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Foreword

Policing in America has been under a spotlight since the gruesome murder of George Floyd. The late civil rights icon John Lewis—in an essay published on the day of his funeral—wrote, “Emmet Till was my George Floyd. He was my Rayshard Brooks, Sandra Bland and Breonna Taylor.” Certainly, for many, George Floyd’s death has illuminated an injustice that continues to resurface time and again. However, unlike before, public opinion on police reform has shifted dramatically with majority of Americans supporting change. More importantly, governments across the United States are responding to this moment. As of July 17 2020, nearly 30 states have introduced more than 350 bills to revise their approaches to policing. Indeed, the time to act is now.

In this whitepaper, I do not present a panacea for the problems facing law enforcement. Instead, I make the case for what I think police reformers must fundamentally consider. For the past three months, I have spoken to multiple individuals—professionals who work in the criminal justice system from police chiefs to criminal defense attorneys, as well as community leaders and activists who are pushing to make law enforcement more accountable and transparent. I have listened to people’s concerns and learned about the communities they serve.

Today, as I reflect on the conversations I had, I remain resolute in my belief that questions of public safety, accountability, and cultural sensitivity are not mutually exclusive. It is possible to adopt certain reforms while not sacrificing public safety. And, while I am acutely aware that municipalities in Pima County are not Chicago or Baltimore, I also recognize that we, too, have room for improvement. We can take steps to improve the image of law enforcement and better the quality of policing locally. I hope this whitepaper provides a blueprint and serves as a resource along the way.
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Introduction

On May 25, 2020, Minneapolis police officers responded to a call about a person who reportedly used a counterfeit $20 bill to purchase cigarettes. When the officers arrived at the scene, they quickly confronted the individual: a 46-year-old black man named George Floyd. In a matter of minutes, three officers wrestled and pinned Mr. Floyd to the ground until he became unconscious and died.\(^1\) Security footage and witness videos revealed one of the officers, Derek Chauvin, pressed his knee down on Mr. Floyd’s neck for at least eight minutes and 15 seconds as Mr. Floyd uttered, “I can’t breathe” more than 20 times.\(^2\)

The brutal death of Mr. Floyd has ignited protests for police reform and racial justice across the United States (U.S.).\(^3\) So far, an estimated 15 million to 26 million people have partaken in demonstrations over his death.\(^4\) For many, Mr. Floyd’s death has been a painful reminder of other Black lives lost due to police violence—from Eric Garner in New York City, Michael Brown in Ferguson, to Laquan McDonald in Chicago, Freddie Gray in Baltimore, and countless more Black men and women.\(^5\)

The subjects of police reform and racial justice have also been the focus of attention in Pima County. On April 21, 2020, prior to Mr. Floyd’s death in Minneapolis, a 27-year-old Latino man named Carlos Ingram-Lopez died in Tucson Police Department custody. The news about Mr. Lopez’s death, however, became public two months after the incident occurred. The body cam video shows Mr. Lopez pleading for water and experiencing cardiac arrest while three officers restrained him facedown for over ten minutes.\(^6\) The delayed release of the footage of Mr. Lopez’s death, coupled with the officers’ handling of Mr. Lopez, raised questions about transparency and accountability, furthering local calls for police reform.\(^7\)

With growing pressure for police reform across the U.S., many counties and cities have pledged or begun to make changes to law enforcement. According to Campaign Zero, an American police reform initiative, 31 of the country’s 100 major cities have implemented policies restricting officers’ use of chokeholds, while three more cities have followed Tucson’s and San Francisco’s lead and adopted all eight policies recommended by the initiative to reduce police violence.\(^8\) Locally, the Pima County Sheriff’s Department (PCSD) recently released a plan to reform law enforcement, focusing on accountability, community engagement, and transparency.\(^9\) Indeed, given that majority of Americans (58 percent) favor bettering law enforcement, now is the time to support and enact police reform.\(^10\)

---

\(^1\) Hill et al., “How George Floyd Was Killed in Police Custody.”
\(^2\) Oppel and Barker, “New Transcripts Detail Last Moments for George Floyd.”
\(^3\) Cheung, “Why US Protests Are so Powerful This Time.”
\(^4\) Buchanan, Bui, and Patel, “Black Lives Matter May Be the Largest Movement in U.S. History.”
\(^5\) Dungca et al., “A Dozen High-Profile Fatal Encounters That Have Galvanized Protests Nationwide.”
\(^6\) Demers, “Tucson Police Chief Says He’s Willing to Resign over Handling of Man’s Death While in Custody.”
\(^7\) Casanova, “Hundreds Attend Vigil to Honor Carlos ‘Adrian’ Ingram-Lopez Who Died in Tucson Police Custody.”
\(^8\) Philbrick and Yar, “What Has Changed Since George Floyd.”
\(^9\) Reyes, “Sheriff Napier Shares PCSD’s ‘police-Reform’ Plan amid National Conversation.”
\(^10\) Crabtree, “Most Americans Say Policing Needs ‘Major Changes.’”
However, what does meaningful police reform require? It is important to ask this question, not only because ideas and support for police reform vary widely, but particularly due to the present context. Today, there exists a delicate relationship between law enforcement and communities of color, including Black, Latino, and Indigenous populations. Although the fragility of this relationship varies from place to place, the lack of trust between law enforcement and communities is widespread. A part of this mistrust is historically embedded, dating back to the foundation of this country and generations of systemic racism. The deadly and violent interactions between law enforcement and people of color that become widely distributed online via posts, images, and videos also reinforce this mistrust.

At the same time, research consistently shows that law enforcement mistreat people of color, reifying Black, Latino, and Indigenous attitudes towards police officers. For instance, research from the Urban Institute suggests Native Americans have the highest rates of fatal exchanges with law enforcement out of any racial or ethnic group. Moreover, according to the database Mapping Police Violence, police are three times more likely to kill Black people than white people. Most recently, in an analysis of ten years of use-of-force records, the Arizona Republic found that, when making an arrest, the Phoenix Police Department uses force significantly more often on Latinos than whites, even though police arrest Latinos and whites at similar rates. These are only a few examples of an array of evidence backing the general feelings people of color hold about law enforcement. For police reform to be meaningful today, policy and decision-makers must consider the experiences of Black, Latino, and Indigenous people.

The purpose of this whitepaper is fivefold. The first goal is to provide a brief history of policing in the U.S. By examining the past, this paper seeks to comprehend today’s tenuous relationship between law enforcement and communities of color. The second objective is to underline the racial disparities that exist across the people who are booked into the Pima County Adult Detention Complex (PCADC). To do so, this paper analyzes jail booking data from eight different law enforcement agencies and finds that Black people are disproportionately incarcerated more than any other racial group in Pima County.

The third aim is to discuss the main findings of a survey involving five major law enforcement departments in Pima County. The survey ranged from an agency’s demographics to the type of trainings they offer their officers to the effects of recent protests. One notable finding reveals law enforcement agencies are following best practices in training and policing. Yet, although important, reforms that strictly emphasize best practices fall short of what meaningful police reform requires today. The fourth purpose is to offer a theoretical framework that may support jurisdictions in their police reform efforts. Drawing on the legal scholar and sociologist Monica Bell’s theory of legal estrangement, the final goal is to put forward a set of proposals that begin to strengthen ties between law enforcement and communities of color.

Before proceeding to outline the methodology, it is important to clarify what this whitepaper does not examine. This paper does not take into consideration current demands for redirecting funds

---

11 Ibid.
12 Ajilore, “Native Americans Deserve More Attention in the Police Violence Conversation.”
13 Mapping Police Violence, “Black People Are Most Likely to Be Killed by Police.”
14 Price and Náñez, “Phoenix Police Records Prove Officers Disproportionately Use Force against People of Color.”
away from law enforcement. These demands deserve appropriate attention and examination, especially when as of August 13, 2020, at least 13 cities have committed to reducing their police departments’ budget.\textsuperscript{15} Similarly, this paper does not investigate the role of school resource officers (SROs) today. The use of SROs is facing increased scrutiny due to growing evidence demonstrating their participation in the school-to-prison pipeline around the country.\textsuperscript{16} That said, due to time constraints, it would not have possible to offer both topics thorough deliberation.

Data and Methods

We commenced the research by becoming familiar with the literature on policing. We consulted academic sources, policy documents, and news articles to understand the history of policing and the recent events happening across the country and in Pima County.

