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Executive Summary
In 2021, the Working Group on Campus Safety and Policing (WGCSP), one of five workstreams within the Tufts University as an anti-racist institution strategic initiative, issued a report and recommendations that established a new vision for campus safety and policing at the university. This vision called for a renewed and broader understanding of campus safety that encompassed the physical, psychological, and emotional well-being of our entire community. One specific recommendation called for the establishment of a separate working group to study the issue of arming the Tufts University Police Department (TUPD). This report provides the key findings and recommendations of that group.

Between April 2021 and February 2022, the Working Group on TUPD Arming (WGTA) met regularly to collect and analyze data, discuss findings, and develop recommendations. This included an extensive review of the current TUPD organization and operations as well as a detailed analysis of more than 150,000 calls for service within the last several years. It also included a full community survey on arming, campus forums, focus groups, and various stakeholder group meetings. This work was done with the assistance of Margolis Healy and Associates, a leading national campus safety consultancy.

This assessment resulted in several key findings. Data from the community survey and other community engagement efforts showed varying views on arming across the university, including among campuses, faculty, staff, and student communities, and within racial and ethnic groups. Importantly, different campuses were shown to have varied safety needs based on their geographic location, operating characteristics, and community characteristics. While data from the calls for service analysis showed that most calls do not require an armed response, given the high volume of calls, TUPD does receive calls regularly, across all our campuses, that require the response of an armed officer because of standard safety procedures in potentially dangerous situations. (Appendix A) Importantly, the WGTA found from its historical data review that actual use of force by TUPD has been extremely rare. (Appendix G)

Based on these findings, and the objective of better meeting the community’s overall well-being needs, the WGTA recommends a hybrid model with differential response. In this model, the Department of Public Safety uses a mix of armed officers and unarmed security professionals and can choose the best resource to respond to calls for service. This will result in fewer interactions between community members and armed officers, and thereby better ensure the psychological and emotional well-being of community members. Importantly, the goal of this new model is to work to eliminate the racial harm and other trauma that is caused by an over-reliance of armed officers.

The WGTA carefully considered full disarming of TUPD but found it had two significant drawbacks. First, many calls for service that are currently managed by TUPD would need to be managed by municipal police due to safety concerns. This would result in an increased presence of municipal officers on our campuses, which the community survey indicated was undesired. Second, in these situations where municipal police would be primary responders, the university would give up control and decision-making authority. As a result, this model would subject Tufts community members to the policies and procedures of the municipal police as well as their respective protocols around detainment and arrest. The WGTA found this to be in conflict with the university’s mission and values and not in the best interest of the university or our community members.
Implementation of the hybrid model with differential response will take time and effort. Tufts’ executive director of public safety is charged with leading the effort to transition to this new model, as well as implementing the other recommendations from the WGCSP. The WGTA intends that this work will enable the campus safety organization to meet the safety needs of all our community members on all our campuses while also helping Tufts achieve its goal of becoming an anti-racist institution.
Introduction

In 2020, President Anthony P. Monaco and the Tufts community committed to making Tufts an anti-racist institution. To this end, the university launched a strategic initiative involving students, faculty, and staff across all our campuses in the work of eradicating structural racism from our institution and creating a just and equitable environment for all our community members. This initiative consists of five workstreams, including the Working Group on Campus Safety and Policing (WGCSP).

The WGCSP was charged with evaluating existing campus safety and policing and developing a vision for a forward-thinking Department of Public Safety at Tufts that understands and shares the values and perspectives of the Tufts community in all its diversity and delivers its services in a tailored manner to meet those varying needs. The WGCSP Final Report issued in February 2021 included 17 specific recommendations, including Recommendation 2.4: Arming Status of Campus Police Officers. This recommendation called for the creation of a new working group specifically tasked with determining the most appropriate arming model for the Tufts University Police Department (TUPD).

