus police forces responding to the survey require an internal review both when an officer withdraws and when an officer discharges a weapon. One responding schools does not require internal review when an officer draws out a weapon, but does require internal review regarding any discharge of the weapon. External reviews by either the state or local police, or a local prosecutor, are in place when campus police officers discharge their weapons at about two-thirds of the responding schools.
CAMPUS PUBLIC SAFETY SURVEY

The Kamber Group is conducting the following survey on behalf of Brown University, which is currently reviewing their campus security procedures. While this survey provides a tool to gauge how other Colleges and Universities operate their campus security, it should not take more than ten minutes of your time.

1) How many campus police officers are currently full-time employees? (please check one, or indicate the total number) _________________________________

2) How many campus police officers are currently part-time employees? (please check one, or indicate the total number) _________________________________
   □ 0 – 5  □ 5 – 10  □ 10 – 15  □ 15 – 20  □ 20 – 25  □ 25 +

3) How many of the campus police officers possess a non-lethal weapon, such as pepper spray, mace, etc.? (please check one, or indicate the total number) ______
   □ 0 – 5  □ 5 – 10  □ 10 – 15  □ 15 – 20  □ 20 – 25  □ 25 +

4) How many of the campus police officers are armed with a gun? (please check one, or indicate the total number) ______________________________________
   □ 0 – 5  □ 5 – 10  □ 10 – 15  □ 15 – 20  □ 20 – 25  □ 25 +

5) If the campus police officers are armed, what led to the decision to arm?
   □ Crime increase  □ Student altercations  □ Campus Policy  □ Other

6) If the campus police officers are armed, was this decision conducted in consultation with one or several of the following? _______________________
   □ Faculty  □ Staff  □ Student Groups  □ Entire Student Body  □ Alumni
   □ Local Police  □ Outside Consultants  □ Benefactors  □ Other

7) Was the decision to arm the campus police considered controversial at the time?
   □ Yes  □ No
8) If there was a controversy, what was the basis for it?
   - Student Opposition
   - Community Opposition
   - Fears of Violence
   - Other

9) When was the decision made to arm the campus police? _________________
   - 2001-2002
   - 2000-1995
   - 1994-1990
   - 1989-1985
   - 1984-1980
   - 1979-1975
   - 1974-1970
   - 1969-1965
   - 1964-1960
   - Other

10) When was the policy actually implemented, and the officers actually armed?
    - 2001-2002
    - 2000-1995
    - 1994-1990
    - 1989-1985
    - 1984-1980
    - 1979-1975
    - 1974-1970
    - 1969-1965
    - 1964-1960
    - Other

11) If the campus police are armed, have there been any negative incidents? Please check all that may apply:
    - Accidental shooting
    - Improper Display of Gun
    - Domestic Violence
    - Suicide w/ Gun
    - Escalation of crime b/c of Gun
    - Off Campus incident w/ gun
    - Racial Harassment w/ Gun
    - Other

12) If the campus police are armed, have there been any positive incidents since arming? Please check all that may apply:
    - Crimes thwarted
    - Greater sense of security on campus
    - Other
    - More positive attitude among officers
    - Positive feedback
13) If the campus police are armed, has there been any change in levels of crime since arming?

- Yes, decrease
- Yes, increase
- No, crime levels are the same
- Other

14) Is there, or has there been an issue of racial profiling on campus?

- Yes
- No

15) If so, how has it been addressed?

- Community forums
- Small group meetings
- Outside Consultants
- Changes in Police policy
- Other

16) Has arming the campus police made this problem better, worse, or no change?

- Better
- Worse
- No Change

17) Are there any written guidelines on when an officer can:

a) Pull Out the Weapon?  
   - Yes
   - No

b) Point the Weapon?  
   - Yes
   - No

c) Shoot the Weapon?  
   - Yes
   - No

18) Have there been any shootings since officers have been armed?

- Yes
- No

19) If yes, please briefly describe the incident and list the year:

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
20) Is there an internal review when an officer pulls out a weapon?  [ ] Yes  [ ] No
21) Is there an internal review when an officer discharges a weapon?  [ ] Yes  [ ] No

22) Is there an *external* review (by local police, or a local prosecutor) when an officer pulls out or discharges a weapon?