We then proceeded to schedule informal conversations and listening sessions with a variety of individuals. We started by contacting city and town councils from each municipality in Pima County. We contacted officials from Marana, Oro Valley, Sahuarita, South Tucson, and Tucson.\textsuperscript{17} We also reached out to representatives from the Pascua Yaqui Tribe and the Tohono O’odham Nation.\textsuperscript{18} In addition to elected officials, we contacted numerous professionals who work in the justice system to obtain a general viewpoint on policing. These individuals included police chiefs from every municipal jurisdiction in Pima County,\textsuperscript{19} including the county’s sheriff, judges, court administrators, county prosecutors, and public defenders.

We also made concerted efforts to reach out to community members to understand their perspectives. We communicated with faith and community leaders, activists, and people who the justice system has affected. We began by relying on community networks as the primary method for identifying participants. Afterward, we used snowball sampling and relied on participants’ connections to recruit additional participants. For the most part, we were successful in communicating with several community organizations. However, working on behalf of Pima County, we found getting in touch with community members challenging. A few organizations never responded to messages or declined to participate. Some people refused to speak because they felt this research project did not go far enough, expressing skepticism about whether these efforts were only a public relations exercise in light of recent events.\textsuperscript{20}

We also encountered challenges when contacting criminal justice stakeholders. For example, some elected officials and police chiefs were wary of the research’s intentions. Before engaging in a conversation, we were consistently asked, what was the purpose of the research paper? Why was Pima County conducting this project? And, who was going to see the final product? In these

\textsuperscript{15} McEvoy, “At Least 13 Cities Are Defunding Their Police Departments.”
\textsuperscript{16} Nance, “Students, Police, and the School-to-Prison Pipeline.”
\textsuperscript{17} We were unable to speak with officials from Sahuarita.
\textsuperscript{18} Likewise, We were unable to communicate with officials from the Pascua Yaqui Tribe and the Tohono O’odham Nation. Both governments’ operations halted due to the spread of Covid-19.
\textsuperscript{19} Although attempts were made to contact police chiefs from Sahuarita, Pascua Yaqui Tribe, and Tohono O’odham Nation, we were unable to reach them.
\textsuperscript{20} See Appendix A for an example of one response we received.
instances, we reiterated the importance of having these conversations to understand the role of law enforcement today, considering the incidents across the country and locally in Pima County.

One reason we wanted to informally get to know police chiefs was not only to better comprehend their role and the respective communities they serve, but also to build rapport before inviting them to participate in a countywide law enforcement survey. To supplement informal conversations and listening sessions, we surveyed five major law enforcement departments across Pima County. CJRU’s Data Coordinator helped developed the survey. Although we designed a few questions, we drew most of our questionnaire from the Pew Research Center’s “Behind the Badge” survey\textsuperscript{21} and the U.S. Department of Justice’s (DOJ) Bureau of Justice Assistance’s “Police-Mental Health Collaboration Programs” checklist.\textsuperscript{22} The questions ranged from a department’s demographic information to recent incidents involving the use of force to national issues relevant to law enforcement.

With Pima County Communications Office’s (PCCO) assistance, we carried out the survey online using SurveyMonkey.\textsuperscript{23} Besides feasibility, we used SurveyMonkey to make all entries anonymous. In our invitation to police chiefs, we assured them that we would not collect any names, emails, or IP addresses.\textsuperscript{24} We expected to elicit more truthful responses by making the survey anonymous. Five out of six law enforcement agencies invited to complete the survey participated.\textsuperscript{25} The following departments were invited to participate in the survey:

1. Marana Police Department (MPD)
2. Oro Valley Police Department (OVPD)
3. Pima County Sheriff’s Department (PCSD)
4. Sahuarita Police Department (SPD)
5. South Tucson Police Department (STPD)
6. Tucson Police Department (TPD)

Most of the empirical data we present in this whitepaper are based on the survey’s results. However, we also analyzed the jail bookings by the agencies listed above in addition to Pascua Yaqui Police Department (PYPD) and Tohono O’odham Police Department (TOPD). To do so, we utilized data from the PCSD’s Spillman Software. The PCSD’s Jail Population Coordinator assisted us by collecting the total bookings made in 2019 by each law enforcement agency, including the booking date, arresting agency, sex, and race of everyone booked into the PCADC. Once we received the total jail bookings, we focused specifically on the major law enforcement departments across Pima County. Before discussing the data, it is crucial to first present a brief history of policing in the U.S., which will provide an essential foundation for understanding the present moment.

\textsuperscript{21} Morin, Parker, and Mercer, “Behind the Badge: Amid Protests and Calls for Reform, How Police View Their Jobs, Key Issues and Recent Fatal Encounters between Blacks and Police.”
\textsuperscript{22} U.S. Bureau of Justice Assistance, “Police-Mental Health Collaboration Programs: Checklist for Law Enforcement Program Managers.”
\textsuperscript{23} SurveyMonkey is an online survey development cloud-based software.
\textsuperscript{24} See Appendix B for the sample survey invitation email we sent to law enforcement departments.
\textsuperscript{25} Four agencies completed the survey. One agency only completed 86 percent of the survey.
I. A Brief History of Policing in the United States

The history of policing in the U.S. is vast and complicated. It is not possible to provide an in-depth review of this history here. Instead, this section presents a short summary of pivotal historical moments that not only shaped the law enforcement agencies that exist today, but also molded the relationships between law enforcement and communities of color. To understand the present, we must recognize that these relationships date back to the origins of policing.

The Early Development of Police Organizations

The historical development of policing in the United States followed two different paths. Policing in the Northern colonies reflected policing in England. Towns relied on an informal and communal system called the “night watch.” According to Gary Potter, a crime historian at Eastern Kentucky University, night-watch officers were “composed of community volunteers whose primary duty was to warn of impending danger.”26 Boston started one in 1636, followed by New York in 1658 and Philadelphia in 1700. The watchmen, however, did not take their duties seriously; they “slept and drank” on the job, and although participation was technically voluntary, many only registered to evade military service or were assigned as a form of punishment.27 Hence, while the night watch persisted after the American Revolution, it eventually proved ineffective as increased urbanization necessitated a structured law enforcement system.

A string of riots that erupted through the country during the 1830s notably exposed the watch system’s futility. In 1837, for example, 15,000 people rioted in Boston after an Irish funeral procession and a Yankee fire company violently collided, leaving numerous injuries and neighborhoods in ruins. Boston’s mayor summoned the state militia to control the riot because the city’s watchmen were “utterly powerless.”28 Known today as the Broad Street Riot, the incident propelled the mayor the following year to form the first municipal police department in the country, closely modeled after London’s police force.29 New York City followed Boston’s example in 1845, Cincinnati in 1852, Philadelphia in 1854, and Chicago in 1855.30 By the 1880s, the watch systems in all large cities evolved into police organizations.31

The municipal police forces that emerged in the nineteenth century exhibited two key characteristics. The first pertained to the area of control. According to police experts Clemens Bartollas and Larry Hahn, American police organizations were “disorganized, with unclear lines of authority.”32 In cities throughout the U.S., a police officer had to answer to the chief of police, the mayor, and an elected councilmember. As police officers served at the pleasure of elected officials, politics gradually became entrenched in policing. The second feature of these police

28 Browne, “Broad Street Riot, Boston, 1837.”
29 Kelling et al., “Police.”
30 Ibid.
organizations concerned the lack of personnel objectives. Police recruits did not receive any training; they “were handed a badge, a baton, a copy of departmental rules, and were sent out to patrol.”

Without clear authority and purpose, early police forces in major Northern cities surfaced as disorderly and unproductive.

The development of American policing unfolded differently in the South. Although seldom referenced in criminal justice texts, the origins of Southern police organizations can be traced back to slave patrols. Arguably, as criminal justice scholars Samuel Walker and Charles Katz note, slave patrols may be the first modern police forces in the U.S.

During the period of slavery, Southern colonial governments enlisted slave patrols to deter slave revolts and apprehend runaway slaves. In her seminal book, *Slave Patrols: Law and Violence in Virginia and the Carolinas*, historian Sally Hadden locates the birth of slave patrols to 1704 in South Carolina. At the time, the government established two state militias. The first militia was founded to defend South Carolina from an external invasion. The second militia was created to protect white Southerners from internal threats, specifically slave “insurrections and mischiefs.” Following South Carolina’s example, slave patrols spread throughout Southern colonial America and in many of the antebellum Southern slave states. In short, slave patrols were responsible for maintaining the social order in the South.

