

NCJTC- Fox Valley | Multiculturalism and Police Understanding the Fragile Relationship with Communities of Color

Welcome, everyone, to the National Criminal Justice Training Center webinar. Our topic today is Multiculturalism and Police-- Understanding the Fragile Relationship with Communities of Color. Presenting today's webinar is Dr. Theodore Darden, a professor of justice studies at the College of DuPage. My name is Jodi Martin. And I will be your moderator for today.

The following webinar and the information contained in it is the full property of the National Criminal Justice Training Center, NCJTC associates, NCJTC affiliates and/or partners. The content of the webinar is for personal training and education. Participant recording of this webinar is strictly prohibited. The information presented on this webinar is collected, maintained, and provided purely for the convenience of the webinar participant. Any use of the webinar content without the express consent of NCJTC is strictly prohibited.

Let's try our first poll question. Can you please launch poll one please? Which of the following best describes your role-- is it Law Enforcement; Educator; Court System Personnel or Prosecutor; or CAC, Social Worker, Victim or Mental Health Service Provider; or Other?

The poll results show that 40% of us today are representing law enforcement. 32% percent represent CAC, Social Workers, Victim or Mental Health Service Providers. At 14%, we have Other. And at 12%, Court System Personnel and prosecutors. And 2% representing educators.

We are very pleased to introduce you to our presenter for today. Dr. Theodore Darden has been a professor of justice studies since 2006 and as department chair, 2009 through 2013, at the College of DuPage in Glen Ellyn, Illinois. Previous to this, he worked in law enforcement for 17 years, where he obtained the rank of Patrol Sergeant.

Dr. Darden was instrumental in bringing community policing to the forefront in the state of Wisconsin. His success in lowering crime rates, building community trust and partnerships, and addressing homelessness at the University of Wisconsin-Madison gained him statewide recognition, when he was named the law enforcement officer of the year by the attorney general's office in the state of Wisconsin. He established the Wisconsin Association of Community Oriented Police in 1996. And he served as its first president.

Dr. Darden joined the Wisconsin Department of Justice Law Enforcement Training and Standards Bureau, where he developed curriculum, provided consultation, and assisted in overseeing police

training in the state's 17 police academies. We are so fortunate to have Dr. Theodore Darden with us today. With that, Dr. Darden, I'll turn the time over to you.

Thank you, Jodi. Welcome, everybody. I'm thankful for being here today presenting this information to you. I'd like to begin by giving some opening remarks.

Over 27 years ago, I became a police officer in the state of Wisconsin. I feel the same way today as I did back then-- policing is about mindset and understanding. My late mentor Herman Goldstein wrote in his book *Police in a Free Society*, "the strength of a democracy and equality of life enjoyed by its citizens are determined in large measure by the police to discharge their duties." I would also add to that quote, "in a manner that is respectful, fair, and representative of the very people who has given the police the right to work with them."

The discussion America is having regarding the police is one both that is necessary and legitimate. When you care about something, you take care of it; you always are looking for ways to nurture it and make it better. The importance of this webinar cannot be understated.

Policing is a tough job. Given the unpredictable nature of human beings and the human experience, that alone indicates that we must continue to expand, evolve, and develop standards of practice and procedures that provide the best of intentions and actions that reflect the best of ourselves.

The concerns many communities have about the police are historic in nature and not only extend governments, but also extend administrations and generations. Our focus here today and beyond should not be striving for perfection but instead on getting better at administering justice for people from all communities in a fair and equitable manner. That ensures you are holding people accountable for their actions but not compromising the values in that process.

Historically, police reformers tried to professionalize police through policies, discipline, training, and organizational structure. These all were meaningful changes. But however, there is a tremendous need to focus on reforms in community relations, leadership styles, empathy, diversity, problem solving, and de-escalation techniques.

Policing employs thousands of women and men who perform their duties assiduously for fairness and justice daily. The vast majority of these professionals do so without incident or issue-- you never hear about them. The difficulties arise when you work in a system that has methods and procedures that have been inherited from previous generations and hire some individuals who have been socialized to view or treat certain people differently based on their implicit or explicit biases. When this has

happened-- when this happens, the system is scrutinized as a whole. We must seek solutions to these problems and deal with them and end them permanently.

We must be honest and committed to this process, along with having courage and an unwavering set of moral principles that is embedded in justice, for the sake of building public safety institutions that we all can be a pro-- that we all can be proud of. Instead of some communities viewing the police as adversaries, there must be a message conveyed that the police belong to the people and serve by their consent. Additionally, the police must see themselves as part of the community and not apart from it. We can no longer afford to get bogged down in the minutia of if police are ethical and fair but instead focus on the purpose of policing in a free society and ensure that their actions are a reflection of the values of the communities that they serve.

We need to find understanding. We do not see the world as it is, but we see it as we are. And when we look at that-- that's what I meant by my attitude that I was bringing into the profession. So I have to ask everyone to consciously open your mind during this webinar.

Critical thinking is important. It's an important part of the intellectual process. We are entitled to our own opinions, but we're not entitled to our own facts. Sometimes our egos get in the way, and it does not allow us to expand ourselves. It always leads us back to the place we've always been.

But if we have deep empathy and true empathy, then we seek understanding. And we do not allow our socialization, or our confirmation, or implicit bias-- or we do not try to confirm what we already believe, and try to take in new information that could lead us to new ideas.

Take a look at these. All of these have something in common. And when you look at these and you begin to ponder what could these all possibly have in common-- what they all have in common is that they resulted in a confrontation with the police in which the individual was killed by the police.

Should we wonder, is it possible to turn these events with the police into a peaceful outcomes? These outcomes impact the police as much as they impact the community. So we have to wonder, with some things that people do daily and the contacted that the police have with them, is there a way that we can re-imagine how these should go instead of how they have been in the past and use these as examples to move forward?

So I challenge you in this webinar to take a look at my objectives and listen objectively. I'm going to first explain how we arrived here today. How did we come to what we are seeing on our television screens; to what we've recently seen in Kenosha, Wisconsin? How does these things unfold? And

where do they derive from? Where do they come from?

Then we can explore, why do they continue to persist, and then, lastly, examine what can be done moving forward, because I believe everyone in this room is here today to do exactly that-- how can we move forward in a positive manner to address some of these things maybe within our agencies? Maybe your agencies are not experiencing some things that other agencies are, but all communities are asking these questions.