TUPD is an accredited, full-time law enforcement agency with nearly 50 sworn officers and nine dispatchers. Tufts’ sworn police officers have been armed and have had full arrest powers since at least the 1940s. They are accredited by the Massachusetts Police Accreditation Commission, an organization that requires adherence to a body of progressive standards that lends to professionalism, transparency, and integrity. (Appendix A)

The presence of armed officers contributes to racial harm and trauma for those who have had or regularly fear negative lived experiences with the police and for those who have loved ones who have had these types of experiences. Such experiences are not only historical but also continue today. This acknowledgement alone does not solve the problem, which is why the WGCSP recommended a focused evaluation of the arming status of TUPD. Shining a light on this topic is a necessary step in pursuing the healing that is required to reduce racial harm, racial trauma, and distrust in our communities.

The Working Group on TUPD Arming (WGTA) was established in April 2021 as a university-wide group, with representation from all campuses and membership from the faculty, staff, and undergraduate and graduate student bodies. (Appendix B) The WGTA was charged with developing a deep understanding of campus police arming issues and options and making a recommendation on the most appropriate arming model for Tufts and our community members in the context of our commitment to becoming an anti-racist institution. The WGTA met several times in Spring and Summer 2021 and weekly throughout the Fall 2021 semester, reviewing internal and external data, consulting with experts, engaging with community members, deliberating, and finally reaching consensus on a recommendation. This report is the result of that work.

The WGTA acknowledges that changes to our arming model alone will not accomplish the goals set forth in the WGCSP’s Final Report. The changes must be complemented by the implementation of the other recommendations in the report.

The WGTA is grateful to the students, faculty, and staff from all four Tufts campuses who contributed their time and personal perspectives through the community engagement process. Their willingness to
do so while also facing the continuing challenges of the pandemic is a testament to their commitment to Tufts and our common goal of becoming an anti-racist institution. The WGTA is also grateful to the TUPD officers who shared their knowledge and experience. Their commitment and professionalism are to be commended.

**Vision for Campus Safety and Policing at Tufts**

The WGCSP Final Report issued in February 2021 sets forth a vision for a contemporary campus safety organization that understands and shares the values of the Tufts community in all its diversity and delivers its services in a tailored manner to meet those varying needs. Like all university departments, the Tufts public safety organization will fully embrace anti-racist principles and practices and ensure all aspects of its operations address the needs of Black and Indigenous people, people of color, and historically marginalized individuals and communities at Tufts. Doing so will promote a healthier, more just, and more supportive environment that enables students, faculty, and staff to fully experience the richness and promise of Tufts.

This vision is supported by a set of core values and principles that is fundamental to the needed reframing of campus safety and policing at Tufts. The first of these is a broader sense of safety and well-being. Beyond physical safety and crime prevention, the aim of campus safety must also include the psychological and emotional well-being of all community members and, most importantly, the prevention of potential racial harm or other types of harm due to interactions with armed law enforcement. A second core value, embracing a restorative and transformational approach to campus safety and policing, emphasizes building community trust and engagement while also identifying opportunities to increase mutual communication and repair harm.

Lastly, the values of deepening inclusion and increasing equity while building trust must be embedded in all aspects of campus safety and policing at Tufts. It is only through such values that all community members, especially those individuals of underrepresented and marginalized identities, will have the potential to perceive the campus safety organization as a positive contributor to the well-being of the Tufts community.

The WGCSP’s 17 recommendations to achieve this vision fall into five areas: Mission; Organizational Model and Resources; Policies and Practices; Training, Education, and Communication; and Oversight and Accountability. When implemented, these recommendations will establish a department that serves the needs of a diverse community, tailors its services to meet those varying needs, strives to be bias-free in its policies, is transparent about its actions with the community, and accepts accountability for its performance.