Slave patrols existed in America for over 150 years until the abolishment of slavery in 1865. Yet, although slave patrols fell apart as a legal institution, their social influence and legacies persisted. In fact, during and well after the Reconstruction era (1865-77), former slave patrollers and their descendants formed part of the people who proceeded to join white supremacist organizations like the Ku Klux Klan. Over time, as historian Potter highlights, “these vigilante-style organizations evolved [into] modern Southern police departments primarily as a means of controlling freed slaves.” Following the Civil War, Southern police departments were responsible for enforcing the Black Codes and Jim Crow laws—laws that were “designed to deny freed slaves equal rights and access to the political system.” In essence, like slave patrols, the evolution of Southern police departments included upholding the status quo.

It is not difficult to imagine the lasting social ramifications that the development of American policing in the South had on Black people’s perceptions of law enforcement. Jim Crow did not end until 1965. After generations of unequal treatment under the law, it is understandable why there are Black people who distrust police officers. Although the historical relationship between police and Black people was primarily discussed here, police relations involving Latino and Indigenous people also share a troubled history. When we consider the relationship between law enforcement and communities of color today, we must remain mindful of the divergent historical experiences that individual communities have had with police.

---

33 Ibid.
34 Turner, Giacopassi, and Vandiver, “Ignoring the Past.”
36 Hadden, *Slave Patrols*.
37 Ibid., p. 28.
39 Ibid.
Political Corruption, Reform Efforts, and Professional Policing

As noted above, without clear lines of authority, the municipal police departments of the nineteenth century developed into political entities. Heading into the twentieth century, with the growth of big-city political machines in cities like Chicago, New York City, and Philadelphia, policing and politics became inseparable. Known as “the political entrenchment phase” in American policing (1840-1930), the events of this era played a significant role in creating the professional law enforcement departments we have today.

Under the control of local politicians, American police departments became “notoriously corrupt.” Criminologists Victor Kappeler, Richard Sluder, and Geoffrey Alpert explain this corruption in their book, *Forces of Deviance: Understanding the Dark Side of Policing*. Not only did political machines control the organization of departments, such as leadership appointments, but for political benefits, they also dictated who the police could arrest and which laws they could enforce. At the same time, police officers were easily bribed. They “took payoffs to allow illegal drinking, gambling, and prostitution,” for example. And, similarly, police officers paid political bosses to ascend in the ranks. An investigation into New York City’s police corruption in the 1890s, for instance, found that the “going rate to become a sergeant was $1600” and as much as $15,000 “for captains’ positions.”

Indeed, the widespread political and police corruption throughout this period prompted various calls for reform. The investigation into the New York City Police Department was one of the numerous inquiries that took place across the country, from Philadelphia to Los Angeles. Yet, as historian Gary Potter notes, the investigative commissions during this time, “while shedding light on the extent of corruption,” had “little lasting impact on police practices.” Change did not happen until reform-minded police executives took their jobs seriously and began to root out the influence of corrupt politicians. They instituted “selection standards and testing, recruit training, civil service, and promotional testing” to reduce incompetency and baseless promotions. Reformers also reorganized police departments to minimize political involvement. They added mid-level management ranks, changed precinct lines, and created specialized police units. Together, these changes enabled police executives greater autonomy over their departments in the first half of the twentieth century.

As police departments grew independent, law enforcement began to be understood as a profession beginning in the 1920s. For one, police forces became more proactive in enforcing the law and fighting crime. This happened in part due to the Prohibition Act, which forced police to enforce a widely unpopular law, and events like the Great Depression, which compelled law enforcement to adopt a strict position on the question of crime as many Americans broke the law to survive.
Second, by the 1950s, law enforcement became increasingly bureaucratized. In 1943, O.W. Wilson, a leader in policing during this period, wrote a highly influential book titled *Police Administration*. In it, he argued in favor of a military model for the organization and operation of policing, emphasized the importance of crime control, and underscored the significance of efficiency in decreasing crime. Consequently, police departments across the country replaced foot patrols by motorized patrols, consolidated stations and functions, and established central headquarters.49

Lastly, the professional phase of policing occurred through the adoption of science and technology. Police departments adopted technologies, ranging from “police record systems” to “fingerprints” to “radio communications.”50 The combination of administrative changes in law enforcement, the bureaucratization of policing, as well as the incorporation of science and technology produced today’s law enforcement departments.

**Race and Policing in the America: Understanding the Present**

Although the professionalization of law enforcement improved police governance and practice in America, it was not entirely positive. For a half century, law enforcement departments grew into vast bureaucracies. In cities throughout the U.S., especially in major ones, police officers hardly patrolled neighborhoods on foot. Law enforcement agencies became inward-looking and distanced from the public.51 More importantly, police professionalization did not tackle the pervasive racism that had existed within law enforcement departments since their founding.

Events during the modern Civil Rights era (1954-1968) not only exposed the racism that persisted from slave patrols to professional police forces, but also further alienated people of color from law enforcement. Across the South, governments used police departments to enforce inherently racist laws that segregated education, transportation, and public accommodation. Further, as Black Americans fought for equal treatment under the law, governments relied on law enforcement to suppress their demands. In multiple occasions, such as during the Selma to Montgomery marches of 1965, police deployed brute force to stop peaceful demonstrations. To this day, “the use of professional police forces to suppress the Civil Rights movement […] did irreparable damage to American policing.”52

The police’s handling of the civil unrest during the 1960s deeply cemented the negative sentiments that people of color had toward law enforcement. During this period—in a reflection of today’s nationwide protests—incidents involving police violence against Black and Latino people sparked riots around the U.S. Massive riots erupted to protest police brutality in Harlem and Philadelphia in 1964, then in Los Angeles in 1965, followed by Chicago in 1966, and Newark and Detroit in 1967. In response, President Johnson at the time organized a commission of lawmakers and law enforcement officials to investigate what cause the civil unrest.53 In 1968, the National Advisory
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Commission on Civil Disorders, informally known as the Kerner commission, identified “white racism” as the fundamental cause of urban unrest and emphasized the “role of police brutality in alienating black citizens and sowing the seeds of urban discontent.” The Kerner commission concluded, as the sociologist Monica Bell notes, that for many Black Americans, the “police have come to symbolize white power, white racism, and white repression.”

To rectify their image, police departments conducted media campaigns promoting positive police-community relations. Then, by the 1980s, police forces adopted community policing as the new strategy for improving police-community relations. Community policing, in short, stressed “close working relations with the community, police responsiveness to the community, and common efforts to alleviate a wide variety of community problems.”

Community policing proved to be an effective initiative for improving the image of law enforcement across the country. However, for communities of color, community policing hardly made a difference. Their distrust was deep-seated, and it only worsened due to the harsh criminal justice policies of the Law and Order era (1969-89) under the Nixon and Reagan administrations, which disproportionately targeted people of color. Indeed, as far back as 1904, there is ample evidence documenting the deep distrust between people of color and law enforcement. Today, studies consistently reaffirm this distrustful relationship. In one recent study, for example, social scientists Lawrence Bobo and Victor Thompson found that although 68 percent of white people have confidence in law enforcement, only 18 percent of Black people felt the same.

Moreover, research continually legitimizes the experiences of people of color. For instance, when it comes to profiling, studies find that law enforcement officers stop Black drivers at higher rates than white drivers and also ticket, search, and arrest Black and Latino drivers more often than white drivers. Research also shows that Black people are four times more likely than white people to be arrested for illicit drugs. Studies also reach similar conclusions when examining the use of force. For example, research finds that Native Americans have the highest rates of fatal exchanges with law enforcement, followed by Black people. Additionally, Black people are three times more likely to be killed by police than white people. Lastly, unarmed Black people are more likely to be killed than unarmed people of any other racial group. By and large, the evidence is clear: across the country the burden of law enforcement has fallen on people of color.
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II. Policing and Racial Disparities in Pima County

The overpolicing of communities of color has not only occurred at the national level, it is also happening in Pima County. Specifically, in Tucson, the Vera Institute of Justice found that in 2018, Black people were arrested more than twice as many times than white people for non-violent incidents, drug possession, and disorderly conduct. These racial disparities, however, are not exclusive to Tucson. After examining the total jail bookings in 2019, we found that across Pima County, numerous law enforcement departments are disproportionately arresting people of color at higher rates than white people.

