Can Racial and Ethnic Disparities Be Mitigated Through Police Training?

Danny Torres: Hello, everyone. Welcome to the first session of our online conversation series, Mitigating Racial and Ethnic Disparities in the Criminal Justice System, Linking Research with Policy. Today's topic, Can Racial and Ethnic Disparities be Mitigated through Training? Thank you all very much for joining us to speak about this very important topic. My name is Danny Torres, I serve as WestEd's Senior Manager of Publications and Dissemination. I'll be working behind the scenes today. And with that, let's start today's discussion. Anthony, introduce yourself, and take it away.

Anthony Petrosino: Well, good afternoon from the Washington, DC area. I'm Anthony Petrosino, Director of the Justice and Prevention Research Center here at WestEd. You might be wondering who WestEd is. We are a not-for-profit research, services, and development firm that's very focused on equity. So, we're delighted to have you join us today for this first event in our series entitled Mitigating Disparities in the Justice System, Linking Research to Policy. This series and the event today are being co-hosted with our good friends and partners from the Center for Evidence-Based Crime Policy at George Mason University, a leading university based center for studying crime and justice.

And I'm honored to once again get a chance to work with my good colleague and friend, Dr. Cynthia Lum, Director of the Center and Professor of Criminology Law and Society at George Mason to plan this series. And besides being one of the top policing experts in the country, Cynthia knows everyone, and everyone seems to respond to her emails, and so we couldn't have done this event without her. This series has become even more relevant and timely. The distressing events last week at the US Capitol has again provoked considerable anger, reaction on so many dimensions, too numerous to account for here.

But it once again highlighted in a visually compelling way that our system can work very differently, depending on the race and ethnicity of the people involved. When Cynthia and I began corresponding about this series, it was right after the wake of another, right in the wake of another horrific event in a year full of them, which was the police killing of George Floyd in Minneapolis. Now, there have been many similar cases in the history of our country, but

that eight and a half minute video provoked outrage around the nation, and indeed the world.

And it led to a series of proposed reforms on how to address equity and fairness. And when it comes to policing, and particularly policing communities of black and brown persons, one of the more common responses in the wake of the George Floyd killing and other similar incidents, and the concerns about biases in policing, is to address police training. If we can only train the police better, give them different kinds of training, more training, we can increase fairness and equity in the system. Several jurisdictions in the United States have now passed laws addressing police training, and many more considering bills to do so.

Following the Floyd case, Iowa passed a law that requires annual anti-bias and de-escalation training for law enforcement. Pennsylvania now mandates training for police officers on trauma informed care, use of force, de-escalation, and recognizing the signs of child abuse and childhood trauma. Minnesota now mandates all peace officers get the de-escalation training for situations that could turn volatile. The Arkansas governor just signed, or signed in the light of the Floyd case, signed an executive order to create a police task force to deal with police training, certification, and standards. And one purpose of the task force is to study and review recommended means for enhancing the trust of law enforcement.

These are just a few of the jurisdictions that are addressing police training through legislation. But does any of this work to reduce biases and disparities in policing? Fortunately, today we have the right panel together to discuss the effectiveness of these approaches. We are delighted to have four of the leading research and policy practice experts together, along with Cynthia. You can read more in the bios that have been posted about each of these folks.

I could spend the rest of our time together introducing them. But briskly, our four speakers today include Tracey Meares, who is the Walton Hale Hamilton Professor at Yale Law School and a founding director of the Justice Collaboratory at Yale. Lorie Fridell is a Professor in the Department of Criminology at the University of South Florida. We're also joined by Robin Engel, Professor of Criminal Justice at the University of Cincinnati and also Director of the International Association of Chiefs of Police and University of Cincinnati Center for Police Research and Policy. Tarrick McGuire is the Deputy Chief of Police with the Arlington Texas Police Department, a leading policy and practice, a leading policy and practice figure in police innovation. He works in a department that serves 400,000 citizens in a city located between Fort Worth and Dallas. I will now turn it over to Cynthia to begin the panel discussion.

Cynthia Lum: Okay, thank you so much, Anthony, for that introduction and for your partnership and WestEd's work, I really appreciate it. I also wanna welcome everybody and our distinguished panel to our discussion series. Both WestEd and CBCP, as research organizations, really hope to prompt ideas about how to strengthen research and analysis in this important area as we really need more evaluation and measurement, exploring the impacts of interventions on justice disparities and perceptions of disparities. It's my hope that we can

keep this discussion going with this conversation series, and also generate ideas for new avenues for research and research translation.

As Anthony pointed out, reformers and the police have been focused on whether training and new approaches to policing can mitigate racial and ethnic disparities. Each of our panelists are experts in the many types of training that have been suggested that could improve policing and community interactions and address fairness and legitimacy in police activities. So, I'd like to start with Professor Meares with regards to training on procedural justice, which really during the 2000's became a much advocated aspect of community policing. What is this type of training, and what do we know so far from research about its effects?

Tracey Meares: Hi everybody. Thank you, Anthony, Cynthia, for the introduction, happy to be with everyone today. Before I answer that question, I need to say a couple of things because we're gathered to discuss research concerning policy interventions pertinent to mitigation of racial disparities. And of course, that, the fact that there's extensive evidence that black, brown, and indigenous people in this country are much more likely to engage with, be processed by, ultimately punished by various components of the criminal legal system and the authorities who lead and comprise them, is a critically important issue.

We also have to have a caution about that because just as important as the disparity issue, it's also the fact that too many people are caught up in the system because we have decided, either explicitly or as a result of no plan at all, really, to pursue a path in which plan, with safety for the public depends upon carceral logic. And I think theory is clear that this approach is neither necessary nor optimal. We can pursue safety without having to invest our resources primarily into the face of the state concerned with force. And I think a first step to doing that is to listen to what the people who feel the brunt of violence in their neighborhoods and the state's response to that problem, often armed, general purpose first responders, tell us about what they need to feel safe.