**Working Group Process, Data Collection, and Analysis**

The Working Group on TUPD Arming met frequently during this evaluation process, and a variety of activities informed its work, including research, data collection and analysis, and gathering input from the community. Margolis Healy and Associates, a leading national consultancy specializing in public safety in higher education, assisted and supported the work of the WGTA.
During initial meetings in Spring 2021, the group discussed foundational questions and identified material needed for deliberation. The working group agreed to engage in a collaborative process where all working group members were free to express their sincerely held views in the meetings while also committing to maintain an environment of confidentiality until the report was completed. To keep the community informed, a series of updates on activities of the group and presentations related to findings from key activities were posted to the Working Group on TUPD Arming web page as they became available throughout the Fall 2021 semester. The working group met 26 times in total between April 2021 and February 2022.

Research and background information on public safety
The working group was informed about campus safety through several means. These included a presentation by members of the department about the scope and functions of Tufts Department of Public Safety and TUPD. Three members of the public safety department also served as members of the working group. Margolis Healy provided information on the history of policing and campus policing in the United States as well as information on the arming status of local and peer institutions. (Appendix C) Additionally, the WGTA convened a discussion with leaders of public safety from our host communities of Boston, Grafton, Medford, and Somerville.

Community engagement and input
WGTA’s process also included broad community outreach and engagement in Fall 2021 to allow varied perspectives. The feedback mechanisms included:

- An online survey completed by 2,959 people designed to measure community comfort with TUPD officers, local police response on campus, perceptions of arming, and preferred response to various calls for service. (Appendix D)
- 15 focus groups (a mix of in-person and virtual) comprised of 138 participants, including the members of our community whom the working group believe to be most impacted by campus safety and policing. (Appendix E)
- Campus forums (one per campus) held virtually and open to all. These included a presentation from Margolis Healy on the history and key issues related to campus policing in the United States followed by a facilitated question-and-answer session. (Appendix F)

The working group received summaries of the findings from the university-wide survey, the focus groups, and the campus forums. Perspectives, suggestions, and concerns received through the outreach initiatives were considered in the course of WGTA discussions about various campus policing models.

Data collection and analysis
With the assistance of Margolis Healy, the working group analyzed three years of TUPD calls for service data (150,000 calls) to understand the nature and volume of calls that make up the work of TUPD, and to determine which calls currently require an armed response and which do not. (Appendix G) The working group examined current methods used in responding to different types of calls (e.g., mental health crisis, medical calls, theft, lockouts, assaults, wellness checks).

A key part of the WGTA’s process was the examination of current and alternative arming models. The group examined in depth a set of 20 sample service calls and the response they would receive based on
the various arming models. This process involved comparing the current fully armed response and alternative models, including the hybrid or differential response model (mix of sworn, armed officers and unarmed campus safety personnel) and the fully unarmed model. Each response model was evaluated for its impact on both the physical safety and emotional well-being of community members. The working group considered the frequency and severity of the various scenarios and how different response models could be perceived by community members and those requesting service.

The working group considered the implications of changing the current response model and of leaving it unchanged, and the impact it would have on the Tufts community as well as the role and responsibilities of TUPD officers. The working group studied the role and involvement of municipal police in each of the different arming models, including how increased dependency on municipal police (necessitated by the disarming of TUPD officers) would affect response time, university jurisdiction, and familiarity of responders with the campus communities and culture.

Campus policing models were also assessed with the unique needs of each campus in mind. Feedback received from focus groups and campus forums helped to highlight the different roles and responsibilities carried out by TUPD, safety officers, and municipal police on each campus, and how each group interacts with students, faculty, and staff on that campus.

**Key Findings**

The following section summarizes the key findings from the community survey on arming (2,959 respondents), the analysis of TUPD calls for service (CFS) from 2018-2021 (150,000 calls), the four campus forums, the 15 focus groups, and the 20 case studies under three different scenarios (fully armed TUPD, differential response by TUPD, fully disarmed TUPD).