Figure 1 below illustrates the number of individuals booked into the PCADC in 2019 by eight different law enforcement departments in Pima County. Altogether, the eight agencies booked into the jail a total of 28,051 people. The TPD was responsible for booking into the jail more than half of these people. The PCSD had 8,162 jail bookings, while the MPD booked 1,105 people in the jail.

Figure 1: The Number of Individuals Booked into Detention by Eight Law Enforcement Agencies in Pima County in 2019.

---

Figure 2 below identifies the racial background of the people booked into the jail in 2019 by eight different law enforcement agencies.

**Figure 2:** The Racial Background of Individuals Booked into Detention by Eight Law Enforcement Agencies in Pima County in 2019.

Evidently, combined, the eight law enforcement agencies arrested slightly more whites than Hispanics. Out of the 28,051 people booked into the jail, 11,518 were white and 11,488 were Hispanic. There were 3,095 Black people, followed by 1,664 Native Americans, and 229 people of Asian descent. Lastly, there were only 37 people who identified as Pacific Islanders.

At first glance, it may not appear that law enforcement agencies are disproportionately incarcerating communities of color in Pima County. However, when you compare the data highlighted above to the overall racial composition of Pima County, the racial disparities come to light. Figure 3 in the following page compares the racial background of people booked into the jail to the racial demographics of Pima County.
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**Figure 3:** The Racial Background of Individuals Booked into Detention Compared to the Racial Demographics of Pima County in 2019.

As Figure 3 reveals, Hispanic, Black, and Native American people were overrepresented in the number of individuals booked into the jail in 2019 when compared to Pima County’s demographics. Hispanics were overrepresented by three percent and Native Americans by two percent. Black people, however, were overrepresented by seven percent. In contrast, white people were underrepresented by ten percent in the number of individuals booked in the jail in 2019.

The next figure represents the racial background of individuals each law enforcement agency booked into the jail in 2019:
Figure 4: The Racial Background of the Individuals Law Enforcement Agencies Booked into Detention in 2019.

![Figure 4: The Racial Background of the Individuals Law Enforcement Agencies Booked into Detention in 2019.](image)

Figure 4 shows various major law enforcement agencies in Pima County disproportionately arrested people of color in 2019. However, without delving into the demographics of each municipality, it is difficult to grasp the extent of these disparities. From the Town of Sahuarita to the Town of Oro Valley, the racial composition of municipalities differs across Pima County. Yet, as an example, if we examine Sahuarita and focus only on the Black population, the racial disparities become clear.

According to demographic data, Black people constitute almost three percent of Sahuarita’s population. In 2019, of the total individuals the SPD booked into the jail, six percent were Black people. A similar conclusion can be drawn across all major law enforcement agencies in Pima County, including the PYPD and the TOPD. The TPD and the PCSD—the two largest law enforcement agencies in Pima County—have the greatest racial disparities concerning the percentage of Black people they arrest. Indeed, law enforcement affects communities of color the most in Pima County, especially Black people.
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III. Countywide Policing Survey Results

To comprehend the role of law enforcement today, we conducted a survey with law enforcement agencies across Pima County. Survey questions covered an agency’s demographic background, best standards and practices, community relations, the effect of recent protests, and national issues associated with law enforcement. The selected results presented in this section are based on the answers of five major agencies spanning Pima County. All results are converted to percentages to maintain the anonymity of each department.

Agency Demographics

One of the survey’s goals was to understand the demographic breakdown of law enforcement departments in Pima County. In addition to asking agencies to list the demographic background of their commissioned officers, We asked them to outline the gender, racial, and ethnic background of their officers in executive leadership positions. Figure 5 beneath represents the gender background of officers in executive leadership positions:

Figure 5: The Gender Background of Executive Leadership Across Five Law Enforcement Agencies in Pima County.

72 See Appendix D for a list of the full results.
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The five law enforcement agencies that participated in survey vary in scale. Yet, as Figure 5 demonstrates, all of them lack female representation among officers in executive leadership positions. In particular, Agency 3 and 4 do not have any women in executive level positions.\textsuperscript{75} The next illustration shows the racial background of officers in executive leadership positions across the five law enforcement agencies.

**Figure 6:** The Racial Background of Executive Leadership Across Five Law Enforcement Agencies in Pima County.

The survey considered Hispanic as an ethnicity rather than a race. Hence, Figure 6 above does not capture the percentage of Hispanics represented among officers in executive leadership positions. Outside Hispanics, there is a notable absence of other people of color in executive level positions, especially in Agency 4.\textsuperscript{76} The only law enforcement agencies that have Black officers in executive posts are Agency 1, Agency 3, and Agency 5.

The final figure in the following page captures the ethnic background of officers in the top positions of the five law enforcement agencies:

\textsuperscript{75} Among commissioned officers, we also found that all five law enforcement agencies lacked female representation.\textsuperscript{76} According to Agency 5, 38 percent of their officers in executive level positions are Native Hawaiian. This is an error.
Figure 7: The Ethnic Background of Executive Leadership Across Five Law Enforcement Agencies in Pima County.

All five law enforcement agencies appear more diverse when ethnicity is included. Agency 4, which does not have any Black, Native American, or Asian people of color in executive positions is composed of 50 percent white and 50 percent Hispanic officers. With 33 percent Hispanic and 25 percent Black officers in top level positions, Agency 3 is the most diverse out of all five law enforcement agencies. Overall, however, all law enforcement agencies are overwhelmingly white.

National Best Standards and Practices

The challenges that police officers encounter are always evolving. Today, now more than ever, law enforcement officials are finding themselves responding to and addressing mental health crises. When law enforcement agencies were asked whether they felt responding effectively to people who are having a mental health crisis was an important role of police, four out of five agencies agreed. It is vital, therefore, that law enforcement agencies in Pima County adopt national best standards and practices to serve their communities, including people with mental health needs.

A section of the survey focused on determining whether agencies follow the best standards and practices as recommended by the DOJ’s Bureau Justice Assistance. Table 1 in the next page lists the results:
Table 1. The Responses of Agencies Following Specialized Training as Recommended by the U.S. Department of Justice’s Bureau of Justice Assistance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does your agency provide at least 40 hours of specialized training for officers that respond to people with mental illness that includes at minimum:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental illnesses and their impact on individuals’ families and communities</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs and symptoms of mental illnesses</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stabilization and de-escalation techniques</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trauma-informed responses</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active listening</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of force</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposition options and the corresponding procedures</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal criteria for emergency mental health evaluation and involuntary commitment</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community resources</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information sharing</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All five law enforcement agencies are providing at least 40 hours of specialized training that included the following six components:

1. Mental illnesses and their impact on individuals; families and communities
2. Signs and symptoms of mental illnesses
3. Stabilization and de-escalation techniques
4. Active listening
5. Use of force
6. Community resources

Four out of five law enforcement departments include trauma-informed responses, disposition options and corresponding procedures, and legal criteria for emergency mental health evaluation and involuntary commitment as part of their 40 hours specialized training.

In order for police officers to respond effectively to people with mental health needs, law enforcement agencies also need to properly train dispatchers. Survey results reveal dispatchers across all five agencies are also following national best standards and practices. All agencies reported training their dispatchers how to receive and dispatch calls involving people with mental illness, recognize and assess a mental health crisis, as well as identify and dispatch appropriate trained officers.

Similarly, survey findings show all five law enforcement agencies are following national best standard and practices when it relates to requiring officers to assess whether a crime has been
committed, determine whether the person’s behavior indicates that mental illness may be a factor, ascertain whether the person appears to be a danger to self or others, and use skills that safely de-escalate situations involving someone who is behaving erratically. With respect to de-escalation, all five agencies have made this type of training mandatory. One agency requires police officers to attend four hours of de-escalation training, while the remaining four require eight or more hours.

Lastly, only one law enforcement agency reported having a policy that describes the use of restraints when detaining people for the purpose of an emergency evaluation.

**The Effects of Recent Protests on Policing**

The success of law enforcement departments today largely depends on whether they have the support of their communities. The five law enforcement agencies that participated in the survey recognize the importance of developing strong community relations. As Table 2 below outlines, all five agencies emphasized the significance of requiring officers to be responsive to community concerns and work in close partnership with the community to solve problems. Agencies also highlighted their support for officers who want to work more closely with community members.