I start with that point because a key principle of procedural justice, which I've studied for almost two decades, is about providing people with voice. Listening to their perspective, seeking their input for policy, making sure that specific interactions with authorities provide them with an opportunity to share their side of the situation. Procedural justice is a theory of social psychology. It's concerned with how people come to conclusions about the fairness of legal authorities such as police, judges, and other actors. But to be clear the theory generalizes well beyond the criminal legal system and those who act in it.

And those of us who work in this area are concerned with legitimation. When and how people engage and cooperate with authorities, follow laws and rules. The research shows that procedural justice is a key component in public legitimacy. Our research shows that four factors matter in addition to voice. People care about fairness of decision-making by authorities. With respect to decision-making fairness, people look to a dish of decision-maker neutrality, objectivity, factuality, transparency. People care about being able to assess the motives of the decision-makers that they're dealing with. And they want to be treated with dignity and respect.

One example of all of this is that in an interaction with a member of the public, a legal authority could take the time to explain what they're doing, and to help the person that they're dealing with ascertain whether the motivations of that authority is sincere, benevolent, well-intentioned. Basically, members of the public want to believe that the authorities that they're dealing with believe that they count. Now, based on this research, Tom Tyler and I collaborated with police trainers in Chicago eight years ago to develop a prototype procedural justice training comprising about 16 hours.

The first full day was addressed to the theory that I just explained, with an emphasis on history. The ways in which past actions of police in Chicago had actually undermined public legitimacy. That day wrapped up with tying ideas about procedural justice, commission, and core values of the department. The second day of training we called tactical mindset. The point of day two was to involve members of the force in implementation of day one theory. The thinking here was that mere understanding of the theory wouldn't necessarily lead to behavior change.

And for any of this training to matter, behavior change in the field is critical. Do we have any research on evidence about behavior change? Yes, we do. A recent study published in April of 2020 by Wood, Papachristos, and Tyler and the proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, one of the leading premier journals peer review, demonstrates a clear behavioral impact of the Chicago procedural justice training on both complaints about use of force, 10% reduction, and use of force itself, a 6.5% reduction over two years. And that finding published in PNAS reflects one found in a much smaller sample in Seattle by Owens and Weisberg on similar procedural justice training.

Now, because the Chicago sample is so large, over 8,000 officers, the study is a critically important demonstration. But the study is not actually an assessment of reduction of racial disparities as such. Now, with respect to that point, however, I take you back to the comments I made at the outset of my remarks because reduction of disparities, of course, cannot be, in my view, merely our only goal. There are many ways to reduce racial disparities, and not all of them are actually aimed at enhancing public legitimacy and fairness. The next major study on procedural justice training I think we could point to is the National Initiative for Building Trust and Justice. That study focused on rolling out improved versions of the Chicago training in six cities, Fortworth, Gary, Minneapolis, Pittsburgh, and Stockton.

That study actually included an additional training component focused on the mind sciences about which you will hear in a moment. And that study has also been assessed in terms of behavioral impacts. I can refer you to a study by the Urban Institute on that. And hopefully we can have a chance to talk more about research, which is burgeoning in the last three or four years. Thanks.

Cynthia Lum: Thank you, Professor Meares. Professor Fridell, many are looking towards implicit bias training, as Professor Meares alluded to, as a game changer with regards to mitigating disparity in policing. Can you tell us a little bit more about this type of training, and what we know so far from research related to it?

Lorie Fridell: Thank you, Cynthia. And let me start by saying, I'm very pleased to be a part of this discussion on Disparities in Criminal Justice and to be on a panel with such distinguished colleagues. So yeah, let me start by describing implicit bias and implicit bias training, here after IBT. So, regarding implicit bias, we link individuals to stereotypes associated with their groups. This is not based on animus and hostility towards those groups. These stereotypes can impact on our perceptions and on our behaviors. This can happen outside of our conscious awareness, even in well-intentioned people who at the conscious level reject biases, stereotypes, and prejudice.

So well-constructed, science based IBT does three things. One, makes trainees aware of the biases that they may not know they have. Two, provides them with the motivation to produce impartial behavior. And three, equips them with the strategies to do just that. And indeed Cynthia, there is a considerable body of science related to this training, and I'm gonna point out where we have consensus and where we do not. There's virtually no debate in the scientific community that implicit bias exists. There are mixed findings from research that attempts to assess the impact of implicit bias on behavior.

And this is of course critically important in the context of discussing how to reduce disparities in criminal justice because if the implicit biases in our head do not impact on our behavior, we need not be concerned. So again, the findings are mixed. Now, obviously I have come down on the side of the science that shows impact, or I wouldn't have produced an implicit bias training program. But this is certainly an area that requires more research. But when I reflect back on the mixed results with different methods and measures, maybe it's not whether implicit bias impacts on behavior, but under what circumstances.

Now, still focusing on the science undergirding this training, I mentioned that one of the key elements of the training is providing attendees with strategies to produce impartial behavior. And these debiasing techniques are geared toward either reducing or managing biases. Let me start by saying it is very difficult to reduce biases. The techniques to reduce biases require long-term commitments to produce change. More immediate and more accessible are techniques to manage our biases. And for this, the attendees need to learn how to recognize and monitor their implicit associations and thwart their impact on behavior.

Now, since there are mixed studies regarding the debiasing techniques, of course, a program should only be transmitting the debiasing techniques that have supportive science. Let me turn to the evaluation research evaluating the effectiveness of IBT. And I'm gonna distinguish between the findings regarding the impact of IBT on knowledge, attitudes, beliefs and intentions, and behavior. The research is fairly consistent documenting the positive effects of IBT on knowledge, attitudes, beliefs, and intentions. This has been documented in general audiences, and by that, I mean beyond criminal justice personnel, but also documented in police audiences.

And this was found in a study by Rob Worden and fellow panelist, Robin Engel, when they evaluated the implementation of IBT with the NYPD. The police who were trained compared to the control group were, among other things, more concerned about discrimination as a social problem, more likely

to recognize bias policing as a legitimate concern of the public, less likely to believe that only racist officers engage in bias policing, and in very large proportions, the trained officers committed to utilizing the skills for producing impartial behavior.

