

Executive Summary

Investigators:
Christina D. Riggs
Albert F. Moran

August 28, 2019

INTRODUCTION

This Executive Summary concerns community member involvement in seven student-led demonstrations that occurred on or near the campus of Swarthmore College (the “College”) between April 19, 2019 and May 2, 2019. These demonstrations followed an April 18, 2019 leak of documents regarding the now-former College chapter of Phi Psi fraternity. The content of those documents is not the subject of this investigation. There was a separate and unrelated investigation on that subject. This investigation focuses on the conduct of individuals (students, administrators, Public Safety officers, etc.) at, or in response to, the seven demonstrations conducted in the wake of the Phi Psi document leak (the “Investigation”).

To conduct this Investigation, the College retained Christina D. Riggs, along with her colleague, Albert F. Moran (the “Investigators”).¹ Although both Investigators are attorneys, they were retained in this matter to act as fact investigators for the College, not as attorneys to provide legal advice. By “fact investigators,” this means that the Investigators were not asked to make any findings or recommendations relating to conduct charges, responsibility determinations, or disciplinary sanctions. Instead, the Investigators were asked to collect factual information and prepare a report so that the College could make its own determinations.

I. Qualifications of Investigators

Christina D. Riggs is a Partner at the law firm of Saul Ewing Arnstein & Lehr LLP. She is the Vice Chair of the Firm’s Higher Education Practice Group. Investigator Riggs has led or co-led multiple investigations at the post-secondary level on a variety of topics. She has received training and instruction on conducting investigations through the National Association of College and University Attorneys. She has also provided such training to multiple institutions of higher education. Investigator Riggs is assisted in this Investigation by Albert F. Moran, an associate attorney in the firm’s Higher Education Practice Group with experience conducting Title IX investigations.

II. Procedural History

On May 8, 2019, the College contacted Investigator Riggs for assistance in conducting an investigation regarding demonstrations that had taken place on and near the College’s campus. Over the next several weeks, the Investigators interviewed 26 individuals, including College administrators, employees, Public Safety Officers, the Swarthmore Borough Police and three students. Each witness was provided an opportunity to identify any documents, videos, witnesses, or other information that the witness believed would assist the Investigators.

In addition to the three students noted above, the Investigators also reached out to an additional 32 students who were involved in, present at, or otherwise identified as having some connection to some or all of the demonstrations. The Investigators requested that each of these

¹ This Executive Summary is authored by Christina D. Riggs and her co-Investigator, Albert F. Moran. For readability, however, the Investigators will be referred to in the third person.

students meet with or speak telephonically with the Investigators in order to share their account of what happened at the demonstrations. But, despite **multiple attempts** to reach each student, these students did not agree to meet or speak with the Investigators.

Several student demonstrators sent the following email to the College:

We write as a group of student protestors at the center of the external investigation into alleged “conduct violations” and possible disciplinary action surrounding our recent nonviolent direct actions. Given the unwillingness of administrators to elaborate on College policies, the refusal to clarify potential outcomes of the investigation, and the lack of transparency offered by the external reviewers when questioned, we write to inform you that we are pursuing legal counsel before continuing this process.

As we wait to confirm the details of our representation, we ask that the investigation account for the time we will need to do so. Please inform the external investigators of this update and feel free to pass along to the College’s legal department as well.

The College shared this email with the Investigators, and the Investigators waited nearly two weeks before contacting these twelve students to account for the time requested in the students’ email. The Investigators sent the following email to each student individually:

I am writing to follow-up on our request for an interview. The College shared with me an email dated May 25, 2019 indicating your intent to confer with legal counsel before participating in this investigation. As two-and-a-half weeks have passed, I am hopeful you have had an opportunity to speak with counsel and are willing to meet with me. If so, please let me know the best dates and times to reach you.

On a related note, part of your May 25 email indicated what you perceive to be a “lack of transparency offered by external reviewers when questioned.” I am not certain what prompted this statement, but allow me to be clear about my role.

The College asked us to take a look at the protests and demonstrations that occurred on the following dates at the noted locations:

- *April 19 (Parrish Hall, 2nd Floor)*
- *April 22 (Parrish Hall, Office of Student Engagement)*
- *April 24 (Parrish Hall, 1st Floor/Dean [redacted for Exec. Sum.]’s Office)*
- *April 25 (The Inn at Swarthmore)*
- *April 26 (Scheuer Room)*
- *April 27-May 2 (Former Phi Psi House)*
- *May 2 (Parrish Hall, 2nd Floor)*

Specifically, we have been asked to look at these demonstrations/protests from all perspectives, meaning we gather information about the actions of not just students, but also administrators, public safety officers, etc.