So how did we arrive here? The only way that we can understand, how did we arrive here, is by examining our past. Everything is embedded in the past. And if we take up-- or take an opportunity to examine the past, maybe we can develop a better tomorrow by understanding the pitfalls of what led us to this process. Minority communities have long had conflict with the police. And those communities-- and those conflicts are deeply rooted in the history.

And so where do I get my understanding of this from? What are-- what has shaped me and-- in terms of how I see what's going on? I've looked to all of these resources that you have. I'm going to keep this on the screen for just a moment and talk through these. And perhaps some of you could take a note. And maybe there's a book on this list that you might find enjoyable to read. But these books and these resources gives us a really in-depth look at how we arrived here today.

Not only these, but there are hundreds of evidence that-- evidence-based studies that I have read. There are dozens of more books and academic studies written by historians and policing scholars over the last 150 years that have talked about the very thing that we're talking about today. And then my own 30 years in law enforcement and academia has shaped my thinking about how to understand this and about how to move forward.

The roots of American justice has a long, tumultuous history with Black Americans. The roots of that system is built and was developed in a class system. The justice system was never to provide the services that we see that it's providing today. It was always grounded in maintaining order and protecting the property of the wealthy class.

It was shaped by a political system, who was basically the wealthy class. And then it morphed and certainly has been structured over the last 150 years around this ideal of race, of socioeconomic status, and of that class system that I spoke to before. These are things that sociologists, historians, criminologists, and even economists have all led themselves back to to find the roots of American justice.

So American justice is not that system in which we see that it says it protects and serves all. It has been embedded in a process of where it has protected and served the upper echelon/the upper classes. And those other groups have tended to have this tumultuous relationship with the American criminal justice system. And the policing system is no different, as a part of that, in terms of how it came about and was developed.

The development of local partners or agents to ensure the status quo was maintained-- was essential to American justice. It expanded with law enforcement, who would have an important part in carrying out that narrative. You needed individuals who were committed to maintaining social control and order. And the watch system in the early days of this country was basically put together to protect those wealthy citizens and those-- and their properties. It wasn't until 1838 that we see the first-- the first police department arrive in the United States in terms of non-uniform in Boston, Massachusetts. What was going on in the south was a totally different aspect of policing that would have a huge role in shaping the relationship between police and minorities, in particular African-American communities, to this day.

The slave patrols began in 1704, and they are exactly what they sound like. They were known as the paddy rollers. And the slave patrols are the beginning remnants of modern southern policing. And these individuals were involved with protecting the property of the owners. And the slaves were the property. And they were there to ensure that the slaves would not insurrect and that they would not run away.

And as we continued to evolve through the modern era of policing, the police-- their role in terms of dealing with immigrant populations, whether it was the new Europeans who were coming to the country, and the Irish, and the Italians, and the Polish, and the Jews-- the police were used to ensure that those individuals were kept in their place, quote unquote. And as those individuals morph into what is known now as a White society or a White America, the tensions were certainly turned to those newly freed slaves in the south.

And it-- the police were reserved to respond to the dangerous underclass, which included African-Americans and new immigrants to the country. And so if you're wrapping your head around all of this, what you should be understanding is that American policing-- the way that we see it today-- did not begin that way, but we still see some of the remnants of that left behind.

And so when you need an entity to enforce the rules and the laws that were put into place, the government placed these policies that you see here on your screen. The legal system needed

someone and something to enforce these rules. And if you look at these across the board, they all involve immigrant populations and ethnic minority groups in which the police were installed and put into place to carry out the enforcement of these rules.

Whether it was Mexican repatriation, where you had a mass exodus enforced against these individuals to move out of the country, the Japanese internment camps, the Chinese Exclusion Act, the Trail of Tears, the Black Codes, the Dawes Act, and so on, and so forth, it was the police that were involved in these at the very basic level. But yet, they were building a relationship with the community. But that was not one with good intent. It was not one with a good intent.

In the South, it really became prominent in terms of African-American communities. With Reconstruction-- after the 13th Amendment was signed, and the Civil War was over, and the slaves were freed, Black Americans had their own communities. They had their own police forces. They were even elected to Congress and elected as representatives of their communities and state senators. But that would all come to a crashing halt when President Johnson walked away from the South and allowed Southerners to decide how they wanted Reconstruction to be-- and the Jim Crow laws that would ensue after the Supreme Court ruled upon *Plessy versus Ferguson*, which created separate but equal.

And with separate but equal came the enforcement of those laws. You had your own colored waiting rooms, your own colored water fountains. Coloreds could not be in particular parts of the community unless they had specific instructions to do so. And now you needed an enforcement tool to do that. And many of the local sheriff's functions became analogous with the earlier slave patrols, where they enforced segregation and they disenfranchised these now freed slaves.

There's a statistic out of the South-- because there's a loophole in the 13th Amendment which states that an individual who was convicted of a criminal offense could be lawfully enslaved as a part of the punishment for that offense. And after the 13th Amendment was signed, three out of every four prisoners in the South for about 30- to 40-year period were African-Americans, 75%, based on the Jim Crow laws that were being enforced by the very individuals who were supposed to provide protection.

So what we had was a mass exodus out of the South-- a mass exodus because of the violent acts committed against Blacks in the South by the government and the police. These individuals' economic opportunities had dwindled to basically nothing. They did not want to be sharecroppers after being basically cheated out of their resources. And so they headed north. And the Great Migration from 1916 to 1970 would prove-- in terms of Black Americans and police relations would

prove to be quite detrimental.

These individuals were fleeing the South for better opportunities, but what they found was redlining, which refers to banks not loaning to African-Americans to buy housing in certain communities. Riots would break out. These individuals were seen as a threat-- they're coming to take our jobs. The neighborhoods that they did move in-- you had White flight, in which the Whites pick up and fled.

The Kerner Report is a-- is a report that was built out of the 1960s. President Johnson put together the Kerner Commission to look at, why was all the rioting occurs, why were these cities burning down-- very similar to the things that we're seeing today. Some places even were known as sundown towns-- all throughout the North-- meaning that Blacks could not even be in certain communities after the sun went down. And the police enforced these types of laws and rules, therefore dividing even more the relationship of the police and the Black community.

The catastrophic outcome to these event was-- was just unthinkable-- the lack of education; the lack of housing; the unemployment rate's very high; no opportunities; the lack of nutrition; lack of health care; lack of economic opportunities. We see these things still abound in minority communities throughout the United States. And many sociologists and criminologists attribute many of these aspects to some of the criminality that we see coming out of these communities.