**Table 2: The Significance of Responding to Community Concerns and Developing Community Partnerships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How useful in policing today is requiring officers to be responsive to community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concerns and work in close partnership with the community to solve problems?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very useful</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat useful</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not too useful</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all useful</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much support does your department’s leadership give to officers who want</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to be responsive to community concerns and work close in partnership with the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community to solve problems?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A great deal of support</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A fair amount of support</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not too much support</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No support at all</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the importance of strong police community relations, it is important to ask how have recent protests affected policing in Pima County? Have protests affected community relations? Moreover, how have local law enforcement agencies responded to the events around the country? Table 3 in the following page lists the effects of recent protests on local law enforcement agencies:
### Table 3: The Effects of Recent Protests on Law Enforcement in Pima County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>How much, if at all, do you think these protests have been motivated by a</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>genuine desire to hold officers accountable for their actions?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A great deal</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not much</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How much, if at all, do you think these protests have been motivated by</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>longstanding bias against the police?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A great deal</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not much</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In general, have these high-profile incidents involving police and African</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Americans made your job. . .</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harder</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easier</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have not made a difference</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Here is a list of things that may have happened in some police departments as a</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>result of these high-profile incidents involving African Americans and the</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>police. For each, indicate whether this has happened in your department or not.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers have become less willing to stop and question people who seem suspicious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, has happened</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, has not happened</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The department has taken steps to improve relations between police and African</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, has happened</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, has not happened</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions between police and African Americans have become more tense</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, has happened</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, has not happened</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers have been more reluctant to use force when it is appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, has happened</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, has not happened</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you think the deaths of African Americans during encounters with police in</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>recent years are isolated incidents or signs of a broader problem between</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>African Americans and the police?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated incidents</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs of a broader problem</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The responses of law enforcement agencies varied across the spectrum. First, mostly everyone agreed that their jobs had become more difficult. Four agencies responded that high-profile incidents involving police and Black Americans made their jobs harder, while the remaining one said there was no difference. As a result of these high-profile incidents, two agencies reported that their officers have become less willing to stop and question people who seem suspicious. Additionally, two agencies responded that their officers have become more reluctant to use force when it is appropriate.

Further, two law enforcement departments reported that interactions between police officers and Black Americans have become more tense as a result of recent high-profiled in-custody deaths. Lastly, three departments have taken steps to improve relations between law enforcement and Black Americans in the wake of recent protests.

The answers of law enforcement departments also differed when we inquired about the motivations behind the protests. Two departments felt that a great deal of recent protests have been motivated by a genuine desire to hold officers accountable for their actions. One department said only some of them, while the remaining two believed that not many of the protests had been motivated by an authentic desire to hold police accountable. Furthermore, three agencies thought that protests had been motivated by longstanding bias against the police. The other two agencies did not believe this was the case.

Finally, with respect to whether law enforcement agencies believed the deaths of Black Americans at the hands of police are isolated incidents or signs of a broader problem, only two agencies identified these deaths as signs of a broader problem. The remaining three agencies concurred that these deaths were isolated incidents between Black Americans and the police.

The survey’s full results are listed in Appendix D. Before proceeding to the next section, it is essential to reiterate that the responses presented above are based on the answers of law enforcement departments only. The following section offers a theoretical frame that may support locales in Pima County build better police community relations and strengthen the relationship between law enforcement and communities of color.

IV. Addressing the Distrust Between Law Enforcement and Communities of Color: A Theoretical Framework

Up until this point, it has been made clear why communities of color experience a lack of faith in law enforcement. The negative perceptions that people of color hold toward law enforcement are generational, deeply rooted in history, and reaffirmed by extensive evidence-based research demonstrating how policing disproportionately affects people of color. The question now becomes what changes can we make to begin remedying relations between law enforcement and communities of color? Although there is no simple answer to this question, there are scholars who have devoted their careers to this issue and can steer us in the right direction.
Academia is in a unique position to inform what significant, yet sensible police reform should embody today. Historically, academic scholarship has directly influenced police governance and practice in America. Scholars, for example, are responsible for influencing broken windows theory,77 community policing,78 and hot spots policing.79 Currently, the concepts of procedural justice and legitimacy have become the principal features of police practices across the country. In fact, President Obama’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing included procedural justice and legitimacy as one of six pillars to build collaborative relationships between law enforcement and the public.80

However, what is procedural justice? Moreover, how is it different from legitimacy theory? Both theories of procedural justice and legitimacy go hand in hand. Procedural justice concerns law enforcement officers’ treatment of people with dignity and respect.81 According to the U.S. Department of Justice’s Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS), procedural justice contains four principles: “fairness in the process,” “transparency in actions,” “opportunities for voice,” and “impartiality in decision making.”82 Procedural justice, in turn, contributes to police legitimacy—a greater “public trust in” and “felt obligation to obey the police.”83

The theory of legitimacy holds that people are more likely to trust and cooperate with law enforcement when they perceive law enforcement as legitimate. Research consistently finds that when people are treated fairly, their support for and trust in law enforcement increases.84 Conversely, if people are treated in a procedurally unjust manner, meaning they believe they have been mistreated and there is no transparency—such as in the Tucson in-custody death of Carlos Ingram-Lopez—then their support for law enforcement diminishes. In instances involving procedural injustice, the public is more likely to understand law enforcement as illegitimate. Indeed, all police chiefs we spoke to, including the Pima County Sheriff, alluded to procedural justice as a core philosophy they inculcate throughout their departments.

Although teaching sworn officers and deputies the importance of procedural justice is a noteworthy step towards bettering people’s views of law enforcement, the reality is that officers and deputies working in a procedurally just manner alone will not repair the relationship between law enforcement and communities of color. As highlighted in the history section, there is widespread evidence indicating people of color, especially Black people, are less likely to trust frontline officers than white people. Further complicating matters is that an incident can cast a shadow over the progress a department has made. Consider the TPD as a local example. Nationally recognized as an innovative and forward-looking department,85 the in-custody death of a Latino man has debilitated its image and fractured community relations. Law enforcement departments must adopt
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other changes beyond procedural justice and legitimacy measures to meaningfully address the frustrations emanating protests nationwide.

The legal scholar and sociologist Monica Bell’s theory of “legal estrangement” provides a strong framework for addressing societal needs today. The theory of legal estrangement seeks to capture the nature of the distrust between law enforcement and Black and poor communities of color, and place their experiences at the center of police reform efforts. Bell’s insights are based on 64 individuals she interviewed in Baltimore, Maryland to understand the uprising that unfolded over the death of Freddie Gray, a 25-year-old black man who died from spinal injuries while the police transported him to the hospital. To borrow Bell’s words, “legal estrangement provides a rounder, more contextualized understanding of this relationship that examines the more general disappointment and disillusionment felt by many African American and residents of high-poverty urban communities with respect to law enforcement.” Put simply, the theory “treats social inclusion as the ultimate end of law enforcement.”

According to Bell, three mechanisms contribute to the theory of legal estrangement:

1. **Procedural Injustice**: the “experiences in which individuals feel mistreated by the police.” As explained above, instances of procedural injustice undermine the public’s faith in law enforcement.

2. **Vicarious Marginalization**: the “marginalizing effect of police maltreatment that is targeted toward others.” Put differently, vicarious marginalization consists of the secondary effects of people witnessing police injustices through television, social media, and personal observations, including learning about specific experiences from family and friends. For those people who have not had negative experiences with police officers, vicarious marginalization reproduces a community’s cynicism and influences their attitudes towards law enforcement.

3. **Structural Exclusion**: the various ways in which police governance and practice disproportionately affect disadvantaged neighborhoods. One example to understand structural exclusion is law enforcement’s failure to respond in a timely manner to an incident in a disadvantaged area. Low-quality policing reinforces people’s beliefs that law enforcement neglect their communities. We can also think of structural exclusion as the product of multiple failed policies that have disproportionately targeted people of color and contributed to the distrust between them and law enforcement.

Together, these three mechanisms contribute to how communities of color understand and engage with law enforcement officers. To reduce legal estrangement and improve social inclusion—and
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thus address the distrust between law enforcement and communities of color—Bell posits reforms at various levels of government must tackle procedural injustice, vicarious marginalization, and structural exclusion. The proposals that are introduced in the next section consider Bell’s framework for reducing legal estrangement.