Our role is fact-finding, which means that we do not make any determinations about conduct charges, findings of responsibility or non-responsibility, or sanctions. So, when asked whether statements made to me will result in disciplinary action, I cannot answer that because I do not know. I can tell you that I will share my factual information with the College, and, based on that factual information, the College could pursue disciplinary action and/or restorative practices should it believe that any community member violated College policies. But I do not know what action, if any, the College may take.

It is also important to add, however, that your name came up as someone who either had information about, or was involved in, one or more of these events. It is therefore possible that others have or will provide information relating to you or your involvement in the events. That information will be shared with the College whether or not you choose to participate in this investigation. That would not be my preference. I want to hear, and I am inviting you to give, your account of what occurred and your response to contrary information, if any.

This is your choice. But I truly hope you will choose to speak with me.

None of the students responded.² Despite no response, the Investigators sent an additional follow-up email to each student once again asking to meet or speak with each student. The Investigators, again, received no responses. Given this, Investigator Riggs also reached out to a parent/attorney who was present on campus during the first day of the Phi Psi sit-in. According to the Public Safety Incident Reports and witness accounts, this parent/attorney helped facilitate conversation between the students and administrators. Investigators hoped that this parent/attorney could provide a student-focused account of, at least, that one demonstration. But after two additional email exchanges, this parent/attorney declined to speak with the Investigators citing attorney-client privilege.

As a result of the above, the student demonstrators' experiences and accounts regarding the demonstrations were not able to be captured in this Executive Summary.

III. Pertinent Information Reviewed

Information reviewed included student and employee handbooks, Public Safety standard operating guidelines, Public Safety incident reports, videos posted on Organizing for Survivors' (O4S) publicly-available Facebook and Twitter accounts, security videos from the College, emails, text exchanges, photographs, articles, and other documentation.

² The Investigators later learned that the student demonstrators also posted a document entitled "Student Protesters Will Not Participate" on the Organizing for Survivors (O4S) Facebook page.

IV. Overview of Executive Summary

This Executive Summary is broken down into seven sections. **Recall that there are over thirty individuals known to have been present or involved in the demonstrations whose accounts have not been included because those individuals declined to speak with the Investigators.*

Part	Date(s)	General Location
I	April 19, 2019	Parrish Hall, Room 222
II	April 22, 2019	Office of Student Engagement
III	April 24, 2019	Dean's Office
IV	April 25, 2019	Swarthmore Inn
V	April 26, 2019	Kohlberg Hall, Scheuer Room
VI	April 27, 2019-May 2, 2019	Phi Psi Fraternity House
VII	May 2, 2019	Parrish Hall, President's Suite

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

I. April 19, 2019

Demonstration: On April 19, 2019, the Swarthmore College Task Force on Student Social Events and Community Standards (“Task Force”) was scheduled to convene for a meeting at approximately 1:30 p.m. in the President’s Conference Room (Parrish Hall Room 222). Shortly before the meeting began, a group of student demonstrators convened in the hallway outside the meeting room and began to chant, clap, and stomp. This demonstration was organized by a group known as Organizing for Survivors (“O4S”), along with the Coalition to End Fraternity Violence. O4S, according to its Facebook page, is “a growing collective at Swarthmore College, rooted in Transformative Justice, that aims to improve Title IX-related issues on campus.”

Information Sources: The Investigators interviewed nine individuals with information about this demonstration, including, but not limited to: Task Force members who spoke directly with student demonstrators, Task Force members who arrived late and walked through the hallway, Task Force members who participated by phone, and non-members who were in or around the hallway. The Investigators attempted to interview various student demonstrators present at the demonstration, but none agreed to speak with the Investigators. O4S did, however, post a video of the demonstration on its public Facebook page. This video is approximately 17 minutes long and shows the hallway outside of Room 222. Witness accounts confirmed that this video does reflect the April 19 demonstration in Parrish Hall. None of the individuals interviewed provided verbal consent to demonstrators to be recorded.