And so when we look at that and you ask yourself, what can the police do to actually thwart this type of embedded, systemic racism-- and the answer is obvious-- nothing. It is absolutely nothing that the police can do to deal with any of these things in these communities that really has caused irreparable harm to the individuals that live there. And this is something that is not talked about in police academies.

It is not talked about in most educational settings. It's talked about in those upper-level classes of criminology and research but not found in some of those bottom-level classes, in which some officers have attended. But it's certainly not anything that we discuss in law enforcement training-- to try to develop an empathetic understanding and view of maybe some of the communities and some other people that you're serving.

But here is something that is another outcome to that. When we talk about a segregated society, most Americans believe that we are not as segregated as we once were. But when you look at the United States Census and where people live, over 95% of African-Americans in the United States live in the 67 largest metropolitan areas in the country.

Now, to give you perspective on that, there's several thousand-- over 18,000 incorporated cities, towns, and villages throughout the United States. And you can find over nine out of 10 African-Americans only living around 67 of those large metropolitan areas. 85% of your Hispanics live in 10 states of the 50 states that we have.

Native Americans primarily live on native land. And Asian-Americans make up a small minority group in few metropolitan areas around the United States. And what you will find around most of these large metropolitan area are still law enforcement agencies that basically are White and are male. Almost 60% to 80% of all law enforcement officers in the United States are White and 88% are male.

So it's still a profession that is certainly dominated by the majority. And there are few ethnic minorities who are a part of these agencies. And that's something that we certainly have to be conscious of and make a concerted effort to get better than we have than over the last 30 or 40 years.

The police over the years that we've talked about-- and what we're experiencing here is probably from 1838 to 1970. But what you had were willing agents of injustice. The individuals who enforced these laws against these communities and these relationships have been embedded in those communities for a very, very long time. And so this is nothing new to us, but it's something that we have to understand.

President Johnson spoke to something-- he stated something in a White House meeting-- it wasn't to the nation, but it was actually in a private conversation. And he uttered these words, "if you can convince the lowest White man that he's better off than the best colored man, he won't notice you're picking his pockets. Hell, give him somebody to look down on, and he'll empty his pockets for you." That's the President of the United States basically articulating a position that many politicians had taken up-- to use-- and to use law enforcement officers to justify their actions and behaviors against African-American communities who were just seeking to be a part of a nation that had promised "Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness."

So this is just a brief-- and I encourage everyone that is viewing this webinar-- I encourage you to do your research, to take a look at what led us here today, because this is just a brief undertaking of that. But there's a whole lot of information that really could wrap this up for you. But you could get a good understanding of why there seems to be this constant angst and consternation amongst the relationship between the police and African-American communities.

What do you believe to be the pivotal moment that negatively shaped police and minority community

relations-- The Slave Patrols; Jim Crow Supreme Court Ruling; The Great Migration and White Apathy; or Political Leaders Ideology?

Thank you for your responses. The results-- at 32%, Jim Crow Supreme Court Ruling was the number-- the most popular response. After that, at 30%, we have Political Leaders Ideology. At 29%, The Slave Patrols. And at 9%, The Great Migration and White Apathy. Thank you for your response.

Thank you, Jodi. That's interesting-- the Jim Crow ruling at 39%. The Jim Crow ruling had a huge impact on those relations. The-- policing in the south certainly was born out of this ideal to ensure that these newly freed slaves knew their place and were used in such a way to really probably embed in the life of those newly freed individuals that, we're not going to be free unless we can escape the rule of the government and those agents of the government.

And that's what many African-Americans see the police as. They see the police as agents of the government. And we need to continue to work on this ideal that the police are not agents of the government; that the police belong to these communities; that they work with these communities. And many agencies around the United States have made tremendous strides and efforts in terms of police and community relations.

And even in some of the events that we see today, those communities had made strides, whether it was Minneapolis or Kenosha-- they had made strides in building relationships with their minority communities. But any event, as we can see, can really disrupt even those strides and bring back these ideals of things of the past that have been embedded and that has shaped these communities for so long. So we have to ask ourselves, why does the problem persist?

One definition of insanity is doing the same things over and over again and expecting different results. Police training has not changed very much, even though many police officers and many police agencies think that it has, since 1970. And what I mean by that is that we still focus the vast amount of our time upon the most serious of events, whether it's with the use of firearms, police arrest tactics-- so defense-and-arrest tactics-- emergency vehicle operations, responding to calls for service. And we spend very little time on developing de-escalation techniques, community policing, problem solving, understanding our communities, and so on, and so forth.

And I think it's understandable for most agencies because most of their liability comes from the use of force. And they take it very seriously that force is used appropriately. Perhaps it's time to take a more in-depth look at how that training is being taught, because it has not very much expanded since the 1970s. Yeah, we've added a few things here and there. But for the vast majority of police

agencies in the states that rep-- provide the requirements, it has changed very little.

But another problem is this ideal of using the police in-- as a political pawn-- the war on crime, the war on drugs, immigrants and crime. And I've had some slides that are further down the road in which I look at all of these and talk about how the police have been shaped-- the mindset of the police has been shaped to be crime fighters. And I guess you have to ask yourself, as police officers and as community members, do you really want your police officers to be crime fighters? Do you want them to be warriors, do you want them to be guardians-- which are two separate mindsets to take into this service that police provides to their communities. So let's take a look at some of these.

When we talk about politics and the criminal justice system, Richard Nixon-- President Nixon really used the ideal of this get-tough attitude on crime-- that we are going to have law and order. It was Nixon who really pronounced himself to be a law and order police. Well, if we take a look back at what was going on in the 1960s and why Nixon was calling himself a law and order president-- that he would be a law and order president-- we were looking at the Civil Rights Movement.

And we were looking at rioting in our streets. We were looking at the Vietnam War and the marches and the protests that were going on there; the burning down of six cities, whether it was Detroit, Philadelphia, Chicago, Los Angeles, and so on. And Richard Nixon played on the fears of the American public.

And when you talk about the war on crime, I don't think in most people's minds-- if they were honest with themselves-- and this is where it comes down to mindset-- they don't think about suburbia. They don't think about those wealthiest parts of their communities. When people think about the war on crime, they don't think about rural communities.

They think about those urban, inner-city areas that are predominantly Black and Brown. They say that's where the crime is. We didn't fight the war on drugs in the suburbs even though all statistics tell us that more money and more drug usage is spent and used by suburbanites. But it was Richard Nixon who used that to his advantage.

Ronald Reagan-- when he talked about the war on drugs, he was also running for president-- law and order because that had been a part of the political platform of that particular party. And it won a number of voters. Bill Clinton, who was from a different party than Nixon and Reagan, decided that he would be a law and order president and use that also as an advantage.