V. Getting Police Reform Right

Thus far, it has been made clear that in order to get police reform right, changes must center the historical and present experiences of people of color. The theory of legal estrangement provides a framework to begin tackling the mistrust between law enforcement and communities of color. The proposals in this section are informed by the numerous conversations we had throughout the research. The proposals are organized around technocratic reforms, democratization efforts, and the role of policing.93

The proposals below are not meant to solve all the problems facing law enforcement. It is important to recognize that in Pima County, the needs of police departments vary significantly across jurisdictions. However, if considered, they can help foster better relations between law enforcement and people of color, and “create the deep and lasting cultural change that will be required to truly overcome legal estrangement”94

Expert-led and Common Sense Proposals

❖ Law enforcement agencies should raise the standards to become an officer. Raising standards can consist of different strategies. Agencies, for instance, may consider increasing the formal education requirements to become an officer to at least an Associate’s degree. Agencies may also consider prioritizing individuals who have more life experience.

❖ Law enforcement agencies should conduct comprehensive and meticulous background checks before hiring an officer. A part of getting police reform right is hiring the right officers in the first place. Background checks should cover not only a candidate’s criminal history, but more importantly, whether the candidate has ever been associated with hate groups and/or terminated from another agency. If the individual is transferring from another agency, an agency’s staff should thoroughly investigate the individual’s workplace history, including reviewing whether the candidate is listed on the Law Enforcement Activity Disclosure List, otherwise known as a Brady List.

❖ Governments and law enforcement agencies should support a statewide or establish a Pima County-wide publicly accessible database tracking serious officer misconduct and terminations. The purpose of this database is not only for transparency purposes, but also to prevent “gypsy cops” who have a record of misconduct from frequently transferring between
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local law enforcement departments. Two public defense attorneys we spoke to identified multiple police officers with questionable behavior who transferred between local law enforcement agencies.

- **Law enforcement agencies should continue investing in best practice training and protocols.** Survey results show agencies are training their officers according to national best standards and practices. Trainings should not only occur during the academy, but also annually throughout an officer’s career. Numerous people we spoke to—from elected officials to professionals in the justice system to community members—emphasized the importance of implicit bias and cultural and linguistic minority training. To borrow the words of one police chief interviewed, “we cannot let off the gas when it comes to training.” Trainings best practices should be required and ongoing.

- **Law enforcement agencies should codify into policy measures that restrict the use of force and have been effectively shown to reduce violence.** Survey results reveal agencies in Pima County have adopted practices that limit the use of the force. Agencies should write into policy the changes they are implementing. These policies should include Campaign Zero’s “#8CantWait” policies such as a ban on chokeholds and on shooting at moving vehicles, a duty to intervene, as well as requiring officers to de-escalate, rely on a use of force continuum, report comprehensively, and exhaust all alternatives before shooting, including a verbal warning before shooting.

- **Law enforcement agencies should codify into policy the procedures for using restraint when detaining people for the purpose of an emergency.** According to survey findings, only one out of five agencies had these procedures prescribed into policy. It is important that practices become policy to avoid confusion.

- **Governments and law enforcement agencies should consider how officer wellness and safety affects job performance.** Unquestionably, officers have a difficult job. Low quality of life at work can make their jobs harder. Enhancing officer wellness and safety can help them exercise the best judgment under stressful, tense situations.

- **Law enforcement agencies should revisit how shifts are assigned.** Survey results show that three agencies in Pima County determine their shift assignments by seniority. In other words, officers who have the longest tenure are more likely to be on duty during the day, while less experienced officers work night shifts. Ideally, agencies should strive for a balance, including more seasoned officers in every shift and patrols involving high-crime areas. Having more experienced officers on scene can lead to better informed decisions.

- **Law enforcement agencies should effectively track and intervene when an officer has received multiple community complaints.** It is in the best interest for law enforcement
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agencies to intervene and take appropriate measures to address an officer’s misconduct before it escalates. An effective intervention can prevent a serious incident down the road and help preserve the integrity of law enforcement agencies.

- **Law enforcement agencies should strive to respond to calls for service in a timely manner no matter where the calls are coming from.** It may be more difficult for larger agencies to quickly respond to every incident given the size of the areas they cover. Responding to calls for service in a timely matter can improve the quality of policing and dispel the assumption that police only care about specific neighborhoods and groups of people. One police chief we interviewed identified the positive effects that responding to calls in a timely way has had in building stronger community support for his agency.

**Proposals to Democratize Law Enforcement**

**Building Policing by Consent**

- **Governments and law enforcement agencies should diversify their workforce, especially their executive leadership.** A part of democratizing law enforcement is building a workforce that reflects the communities it serves. Survey findings demonstrate a lack of diversity, particularly when it comes to gender and Black people, in several law enforcement agencies throughout Pima County. This is especially the case across executive leadership positions. Two police chiefs and various community leaders underscored the significance of diversifying the workforce, particularly at the top as “leadership sets the tone.”

- **Law enforcement agencies should establish citizen review boards composed primarily of individuals from non-law enforcement backgrounds.** Citizen review boards should be gender-balanced and racially diverse, reflecting their respective communities. Law enforcement agencies should act based on their citizens’ recommendations.

- **Law enforcement agencies should incorporate the use of a written consent form to ensure Pima County residents understand their rights before consenting to vehicle searches.** The form should clearly state people’s constitutional right to refuse an officer’s search of their vehicles. Without probable cause, officers should only proceed after they have received written consent to search.

- **Law enforcement agencies should abolish no-knock warrants.** Law enforcement should notify residents in advance before entering to search their property.

- **Governments and law enforcement agencies should revisit the concept of legal immunity.** Historically, legal immunity has prevented police officers from being held liable by citizens for violating the law and other serious misconduct. Municipal governments should be held responsible for the actions of their police officers. Governments can offer law enforcement
agencies insurance policies to financially protect officers. Therefore, if a citizen sues an officer, the officer also pays a fee for his or her misbehavior.

Making Law Enforcement Transparent

- **Law enforcement agencies should equip their officers with body-worn cameras.** Body-worn cameras not only offer a method to hold officers accountable, they also enable transparency. Every police chief we talked to supported body-worn cameras because they increase accountability and transparency. Survey results also show that five law enforcement agencies support their use. Currently, the PCSD is the only law enforcement agency that does not equip their officers with body-worn cameras.

- **Law enforcement agencies should create and regularly update a public database listing officer misconduct.** By creating a public database that displays officer misconduct, community members will be able to track how many complaints an officer receives and follow-up to determine whether the officer has been held accountable.

- **Law enforcement agencies should consider creating organized police watching community groups.** An organized police watching community group can not only make law enforcement more transparent, it can also generate greater community involvement. Organized police watching groups can be helpful in Tucson, particularly after the City Council voted to repeal a controversial ordinance that banned video recording and interfering with police. An organized police watching group will provide transparency and not interfere with police.

- **Law enforcement agencies should disseminate positive interactions with community members in addition to day-to-day activities.** Sharing everyday interactions with residents can demystify the work of police officers and counter the negative images widely distributed online. It is important that positive and mundane exchanges with law enforcement are also widely shared. This is especially important now given that the TPD, after the in-custody death of a Latino man, adopted a policy of immediately releasing body-worn camera footage of in-custody deaths. If only forceful and deadly interactions are shared, people’s negative experiences with law enforcement will reproduce themselves vicariously. As one community leader mentioned, “If you’re doing a good job, tell the community.”

- **When possible, government and law enforcement agencies should hire independent counsel to investigate police misconduct.** An independent investigation conducted beyond the control of law enforcement can help legitimize the evaluation of police misconduct among community members.

- **Law enforcement agencies should notify community members of the actions taken in response to a complaint against an officer.** If agencies communicated the specific actions they took after receiving a complaint, community members can feel like their concerns are being taken seriously. Agencies can communicate their actions via a letter, phone call, or text message to avoid residents feeling ignored.
Reconciliation

- **Law enforcement agencies should hold reconciliation sessions with members of the community.** Another suggestion we heard several times throughout the research was the importance of holding reconciliation sessions with leaders from law enforcement and community members. Individuals from a police chief to elected officials to community leaders expressed their support. The purpose of reconciliation sessions is for law enforcement leaders to meet and listen to the concerns of community groups. As one Black community leader said, “People need to feel like someone is hearing them.” Reconciliation sessions can help restore community trust and demonstrate accountability by police departments. It is important for police leadership to attend these meetings as “absence speaks louder than words.”

Revisiting the Role of Law Enforcement

- **Governments should reexamine the evolving role of law enforcement.** Evidently, as noted in the survey results section, law enforcement officers are increasingly finding themselves addressing mental health crises. Given this reality, it is important that they are properly equipped to treat people with mental health needs. At the same time, however, it is important to recognize that social workers and licensed health practitioners are better suited for this task. Put differently, to reiterate what several people said during the research, officers are fundamentally unprepared to meet our growing list of societal demands. Governments must support police officers by investing in social services.