**Attitudes:** The community survey, campus forums, and focus groups

Five university-wide findings emerge from the community survey. The first is that most community members prefer a change from the current, fully armed model. This is reflected in high levels of discomfort with armed officers by some in our community. The second is that less than half of the Tufts community currently feel that an armed TUPD makes the Tufts community more physically safe. This significant finding reinforces the urgency around emphasizing a more subjective and nuanced definition of safety for all members of the Tufts community. The third finding is that support for arming increases with age. Older community members are generally more comfortable with arming than younger community members. The fifth finding was that the transgender community was the group that was most uncomfortable with armed officers across all four campuses.
There was a significant difference in attitudes toward arming across campuses, with Medford/Somerville and SMFA being the most uncomfortable with armed officers and Grafton and Boston being most comfortable. However, just as it is important to note that a significant minority of undergraduates prefer an armed TUPD to an unarmed one, a significant minority of members of the Grafton and Boston campuses are comfortable with unarmed officers.

Both the campus forums and the focus groups largely reinforced the findings of the community survey. The facilitators from Margolis Healey reported that no consensus on arming versus disarming emerged from the 15 focus groups. They also noted a level of tension and frustration across all focus group participants. While some focus group participants said that an armed TUPD made them feel safer, others registered the opposite feeling. The focus groups also revealed that many members of the Tufts community are uncomfortable with the sight of firearms and would be significantly more trusting of an unarmed officer or one concealing their weapon. Many also expressed that arming was only one of many issues related to policing and the anti-racist aspirations of the university. Similar points were raised during the campus forums, reinforcing our overall sense of a Tufts campus community that is unsatisfied with the status quo but in which there is no strong majority in favor of a fully disarmed TUPD either.

**Analysis of calls for service**

Margolis Healey collected and analyzed over 150,000 calls for service (CFS) to the TUPD between 2018 and 2021. They then divided the calls into those that, according to their classification scheme, required an armed response, those in which an armed response might be warranted, and those that could be handled by non-armed officers. One of the central findings of the CFS analysis is that most calls (91 percent) fall into the final category. Of the 7 percent of the calls that were coded as requiring an armed response, around two-thirds fell into the three largest categories: security alarms (30 percent), money escorts (25 percent), and property alarms (11 percent). The working group discussed with Margolis Healy the rationale for their classification scheme. The WGTA’s conclusion is that while the classification is a valuable tool for understanding the general needs of our community, by itself, it does not indicate a particular optimal model for Tufts.
The working group also discussed ways in which different operational practices might allow TUPD to respond to the most frequent armed calls for service differently. The next two most frequent categories of armed calls were reports of suspicious activity (8 percent) and noise complaints (6 percent). The working group discussed how perceptions of suspicious activity are prone to racial bias, while at the same time noting that our open campus does raise safety concerns. Noise complaints are an inevitable product of undergraduates living in two of the densest cities in the country. Like some of the less frequent calls reported in the CFS, while noise complaints have the potential to turn violent, they are usually resolved peacefully. In general, the CFS analysis revealed both that Tufts has relatively safe campuses and that there are ways to dramatically reduce the armed imprint of the TUPD (i.e., the number of overall community interactions requiring an armed TUPD response).

Case studies of 20 scenarios
In addition to its analysis of the calls for service, the working group discussed 20 distinct scenarios to estimate how well an armed, a differential, and an unarmed response satisfied its core considerations for arming in the context of the university’s anti-racist initiative. (Appendix H)

The working group reached a consensus that the fully armed status quo was not optimal in about half of the cases reviewed. Specifically, a fully armed response was not deemed to significantly improve public safety enough to offset the serious negative impacts on well-being and community trust in cases that represent three of the most frequent types of calls for service: well-being checks, lockouts, and building alarms. Using armed officers to respond to these routine and low-risk situations creates a perception of over-policing and leaves a large armed footprint.