Now, the research findings are mixed when we look at the evaluations of the impact of IBT on behavior. And indeed, we've got a lot of researchers in the audience, they will recognize that this is a much more endeavor. Now, although this body of research is mixed, it does include studies documenting the impact of reductions in bias behavior as a result of IBT. Just as one example, science departments who were randomly assigned, excuse me, academic departments. Academic departments that were randomly assigned to receive IBT or not, the science programs that received the IBT training were significantly more likely to hire women and minorities compared to the control departments.

Now, the Worden, Engel study did not find evidence that IBT impacted on police disparities on the streets of New York. And the research pointed to two possibilities. One, maybe the training did not impact on behavior, or two, maybe the study did not detect the impact of the training on behavior. And in fact, regarding the second, the researchers commented on the challenges of detecting an impact on disparities, and they wrote, "Estimating the effect of a single training curriculum on officer's decisions may well be akin to finding the proverbial needle in a haystack."

But let me finish, because when we're speaking about whether IBT works, let me highlight a very common myth. It's based on valid science, but the science is misapplied to IBT. The critics of IBT point to legitimate research that shows how many lab administered interventions, designed to reduce or eliminate bias, fail. But then these credits misapply the science to IBT training, claiming that it can't possibly succeed. Well again, the main purpose of IBT is not to eliminate bias, but rather to promote awareness of bias and provide the trainees with the motivation and strategies they need to manage and interrupt it, and of course, the key outcomes that we pursue: changes in attitudes, knowledge, beliefs, and of course, behavior.

Cynthia Lum: Okay. Thank you very much, Professor Fridell. Professor Engel, a great deal of a recent discussion is focused not just on police-community relationships, but also police accountability to disparate uses of force. Some have looked towards de-escalation training to offer an approach to reduce use of force more generally. Can you tell us a little bit about this type of training and what we know from the research in this area?

Robin Engel: Great, well, thank you, Cynthia, and to my fellow panelists, and welcome to all of you, practitioners and researchers, funders that are listening today. My perspective on this is both from a practitioner and a researcher. In 2015, we had an officer involved shooting at the University of Cincinnati and a tragic incident where there was a loss of life of an unarmed black male at the hands of a white UCPD patrol officer in the area slightly off-campus, and I took over the UCPD and implemented a lot of reforms. And when I did that, one of the things that I wanted to look at very specifically was changes in our use of our force policy and changes in our use of force training.

So, like many of you practitioners out there right now, I wanted to know, bottom line, does de-escalation training work? Because de-escalation training we know is widely supported across various stakeholders, it's endorsed by experts and academics. It got a real boost from President Obama's Task Force on 21st Century Policing in 2015, recognized by the Police Executive Research Forum and their guiding principles in 2016, or sorry, 2016, and then the International Association of Chiefs of Police also had a national consensus policy and discussion paper in 2017 on use of force. All of these bodies recommending de-escalation training.

As late as 2019, CBS News survey poll, they looked at about 155 police agencies, the three largest agencies in every state, and every single responding agency indicated that they did de-escalation training. As early as 2017, even before all of these new issues and challenges that we're facing in our country, 40 States had already had standards related to de-escalation training in place. But despite all of this, we know so little about the quantity, the quality, and the content of police training on de-escalation. And further that, we know that it matters. There're dozens of different vendors out there.

And there's also in-house training that's been developed by agency's own police trainers. Within every state, there's, even there's structured training requirements and programs. There continues to be this wide variation in the delivery. And interestingly enough, there's no uniform accepted definition of de-escalation. And in some cases, officers don't use the term de-escalation in their training due to the stigma that has been associated with de-escalation training. Why this stigma? Because even though there's been a heavily endorsed training by police executives and policymakers, there's still some controversy regarding officer safety issues.

There's concern that the trainings contradict traditional tactics. Things like time, distance, and cover that are typically trained might be interpreted as retreating or hesitancy to use force. And so officers, some believe that there's a potential to add risk to officer safety as a result of de-escalation training. And, unfortunately, until this past year, there was literally no evidence regarding the effectiveness of de-escalation training for policing. Now we know that most police training is not evidence-based, yet police training of all types is one of the most consistently demanded reforms.

It's often seen as a cure all, particularly for racial and ethnic disparities, but the evidence, in particular for de-escalation training, is shockingly inadequate. We did a systematic multidisciplinary review of de-escalation training with my colleagues, Hannah McMannis and Tamra Harold. This was back in 2017 and 2018 when we're putting this together. And we found 64 de-escalation training studies that had been identified, most in the fields of nursing and psychiatry, but not one study in policing or criminal justice. Many of these studies had weak designs, there were no randomized controlled trials, and even though they had generally positive findings, they mostly looked at self-reported behavioral outcomes and not actual behavioral changes.

We also know that there were wide variations in the training concepts and across these trainings, and it was unknown if there were unintended consequences. Now the evidence base is starting to change, I'm glad to say.

We have four new studies just in the past year or so. Polis's T3 training tactic, tact, tactics and trust, has been evaluated by Wolfe, McLean, Alpert, and Smith. That research group, they took a look at that training that had been implemented in Fayetteville, North Carolina and Tucson, Arizona, and what they found were changes in officers' attitudes, but they were unable to detect changes in behavior in the field.

We also see now a customized training in Tempe, Arizona. And Mike White and his colleagues at ASU are looking at evaluating that training as well. And they're finding changes in officer attitudes, and they're just beginning to look at changes in behavior. And those findings aren't quite ready yet, but we're looking forward to see what's forthcoming. We also have a pilot study that was conducted with the University of Cincinnati police division. It was led by Gabrielle Isaza, looking at PERS Integrated Communications Assessments and Tactics, or the ICAT training in de-escalation.

And what she and her colleagues found were changes in attitudes and self-reported behaviors, but unable to measure actual changes in use of force, and I think that's probably a good thing because I was in charge of that police department we didn't have enough uses of force to take a look at. The most recent study, and I think the most important, is with the Louisville Metro Police department, and what we have found here; this is using our most rigorous research design to date, a stepped wedge randomized control trial design.