Moving Forward: Making the System More Equitable

The purpose of this paper has been to provide a blueprint for what police reformers must consider when seeking to make changes in law enforcement. By examining the history of policing in America and the lasting effects of law enforcement, reforms must center the experiences of people of color. In doing so, we have offered a theoretical framework and a set of proposals that can help governments and law enforcement officials understand and begin to address the nature of the distrust that exists between police and communities of color. To make our criminal justice system more equitable, it is essential to acknowledge that changes are needed not only in law enforcement, but in also other areas. Moving forward, addressing the present moment will require significant reforms in the broader criminal justice system such as prosecutorial, sentencing, and bail reforms. The time to act is now. We can and must do better.
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Appendix A

Response Example from Community Organization

June 26, 2020

Mr. DeLaRosa,

Thank you for those clarifications. We’d like to raise our concerns with the process, concepts, and goals of the proposed “white paper on police reform” and suggest constructive alternatives.

1. **The goal of this process must be better defined.** Your email stated that the purpose is to “address the underlying relationships that exist between communities of color and law enforcement” and to “take action” from there, but that could mean many different things to different people. For you to say that you “sure hope” that there will be concrete action taken is less than encouraging.

2. **To have any meaningful impact, there must be a long-term commitment on the part of County leadership to an inclusive and independent process.** Part of the community distrust at issue here leads groups like ours to wonder if writing this white paper is simply a PR exercise to placate members of the community until the current controversies blow over.

3. **There is a concerning lack of diversity of people being consulted in this process.** With a few notable exceptions, almost all of the organizations you are talking with are city and state entities. Nearly half are law enforcement. This creates an echo chamber, not a process for growth. These government and systems actors are deeply entrenched in the status quo. Clearly, if these folks knew of a better way, they would have implemented it by now. This is a time to “think outside the box” and consult beyond those with a vested interest in the current system to reach out to *those who are directly impacted by the system.*

Wherever possible, we recommend speaking with individuals who are receiving services or participating in programs instead of/in addition to the administrators or heads of agencies, who may be reliant on County funding or concerned about causing conflict with law enforcement. Suggestions:

- Neighborhood organizations, particularly in highly policed and surveilled communities such as South Tucson.
- Youth-led organizations, especially youth of color (MIECHA, Ethnic Studies)
- Service providers, including crisis intervention programs, drug treatment, behavioral health, and those that serve the homeless
- NAMI and other groups that deal with behavioral health issues
- Sonoran Prevention Works, methadone clinics, and other harm reduction programs
- Family members of people held in the County Jail and formerly incarcerated people
- Refugee and immigration organizations
- Halfway houses and reentry organizations
- Crime survivors of color with cases that were not pursued because of “lack of evidence” (many of them are sexual assault cases).

If specific groups are invited and choose not participate, it is the duty of the County to reflect deeply on that rejection. Instead of ignoring or passing it off as an organization not wanting to “participate in a democratic process” the county should be asking *why does this group not want to participate? Have we*
disregarded them in the past and have relationships to heal? Have we not created a safe space for all people in this process? Also, please be mindful of engaging with people who have suffered harm at the hands of law enforcement or other system actors. Their views are important, but to be share the process must be safe for them to tell their stories without fear of stigma, retaliation or re-traumatizing them.

Here are the parameters of a process that we would be open to engaging in:

1. The goal of the process is to fundamentally reshape how the County invests in community safety, health, and wellbeing so that there are more positive outcomes for all residents of Pima County.

2. There is an express commitment from all decision-making actors and governmental parties to the stated goal and to engage in this process fully, for as long as it takes to reach the goal. This commitment is matched with money and other resources (staff time) needed for the work to be successful.

   a. This will necessarily require elected officials to actively resist efforts by entrenched special interests (police unions, prosecutors, political parties, businesses, funders) to squash the process. There must be a willingness to accept controversy and stand up to attempts to intimidate or suppress the process, and to hold powerful people accountable for their part in perpetuating these problems.

3. Critically examine the purpose, function, and outcomes of Pima County’s criminal justice system and institutions.

   a. Accept that criminalization of social problems is a failed approach. Making substance abuse, mental illness, homelessness, and other "deviant" behavior illegal does not address those problems or make people safer.

   b. Identify gaps and unmet needs (waiting lists, number of people turned away) in community services such as domestic violence and crisis intervention, trauma services, mental health, drug treatment, medical care, housing, food security, and other primary needs that provide community safety and wellbeing.

   c. Analyze police/911 calls to determine key areas of community need that are outside the appropriate scope of law enforcement. Here is a good model: https://www.firerescue1.com/fire-ems/articles/tucson-fires-three-tiered-approach-to-manage-increasing-call-volumes-2rWpcruxyKcoApC/

   d. Pinpointing resources and professions that would better serve the areas of mental health, substance abuse, childhood trauma, etc., that are not police. The county then must reallocate the budget to county finances to those resources instead of police.

   e. Conduct a comprehensive analysis of the County budget, demonstrating the relative distribution of County resources to policing, surveillance, and incarceration vs. investment in community wellbeing, social services, housing support, etc. There are excellent models available for this, such as: https://populardemocracy.org/news/publications/freedom-thrive-reimagining-safety-security-our-communities
4. Evaluate objective, statistical data in addition to subjective consultations with individuals. There is ample evidence, both qualitative and quantitative, to demonstrate the source of the significant distrust that has caused an adverse relationship with law enforcement in Tucson and Pima County.

   a. Identify instances in which Pima County law enforcement interventions have escalated a situation, caused harm, and/or are unnecessary. Assess what other responses would have been more successful.

   b. Examine disparities in arrest, detention, and incarceration rates for Black and Brown members of Pima County

   c. Address the hyper-surveillance of communities of color by police. A simple GPS map would bear this out.

   d. Remove SRO’s from schools. There is ample evidence that SRO’s in public schools result in disproportionate criminalization of children of color.

   e. Assess the evidence of regular use of force and violence against people of color, as exemplified by the recent case of excessive force against Immanuel Oloya, a Black teenager who is a quadruple amputee, without charges against the officers responsible.

Again, we appreciate the opportunity to dialogue with you about this important effort. AFSC-AZ is open to continuing this conversation, and working to build a process that is intentional, inclusive without causing harm, and committed in implementing real change to Pima County.
Appendix B

Sample Survey Invitation Email

Dear <Chief/Sheriff Name>,

The last time we spoke, I mentioned I was developing a survey as part of my research paper on policing in Pima County.

I am now happy to share that the survey is finally ready for distribution. The goal of the survey is to better comprehend how policing operates in different law enforcement agencies across Pima County. I am sending the survey to every Chief of Police in Pima County, including the Sheriff. I would very much appreciate your participation.

I would like to assure you that your responses will be completely anonymous and they will not be subject to public records requests. I will not collect any names, emails, or IP addresses.

After having my colleagues take the survey, I expect it will take you between 25-35 minutes to complete it. A few questions in the survey ask about your department’s demographics. To make the process easier, it would be helpful to have this information handy in advance.

When you are ready, please click here to complete the survey. I recommend completing the survey on Google Chrome for best results. The survey is live now and will only be available until next Friday, August 14.

Thank you in advance for your help. I sincerely value your time and work. If you have any questions or concerns, please do let me know.

My very best,

Bill
### Appendix C

**Additional Data Figures**

**Figure 8:** The Racial and Gender Background of the Individuals Law Enforcement Agencies Booked into Detention in 2019.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arresting Agency</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MPD Male</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPD Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVPD Male</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVPD Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCSD Male</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCSD Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PYPD Male</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PYPD Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPD Male</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPD Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STPD Male</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STPD Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOPD Male</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOPD Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPD Male</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPD Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Graph showing the percentage of individuals booked into detention by race and gender for each law enforcement agency in 2019.*
**Figure 9**: The Gender of Commissioned Officers Across Five Law Enforcement Agencies in Pima County.