Another group of cases—theft, vandalism, possible drug overdose, sexual assault, student protest, controversial speaker on campus—produced mixed opinions among working group members on the desirability of an armed response. Here, WGTA members agreed that one could not rule out the immediate threat of physical violence, even though it is unlikely. A differential or hybrid response would
allow TUPD to calibrate its reaction to these situations and would not increase the presence of
municipal police officers on our campuses.

The working group generally agreed that there were several scenarios in which an armed response was
preferred to an unarmed one. This includes not only the case of a violent intruder but also those where
there is a credible threat of violence. No unarmed officer could safely answer such calls for service, and
Tufts would therefore be dependent on a response from municipal police.

Another scenario for which the working group decided an armed response was warranted involved a
hypothetical irate pet owner at the Grafton campus who was threatening staff and customers. The
working group learned that armed officers have become standard in hospitals, and increasingly in
veterinary clinics, because of the frequency of emotionally traumatic situations.

Finally, there were several scenarios in which the working group felt that the presence of an armed Tufts
officer is preferable to an armed municipal officer, both on- and off-campus. The working group learned
that fully sworn, armed Tufts officers can jointly respond with municipal officers, or at times instead of
municipal officers, to off-campus noise complaints or other situations. The working group found
considerable evidence that TUPD has jurisdiction to handle these situations without necessarily exposing
members of the Tufts community to the criminal justice system. It also noted, both in this scenario and
throughout our discussions, how the additional oversight that the university has over TUPD and its
specialized training to handle calls on our campuses makes them better able to interact with our
community members than municipal police.

**Recommendation: Hybrid Model/Differential Response**

After careful review and discussion of these 20 scenarios, the working group concluded that a
differential response model with a mix of armed, sworn officers and unarmed campus security
personnel is best suited of the three models to maintain physical safety while improving overall well-
being and community trust.

The working group believes that adopting a differential response would enable TUPD to determine the
specific needs for each call for service and respond with the most appropriate resource. This approach
from TUPD staff would be most responsive to the needs of Tufts community members, especially those
who have experienced racial harm and trauma caused by police interactions. One of the components of
a differential response within the Tufts community would be expanding the number of non-sworn,
unarmed campus safety officers on the staffing roster of TUPD. Currently, 25 campus security officers
(CSOs) work on the Boston campuses and one works on the Medford/Somerville campus. TUPD is a 24-
hour, 7-day a week department; thus, the CSOs are split between three shifts. Keeping in mind that all
campuses have their own unique characteristics and needs, additional unarmed staff would be
strategically added to respective campuses to best match those needs.

Most importantly, in a differential response model, members of the community will have significantly
fewer interactions with armed police officers due to the increase of CSOs who would address most
routine calls for service. Unarmed CSOs will be responsible for SafeRide functions (vehicle and walking
escorts), lockouts, most on-campus wellness checks, some alarm checks, patrolling of assigned areas on foot and on bicycle for some campuses, and any other calls for service that do not require an armed officer to respond.

TUPD has nearly 50 sworn police officers across all four campuses covering three shifts per campus for 24 hours, 7 days a week. In the new model, the armed officers would focus on criminal complaints and other potentially dangerous situations. (Appendix A) These officers would also support the community as needed if a call for service escalates to require police officer involvement. While the specific mix of armed officers and unarmed CSOs will need to vary by campus and shift, the overall outcome will result in armed policing being used to the lowest extent appropriate for the calls for service across all Tufts campuses.

CSOs will continue to dress differently and not wear uniforms that resemble traditional security guard uniforms, nor will they wear uniforms that resemble those of TUPD sworn officers. They will be outfitted in polo shirts with embroidered insignia and khaki pants. The goal of increasing the presence of CSOs is to build community and create community partnerships and to foster non-enforcement interactions with TUPD.

Another component of the differential response would be further development of the way in which TUPD addresses mental health calls for service. Currently, students on the Medford/Somerville campus can call ProtoCall, a third-party mental health call center, directly or the counselor-on-call directly. This model bypasses the student calling TUPD directly. For events where there is likely to be imminent danger or if it is the student’s preference, they can call TUPD directly for intervention.