Overview: At this demonstration, students lined the hallway, including in front of office doors, holding signs and chanting loudly. The Investigators were unable to determine the precise number of students, and most witnesses could not estimate the number. But one Task Force member estimated that the hallway was lined with approximately 100 demonstrators.

By all accounts, the demonstrators did not prevent the ingress or egress of the Task Force members (or anyone else), though at least one Task Force member expressed that it was “not ideal” having to walk down the hallway with that many demonstrators. At least two College employees working near the hallway (but not attending the Task Force meeting) told Investigators that the hallway was very loud making it difficult to complete work that day. But these witnesses confirmed that the demonstrators did not attempt to enter any private offices.

Before the Task Force meeting began, the Task Force co-chairs went into the hallway to listen to and speak with the demonstrators. The demonstrators read a prepared statement that, among other things, called for the end of fraternity leases at the College. In response to the prepared statement, both chairs thanked the students for their information and views, but confirmed that the Task Force would not finish its work that day. Based on witness accounts and the O4S-posted video, the demonstrators appeared disappointed that the leases would not end immediately, and several chants broke out. Based on all available accounts, only one Task Force member was singled out by demonstrators. This Task Force member was interviewed, and by their own account, the demonstration was “loud, but not out of bounds.”

The Task Force chairs were not prevented from returning to the meeting room. As for the meeting itself, witnesses advised that meeting attendees were tense and rattled after the demonstration, and that volume outside the room was loud at points, making it difficult to hear and discuss agenda items. But, by all accounts, the meeting was able to go forward, despite being delayed 20-30 minutes.

II. April 22, 2019

Demonstration: On April 22, 2019, at approximately 3:00 p.m., certain O4S members met with the College President and her Chief of Staff. After the meeting ended, some of these individuals and other O4S members entered the Office of Student Engagement (“OSE”) common space at approximately 4:00 p.m. to speak with the Director of Student Activities.

Information Sources: The Investigators interviewed four individuals with information about this demonstration. The Investigators attempted to interview various student demonstrators present at the demonstration, but none agreed to speak with the Investigators. O4S did, however, post a video of the demonstration on Facebook. The video is approximately 7.5 minutes long, and the person recording the video appears to be hidden behind a pole in OSE. Witness accounts confirmed that this video reflects the April 22 demonstration in the OSE office located in Parrish Hall. Neither of the two administrators who spoke during this video consented to be recorded. One did not know they were being videotaped until they saw the video posted online. The other did not know they were being videotaped until halfway through the encounter because of the placement of the student-recorder behind a pillar.

Overview: Around 4:00 p.m. the Director of Student Activities for OSE was in a pre-arranged meeting with the Associate Dean and Director of Student Engagement. After the two were notified that students were congregating in the OSE office, a student knocked on the Director’s office window. At this point the Director and Associate Dean walked outside into the OSE main space to speak with the approximately 10-15 students who had congregated.

At all times, the students maintained space between themselves and the administrators. Overall, the students made two demands, namely that the Director (1) not approve party permit requests by the fraternities or fraternity leadership for the remainder of the semester; and (2) immediately remove both students living in the fraternity houses to emergency housing. The Director advised that he could not make that decision autonomously. Based on witness accounts and the O4S-posted video, multiple students voiced frustration at the inability to meet these two requests immediately. Ultimately, the meeting ended with the Associate Dean requesting a copy of the demands in writing.

At some point after the meeting ended, two students wrote “no more parties” on the OSE student activities whiteboard and crossed out DU and Phi Psi. When told to stop, they complied. Administrators confirmed that the board was cleaned up and remains usable. Nothing else was done to property within OSE. Apart from this whiteboard incident, the interrupted meeting, and the videotaping/posting, administrators described the demonstrators as “not disrespectful.” In addition, although demonstrators were described as “demanding,” “persistent,” and offering some “low blows,” they were also described as “cordial,” “communicative,” “not hostile,” and “not intimidating.”

III. April 24, 2019

Demonstration: On April 24, 2019, at approximately 4:00 p.m., a group of students approached a Dean of Student Life at his office in Parrish Hall.

Information Sources: The Investigators interviewed nine individuals with information about this demonstration, including the Dean and one student demonstrator, as well as two administrators who witnessed the demonstration, two administrators who appeared after the demonstration, and three Public Safety officers. The Investigators attempted to interview student demonstrators known to be present at the demonstration, only one agreed to speak with the Investigators. The one student interviewed confirmed that she was aware that someone connected with O4S was recording the incident. This recording appears on O4S’s public Facebook page. The video is approximately 8 minutes long. During the video, the Dean explicitly states to the person recording that the individual did not have the Dean’s permission to record; yet the recording continues. Investigators also reviewed the documents that the student demonstrators pushed under Dean’s door, as well as text message exchanges between administrators relating to the demonstration.