We also had repeated officer survey measures and some cross-sectional work as well. And what we have found here is not just changing, changes in officer attitudes, but also changes in behavior. A 28% reduction in officer use of force, a 26% reduction in citizen injuries, and a 36% reduction in officer injuries. This is the first study to date that has been able to demonstrate that de-escalation training has an associated statistically significant impact on reductions in use of force, citizen, and officer injuries. The impact on racial and ethnic disparities is something that I'll return to later in the program. Thank you.

Cynthia Lum: Thank you very much, Professor Engel. Deputy Chief McGuire, each one of the panelists have discussed very specific type of training, and a very current type of training, but we know that one staple of police training in the US has been what is generically known as training on community policing. So, I was hoping you could give us a sense of what this training looks like today, and how, if at all, this existing training on community policing addresses disparities that might result from police activity.

Tarrick McGuire: So similar to my other colleagues, I'm very honored to speak with each of you today and carry on in this discussion. One thing that I will say is I'm so happy that they have covered the historical and current research as it relates to these specific topics and areas that they are subject matter experts in. When I think about community-police relations, I think about three primary areas. I think about collaboration, I think about partnership, and also think about problem solving. I think every police department on a daily basis, in their mission, in their focus in service to the community, has to incorporate those three particular areas.

But Cynthia you know, as well as many others on this call, as Anthony talked about in the beginning of our conversation, somewhere across the nation today a police department will have to deal with a crisis. Somewhere across the nation today a police chief will have to deal with some sort or form of police misconduct. But in lieu of dealing with those issues as well, we know that officers go out every day, risk their lives, they serve communities, and there are millions of positive interactions that police officers have as it relates to community and police relations. But the interesting thing about the United States is that we do not have a national police force. Every police community is designed as it relates to how the community desires their police department to police, and in doing so, there are particular unique challenges.

And so, I truly believe that the policing profession has evolved, and it continues to evolve as we have this discussion today. But although that we have evolutions in policing, although that we have improvements in training, I believe that we're still haunted by the historical ills that policing has caused, particularly on communities of color. I'll just share a personal experience with you because I think sometimes when we talk about police training, and we talk about communities of color, we talk about training from a perspective of a controlled environment and not a reality environment. And what I mean by that is oftentimes the community shares a different perspective with the police.

We as a law enforcement agency try to justify or explain our actions, which is very important when you talk about procedural justice framework. But a lot of times there are some things that we cannot underscore as it relates to research. And as we look at quantitative and qualitative knowledge, I think some things are not captured, as Robin has just highlighted recently, as relates to de-escalation training and through police experience. And so, I'll just share an experience very quickly. I have an older son who is a college athlete. And my son personally was stopped by the police probably within the last couple of months for not having his headlights on.

And the first thing my son did was call me on his FaceTime, which he very seldom does. And as he was being pulled over, and the FaceTime screen popped up, I saw red and blue lights flashing behind his head. And I as a parent, I as a police executive, became fearful and wondering what was going on. Now during that interaction, the officer even spoke to me as the parent. He allowed my son to leave, he explained why he pulled him over. He shared the tenants of procedural justice that Tracy talked about earlier. And so, but that fear that he had at that particular moment, I can't explain that on a level for him being a young black male.

The fear that I had as a parent, although I'm a police executive, I really cannot quantify as it relates into words. And so we, although that officer did what he was trained to do, or what we would expect to do is we call the seven-step approach, the reality of that fear sometimes cannot be quantified. And so, I think it's important to note as we talk about training in a controlled environment, that we also evaluate training and its impact in an uncontrolled environment, because we put officers through academies, we put them through different phases of a training, and the question is, is we equip them with the knowledge, but the other alternate question is how do they apply that knowledge and evaluate the decisions that they make?

So, I simply state that officers face unknown challenges every single day. And the fear is real of police in particular communities, particularly in black and brown communities. And so, we have to evaluate, not only where we've been in training, but what do we want training to look like in the near future? So, I will just kind of quantify our community policing and community-police relations, trying to get in twofold today as it relates to the application of it. If we look at it from a pre-context standpoint, we know that police departments work in different formalities to go out and build trust every single day, in areas, especially in particularly disenfranchised areas that we're not very successful in.

And so, policing has evolved to incorporate restorative justice practices in lieu of trying to eliminate these particular biases that we talked about. So real quickly as I close, I think it's important to acknowledge how training tries to work toward the elimination of what those disparities are. And I think, Cynthia, it's important to note that there is a difference between disparities in data, and there's a difference between disparities and disparate treatment by the police. And so how does training look today? In my opinion, there are three different areas that we have to talk about and evaluate to where training will go to.

There's an area of social equity, racial equity, and then justice. So, for example, we see laws that are now being legislated to change police behavior as it relates to over-enforcement, to decriminalized marijuana, decriminalize particular narcotics that are going across the nation. And then these issues, in by part address substance abuse to try to provide people the help that they actually need. We know that police departments are now focusing on training such as social justice, racial equality centered around hate crime. And then finally, I think that the idea of justice has a unique focus as it relates to trying to ensure that we treat people with fairness, decency, and respect. And so, I know that we'll have additional questions, but I think that as it relates to creating disparities in training, I think that not only is it a police, a police initiative to reduce those disparities, but we also must have help from academics and other community stakeholders.

Cynthia Lum: Okay, thank you, Deputy Chief McGuire. Powerful words indeed. The, I'd just like to return to a couple more questions, a few questions for the panelists again. Because I think Tarrick raises some important concepts. Everybody has raised these concepts about implementation and the realities of what's happening on the street as opposed to inside of a training environment. Professor Meares, let me go back to you and some of the issues that you touched upon with procedural justice. I know there are several components of achieving procedural justice which you mentioned. As we move forward, there's a lot of practitioners on this call today. And as we move forward, what aspects do you see are most relevant in terms of improving, not just police-community relationships generally, but disparities more specifically?

