

Proactive Prevention

This approach is founded on the idea that averting riots entirely is the strongest way of limiting damage and avoiding chaos. It focuses on preventing riot activity by proactively deterring from the behavior.

What could be done?

- Organize post-win parades or celebrations
- Advertise illegality of riot activity
- Slow exit traffic from Beaver Stadium

Pros:

- Prevents destruction
- Productive alternative to rioting
- Reduces bad publicity surrounding the post-win atmosphere

Cons:

- Significant financial investment
- Students may interpret this as the University being overbearing and rebel
- Planned events may not be seen as legitimate alternatives by the students

Change Culture

This approach is based on increasing overall student pride and respect for the downtown area in order to change the mindset of the community such that the riots never occur in the first place.

What could be done?

- Organize events to help build respect for downtown area and remind students of the negativity of riots
- Campaign for better treatment of the downtown area

Pros:

- Can reduce or even eliminate the need for police enforcement after games
- Neither the student body nor the police will be negatively impacted
- Positive attitude towards the town

Cons:

- Deindividuation during actual riots may lead to difficulty in students retaining their mindsets
- Difficult to find a solid plan of action that would effectively change the student mindset

Increase Enforcement

This approach recognizes that there is likely no perfect way to prevent students from rioting and focuses instead on maintaining order during the event and doling out punishments following the event.

What could be done?

- Increase the punishments for rioting
- Enforce tenant compliance
- Provide busses away from the events
- University zero-tolerance policy for participation in the riots

Pros

- Threat of arrest may deter students from rioting
- Increased enforcement makes it easier to stop illegal activity
- The technique is historically effective

Cons

- Harsher punishments may further sour student perspective of police
- Increased responsibility placed on police rather than students
- Potential increase in tax dollars

Notes:

You Break It, You Buy It: Discussing the Riots at Penn State

The Problem:

With alarming regularity, students form mobs in the downtown State College area following various events, most often related to sporting wins. These mobs more often than not turn violent, resulting in tens of thousands of dollars in vandalism and property damage throughout the town. The frequency and severity of these riots damages the physical town of State College, it damages the relationship between the University and the town of State College, and it damages the reputation of the University as a whole.

¹ Madensen, Tamara, John E. Eck, and United States. Department of Justice. Office of Community Oriented Policing Services. *Student Party Riots*, vol. no. 39.;no. 39.;, U.S. Dept. of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, Washington, D.C., 2006.

What Makes A Riot:

The US Department of Justice studied what they termed “Student Party Riots” and published a report outlining *the problem and its potential causes*.

Student party riots tend to include intoxicated men and women who create a disturbing presence late at night. Students from other universities may be present, and injuries and property damage are common.¹

The Goal:

The same study from the Department of Justice also outlined *possible criteria for success*.

If the riots are successfully dealt with, we can expect to see fewer instances of rioting. Property damage, injuries, and police confrontations during the remaining riots will be fewer and less severe.¹