And the crime bill of 1994 has been looked upon as a part of the mass incarceration process of Black

and Brown members in the community. And Donald Trump certainly has used his presidency to talk about he is a law and order president and has actually used the police in political speeches and backdrops, as well as any of these other presidents. And he talked about immigration and crime.

And so the war on drugs/the war on crime-- planting the seed in the American public's mind that we need to be tough minded-- we need our police to go out there and be the crime fighters that we need them to be. But we have to ask ourselves, are the police even capable of reducing crime in our communities? Because all the research indicates that the police are really reactive in nature and it's probably not as much crime in our communities as one would think, our public or the police. And I'll talk about that just shortly.

Think about all the policies that has driven policing. We have saturated patrols. We have hot spot policing. We have zero-tolerance policing. We have broken-windows policing. All of these policies have pushed forward an over-policing of certain communities.

Take a look at your calls for service in your agencies. Take a look at where your citations are being written and who they are being written to. Just go through those. In most police agencies around urban areas in particular, they're going to find that they spend an overwhelming amount of time policing Black and Brown communities.

And if they're doing it in a very aggressive way, which all of these tactics are-- they are very aggressive-- zero-tolerance, saturated, hot spot, broken-windows-- what you begin to do is cast a wide net, what we call net widening. And what that begins to bring in are individuals who are just collateral damage, if you will, of those individuals who are probably causing the most problems. There are only a small amount of people causing a large amount of the issues in communities, but we tend to police the entire community in such a way where it begins to drive a wedge in police and community relations.

When you look at how the war on drugs was fought-- and I talked about it and mentioned it earlier-- it was fought in predominately African-American and Hispanic communities. But however, all of the statistics and research indicates that Whites are far more likely to possess illicit drugs and use those drugs at about the same rate as African-Americans and Hispanics.

And if you think about it, if Whites are using it at the same rate, that means that there are far more Whites that are using it, because they make up almost 67% of the entire population. And so you would think that those same tactics would be used in other communities if there was really a war on drugs.

When we look at the results of the actions-- when we look at the prison population for drug offenses-- African-Americans make up 45% of the prison population for drug offenses, while White Americans make up 30% of the prison population for drug offenses. African-Americans make up about 12% to 13% of the overall population. And Whites make up about 67% of the overall population. And from the previous slide, you saw that they even possessed and used drugs-- possessed drugs at a higher number and used drugs at about the same rate. So we have to ask ourselves, are we-- do we have the right tactics when we're looking at these events?

When we look at suspect citizen, racial profiling, Blacks are almost twice as likely to be pulled over as Whites, even though Whites drive more. On average, Blacks are four times more likely to be searched. Blacks are less likely to be found with contraband than Whites when they're both searched.

So these are things that we have to ask ourselves-- again, I keep coming back to what I think-- which are academic questions, but actually common sense questions-- are-- is what we're doing working, or is it driving a wedge in the relationship between the police and the communities that they serve?

The Ferguson, Missouri DOJ report-- the United States Department of Justice report produced some just eye-popping statistics. From 2012 to 2014, in Ferguson, Missouri, 85% of their vehicle stops were for Blacks; 90% of citations issued; 93% percent of arrests. 67% percent of the population is what Blacks make up in Ferguson, Missouri during that time. They were two and a half times more likely to be searched after a traffic stop, 26% less likely to be in possession of illegal drugs and weapons.

If you look at the asterisk at the top, between 2011 and 2013, Blacks also received 95% of the jaywalking tickets and 94% of tickets for failure to comply. Studies in Milwaukee, Charleston, South Carolina, Nashville, New York City, North Carolina, and Kansas City produce similar results. And so these are the type of activities that sits communities on a powder keg. And that powder keg is simmering. And it only takes one event for it to explode because that relationship has totally eroded.

And I'm not so sure if the police even understand in many of these communities that this is in fact what they are doing. I'm not so sure of that. I don't think anyone can put their finger on that, because I believe that most police officers believe that they are just doing their jobs but don't realize that-- look how this job is being done. This is really lopsided.

But John Ehrlichman tells a very interesting story. John Ehrlichman was the chief-- the domestic policy chief for Richard Nixon in his administration. And he told a truth that many people had suspected and some even knew of. He said, "you want to know what this was really about?" And he was referring to

Nixon's declaration on the war on drugs.

He said, "the Nixon campaign in 1968, and the Nixon White House after that, had two enemies-- the anti-war left and Black people. You understand what I'm saying? We knew we couldn't make it illegal to be either against the war or black, but by getting the public to associate the hippies with marijuana and Blacks with heroin, and then criminalizing both heavily, we could disrupt those communities. We could arrest their leaders, raid their homes, break up their meetings, and vilify them night after night on the evening news. Did we know we were lying about the drugs? Of course we did."

Now, I don't think many people were as sinister-- and I'm talking about police officers-- as John Ehrlichman is saying about the administration. But what the administration was doing was planting a seed. And they were saying it over and over again. It was being backed up in the media.

The police began to take on this ideal that they must do something about it. They were the front line between good and evil, right and wrong, criminals and victims. And so they were going to go where they believed that the crime was embedded. And so, basically, they became willing agents in that process.

There have been several times that the police have been tried-- or police reform has tried to be put in place. And I'm only giving you just a few of these commissions. But there are several commissions that were involved with police reforms. But the National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement was the Wickersham Commission that was put together by President Hoover in the 1920s and 30s. The Kerner Report was put together by the Kerner Commission that was put together by President Johnson after the events unfolded in the 1960s. And then after the Ferguson incident, it was the Presidential Task force on 21st Century Policing that was put together.

And when you look at all of these, they all go back to a certain thing. It goes back to leadership, training and education, and community relations. They all lead back to the same place, but we keep revisiting these same events over and over again. And perhaps maybe it's time to listen to-- maybe there's some merit in these ideals of training, and education, leadership, and ideology, and police, and community relations.

Why does it persist? You have to have willing agents to carry out those means of injustices; individuals who believe that they are just doing their job-- I'm just doing my job. But yet, that relationship between police and African-American communities continue to erode in many places around the United States. And it looks the same as it did in the 1960s.

"Hatred is a known enemy in which a defense can be deployed. Silence, ignorance, good intentions, and apathy are the real assassins that are likened to undetected high blood pressure which is known as a silent killer to which there is no defense." We can no longer be silenced.