Overview: On the morning of April 24, 2019, a student asked to speak with the Dean later that day about a “Title IX-related issue.” The Dean offered to speak with the student at that time, but the student said they had class and wanted to speak at 4:00 p.m. The Dean said he had another obligation that afternoon, and would be available for a few minutes only due to a prior obligation. The student agreed to return at 4:00 p.m.

At 4:00 p.m., the student, joined by approximately 20 other students, went to the Dean’s hallway office door. The Dean opened the hallway door associated with his office, and the original student asked him to listen to the other students. The Dean reminded the original student that he had a prior obligation that afternoon, but he agreed to listen to the students.

Five students offered sentiments that the Dean and the College failed to protect students. A sixth student relayed two demands, namely that the Dean (1) not approve party permit requests by the fraternities or fraternity leadership for the remainder of the semester; and (2) immediately remove both students living in the fraternity houses to emergency housing. The Dean replied that “those issues are under discussion” and that “it’s not my position to make that decision unilaterally.” According to witness accounts and the O4S-posted video, multiple students voiced frustration. The Dean thanked the students for their time and informed the person recording that they did not have his permission to record him (the recording continued).

At this point, the Dean attempted to close the hallway door to his office suite. One student rushed toward the door and attempted to push it open, preventing its closure. This student was followed by another student who placed his hand on the door. Although unclear, this second student did not appear to add force against the door. No other student appeared to apply physical force to the door, though many students stepped in closer proximity to the Dean. The Dean said “please let me close my door” more than once. The students remained in the doorway, preventing the Dean’s hallway door from closing. There was no physical contact between the Dean and the students; all contact was with the door.

After a few moments, the Dean quickly retreated to his interior office, closing and locking the door behind him. Some, but not all, of the demonstrators followed the Dean and stood at his locked door. While in his office, the Dean attempted to call Public Safety. A few minutes later, the demonstrators shoved papers under his door and said they would come back every day. One of these documents read at the top of one page, “*Statement, read redacted docs, tumbler? Until he leaves follow him out not quiiiiite to his car lol.*”

After a few moments, a fellow administrator knocked on the Dean’s door and said the suite was clear. By all accounts, the Dean was visibly rattled and upset. Another administrator who was in the hallway during the student’s demonstration described the situation as “a little scary” given the “sheer volume” and “level of rage” by the students. The Dean took a “nontraditional route” to his car, accompanied by a colleague, and drove to his prior obligation.

IV. April 25, 2019

Demonstration: On the afternoon of April 25, 2019, the College President and Chief of Staff were meeting with members of the College’s Board in the Ingleneuk Room at the Inn at Swarthmore. A group of student demonstrators appeared at the Inn.

Information Sources: The Investigators interviewed eleven individuals with information about this demonstration, including administrators who witnessed the demonstration or who appeared after the demonstration began, Public Safety officers who witnessed the demonstration or who responded outside the Inn, and Borough Police. The Investigators attempted to interview student demonstrators known to be present at the demonstrations, but no one agreed to speak with the Investigators. O4S did, however, post three videos of the encounter on its public Facebook page. Witness accounts confirmed that these videos reflect the April 25 demonstration at the Inn. None of the individuals interviewed provided verbal consent to be recorded, but also did not ask that the recording stop. In addition to speaking with witnesses and reviewing videos,

the Investigators reviewed text message exchanges between administrators relating to the demonstration.

Overview: At approximately 2:00 p.m., a student knocked on the door to the Ingleneuk Room, opened the door, and a group of approximately 25 students entered the room and surrounded the table at which the meeting attendees were sitting. A number of the students read statements, either from their cellphones or from papers they were carrying, asked questions of the meeting attendees, and demanded that the College end the DU and Phi Psi fraternity leases. At various points during the demonstration, certain administrators attempted to speak, but were cut off by the student demonstrators. During the demonstration, students were told to avoid blocking the room's fire exits and to avoid blocking the Inn's restaurant; by all accounts they complied.