Tracey Meares: All right, so, I'm so grateful to Deputy Chief McGuire for speaking because I think it actually emphasizes the point I was trying to make at the outset. Often when people ask that question, what aspects, they're asking things like what matters more? Voice, treating people fairly, so on? That's just the wrong question to ask, in my view. And it's the wrong question to ask in the context of when we're trying to produce evidence about the effectiveness of training.

If you'll notice, each one of the panelists in discussing their training actually mentioned aspects of procedural justice as part of training that could or could not be effective, even in the context of de-escalation.

Robin, the name of the training that Robin mentioned included trust. That tells you that procedural justice and these other ideas are bound up in how to create effective training, which in turn is going to just create more fair interactions with members of the police and the public. I only have a couple of more minutes so I wanna say two things. First, how to make it more effective? PJ can be optimized by linking it to different aspects of the theories that we've been talking about. Linking procedural justice to de-escalation, linking procedural justice to the mind science. Our own procedural justice actually has a mind science component called procedural justice tactical, which includes not only the fast traps of implicit bias, but also slow traps.

And this training was developed by justice collaboratory, Philip, member, Phillip Atiba Goff, his team, and members of the police department from the Chicago Police Department and the New York Police Department. Second, must focus on internal procedural justice. You can't expect police officers to treat people with respect in the field, when they are not treated with respect, dignity, and the like internally. Third, you have to involve the public, this is the part of voice, in the development of the policies for which officers are trained. Training has to be based on something. It needs to be based on policy. This is the approach we took in the Baltimore police department, where I serve on the monitoring team.

Just to wrap this up, just, it's important, I think, for the viewers to understand, that evidence is a set of facts in answer to a question. But it really matters what question you're asking. My view, of course, is that the questions that need to be asked ought to be guided by theory. And the theories that I care about are not so much whether people of color in one group are treated exactly like non-people of color in another group, but instead deep theories about what does fairness mean? What does legitimacy mean? What does it mean to treat someone as a citizen? Those are the questions that we need to ask, and those are the questions for which we need evidence. Evidence that can be produced in part by randomized controlled trials, but also qualitative evidence, survey-based evidence. Different bodies of evidence are necessary to answer different questions. Thanks.

Cynthia Lum: Thank you so much, Professor Meares, for those thoughts. Professor Fridell, just following on that a little bit, and also on Deputy Chief McGuire's comments as well. What do police leaders need then, to fulfill the promise of implicit bias training? You know, do we need operational adjustments? Do we need changes to policies? Or something else to impact policing disparities?

Lorie Fridell: Good, and this important question highlights the fact that providing IBT to line personnel is just one bullet point on a longer list of what police leaders need to do in their ongoing quest to produce impartial policing. IBT is not the answer to the issue of disparities in criminal justice, rather it is a necessary component of multi-dimensional efforts. Now in our own training program, we have different versions of the curricula for the officers and deputies, the first line supervisors, mid managers and command. And in the command staff

training, we highlight the need for a broad organizational approach to promoting, sustaining, and in fact, institutionalizing the messages of IBT.

And in our discussion of this comprehensive program to produce fair and impartial policing, we discuss such topics as leadership and culture, recruitment and hiring, policy prohibiting bias policing, measurement, and the all-important, operations. So, since you gave me five minutes instead of 12 hours, I'm gonna need to focus on two aspects of the comprehensive program. One is the role of the leadership in reinforcing the messages of IBT after the training, and a second one, one aspect of operations.

Now, part of the first, it's really important for the leadership to commit to and reinforce the messages of IBT. And this certainly includes follow up or booster training at a suitable interval and is particularly important in that booster training to reinforce the skills portion of the training and rejuvenate the motivation to use those skills. And then, of course, the agency leader needs to continuously convey their commitment to impartial policing, and infuse the messages, in fact, throughout the culture of the agency. And they can message it through personnel evaluations, mission statements, academy and in-service training, even SOPs and the forms that you use for special operations. So, let me turn to operations since fulfilling the promise of IBT is more about the line training and it's more about messaging.

And as of last Wednesday morning, I had a whole different outline for this session, but the events at the Capitol are obviously too important and too salient to ignore. Particularly the allegations that the police response to the Trump supporters was not the same response that maybe Black Lives Matters protestors might've received. Now, as a caveat as I move forward, I need to point out as a social scientist, it is very difficult to determine whether and how bias might have impacted on the law enforcement response. But as an informed observer, I shall speculate on how various biases could have impacted the leadership and the line personnel.

At the planning stage, bias may have affected the degree of threat perceived by the leadership, based not on the evidence, but rather on implicit conceptions of the threat posed by the Trump supporters. We are learning now of information that was available on social media that should have raised alarms for the potential for violence, and maybe because of their preconceived notions, the leadership did not dig deep into that intelligence, not as deep as they might've dug if they were working, looking at another group. Or maybe they did dig deep, but they were victims of confirmation bias, meaning they processed that evidence through their preconceived notions.

Out-group bias could have impacted the leadership and line levels. Now out-group bias, we learned that every person has an in-group, or our we, and everybody else is in our out-group, they are they. And pursuant to this science, we are more comfortable with our we, than we are with our they. We also see more positive characteristics in our we than we do with our they. So, we know well that Trump has much support from police across the country. So, to continue my speculation, the police leadership on down to the line personnel may have perceived the Trump protesters as their we.

And it's not a stretch to assume that Black Lives Matter protestors are situated in their they. So, this application of the science to the recent events serves to highlight first of all the importance of training at all levels of an agency, but also a broad organizational approach. But let me end by stating clearly that if in fact bias impacted on that law enforcement response at the Capitol, we should not assume that it is because they are inherently incompetent or bad people. We should not assume that they were consciously and intentionally favoring this group over others, it's just because they're humans like the rest of us.