Educate our ignorance. Ensure that our intentions are met with the same training and education that is necessary to understand and get after what we need to do. And don't be apathetic. We have to be committed to actually doing something. We actually have to be committed to doing something.

OK. It's time for another poll question. Why do you think the problems between the police and minority communities persist? Is it poor police training and education, lack of leadership in police agencies, poor police and community relations, or deep rooted racism and implicit bias?

The results show that 49% selected the deep rooted racism and implicit bias. The second response, poor police and community relations, was at 28%. At 18%, poor police training and education. And 6%, lack of leadership in police agencies.

Well, that's-- that's interesting. I didn't expect, actually, deep rooted racism and implicit bias to be the-- the leader here. I really didn't expect that. That, coming from this group, probably says something. They're the experts in their field, the leaders probably in their agencies certainly. But there should be another category-- a combination of all. I'd imagine that most of us understand it's probably s-- a little bit of all of these at some level why this continues to persist.

So what about the future? I think going forward in understanding the future of policing, I'm going to have some information here that I'm certain that few police agencies and officers probably even know and the community-- even fewer members of them even know. Let's begin by destiny, though.

"Destiny is a creation of your own making. Therefore, destiny is a choice." So we have a choice here. We have a choice to meet these things head on, admit what our shortcomings are and work on those, and really take care of the profession and the people that we support and love in our police and our communities. But it's our choice. It's all of our choice.

But there is a myth that's out there that's related to police. And it's what is known as the myth of the crime fighter. The police-- being these agents of crime fighting that really makes the difference in determining if crime rates go up or down, this is an impossible mandate.

There are 1.1 million law enforcement officers nationwide in the United States. And there's somewhere between 14,000 and 15,000 state and local agencies that are involved with the bulk of policing in our communities. And to ask them to be crime fighters and somehow be responsive to

these communities in those numbers-- remember what I stated-- 1.1 million nationwide. We have 330 million people in the United States. This is an impossible mandate on so many levels.

The police are pretty much reactive in nature because that is the nature of this job. An individual-- you don't know what's going on behind somebody's closed door. You have to wait to get a call. Most police are not happening upon things when they are in progress. So you have to depend on the citizenry to actually make those phone calls, and become those witnesses, and provide the police that information.

But if the police believe that they are responsible for crime and the community believe that they are responsible for crime, here's the problem with that-- when basically domestic violence, whether it's a sexual assault, or a homicide, burglary, or an armed robbery-- these are things all after the fact. And the police have to respond to these things. So therefore, the crime has already been committed.

It's almost setting the police role up for failure. If the crime has already been committed, most people will begin to think, well, where were the police? What were they doing? Why weren't they here to prevent this? Aren't they the crime fighters? And psychologically, that could get inside an officer's head. Because most people that I know, and most people as students that I'm familiar with, who want to become police officers-- they really, really want to help people.

That's what they say-- they want to be a part of the solution. They want to provide that service. They want to do good in life and help people. Those individuals can get discouraged and demoralized when they show up to a crime scene and they have to now have the responsibility of saying, where was I? What did I do? I want to help people, but how can I prevent this? I'm in a patrol car. I'm patrolling around. I'm waiting for a call.

And I don't think we really understand how that can creep into the psyche of every police officer. Maybe there becomes a point in time where we have to constantly remind our officers on the street that they are not the sole response-- their sole responsibility is not to crime; that it's every community member's responsibility; that they only can respond once they get a call or, in their proactive roles, to try to do the best they can at finding things out before they happen. But that's almost impossible to do. Every officer knows that.

Why are police policing everything? This is unreasonable. "Why are the police agencies willing to police everything--" the reason why I have that in quotes-- that was a question that I was asked last summer by Herman Goldstein before he passed away. And for those of you who aren't familiar with

Herman Goldstein, he is the father of problem-oriented policing. He is the father of problem-oriented policing.

And Herman has studied-- in his lifetime, he studied the police. He gave his life to the police. And he asked-- Theo, he said, "why are the police so willing to police everything?" He said, this is a tremendous responsibility that they're taking on, and it might be problematic.

The police are not trained or educated to deal with mental health. We have police all over our schools and asking them to provide safety and protection even though-- even though less than 1% of all violent acts are committed in our schools. But we have certainly a media that will take even one story, and it will pronounce that story, and it will put pressure on the police and pressure on the community to tell the police, you need to be in our schools, you need to get these things-- our schools protected.

There are thousands of schools around the United States-- thousands, tens of thousands. And now we're asking the police to take on that role, where the police are enforcing rules and regulations, especially local police, that may be outside of their boundaries. Immigration is a part of the federal responsibility. It is not a part of the local responsibility, but yet now we're putting pressure on local police to somehow respond to immigration and immigration policy-- something in which they have no jurisdiction at all.

And so when we talk about this impossible mandate, even when we look at crime prevention, all of the underlying conditions that possibly may lead someone to committing a criminal act, the inequalities that are involved in that-- lack of employment, underemployment, family problems, and conditions-- all of these things-- what can the police do about those things? School dropouts, individuals who are addicted to prescription drugs or illicit drugs, individuals who suffer from mental health conditions-- what can the police do to prevent any of these? And I think the short answer is nothing. But yet, we're asking our police to cover all of these things. Some agencies have gone to public safety divisions to deal with these things.

Look at violent crime-- look at the violent crime rate from 1990 to where it is now. We have seen the greatest crime drop over the last 20 to 30 years that America has ever experienced. That-- but yet, we're still using the same aggressive police tactics involved in saying that we're responding to all of these crimes.

And in many communities, it's generally only one or two areas in which you find most of your activity, that the police find most of their calls for service. And perhaps maybe the way that we're looking at

these things are not the way that we should be looking at them. So think about that.

I'll show you another slide. This is serious crimes committed by juveniles. Just take that in for a moment. Even juvenile crime since 1992 has just plummeted. And these are serious violent crimes by youth.

Over a 35-year period, when we see it-- it had that one death. It spiked between 1990 and 1992. And then it just fell tremendously. So I think that's something that the police need to be aware of and perhaps understand-- that perhaps our understanding of crime and how we view it is not actually what is happening in and around our cities.

What this slide is, is a slide that refers to undocumented immigrant population. And as we see, the increase in the undocumented immigrant population from 1990 to 2007, in particular-- it was increasing, and then it began to dip after that. But it does not coincide with our violent homicide rate, as those numbers went in the opposite direction.

And as a matter of fact, all of our crime numbers decreased as our immigrant population increased. And the reason why I bring that up is to take it back to several slides before, where I talked about political rhetoric and how it could stir the human condition to think that there is a problem when there obviously is not a problem associated with crime and the amount of undocumented-- undocumented immigrants in the United States.