Eventually, the Provost asked the students to wait outside the Ingleneuk Room so that the administrators could discuss the student's questions and demands. The students complied and gathered in the area outside the Ingleneuk Room. During this time, the students sang songs until the Provost stepped out of the Ingleneuk Room and asked the students to quiet down, which they did. The students were eventually told by the Inn's General Manager that they could not block access to the Inn's restaurant and to wait outside. Most students complied; but a few students remained inside. Eventually, the College President gave a statement outside the Inn to approximately 10-20 student demonstrators, where she confirmed that no fraternity parties would take place that weekend. The students seemed disappointed and indicated that they wanted a full cessation of all fraternity activity for the rest of the year. The students were told that they could protest outside on the sidewalk if they wished; they complied and most departed.

The pre-arranged meeting involving the Board members was not able to be completed that day. Public Safety was aware that this demonstration was occurring, but most officers waited outside the Inn and did not enter the Inn at any point. The Borough Police were made aware of the April 25 demonstration, but were not asked to respond. The Inn did not receive any complaints regarding the demonstration.

V. April 26, 2019

Demonstration: On April 26, 2019, a demonstration occurred in and immediately outside of the Scheuer Room in Kohlberg Hall during a Task Force meeting.

Information Sources: The Investigators interviewed five individuals with information about this demonstration including, but not limited to: Task Force members who spoke directly with student demonstrators, Task Force members who arrived late and walked through the hallway, and non-members who were in or around the hallway. The Investigators attempted to interview student demonstrators known to be present at the demonstrations, but none agreed to speak with the Investigators.

Overview: By all accounts, this demonstration was similar to the April 19, 2019 demonstration. One difference, however, was that on April 26, 2019 the demonstrators entered the room where the Task Force meeting was being held. None of the available witnesses could

provide a precise number of demonstrators, but estimated that somewhere between 50-80 demonstrators entered the room. By all accounts, the demonstrators hung signs in the room. Some of these signs were pages from the leaked documents or the Tumblr accounts; others were homemade posters. At least one witness said it was “impossible to look anywhere in the room and not be forced to read the signs.” One witness found it very “upsetting” and left the room; she was not prevented from leaving. Another witness found the fact that the demonstrators entered the room and hung signs “all over the room” very disruptive. But other attendees described the demonstration as “angry, but not out of bounds.” No one saw any physical obstruction or threats.

After approximately 15-20 minutes inside the room, the demonstrators went into the hallway and the meeting proceeded. Once they were in the hallway, demonstrators lined the hallway on both sides, and one witness thought that coming and going would have been challenging. This witness heard and saw chanting and singing, but nothing extremely disruptive. The noise was “not consistently loud.” The Task Force members that were interviewed confirmed that the demonstrators were loud, but not as loud as the April 19 demonstration. The meeting was able to proceed forward, albeit delayed. No one was prevented from leaving the meeting once it ended.

Prior to the Task Force meeting, there had been a planned meeting between the College President and other administrators and O4S. More than 20 students appeared at the meeting and it was described as “tense.” When the meeting was ending, witnesses recalled an alumnae making a direct, personal statement against the Dean of Students, noting she did not trust him and pointing her fingers in his face. By all accounts, the Dean remained calm and did not respond. No other direct personal comments in either direction were noted.

VI. April 27, 2019 – May 2, 2019

Demonstration: On the afternoon of April 27, 2019, O4S demonstrators gained access to the Phi Psi house and began a sit-in inside the house. To gain access, a student called Public Safety and claimed she left a personal item in the basement of the house.

Information Sources: The Investigators interviewed seventeen individuals with information about this demonstration including, but not limited to: the Public Safety officer who responded to the call, other Public Safety officers who responded and monitored the area, the Borough Police Chief, and College administrators who were present at or otherwise involved with the response to the demonstration. The Investigators attempted to interview student demonstrators known to be present at the demonstrations, but only one agreed to speak with the Investigators. The Investigators also attempted to speak with a parent/attorney known to be present at the time of the demonstration, but this person declined to speak with Investigators, citing attorney-client privilege. The Investigators reviewed security videos of the Phi Psi house rear entry, materials posted to the O4S Facebook page, and text message exchanges relating to the demonstration. Investigators also reviewed a May 10, 2019 *Voices* article (noted below).