Cynthia Lum: Thank you, Lorie. And thanks for bringing in that, that's such an important topic because I know it's weighing on all of our minds right now as we try to make it through so many different challenges that we're facing today and trying to address all of them, it seems like at once. So, thanks very much for raising that. Professor Engel, just going back to de-escalation a bit. In your view, what's needed to, to ensure that training principles are being adopted, implemented, and institutionalized? How do we, do we have a sense of whether or not de-escalation techniques might be able to address concerns of use of force or disparity if they're operationalized as well?

Robin Engel: Well, I'm going to piggyback a little bit on Lorie Fridell's comments about what happened at the Capitol. Because I've been hearing a lot, too, with, "Well, de-escalation doesn't work. Look what happened at the Capitol." And I just wanna assure everyone that's listening is that what happened at the Capitol was not de-escalation. It was not de-escalation training. Those trainings typically, they have core topics that include critical thinking and crisis recognition and intervention and communication skills and operational tactics, none of which were implemented appropriately at the Capitol. So, when we talk about and think about de-escalation training, we have to understand and put it in context of it's designed specifically to make police-citizen encounters safer.

And with that in mind, we now do have at least one study that has demonstrated that these de-escalation trainings can reduce the frequency of use of force on officer injuries and citizen injuries. But what we're now learning as well is what impact could this have on racial and ethnic disparities? And that's sort of where I left off last time, and I wanna revisit that question because initially what we're finding with the Louisville Metro Police Department is overall reductions that were significant and related to the training. But when we look specifically by citizens of race, new analyses that we're just working on right now, and Nick Corsaro has been leading this work, he's a fabulous statistician, and what we're finding is that the magnitude of the reductions is actually greater for white citizens compared to nonwhite.

So, while everyone is coming down in use of force and injuries, the reductions are greater for white citizens. And so the question is why? Why is it that as we have these overall reductions, that we might see increases in racial disparities? Initially we thought, well, it might be linked to the severity. We know that certain types of force are more likely to be impacted by this particular de-escalation training. So, low and moderate severity uses of force went down more so than the highest severity categories of use of force. And so, we thought, well maybe there's a racial connection there.

But when we look across time in the Louisville Metro Police Department, there were even black and white citizens in terms of the severity of force that they received. So, that's not really gonna be the explanation here. We also know some new analyses, Ryan Moss has been added to my research team, he's doing a great job, he's looked at the receptivity to ICAT training. Finding that female officers, nonwhite officers, and officers with less tenure time at Louisville Metro are more likely to embrace that type of training. But we're also finding that, of course, the majority of officers are white and male. So, that's not exactly explaining what's happening here.

What we'd like to focus on, and in the research coming up, is communication skills. It may be that officers feel more comfortable using de-escalation skills and communication tactics on same race officer-citizen parings. That's a possibility as well. But what I love about this work, is that we are developing a feedback loop, in real time, with the Louisville Metro Police trainers. So, as we discover this type of work or these findings, we're feeding that back in, and they're making changes to the training as a result of this. But we need more studies. We cannot just rely on findings, obviously, from this one study.

And we, we need to be really looking at how this study impacts the larger work. We know that Louisville Metro Police Department was a challenging environment. Their trainers have their hands full with possible officer morale issues. 75% of officers said that their work was dangerous. 85% agreed that there was a good chance that they would be assaulted on the job. Only a quarter of these officers said that the agency was a good agency to work for. So, the trainers were going into an agency with very low morale, and this was before Brianna Taylor and George Floyd were killed and leading to months of unrest in Louisville and other cities.

So, while it's very encouraging that we see the overall reductions in use of force related to these trainings, and officer and citizen injuries, we need to better investigate what's happening with the racial and ethnic disparities here. Training content delivery matters. And a holistic approach matters. And I'll turn it back over to you, Cynthia.

Cynthia Lum: And I also think what you and Lorie and Tracey emphasize is that also this constant research knowledge that's evolving, that's contributing to our thinking about this training, and that helps develop the training along the way, I think it's also kind of an asterisk of the importance of continual research and analysis in this field. So, thanks very much. And one thing I wanted to just emphasize, Robin, that you had mentioned, is that reductions don't always mean positive. We can have reductions in numbers of use of force or other outcomes, but it doesn't always mean that disparity is reduced as well, sometimes disparity can increase. So, I think that's an important point.

Deputy Chief McGuire, I just want to close with you before we open up to some questions that the audience posed, before when they registered and also now. When you talked about community-oriented policing and some of the training around that, there's a lot there, and we've talked about a lot today. What do you think are some significant changes that are needed? And I know some of the panelists have already raised this, but should we change the way we're doing community-oriented policing? And in what view, in your view, what would that be?

Tarrick McGuire: So, let me say this, Cynthia, and you know this. 2016, I was in Washington, DC, I spent a year there, when President Obama was in office, to work on national police reform. And I was very enlightened to the differences in policing across the United States. I was very enlightened to different experiences that the law enforcement officers have and also community members. Even today as a public speaker, as a person that teaches on procedural justice at different institutions, I'm still surprised when I walk into a classroom setting with law enforcement officers, and I say, "By a show of hands, how many of you all have had procedural justice training?"

And probably about 25% of the classroom have somewhat of an idea or has heard the term procedural justice. Or I'll ask them, "How many of you all have had de-escalation training or the special topics that we've discussed here today?" And many of them have not had that specific or training inside of a learning environment. And so, I think that we continue to ask ourselves, how do we find ourselves at the same intersection, time and time again, having the same discussion, calling on another presidential commission or a national conversation, a national dialogue, as it relates to community and police relations and how we improve it, and how we change it.

But the eye-opening thing to me was when I was conducting research during that year, it was very interesting to have what we call critical conversations. Critical discussions. And I'm not talking about at the police academy. If I were to bring you back into some resource, and myself and Dr. Bahiyyah Muhammad at Howard University did, we were able to bring officers in from Baltimore City, from Montgomery County, Maryland, and from other jurisdictions around the DC area. And bring them into Howard University, into a classroom in their police uniforms and say, "How do we improve community-police relations? How do we build public trust?"