If you look at FBI statistics-- and for those of you who are in law enforcement in the room, maybe your agency reports your statistics to the FBI. This is what the FBI in 2018 statistics reported. It said that the police report-- reported that there were 1.2 million violent crimes reported to law enforcement in 2018. Of that, there were approximately 18,000 law enforcement agencies in the United States.

What this means is that there were about 67 violent crimes per agency in a year. And what that means-- that two or less violent crimes per week per jurisdiction-- that's not a lot. That's not a lot at all when you look at the overall numbers, because we know that some communities are more overwhelmed with these calls than others. So the vast majority of police agencies in the United States are not even dealing with violent events.

The Vera Institute of Justice Research produced a very interesting set of numbers. The police made over 10 million arrests in 2016 in the United States. 5% of those arrests were from violent criminal offenses-- so that's only about a half a million of those arrests. 80% of those arrests of those half

million were for low-level violent offenses-- so eight out of every 10 of those 500,000 were for low-level violent offenses. Studies consistently indicate that police officers only make between one and two felony arrests a year. And most police officers in the United States make less than that on average.

So just to have you think about that, the role of the police in terms of even looking at crime-- but let's look at the clearance rate of our police officers. And I think this is all important in terms of police and minority community relations because this goes to, are we using our resources in the best way that we possibly could? Only 62% of homicides were solved in 2018. Only 33% of rapes were solved in 2018; only 30% of robberies; 52% of aggravated assault; and then property crimes are very, very low.

And so the reason why I bring these things together is because, when we're talking about that impossible mandate, many of these things probably go unsolved because the police lack information and evidence in terms of getting help from the general public to help solve these issues. Could some of these, or many of these, be driven by the lack of relationship between the police and their communities? And we know that African-American communities experience homicide at a much higher rate than White communities. And so, in particular, is it perhaps the lack of that relationship that produces these low clearance rates? And that's something for us to examine.

When we look at police officer deaths in the line of duty, there's a narrative out there about the dangers of policing. And I don't think any of us would disagree that there are inherent dangers in policing, but those dangers have not produced worse results over the years. And so we can look from 1957 all the way to 2017-- and so 60 years later, we are probably at where we were in 1967 in terms of police officer deaths on duty.

And when we look at those overall numbers, perhaps we don't want this narrative out there, because that could send a sense to officers the dangers of their job-- yes, it is a dangerous job, but if you think that you're in constant danger, in particular in certain communities, maybe you're more likely to use force in a manner that was probably not necessary. But it could be an implicit bias that's driving that. And I'm not talking about the implicit bias in terms of race, but maybe the implicit bias in terms of the dangers of the jobs-- of the job given a specific community.

And so when having all of that information, perhaps 21st century-- the vision for our 21st century police-- the vision should be more on hiring and recruitment. Can we find those individuals who have a good understanding and a good mindset of what this job entails when you work with people-- community relations; empathy; more of a guardian approach rather than a warrior approach, which

we see which is really not necessary based on the numbers that we have; maybe a revamped training approach and a minimal education requirement that many agencies have gone to, but maybe those education requirements are more in line with producing the understanding and the mindset that we need more so than just any program that you can find yourself in?

Leadership-- I think leaders have got to expand their vision. If we've always do-- if we always do what we've always done, we're going to always get what we always got. And so maybe we need those leaders who are willing to take more risk; who are willing to put it out there and say, I'm willing to have a different vision than what most agencies have taken on.

Every agency in the country is different. Every state in the country is different. And so you might need a different approach based on your community, based on your personnel, based on your location, and so on, and so forth. And transparency, trust, and legitimacy are the pillars in which the agency stands. And they must be stated over, and over, and over again, and found throughout training, found throughout your policies and procedures. And they need to be reminded almost daily of these kinds of roles as officers.

Perhaps that leadership model takes on a public safety model-- more so of getting other providers involved with the police. Communities could look to having human services and social workers work alongside their police. So when you get a call of someone who is having a mental breakdown, that the police serves a backup role; the mental health professionals serves that primary role.

Psychologists, drug addiction counselors, and advocate programs, Department of Children and Family Services-- yes, they are partners, but they're still seen as apart from the police. People will call the police first. And so maybe those agencies work more hand-in-hand under one roof in terms of a public safety model in many communities, where they are working as partners directly or, when that call comes, that those individuals are going to that scene with the police. The police search-- secure those scenes, make sure that they're safe. And now these individuals, who are trained and educated to do these jobs and responses, can get right in there and perhaps help build better relations also with communities.

And when we talk about those relationships, partnerships and outreach-- your departments have got to be committed to that. They have got to be transparent; take more of a problem-oriented approach rather than a crime fighter approach, that guardian attitude more so than that warrior attitude; the practicing of de-escalation; empathy and justice instead of order; evidence-based practices-- using those practices that we have found to be more in line to say that they work rather than just using

those practices to say that we're doing something.

OK. We'll move to the next poll question. What do you believe could positively improve the relationship between the police and minority communities? Is it better recruitment and training, community policing philosophy, leadership philosophy, or is it police understanding of the actual problems?

The results show-- the number one response, at 35%, is the community policing philosophy. The second highest response, at 32%, is the police understanding of the actual problems. At 22%, we have better recruitment and training. And at 11%, leadership philosophy.

Thank you, Jodi. The community policing philosophy-- many agencies have really incorporated and done a great job with that. I believe that-- from my research and my understanding, that the police understanding of the actual problems may be at the root of what we need to get to. We have individuals that want to do well, but maybe they do not understand exactly how to do well. And so understanding the actual problems in and out of these communities and working with these groups with a community policing philosophy could certainly go a long way.

The attitude and commitment of the police becomes so important to this. Are we actually trying to maintain order, or are we actually trying to provide justice-- they're two different things. Order involves policing people. It creates an us versus them attitude. It develops an apathy-- hey, we're doing the work.

We're just doing our jobs. You people call us. We show up. And now we seem like we're the bad people. We've all heard that in our communities-- those of us in law enforcement-- from people that we work with. And it's a frustration. It's a frustration of the officer because that's what they believe. But perhaps it's because we have been trained to move towards order more so than justice.

When we talk about education and training that looks at justice, we talk about protection. We talk about preserving liberty and adhering to the rights of people. We start policing problems. We look to be partners in our communities. And we have empathy for those. And we even have empathy for those we arrest; and if you don't, we should, because this is not a personal.