Overview: Although most students declined to speak with the Investigators, certain O4S members were quoted in a May 10, 2019 *Voices* article. This article states that at approximately

3:45 p.m. on April 27, 2019, a Public Safety officer (PSO) went to the Phi Psi house to respond to a call from a student, who requested entry to retrieve an item she had left at the house during a party. The PSO met the student (who was with two other students) at the door leading into the house's basement and let her into the house. According to the *Voices* article, the student then texted another student who was waiting nearby with nine other students, and as soon as this text message was received, these students "joined her in taking the space." The *Voices* article proceeds to state that the PSO "attempted to bar access to the house by forcibly closing the door," and at that point, a student "wedged himself in between" the PSO, the door, and another student in a struggle to keep the door open. The article notes that this student's book bag became caught between the PSO and the door. According to this student, if the demonstrators "missed this one opportunity to get into the fraternity," they "would be back at square one and all the hours of work and planning and really thorough weighing of pros and cons and consequences would all be for nothing." The student also stated that he "kind of went into this mode of 'get in and do this.'"

Another student quoted in the *Voices* article who was present stated that she saw the PSO "trying to close the door and keep himself in front of the door and others were trying to keep the door open and get through it." According to this student, "[i]t wasn't their bodies interacting with each other as much as their bodies interacting with the door." The *Voices* article notes that "phones were drawn" so as "to document the altercation" and that shortly thereafter "the students were inside." Then, the article states, one of these students ran upstairs and opened the front and side doors to the Phi Psi house to allow other students to enter. The students who gained entry became excited, and in some cases, emotional as they "recover[ed] and comfort[ed] one another." One student "thought the situation would be calm," but started running when she saw another student running and entered the house through the back door when she saw a Public Safety officer blocking the front door. According to the *Voices* article, the "cautious celebration" lasted 15 minutes before the students learned that Public Safety had called the Borough Police, which worried "the large number of students of color, international students and others who were most vulnerable to the risk of arrest" and led them to leave the house. According to the *Voices* article, approximately 30 students remained in the house "so as to secure their position," and these students "took a stance of non-engagement with the police."

The responding PSO described a similar entry encounter. When the responding PSO arrived on scene, he knew the student and let her into the house. She claimed to have left her wallet inside. Once inside, the student made her way to the basement, where she opened a back door and let other students inside. When the PSO went downstairs, there was an altercation near the back door – he was trying to close the door as two students were trying to gain access. By the time this PSO went back upstairs, other students had been let in via the front door. He secured the front door. He notified Public Safety and the Borough Police.

College administrators also arrived on scene. By all accounts, the College wanted to facilitate a peaceful way for the students to leave the house. The College did not want students arrested; the Borough Police Chief confirmed that the College administrators did not want students arrested. Because Phi Psi held the lease on the house, however, College administrators had to work with Phi Psi leadership in an effort to minimize Borough Police involvement.

In addition, a parent/attorney who was on campus that day helped facilitate conversation between the students and the administrators. By all accounts, this person was very helpful and assisted in negotiating two things: (1) circumstances that would allow the house's lone resident to retrieve his belongings without having to interact with student demonstrators inside the house; and (2) an agreement that a set number of students would remain inside the house overnight but that those students would leave by 7:00 a.m. on April 28, 2019. Item (1) occurred; Item (2) did not. At 7:00 a.m. on April 28, 2019, the students did not leave the house. The students remained in the house until May 2, 2019. The house's resident had to stay in an alternate location throughout the duration of the sit-in.

On May 2, 2019, all but one student left the Phi Psi house in order to demonstrate in Parrish Hall, taking items from the Phi Psi house with them to Parrish Hall. The Borough Police Chief arrived on scene and spoke with the remaining student, who left the house. According to the Chief, there was no threat of arrest made to that student. Once the one remaining student left the house, Public Safety and OSE staff members secured the house. OSE staff members then collected and catalogued all of the demonstrators' possessions that had been left inside the house and coordinated a pick-up process.

VII. May 2, 2019

Demonstration: In the late morning of May 2, 2019, student demonstrators staged a sit-in in the President's Suite on the second floor of Parrish Hall.

Information Sources: The Investigators interviewed twenty-two individuals with information about this demonstration including, but not limited to: two students, College administrators, Public Safety Officers, and the Borough Police Chief. The Investigators attempted to interview student demonstrators known to be present at the demonstrations, but all but one declined to speak with the Investigators. There are four security videos of this demonstration, as well as three videos posted by O4S. The Investigators also reviewed materials posted to the O4S Twitter page and text message exchanges relating to the demonstration.