Going forward, TUPD officers will complete Critical Intervention Team (CIT) training, which will benefit all parties involved in mental health calls for service. CIT training is an internationally recognized, specialized police curriculum that aims to reduce the risk of serious injury or death during an emergency interaction between police officers and persons with mental illness. The training allows participants to learn critical elements that will lead to better outcomes, such as active listening, empathy evaluation, de-escalation techniques, holistic intervention with community partners, and peer support.

As previously noted, the current model of an armed response to all calls for service perpetuates harm and fear to members of this community and should be replaced with a model that maintains both physical and psychological safety for all community members. The goal of the new model is to work to eliminate the racial harm and other trauma that is caused by the over-reliance of armed officers on campus. Implementation of a differential response is a transformational change that will take commitment and engagement from all stakeholders.

Rationale
Our recommendation for the hybrid model was guided by the following considerations:

Physical safety
As an institution with open campuses in both urban and suburban locations (and including a residential component), the nature of our spaces requires prioritizing the physical safety of community members.
While threats of violence, including mass casualty incidents, are statistically rare, the potential for these incidents does exist. Because of this, the university is obligated to take every precaution necessary to protect our students, faculty, and staff from danger at all times. It is therefore necessary that TUPD officers have the tools and training required to ensure the physical safety of community members.

**Overall well-being (including considerations of racial harm and trauma from interaction with armed law enforcement)**

Part of the mandate of university’s anti-racist vision is to embrace a broader understanding of safety to allow all members of our community to fully contribute to and benefit from their time at Tufts. Recognizing that the presence of armed officers can have a detrimental impact on members of the community, the working group sought to find ways to minimize the presence of armed officers who would ideally be reserved for the most serious emergency situations. (Appendix A) The differential response model ensures that physical safety is maintained while also reducing the imprint of armed officers on our campuses, thereby better meeting the psychological and emotional needs of community members.

**Tufts control and governance**

TUPD is a professional, highly trained, and fully accredited law enforcement agency. As a department within the university, it is part of the university’s control and governance structures. In assessing the various arming models, the WGTA prioritized the university’s retention of oversight and control of its campus safety function, and, importantly, minimizing the presence and involvement of armed municipal police officers on our campuses. The differential response model maintains Tufts’ current jurisdictional authority and minimizes exposure of the community to municipal police agencies outside Tufts’ organization and culture.

**Building greater trust and communication between the community and TUPD**

The working group recognizes that our recommendation on arming represents only one step toward achieving a stronger and more trusting relationship between TUPD and the Tufts community (further explained in the [WGCSP’s Final Report](#)). The working group’s recommendation will provide a framework that incorporates and encourages both physical safety and a greater sense of belonging for all members of the Tufts community.

**Impact on TUPD**

As the university evaluates and enhances its public safety model, consideration of the impact on TUPD is vitally important. The wellness and safety of law enforcement officers is critical not only for the officers, but also the safety of the Tufts community. The university has a vested interest in the health and vitality of the department as an important part of the Tufts community.

**Why Not Full Disarming?**

There is significant variation in college and university arming models. While Tufts’ current model of sworn, armed police officers is common for universities in urban settings, there are institutions in Massachusetts and nationally that have unarmed campus police departments. In the course of our community engagement efforts, many members of the Tufts community expressed their preference for
full disarming. Additionally, several groups representing Tufts students, faculty, and staff have made written requests to university leadership to disarm TUPD. Given this context, the working group considered full disarming of TUPD to be a viable alternative at every step in our deliberations.