This is not personal. If you are committed to doing the right thing, then even those individuals that you arrest you have empathy towards because you're providing a service to the community. And they are part of the community. They may be a part of the issue or the problem, but they still are a part of the community.

I have a saying, and it goes like this-- when people are at their worst, we need to police to be at their best, period. No matter how someone is acting out, I have to be the best representative of the community that I can be. It cannot be personal. I cannot let my emotions overcome me. I cannot believe that I am the end all and the cure all. Because I might mean well with that intent, but I'm not doing well at that moment.

This is not a one-size-fit-all approach either. Every jurisdiction has similarities and differences. Every police agencies-- every police agency has got to put together an approach and a plan that fits them. If someone comes out and say, oh, here's a national model-- there's no national model to this.

American policing is different than any other policing in the world because we do it generally at the local level. It is controlled at the local level. Our communities are different. Therefore, we're going to have to take a different approach. There are different things that are going on. We have different people in our communities, but we've got to find the right approach to fit us.

Every agency has different leadership styles and preferences. That organization is being led by a leader who is setting the culture in their agencies based on the principles and standards that they have, and hopefully working with their other administrators and all of their officers in developing what that approach and what that culture will be, and then standing with that and moving that forward. Every state has different mandates and training requirements.

So we know that there is not a national approach. When we hear people look at the police nationally, I think that's where most people are losing their way-- because of that. As I mentioned before, the police are local. Every state has different mandates. But I think it's time for police agencies and police chiefs to take a more active role in talking what their post boards-- their training and standards boards-- and say that, this is what we need, whether it's more hours, whether it's more details and training.

These are things that are necessary to prepare the women and men to do this job the best way they can and stop leaving them short. We have been very fortunate with the vast majority of police agencies and police officers in this country that we do not see these issues and problems that some people face more so than others. But there are still training standards and tactics that can be implemented and hours implemented that could be used to better the approach.

And I think one of the most important things is that every officer is different and sees the world differently. Yes, you can train them all in the same academy, but you have to remember that they

have all grown up and been socialized differently. And so the culture in your agency/the leadership in your agency will be all the more important to ensure that every officer is adhering to the standards that have been established within your agency.

You don't want your agency to ever be a part of some of the things that these agencies have been a part of in police consent decrees. These are all agencies that have been sued by the United States Justice Department because of the civil rights violations that have been found to have been used against their public. And it's unfortunate that these things occurred in these agencies. And police administrators, and personnel, and other officers cannot control the actions of all of the officers in their agencies, but yet we are responsible for those people.

And so this is a side that you certainly do not want to end up on the side of, in which the department has to enter into an agreement about how things will be done. Many of these agencies have made strides forward since then. Some of these agencies are still under consent decrees. But this is certainly where you don't want to end up.

"We have raised the last two American generations to be colorblind instead of understanding, be tolerant instead of respectful, be apathetic instead of empathetic, and to be ignorant rather than educated. There is a destiny that no generation deserves but awaits them if this continues." We have got to take information like we have discussed today and use that going forward. We can no longer do some of these things that we've done.

It's one thing to say that you are colorblind. But then does that mean that you also miss the person who's standing in front of you-- that you're not understanding what they may be experiencing or going through; that somehow that they may be different than you? To tolerate someone-- just to tolerate them because they exist or to be respectful, and hear them out, and actually acknowledge them as a human being with feelings and thoughts-- and although you mean well, in terms of the apathetic sense, to say, I understand, I need you to be more empathetic-- to get down and walk in that person's shoes and then to provide that education to close those gaps that you may have.

So when you talk about moving forward, history has provided us with important reminders. We no longer need to see these things over and over again. We can address these things; many agencies have. There are great ideas out there, and then there's other great ideas that are waiting in the wings to move forward with.

Police are entrusted with the souls of their communities. And their legitimacy depends on the public perception and the public's approval of their actions. The police are not crime fighters. They're public

servants with a very important role in society.

Police leaders must be visionary, bold, committed to real changes rather than the status quo. And then empathy, compassion, respect, and responsibility, along with training, the selection process, leadership, and the overall philosophy are all key aspects to moving forward and shaping the policing for the 21st century and beyond.

OK. We'll move into to our last poll. The question is, what has impacted you the most regarding this webinar? Your choices are the historic context of the problem between police and minority communities; why police training and leadership continues to have difficulties addressing the issue; is it the complexities of police philosophy and the need to re-imagine policing in the United States; or, lastly, is it how the police can move forward and improve relationships with minority communities.

The results show that 36% stated complexities of police philosophy and re-imagining policing. Right behind that, at 34%, we have historic contacts between police and minority communities. At 19%, the response was, how the police improved relationships with minority communities. And lastly, at 10%, police training and leadership challenges addressing the issue.

Wow. That-- the complexities of police philosophy and a need to re-imagine-- this is something that we have not done in this country for some time. The philosophy that we have of what police do, and who police are, and how they are trained really has not changed dramatically in the 50 years since we've been committed as a country to police training.

And when we talk about re-imagining policing and the philosophy of policing, I believe therein lies the key. And I believe there are some great ideas that are happening right now. And I believe there are some other things that we can do to go along with embedding a community policing philosophy to go along with a guardian mentality that can drive police into the 21st century.

The vast majority of police officers do this job because they like people. They're committed to service. They do it very well. And the only thing that they're doing is looking for new leadership and visionaries to provide the way for them to do their jobs better.

Some of the things that we have seen erupt across this country-- those few incidents-- there are not many. And that's what I don't think many people understand-- there are a few incidents, but those few incidents remind us that we have work to do. And I believe that it would give us a way to move forward to re-imagine policing for a 21st century rather than being stuck in a 20th century model.

OK. Thank you, Dr. Darden, for the excellent presentation today and sharing your insights and knowledge with us. We are now moving into the question and answer portion of our webinar. If you have any questions for our presenter, feel free to enter them in the question box. We do have a number of questions that came in, Dr. Darden. And I can just start reading them off to you. How is that?

OK.

"Can you share how the vicarious trauma of Blacks continue to negatively impact police relations when instances of brutality occur and why?"

Oh, that's a great question, whoever asked it. The vicarious trauma, other people witnessing that-- these stories have probably been passed down in many of these communities. When one person witnessed something in a community or several people witness maybe an excessive use of force or a misuse of force-- or it even could be a lawful use of force.

Any time the police use force and the community witness it, but in particular minority communities, African-American communities, it has this different feel to it. It's because that community, in particular African-American communities, have never felt that real connection between the police and themselves. And so it has a tremendous impact. And it could go on for generations. It could be passed down and down.