External review when Officer pulls out weapon?
[ ] Yes  [ ] No

External review when Officer discharges weapon?
[ ] Yes  [ ] No

23) How often have Officers pulled out their weapons since they have been armed?

[ ] 0 – 5  [ ] 5 – 10  [ ] 10 – 15  [ ] 15 – 20  [ ] 20 – 25  [ ] 25 +  
[ ] other

24) How often have Officers discharged their weapons since they have been armed?

[ ] 0 – 5  [ ] 5 – 10  [ ] 10 – 15  [ ] 15 – 20  [ ] 20 – 25  [ ] 25 +  
[ ] other

25) Are there any comments or suggestions that you would like to make regarding arming campus security officers? (please feel free to use extra space if needed)

______________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________
COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES CONTACTED

CONNECTICUT – 1
  1. University of Connecticut

MASSACHUSETTS - 31
  2. Amherst College
  3. Assumption College
  4. Babson College
  5. Bentley College
  6. Boston College
  7. Boston University
  8. Brandeis University
  9. Clark University
 10. Emerson College
 11. Fitchburg State College
 12. Holy Cross
 13. Massachusetts Institute of Technology
 14. Massasoit Community College
 15. Merrimack College
 16. Mount Holyoke College
 17. Northeastern University
 18. Smith College
 19. Suffolk University
 20. Tufts University
 21. University of Massachusetts at Amherst
 22. University of Massachusetts at Boston
 23. University of Massachusetts at Dartmouth
 24. University of Massachusetts at Lowell
 25. Wellesley College
 26. Western New England College
 27. Westfield State College
 28. Wheaton College
 29. Williams College
 30. Worcester Polytechnic Institute
 31. Worcester State College

PENNSYLVANIA – 1
  32. Lafayette College

RHODE ISLAND - 6
  33. Rhode Island School of Design
34. Providence College
35. Bryant College
36. Roger Williams University
37. Rhode Island College
38. University of Rhode Island

NEW YORK - 15
39. Fordham University
40. NYU – New York University
41. Pace University
42. University at Albany – SUNY Albany
43. Buffalo State University – SUNY Buffalo
44. SUNY Brockport
45. SUNY Cortland
46. SUNY Cobleskill
47. SUNY Fredonia
48. SUNY Geneseo
49. SUNY Institute of Technology
50. SUNY New Paltz
51. SUNY Oneonta
52. SUNY Oswego
53. SUNY Stony Brook

IVY LEAGUE SCHOOLS- 7
54. Yale University
55. Harvard University
56. University of Pennsylvania
57. Princeton University
58. Dartmouth College
59. Cornell University
60. Columbia University
Appendix C
Use of Force Statistics for the Brown University Police
And Security Department
1997-2001
Appendix C

Completion of a use of force report is required by Brown University Police and Security any time an officer uses any level of force while interacting with a civilian. The use of force can range from discharge of pepper spray to the weaponless physical force required to restrain a suspect. The chief and the line supervisors review the reports.

There were 40 use of force reports filed from 1997 to the end of 2001. In every instance, the use of force report was filled out very soon after the occurrence and in no instance more than two to three hours later. The following is a breakdown of the various categories represented in the reports. The suspect was not armed with any instrument in any case but two. In these two cases, one suspect was armed with a metal object and the other with a knife.

Crimes that Occasioned Use of Force Arrests
- 14 Assaults
- 5 Malicious Mischief Cases
- 5 Disorderly Conduct Cases
- 3 Trespassing Cases
- 2 Apprehending/Juvenile or Wanted Individual Case
- 2 EMS Rescue Calls
- 2 Public Disturbance Calls
- 1 Attempted Theft Case
- 1 Investigation of an Unsafe Condition Call
- 5 Miscellaneous Cases

Use of Force Arrests by Year
- 3 arrests in 2002
- 6 arrests in 2001
- 8 arrests in 2000
- 12 arrests in 1999
- 8 arrests in 1998
- 3 arrests in 1997

Race of Suspect in Cases Requiring Use of Force
- 21 Whites
- 9 Blacks
- 4 Hispanics
- 1 listed as Arab
- 1 Asian
- 4 Unknown
In all cases a male suspect was involved. Twenty-three suspects were between 18 and 25 years of age. Four were between 26 and 34. The ages of the remainder are unknown.