And if I were to bring you into that environment, you could cut the tension in the classroom with a knife. And by the way, there recently had been an officer involved shooting probably, in Tulsa, Oklahoma, days before Terence Crutcher was shot and killed. And so, it took us a semester to work on the idea of building trust. And one thing that we discovered as it relates to law enforcement training and community accountability and learning, for us at that particular time, experiential learning was very important as it related to our research. And so, I'll give you an example of something that we did. Two things that I'll highlight very quickly.

We went to Penn and North in Baltimore. And at the intersection of Penn and North, it was very busy and probably about two blocks away from the Freddie Gray incident. And on one side of the intersection, you saw narcotics being sold, you saw marijuana being smoked, you saw a person with mental illness on the other side of the intersection. Then you saw the police officer there on foot patrol. And we all were law enforcement and students alike in plain clothing. And for the first time, we were able to see what was going on in an experiential, experimental learning environment, what it looked like to be a police officer, although we were officers.

And then the students, who were from urban areas, got to see what the police were seeing. And then if you take that a step farther, being the, we went to Prince George's County, Maryland, and the students were able to go

onto another experiential learning environment, what it was like to hold a firearm in a simulation exercise. And some of them shot the wrong person. And so, the takeaway from that was just a greater respect and an understanding of what each and every person was experiencing and what they were going through.

So, I would talk about closing comments on community-police relations today, and how do we not continue to revisit these conversations that we're having, going back to talking about social equity, racial equity, and justice. Community policing today is not the issue of the police department. Community policing today is not the issue of the community. Community policing is the issue for everybody. We have to be able to collaborate. We have to be able to come to the table in an intentional way and apply what the evidence is telling us, apply what the science is telling us. So, understand that this program that works in Arlington, Texas may not work in another city.

But you've heard from the criminologist today, particular ideologies or particular benefits to law enforcement that can be applied across the nation. And what I mean by that is is we can, when you talk about implicit bias, we can take a look in ourselves, look at ourselves, and say that, you know what? We bring people and we hire people from all across the country, from all across the world, from all different walks of life, that may have not been in a particular community before. But when they go to that community, we know that they're gonna face danger at times, we know that there are other socio-economic issues, but the least that we can do from a fundamental standpoint across the nation is treat people with fairness, dignity, and respect.

And listen to them. And understand what matters to them. And then we can evaluate what matters to them and see how that applies to public policies and practices that we're implementing in the police department. And I think as we look at that, and we look at other models where we're addressing mental health and other ills that that impact communities around social justice, then we will see transformation. Because at the end of the day, I'm not a person that believes that we do not need police. We need police in every particular community. But what we have to start doing is stop looking at the police and the community as a separate entity and looking at police and community as a collaboration to improve public safety in the places that we live, work and play.

Cynthia Lum: And I suspect, Deputy Chief McGuire, that in many community police trainings, the community is probably not involved. Am I correct about that?

Tarrick McGuire: Absolutely. I think that, Cynthia, we've discussed this before. I think it's very important that we move training from beyond the academy of the police walls. And that we begin to institute training in communities and environment where people are not going to come to the police station. There are two reasons, or two or three reasons why you come to a police station. Right, normally you want some police records, normally you're coming to pick somebody up from jail, or normally you come in to normally meet somebody for a particular meeting. But as we look at the disenfranchisement from historical ills that have been caused in particular communities, we have to figure out more innovative ways to meet people where they are in their environment, and not come in at an official police capacity.

Cynthia Lum: So true, Tarrick, and for people, that's a good statement and lesson for all of us generally, isn't it? As we try to heal more generally in this country. I wanna turn over to Dr. Petrosino. He has some questions that have been posed by the audience, Anthony.

Anthony Petrosino: Thank you, Cynthia. Several of the questions had to do with is a recording gonna be made available, and it will be sent to all registrants. So, thank you for that. Also, folks are asking quite a bit about how they get their hands on the research papers and documents, so we'll try to put together a list that will go out with the, with the archived event. So, thank you for that. Some really great questions and comments, and we appreciate those. I wanted to start with Tracey, but I invite any of the panelists to respond, which is a very big issue here, which is that we see disparities in every area of life, from education to income to housing to COVID-19 healthcare. To what extent are the disparities we see in policing separate or reflective of that? And therefore, I guess the implication, what can we really do if we're not gonna restructure society?

Tracey Meares: We need to restructure society. That is the point, right? And so, we're in the middle of a COVID pandemic, and that's actually, it's nice that the questioner mentioned that. Because thinking about how to address the COVID pandemic, to me, and to many of the people who live in communities that are plagued by violence, and also the state's particular response that relies too much on force as I mentioned, helps us to understand what we can do. Safety is not just about whether police show up, safety is about having access to housing and education. It's having access to clean water so that you can wash your hands multiple times a day in the midst of a COVID pandemic.

And the police don't provide communities with clean water. Look at Flint, right? And so, when we're thinking about inclusion and addressing disparities, we have to address the history of disinvestment in many communities over time, and that disinvestment has led to violence among other things, but in order to address it, we do have to invest. And my understanding of just thinking about what we're about to do with respect to COVID and the infrastructure responding to that is relevant. I could go on, but I will refer the questioner to a couple of papers about which I have written on this very topic. The short answer is simply both. It's a general problem, but it's also a specific problem, and we need to address both of them.

Anthony Petrosino: Any other responses before we move to the next question? Okay. The next set of, there's also a set of questions, and I'll pose this to Deputy Chief McGuire, which is about, and again I invite anybody else to respond to them, which is about how do you transform police culture and the rank and file to buy into reforms that come at the top? You may have an administrator that wants to transform a department to embrace some of the things we've been talking about today, but may not be able to get buy in, so how do you transform that within a department?

Tarrick McGuire: So, I think it's very challenging. Because if it was easy, we would not be having the issues that we've identified today. But the interesting thing is right now I'm trying to complete my doctorate degree. And I'm focusing on the administration of police consent decrees, and if they are effective or not. And

so the research preliminarily shows that, in some environments, there are short-term successes, and in other environments, there are challenges with sustainability. And so, if I just talk about practical application as it relates to reform, number one, we look at the word reform as if it's some negative word. To me, reform is how does the law enforcement executive or the police chief or the command staff of that department set the tone for the organization?