In comparison to the recommended differential response model, the working group found two significant drawbacks with a fully disarmed campus police department:

**Increased presence and involvement of municipal police**
In our current model, municipal police respond to calls on our campus primarily in situations where TUPD requires additional support. In these situations, TUPD is the primary responder and maintains control and decision-making authority. In a fully disarmed model, many calls that TUPD manages today would require municipal police response for safety reasons. This would result in more frequent municipal police presence on our campuses, which, as stated earlier, was viewed as highly undesirable by respondents to our community survey. Accordingly, the working group concluded that full disarming would be less effective than differential response regarding the overall well-being (in particular, the psychological and emotional needs) of community members.

**Loss of control and decision-making authority**
In addition to increased municipal police presence, a fully disarmed model would also result in many more situations in which municipal police are primary responders and TUPD is in a supporting role. As such, municipal police would have ultimate decision-making authority on how these calls are handled. Municipal police officers will follow their department’s policies and procedures and interact with Tufts community members as they would with any other members of the public. Decisions about detainment and arrest would be at the discretion of the responding municipal officer and TUPD would have no authority to override those decisions. The working group found this to be in significant conflict with Tufts’ mission and values, and therefore an unacceptable reality of the full disarming option.

Our discussion with municipal police leaders in our host communities confirmed that if TUPD fully disarmed, there would be a material increase in the presence of municipal police on our campuses, and that the nature of their responses would be considerably different from TUPD’s. TUPD is also able to respond more quickly as they are located on campus, and our officers receive training specific to working on Tufts campuses and with the Tufts community.

Understanding these drawbacks and the potential implications for the Tufts community strengthened the working group’s conviction on the differential response recommendation. In practical terms, differential response retains the positive aspects of the current fully armed model, meets the currently unmet needs related to overall well-being and avoidance of racial harm, and avoids the shortcomings linked with full disarming.

**Implementation**
The data collection, research, findings, and recommendations in this report are the result of the work of the WGTA over the past 11 months. This report and the recommendations herein represent the consensus view of the working group. Individual views and perspectives differed throughout our work
together, were shaped by group deliberation, and ultimately resulted in a consensus view on the best path forward for Tufts.

Implementation of a differential response model for TUPD with a mix of sworn, armed police officers and non-sworn, unarmed campus security personnel will require further time and effort. It will require the development of new staffing models for each campus, hiring of new personnel, changes to policies and procedures, and new training. Tufts’ executive director of public safety is charged with leading the effort to transition to this new model. In addition to oversight from the existing administrative management structure, as part of its charge, the newly established independent advisory group, which includes students, faculty, and staff from Tufts’ four campuses, will also monitor progress toward implementation of the differential response.

Finally, it is the intention of the WGTA that this work will enable the campus safety organization to meet the safety needs of all our community members on all our campuses and help Tufts achieve its objective of becoming an anti-racist institution.
APPENDIX A: Tufts’ Current Arming Model

Tufts University Police Department (TUPD) is an accredited police department with nearly 50 sworn officers, and nine dispatchers. TUPD is a full-time law enforcement agency that provides services to the Tufts community on all four campuses and in the surrounding communities. Tufts’ sworn police officers also have full arrest powers. TUPD takes pride in being accredited by Massachusetts Police Accreditation Commission because that organization requires adherence to a body of progressive standards that leads to professionalism, transparency, and integrity. Also, the leadership of TUPD is committed to ensuring policies, post orders, and procedures are promoting agency accountability.

As a law enforcement agency, TUPD officers are sworn and armed. The objective of the use of force is to maintain and/or re-establish control over a situation that may have become physical and poses a threat to the officer(s) responding to the call for service, to the community, and to the other person(s) involved in the event. There are several examples that outline the instances in which a police officer may use force lawfully. TUPD officers undergo training to provide them with a concrete basis for understanding which level of force is needed and to assist them with using sound judgment and with making objective, reasonable, and prudent decisions regarding the use of force.

Currently, officers are trained to use de-escalation techniques and other communicative alternatives in lieu of higher levels of force whenever possible and appropriate before resorting to force, and to reduce the need for force.