Overview: For context in reading this Overview, it is important to understand that there is a glass door on the second floor of Parrish Hall that separates the President's Suite from the East Wing Hallway. The two sides of the glass door will be referred to as the "President's Suite Side" and the "East Wing Hallway Side." The glass door swings inward to the President's Suite Side. With this context, the summary is divided into five parts: (1) Demonstrators' Entry into the President's Suite Side; (2) Incident at the Glass Door; (3) Incident at the Back Door; (4) Shutting Down the President's Suite Side; and (5) Demonstrators Exiting the President's Suite Side.

Entry into the President's Suite Side

Before noon on May 2, 2019, the glass door referenced above had been closed and locked. Sometime after it was locked, a student attempted to open the glass door from the East Wing Hallway Side. She then walked into the Provost's office, which is nearby on the East Wing Hallway Side and told an employee that she needed to deliver a letter to the College President. That employee advised the student that the President was out that day, but that she

would take the letter. According to the employee, the student seemed very upset and said she wanted to deliver it personally. The employee opened the glass door and brought the student into the President's Suite, where another employee confirmed that the President was out that day.

Once inside the President's Suite, the student began rummaging through her backpack and then told the employees in the Suite she must have left the letter downstairs. One employee offered to walk her downstairs to get the letter. The student advised that her friend was bringing it up. By this point, the Chief of Staff and Dean of Students had entered the President's Suite. Shortly after those two arrived, a student fitting the description provided by the first student arrived at the glass door on the East Wing Hallway Side. The Dean let this student into President's Suite Side and asked for the referenced letter. This student advised that they did not have the letter. (One student interviewed told Investigators that they did not believe that there was a letter, and that saying there was a letter was, they believe, a means to reach the President.) After a few moments, this second student opened the glass door on his own and let an additional seven students into the President's Suite Side before the Dean could secure the glass door. At or around that point, the Chief of Staff pressed the Garnet button, which called Public Safety. A Public Safety Officer (PSO) who had been in the nearby Rose Garden arrived moments later. The Dean advised this PSO to guard the glass door from the President's Suite Side and not let anyone in or out of the door (there was an available, secured back door for exit).

Incident at the Glass Door

As time went on, a large number of student demonstrators congregated on the East Wing Hallway Side of the glass door. Another Public Safety Officer was stationed on the East Wing Hallway Side of the glass door. Around 12:38 p.m., an associate director for Public Safety arrived on scene and entered the President's Suite Side via the back, secured stairwell. When he opened the back door, at least three students followed him in and onto the President's Suite Side. One of those students walked up the hallway and made his way toward the glass door within 8 seconds of coming through the back door.

This student had an altercation with the PSO who was guarding the glass door on the President's Suite Side. Based on available witness accounts and a video posted by O4S, the student attempted to open the glass door from the President's Suite Side. The student succeeded in opening the door slightly. An unknown number of students on the East Wing Hallway Side attempted to push the door open. The Public Safety officials on both sides of the door attempted to close the door. A director for Public Safety attempted to pull the student on the President's Suite Side away from the door, but after a few seconds this director stopped trying to pull the student away from the door and began pushing on the door itself to close it.

What happened from that point is disputed. The student on the President's Suite Side claimed that a PSO pushed him; the PSO denied pushing the student. The only available video has an obstructed view. On that video, another individual is seen recording with an unobstructed view. The Investigators requested a copy of this student's recording, but never received it. By all available witness accounts, the momentum from the door being pushed and pulled, and eventually being shut, moved the pertinent PSO and the student forward, resulting in their falling forward. Immediately after this altercation, the President spoke to the demonstrators on the

President's Suite Side via cellphone. She was home with her elderly mother and offered to meet the demonstrators in the Rose Garden; this offer was declined.

Incident at the Back Door

Certain available witness accounts also described an altercation involving an associate dean that occurred when the associate dean came up the back, secured stairwell, escorted by a director for Public Safety. By many accounts, there were a number of students inside the stairwell. When the director and associate dean reached the second floor and opened the back door to the President's Suite side (which opens inward toward the stairwell), 4 or 5 student demonstrators attempted to hold the door open and one student attempted to follow them in. This effort trapped the associate dean between the students, the door, and the director (who was stopped in the doorframe to keep students from entering the President's Suite Side). The incident lasted around 25 seconds, and no students made their way onto the President's Suite Side. The associate dean was not injured, but was very upset by this encounter. Other administrators described the associate dean as shaken.