Extent of Force Used

- In five cases, the suspect received minor injuries; none requiring hospitalization.
- In 21 cases the officer warned the suspect before applying force.
- In 10 cases pepper spray was used.
- In 10 cases the use of force was limited to the force needed to place handcuffs on the suspect.
- In 5 cases weaponless physical force was used to protect the officer.
- In 13 cases weaponless physical force was used to restrain the suspect.
- In 1 case weaponless physical force was used to apprehend the suspect.
- In 1 case the reason for the use of force is unclear.

- The use of a baton was not reported in any case.

- The Chief did not file any charges against any officer after his review of the use of force cases.
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Review of Non-Lethal Weapons
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Review of Non-Lethal Weapons

Non-lethal weapons are specifically designed and employed to incapacitate while curtailing fatalities. Unlike weapons that possess the capacity to permanently destroy by blasting or fragmentation, non-lethal weapons have non-fatal effects on targets and can also discriminate between targets and non-targets in the area of impact. Thus, in the event of accidental usage or discharge, unintended or accidental targets can eventually walk away from incidents. Non-lethal weapons would provide the Brown University campus police officers with greater protection and provide acceptable choice to members of the community who mistrust officers to carry firearms. Among the respondents to the survey of University and College Police departments, 84% of the un-armed schools and 92 percent of the armed schools carry non-lethal weapons. Many cited pepper spray or batons as their non-lethal weapons of choice.

Yet, many other types of non-lethal weapons are available to aid campus law enforcement personnel in protecting themselves and others, providing other options to disarm or disable a perpetrator without causing fatalities. Unlike night sticks or some types of pepper spray that require close proximity for effectiveness, several types of non-lethal weapons can be used either to combat hostile or rowdy crowds or confront aggressive individuals from a distance.

Pepper Spray Pellets
Derived from the chilli pepper, these pepper spray pellets can be discharged from a high-pressure air gun from 30 to 40 feet away for intervention with a violent situation. One system, known as the PepperBall was first used at the World Trade Organization riots last year and later at a riot in Salt Lake City during the Olympics. The PepperBall can leave a large bruise but is not lethal. Police can shoot a pellet at a target or shoot balls near the target to release pepper spray into the air.
**Sticky Foam Glue Guns**
Officers can utilize high-powered glue guns that fire pellets of compressed sticky foam to impede the movement of hostile crowds. The sticky foam expands to 30 times its original size and covers demonstrators. This type of glue gun is several steps ahead of the crude spray guns of the early 1990s and is far more accurate than the earlier variations.

**Ensnaring Nets**
Recently tested and deployed in Japan, this accurate non-lethal weapon allows police forces to contain and control rowdy groups with a large net that can be deployed from several yards away.

**Optical Laser Dazzler**
The optical laser dazzler is a laser gun that resembles a torch. This non-lethal weapon fires a random series of green flashes up to 400 meters that temporarily blind the targeted individual(s) and create an optical shield for the police to operate behind. It is currently being used by the Los Angeles Police Department.

**Beanbags**
Beanbag munitions are designed to knock a target down without causing fatalities. They are made from various materials and are filled with lead shot. They are designed to spread the impact of a blow over a wide surface area without penetrating the body. Beanbag munitions can be fired from conventional shotguns.

**Tasers**
Used by a growing number of police departments in Florida, this non-lethal weapon is very similar in appearance to a pistol and allows law enforcement to hit someone from a safe distance without causing a fatality. It simultaneously fires two probes that trail electric cable back to the Taser. These can be fired from a distance of 21 feet. When the probes make contact with the target they transmit 50,000-volt electrical pulses along the wires and into the body of the target. This causes an uncontrollable contraction of the muscle tissue, causing the targeted individual to fall to the ground. This temporarily induced immobility assists law enforcement in apprehending suspects who may resist arrest. When the weapon is fired, the time and date is recorded and the information can be downloaded onto a computer. Additionally, every time it is fired the weapon ejects up to 40 small confetti-like I.D. tags, which each contain the serial number of the cartridge to help identify the officer who fired it.

In April of 2002, the University of Iowa at Iowa City began training their campus police officers to use the Taser M26 stun gun. These officers learned technical skills and completed eight hours of instructional reading before they were deployed with the gun in the last week of April. The Tasers cost about $400 each.