The continuum of force begins with the officers using verbalization (i.e., efforts to de-escalate matters with interpersonal communications skills). They also have weaponless (hands-on) techniques used to prevent physical harm, compliance techniques such as restraints, pepper spray, and impact weapons (e.g., approved batons used as impact instruments by officers to defend themselves or others from the threat of physical injury). Officers are also trained in alternative, less-lethal options such as the drag-stabilized bean-bag round, which is deployed from a dedicated shotgun platform. Lastly, firearms (pistols and shotguns) are options that are considered deadly force. When using deadly force, a reasonable officer must experience a counter act of lethal force or any other force that could cause serious bodily harm or death to the officer or to other members of the community. The handgun is a part of the duty belt and is worn by an armed officer throughout his/her shift; the patrol rifles are stored and reserved for incidents in which the use of a handgun is not adequate to stop the threat that a violent offender is presenting to the officers or members of the community.

TUPD officers attend use of force training five times a year. The training includes de-escalation strategies, defensive tactics, and several other components related to firearms and decision making. The goals of these training sessions are to improve the officers’ ability to navigate the force options as needed and based on the totality of the circumstances.

Currently, the presence of TUPD in the current capacity at Tufts reduces the need for municipal police responses. While TUPD and the municipal police have an effective partnership, municipal police have fewer diversionary practices than the university police and are less well-suited to serve the needs of Tufts community members. Importantly, TUPD currently collaborates with many Tufts departments to address service calls involving members of the student body. Municipal police would not be able to collaborate with university departments in this way.
Tufts’ campuses are located in Somerville, Medford, Boston, and Grafton. Our campuses are open and often attract unwanted guests. Because of the partnership between TUPD and the municipal police, Tufts’ officers are afforded the opportunity to address off-campus incidents in an effort to render alternative options for calls for service. This allows the university to control how these situations are handled and retain ultimate responsibility and decision-making authority.
APPENDIX B: Working Group Membership

- Robert Amato, Professor, Endodontics, School of Dental Medicine
- David Art, Professor, Political Science, School of Arts and Sciences
- Rocco DiRico, Executive Director, Government and Community Relations
- Michael Howard (Chair), Executive Vice President
- Soo Min Kim, Undergraduate Student, School of Arts and Sciences
- Kalimah Knight, Deputy Director, Media Relations
- Allison Larmann, Graduate Student, Fletcher School
- Mary McCauley, Director, Public Safety
- Joseph McManus, Executive Associate Dean, Cummings School of Veterinary Medicine
- Katrina Moore, Senior Director, Africana Center
- Eric Morales, Police Officer, Public Safety
- Samuel Sommers, Professor, Psychology, School of Arts and Sciences
- Yolanda Smith, Executive Director, Public Safety
- Barbara Stein, Vice President, Operations
APPENDIX C: Research and Background Information on Public Safety

The Evolution of Campus Policing, prepared by Margolis Healy and Associates
(presented by Steven Healy at campus forums on October 25, 26 and 27, 2021)
APPENDIX D: Community Engagement and Input

Arming Survey Summary prepared by Margolis Healy and Associates
APPENDIX E: Community Engagement and Input

Focus Group Findings prepared by Margolis Healy and Associates
APPENDIX F: Community Engagement and Input
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1. Intoxicated Person
2. Distraught Pet Owner
3. Stranger on Campus
4. Building Alarm
5. Vandalism
6. Welfare Check
7. Noise Complaint (Off-Campus)
8. Lockout
9. Theft
10. Medical Call/Response to Potential Overdose
11. Mental Health Crisis (Boston Campus)
12. Assault
13. Bomb Threat
15. Student Protest
16. Controversial Speaker on Campus/VIPs
17. Violent Intruder
18. Sexual Assault
19. Mental Health Crisis (Medford/Somerville Campus)
20. Mental Health Crisis (Grafton Campus)