And in setting the tone for that organization, that organization has to embody what the community desires, but also ensuring that internally that, that thought process is permeating through the organization. And so how do you do that? I don't think that there is a panacea of how you do that, but if I were to look at other organizations that are going through some type of DOJ or criminal justice reform, then you look at what they're doing. And so, number one, you look at the mission statement of the organization. You look at the core values of the organization and how that permeates into the training environment. How does it permeate into the daily interactions of your officers?

And then, I think one important thing is, is to evaluate what's important to the community. Right now, if you look at the Baltimore Police Department as it's going through its reform, I think one of the highlights of their process that Commissioner Harris has done in partnership with other academic stakeholders, they have actually went out to the community as it relates to policies and procedures and made these processes public and truly saw feedback. They have done policing campaigns to reinvest in the type of officer that they want to bring inside of an organization. So, I think it's a multifaceted perspective, or multifaceted level that you have to take to create organizational transformation.

The last thing I will say that I think that is a fallacy, no police chief has the power to change organizational culture. No one person can change the organizational culture. I think that as you look at reforms, the chief has to bring in the framework and the ideology to penetrate that organizational culture, to set the stage for those reforms to unfold. And ultimately there has to be dual accountability between the police department and the community.

Cynthia Lum: Tarrick, thank you very much for that. I just want to kind of spin off of something that you just mentioned, but a number of folks were asking this as I kind of reviewed some of the Q and A. And Lorie and Robin, perhaps you might take this question about diversifying the police force. I think we hear a lot about diversifying the police force as a solution or perhaps hiring the right people as a possible solution, to be more receptive to the training that we've talked about here. Do we know much about that, and does that matter as much, as some of the things that the Deputy Chief is talking about?

Lorie Fridell: And I'll start by saying that there are many reasons to add diversity to a police department. But in terms of my own area and implicit bias, people that are from underrepresented groups come in with their own set of biases. So, sometimes I think the public thinks, "If we could just get rid of all of these white males, bias would go away," when in fact again, underrepresented groups do bring in their own biases. So it's not the answer. Now, where it does relate to the science is, the contact theory says the more positive contact you have with people who are different from you, it can reduce your

biases. So, if your partner is Muslim or transgender or something like that, that could have a bias reducing aspect. But I know we have a little bit of time, so let me turn to Robin.

Robin Engel: Well, I think a lot of the research has really looked at differences in officer behavior related to demographics. But what we have neglected is how citizens respond to officers with different demographics. And so, that's really, I think, where we need more work and better understanding that if citizens are being received by someone who looks like them, who is involved in their community, someone that they recognize, that the interaction might be very different, just based on the ways that both the citizen and the officer respond. So, I think we're very limited when we just look at studies to say, "Well, are male officers more likely to use force than female officers?"

Well, how are the citizens responding to female versus male officers? That's what we really need to be taking a look at. And the final thing I'll say about diversifying police agencies, obviously this is a crucial area where we need more research. How and why are minority candidates falling out of the process? Informed, in terms of recruitment, and what types of folks are we trying to bring into the law enforcement profession, not just by demographics, but by attitudes and background and all of these other things. So, I think there's great opportunity here. And I would reach out to my colleagues and say let's build a research base that can be really valuable for our law enforcement executives.

Cynthia Lum: Thanks so much, Robin, for that. I guess I'll end with one question that seemed to be raised by a few folks in the Q and A, which is a bit of an academic question, but it's so important. Talking about data, and I think data is very limited with regards to measuring and studying the outcome that we are all talking about today, that is disparity or perceptions of disparity. And I'm wondering if any of you have any experience with agencies who have been successful in trying to improve their data collection in this area, given that there is no national data collection on certain topics that we've been talking about today. And what are some initial steps that agencies, not just police agencies, but other agencies, schools, and other public service agencies might take to improve their data collection so that we can in fact see if any of this is effective?

Robin Engle: I'll take a stab at that very quickly. It may seem small, but I think it's, the larger point is important here. We're seeing some agencies that are now collecting information about the use of de-escalation skills and tactics in the field. So not just use of force, but whether or not de-escalation was used during those encounters. And I think this is important for two reasons. First, of course, we can gather additional information about officer performance and assess what's working. But secondly, it reinforces to the officers that this is important to management, that this is an expectation of your work.

When you have to fill out a form every time and indicate whether or not you used these particular skills or tactics, it sends that message to help change that organizational culture because we all know we need a holistic approach. It's not just about training. It has to involve data collection, it has to involve field supervisors, changes in policies, and all of these things have to work

together and be integrated, in order to have the best impact in the changes we'd like to see.

Cynthia Lum: That's such an important statement to end on, Robin. I think many of the skills that we really want advanced officers to have today are almost never recorded, reported in terms of them using those skills and implementing them. So, so thank you for that. I'm going to turn this back over to Anthony, but thank you all, panelists. This has been an incredible discussion, I really appreciate it. Anthony.

Anthony Petrosino: Thank you, Cynthia. We had really, had difficulty in deciding how long to make these. And of course, we would love to have had this to be two hours or longer just as we were getting this discussion going but thank you so much. I wanna echo Cynthia and thank our panel for the discussion today. And judging from the comments and the responses from folks, you're getting a virtual standing ovation. So, we really appreciate all of you for participating. And thank you for our audience. We had an incredible turnout. The comments and questions, and we thank you for that. As mentioned, this is the first in our series, and we'll be announcing those future events as they are finalized.

With that, we're gonna bring this event to a close. Please stay safe and stay well. I turn it over to Danny Torres of our Communications Department, who did such a critical job helping us plan and implement today's event. Danny.

Danny Torres: Thank you very much, Anthony and Cynthia, and to all our panelists. That was a great session. And I really appreciate all of you who participated and joined us today.