And now, with the advent of mass media, and misinformation, and disinformation, people are trying to weigh in within seconds of an event happening. And everybody has an opinion. And things get out of control. And then that sends it not only through that community, but it sends it nationwide. And it impacts other communities that are not even experiencing some of the things that could be going on where the event took place.

But it certainly-- it certainly plays a large role in those families and those neighbors that have witnessed those events. And that's something that I think that-- how do you mend those relationships? And that's going to have to be actions that the police are proactive in instead of reactive. Yeah, that's a great question.

Excellent. Thank you. The next question-- "how do you make changes from the top in law enforcement agencies when police chiefs won't recognize this history?"

The police belong to the people. The police chief is generally set in place by a police and fire commissioner or appointed by a mayor, then it had to be approved by a police and fire commission.

And I think that job-- we have to find ways to work together.

This-- these historic underpinnings of the problem-- if the police chief is not in recognition that those events of the past certainly impact our present-- and not only that, the actions of the police in the present to go along with that-- it is a very difficult thing to do. You can't make someone listen to you.

Again, I talked about it earlier-- we have to have open minds and be dedicated to a process. But I hope that if you are a transformative leader more so than an autocratic leader, that you're willing and-- to listen and be open about any ideas that the public brings forth. But I suggest if that's going on, then you have to get the mayor's office involved, or a police and fire commission involved, where there can be open dialogue to discuss these things.

Excellent. Thank you. "For a small department with an almost all African-American community, what would you recommend as a path moving forward to strengthen community relations?"

I would recommend you start at the bottom. You start doing things where the officers are more proactive in getting to know the people in the community. Start community meetings. Start asking your public what would they like to see their police be more proactive doing. Try to get on a first-name basis. Let them know that they're also-- that the community is also responsible for helping the police address the issues that impact everyone.

Many people will talk about to make sure that your agency is diverse. Try to diversify it even more. If you work in a predominantly African-American community-- and your officers could be predominantly African-American too, but I would suggest you try to diversify your community one way or the other-- bring in different faces, different voices, or different perspectives.

And then get out there and talk with the people. And have meetings. Maybe do once a month-- and it's not like a neighborhood watch meeting or something like that. It goes beyond that. It's something you have to be committed to; to have these open venues where people can openly discuss issues and concerns with the police and work with the police to address them as well.

Great. Thank you. "What can prosecutors do moving forward in repairing the harm in a community that now has no trust or mistrusts the police?" And they're looking for practical solutions.

I think a practical approach-- solution is you have to start within. I don't know if there's anything that a prosecutor's office can do per se in terms of the way that they charge people, and so on, and so forth. But I think that that's certainly the prosecutor's responsibility. And then they have that discretion. But

with that discretion, perhaps finding different ways to probably diverge some people out of the system using different practices and procedures-- not only looking at people in terms of ethnicity and race, but also socioeconomics-- taking that into context.

But I think the-- probably the most important thing a prosecutor's office can do is take a look historically at these issues and these concerns and just make sure that they're using their office in a fair and practical manner; that they are really looking at how they are charging people and-- are we charging people differently? Are we looking at all the things that we could be looking at from every different angle in these cases that we're dealing with? Can we divert and look at alternative solutions for some of these individuals?

But I think more so than that, also, transparency with the community-- introduce yourself to the community as the prosecutor's office. Certainly the head prosecutor in most places-- the state attorney, or the district attorney, or the commonwealth attorney depending on what state you live in-- they're elected officials. And so every three or four years, they go out on a campaign trail. But what about a few times maybe quarterly just to have an open session for prosecutors and their communities and try to work with people? That way-- those are the only things that I can think of off the top of my head that could be practical.

That's great. Thank you. "What should police entry-level training look like to adequately prepare young officers for the work before them?"

Oh, wow, that's a great question. That entry-level training-- we have the basics that are going to be taught. And we know what those are-- the big four, as I call them-- use of force or firearms, defense and arrest tactics, emergency vehicle operations, and then getting people prepared to take calls for service-- and so all those things that are surrounded by officers safety.

But I think we have to start incorporating in great detail the historic concept of police and community, some of the things that we talked about today. Talk about the role of police in a free society-- I think that's important. De-escalation is important; mental preparedness-- not only mental preparedness to do this job, but to take care of yourself mentally as a police officer. But we have-- certainly community-oriented policing, and not at four hours or eight hours. But it is something that really takes about 40 hours, woven in through different aspects of the training, that could really take hold.

And we need more doing than sitting. We need interaction from our recruits. We need to hear from them what their thoughts are. Generally, agencies hear from their recruits when they are hired

through the hiring process through an oral interview.

And then the first thing we tell them to do when they get into the law enforcement academy is to sit down, shut up, and now we're going to tell you how to do this job, rather than continuing to use the talents that they bring to the table. You want to hear their voice. You want them to be a part of the training.

And here is one of the most important things that I think that any training academy can do-- they need to start providing leadership training in their police agencies. Patrol officers-- and these-- that's what these individuals are going to be. They are going to be the leaders of your agencies. They interact with the public day in and day out. And when you talk to them about decision making, when you talk to them about building community relations, when you talk to them about making arrests, and all the other duties that they have, they need to know that they are doing so from a position of leadership; and then to explain to them what that looks like, and what the principles of leadership are, and talk about the culture of the agency, and so on, and so forth.

Excellent. One final question for you-- "Dr. Darden, what is your philosophy regarding utilizing community outreach unit?"

It depends. It depends on what those units are being used for. I'd like that. I like getting officers involved in the community. As a young officer, I was afforded the opportunity to be a community police officer.

And what I found out is that it gave me an opportunity to actually have those discussions that people want to have on a very personable level-- that they saw me as a human being. They did not see me as a suit. And I presented myself as a member of the community on an equal basis, on a first-name basis. And people were willing to give information. They were willing to provide input on things that could be done in their communities and in their areas.

And so having a unit like that, I think, is very, very important. But I think it should be dispersed throughout your community. If you work in a very diverse community, you make sure that you have those community service units for every area, not just the ones that you think that they are necessary, because they are necessary in every area, in every part of your community. And I believe that they will be embraced by those that you provide a service for.

I'd like to thank Dr. Theodore Darden a final time for his time and insight on this important topic. If you're interested in additional training, please visit ncjtc.org for a listing of upcoming training

opportunities or to review our on-demand online training. Thank you for joining us today. And have a great day.