Shutting Down the President's Suite Side

According to available witness accounts, the College administrators who were present left around 4:30 p.m. to attend a memorial for a deceased student. At that point, the President's Suite Side was locked down, meaning that the glass door remained locked and guarded on both sides, and the bathrooms on the President's Suite Side were closed. Bathrooms on the East Wing Hallway Side of the glass door remained open. Students inside the President's Suite Side were permitted to leave through the back door, but no one could re-enter the President's Suite Side once they left. No one could come or go through the glass door. There are undisputed and disputed facts about the ability to pass food, water, and medication through the door.

- Food: Student demonstrators claimed that Public Safety officers refused to allow students on the East Wing Hallway Side to hand over food to those on the President's Suite Side. Public Safety officers confirmed that they did not permit students to pass food to the students on the President's Suite Side from students on the East Wing Hallway Side, but that the students on the President's Suite Side were permitted to leave if they wanted.
- Water: Student demonstrators claim that Public Safety officers refused to allow students on the East Wing Hallway Side to hand over water to those on the President's Suite Side. Public Safety Officers confirmed that they did not permit students on the East Wing Hallway Side to pass water to the students on the President's Suite Side, but that the students on the President's Suite Side were permitted to leave if they wanted. Public Safety Officers and College administrators also confirmed that there is a water cooler in the President's Suite. Security videos from inside the Suite confirm that student demonstrators had access to water from that cooler at or around 12:00 p.m. In addition, one administrator confirmed that the Suite's water cooler had water available in it as late as 5:15 p.m. that day when this administrator returned to the Suite. This administrator also informed the Investigators that she left an additional jug of water near the cooler when she left.

- Medicine: Student demonstrators claim that Public Safety officers refused to allow students on the East Wing Hallway Side to hand over medication to a student on the President's Suite Side. The Investigators were able to speak with one student with information on this subject. That student confirmed that they first made the request to pass medication through after the College administrators had left for the memorial service, which would have been around 4/4:15 p.m. This request was initially denied by Public Safety. But the student confirmed that around 5:15 p.m. an administrator returned from the memorial and brought the medication to the student on the President's Suite Side through the back stairwell. The administrator also confirmed this information. The student did not recall any other attempts to pass medication to President's Suite Side.

Demonstrators Exiting the President's Suite Side

The student demonstrators left the President's Suite around 8:30 p.m., citing a threat of arrest. The Investigators were unable to confirm the source of this statement. By all accounts from College administrators, Public Safety officials, and the Borough Police Chief, no one conveyed to students demonstrators that arrests or warrants were pending. The Investigators uncovered only two references to "arrest" in relation to Parrish Hall on May 2, 2019.

- First, a student demonstrator told the Investigators that someone heard a Public Safety officer in the hallway say they were writing warrants for students' arrests. This student did not hear this herself and did not know who said it or heard it. The Investigators confirmed that Public Safety Officers at the College do not have arrest power. The Investigators also spoke to the Public Safety Officer who was in the hallway around 8:30 p.m. This PSO denied making any statement about arrests, and was startled when the demonstrators left the President's Suite Side of the glass door because nothing on his side of the glass door indicated to him why this would occur. Immediately before the demonstrators left, the students in the East Wing Hallway were singing and praising the students in the President's Suite. No one mentioned arrests on his side of the glass door. This PSO also noted that Borough Police had been there since the afternoon, which was confirmed by Borough Police. Borough Police also confirmed that they did not attempt to make any arrests, and that no one from the College asked the Borough Police to make any arrests. According to the Borough Police, the College did not want any arrests made. This is consistent with College administrator accounts.
- Second, a Public Safety officer who was conducting a pre-party check-in at another campus location on the evening of May 2, 2019 (i.e., not in Parrish Hall), used the term "arrest." During the pre-party check-in process, one of the host students asked this PSO about the demonstrators at Parrish Hall, specifically asking what could happen to the demonstrators. This PSO responded that if the College President wanted to obtain arrest warrants she could. The student asked if it would get that far, and this PSO responded that he hoped it would not. This PSO did not know if somehow that statement was transmitted to the student demonstrators in Parrish Hall. The Investigators could not determine whether this was the source of the pending arrest threat noted by the student demonstrators.

END OF EXECUTIVE SUMMARY