![Gender Percentage Chart](image)

**Figure 10**: The Racial Background of Commissioned Officers Across Five Law Enforcement Agencies in Pima County.

![Racial Percentage Chart](image)
Figure 11: The Ethnic Background of Commissioned Officers Across Five Law Enforcement Agencies in Pima County.
## Appendix D

### Policing Whitepaper Survey Responses

How many commissioned officers are

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency 1</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency 2</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency 3</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency 4</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency 5</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How many commissioned officers are

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>Native Hawaiian Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency 1</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency 2</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency 3</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency 4</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency 5</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How many commissioned officers are

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Non-Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency 1</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency 2</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency 3</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency 4</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency 5</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How many officers in Executive Leadership positions (Lieutenants, Captains, Assistant Chiefs, Chief) are

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency 1</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency 2</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency 4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency 5</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How many officers in Executive Leadership positions (Lieutenants, Captains, Assistant Chiefs, Chief) are

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>Native Hawaiian Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency 1</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency 2</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency 3</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency 4</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency 5</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How many officers in Executive Leadership positions (Lieutenants, Captains, Assistant Chiefs, Chief) are

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Non-Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency 1</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency 2</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency 3</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency 4</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency 5</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you provide training for de-escalation?

- Yes 100%
- No -

Is the training

- Mandatory 100%
- Voluntary -

How many hours of training?

- 4 20%
- 8 or more 80%

De-escalation trainers include: Please check all that apply

- Law enforcement personnel -
- Mental health program partners -
- Mental health care consumers/and or family -

Does your agency provide at least 40 hours of specialized training for officers that respond to people with mental illness that includes at minimum: (check all that apply)

- Mental illnesses and their impact on individuals’ families, and communities 100%
- Signs and symptoms of mental illnesses 100%
- Stabilization and de-escalation techniques 100%
- Trauma-informed responses 80%
- Active listening 100%
- Use of force 100%
- Disposition options and the corresponding procedures 80%
- Legal criteria for emergency mental health evaluation and involuntary commitment 80%
- Community resources; and 100%
- Information sharing 60%

Do the training courses include hands-on experiential learning, with: (check all that apply)

- Scenario-based role playing 100%
- Visits to mental health facilities -
- Group problem-solving exercise 60%

Do dispatchers receive training that addresses, at minimum: (check all that apply)

- Procedures for receiving and dispatching calls involving people with mental illness 100%
- Recognizing and assessing a mental health crisis including appropriate question to ask callers 100%
- Identifying and dispatching appropriately trained officers 100%
- Procedures for documenting mental health calls for service including the final dispositions achieved by the officers 60%

Do mental health professionals who work with your agency receive training or hands-on experience on topics including: (check all that apply)

- Law enforcement policies and procedures 100%
- Participating in officer ride-along 60%
- Observing 911 call-taking and dispatching functions 20%
- Observing booking and jail intake procedures -

Does your agency have a process for reviewing and evaluating mental health and de-escalation training?

- Yes 100%
- No -

Does your agency modify the training curricula based on these findings and other developments in the field?

- Yes 100%
- No -
Does your agency have protocols that require responding officers to: *(check all that apply)*

- Assess whether a crime has been committed 100%
- Determine whether the person’s behavior indicates that mental illness may be a factor 100%
- Ascertain whether the person appears to be a present danger to self or others 100%
- Use skills that safely de-escalate situations involving someone who is behaving erratically or is in crisis 100%

Does your agency have protocols that require responding officers to: *(check all that apply)*

- Engage the services of the person’s current mental health care provider, a mobile crisis team, or other mental health crisis specialists to determine an appropriate action 100%
- Divert the person to mental health facility or diversion center when behavior appears to result from mental illness 100%
- Arrest the person when a serious crime has been committed 100%
- Connect the person with a friend or family member, peer support group, or treatment crisis center when no formal action (i.e., emergency evaluation or arrest) is taken 100%

Does your agency maintain an easily accessible list of mental health care resources for use by officers when affecting an arrest?

- Yes 80%
- No 20%

Does your agency have a policy that describes the use of restraints when detaining people for the purpose of an emergency evaluation?

- Yes 20%
- No 80%

When jail diversion and/or receiving centers are available to the officers, there are protocols that specify: *(check all that apply)*

- The criteria established by the center for accepting individuals from officers 80%
- That the centers not turn away people who meet criteria for evaluation and services 20%
- Intake procedures, including obtaining information about the person’s observable behaviors from the officers, will be conducted in manner that expedites officers’ return to service 60%

Does your agency have protocols that govern the exchange of information between law enforcement personnel and mental health program partners?

- Yes 60%
- No 40%

Does the protocol specify: *(check all that apply)*

- Which law enforcement personnel and mental health care providers have the authority to share information 67%
- The information to be shared 100%
- The circumstance for sharing information 67%
- The process for sharing information 67%

Does the policy/protocol state that when possible, officers inform the person with mental illness and their family members about: *(check all that apply)*

- How to connect with mental health care provider 100%
- Criminal proceedings 100%
- Diversion programs 100%
- Protective orders 100%
- Victim support groups with family members and crime victims 100%

How important is it, if at all, for law enforcement officers today to have a good knowledge of what scientific research shows are effective policing strategies?

- Very important 20%
Somewhat important 80%
Not too important -
Not at all important -

In order to be effective at their job, how important is it, if at all, for law enforcement to have detailed knowledge of the people, places and culture in the areas where they routinely work?

- Extremely important 100%
- Somewhat important -
- Not too important -
- Not at all important -

Even if you think both are important parts of your work, do you see the role of police officers MORE as…

- A protector 40%
- An enforcer -
- Both equally 60%

How well do you think the public understands the risks and challenges that law enforcement officers face on the job?

- Very well -
- Somewhat well -
- Not too well 60%
- Not well at all 40%

Officers who consistently do a poor job are held accountable

- Strongly agree 20%
- Agree 60%
- Disagree 20%
- Strongly disagree -

Are officers in your agency expected to meet a predetermined number of tickets, arrests, citations, or summonses, or not?

- Yes, FORMAL expectation -
- Yes, INFORMAL expectation -
- No 100%

Are shift assignments in your agency determined by seniority?

- Yes 60%
- No 40%

In general, would you say the rules governing the use of force in your department are…

- Too restrictive -
- Not restrictive enough -
- About right 100%
- The department has no such guidelines -

How useful are your department’s use of force guidelines when officers are confronted with actual situations where force may be needed?

- Very useful 80%
- Somewhat useful 20%
- Not too useful -
- Not useful at all -
- The department has no such guidelines -

Do you think officers should or should not be required to intervene when they believe another officer is about to use unnecessary force?

- Yes, they should be required to intervene 100%
- No, they should not be required to intervene -
When it comes to the way most officers in your department deal with members of the public, which do you worry about more?

- The officer will **NOT SPEND ENOUGH TIME** diagnosing the situation before acting decisively **60%**
- The officer will **SPEND TOO MUCH TIME** diagnosing the situation before acting decisively **40%**

Suppose that an officer is faced with a law enforcement situation in which doing the morally right thing would require breaking a department rule. What would you advise the officer to do?

- Follow the department rule **-**
- Do the morally right thing, even if it requires breaking a department rule **100%**

In your opinion, how useful in policing today is…

- Requiring officers to be responsive to community concerns and work in close partnership with the community to solve problems?
  - Very useful **100%**
  - Somewhat useful **-**
  - Not too useful **-**
  - Not at all useful **-**

How much support does your department’s leadership give to officers who…

- Want to be responsive to community concerns and work close in partnership with the community to solve problems?
  - A great deal of support **80%**
  - A fair amount of support **20%**
  - Not too much support **-**
  - No support at all **-**

Do you think responding effectively to people who are having a mental health crisis is…

- An important role of police officers **80%**
- A role of police officers, but not an important one **-**
- Not a role of police officers **20%**

Regardless of whether your department uses body cameras, do you personally favor or oppose the use of body cameras by police?

- Favor **100%**
- Oppose **-**

Do you think body cameras on officers would make members of the public…

- More likely to cooperate with officers **60%**
- Less likely to cooperate with officers **-**
- It would make no difference **40%**

When dealing with the public, do you think wearing a body camera would make officers…

- More likely to cooperate with officers **20%**
- Less likely to cooperate with officers **-**
- It would make no difference **80%**

How would you rate relations between the police in your department and the following groups in the community you serve?

- Whites
  - Excellent **40%**
  - Good **60%**
  - Only Fair **-**
  - Poor **-**
  - Too few in this community to say **-**

- Blacks
Excellent 20%
Good 60%
Only Fair -
Poor -
Too few in this community to say 20%

Hispanics/Latinos
Excellent 60%
Good 40%
Only Fair -
Poor -
Too few in this community to say -

Asians
Excellent 20%
Good 40%
Only Fair -
Poor -
Too few in this community to say 40%

As you may know, demonstrations have been held in many parts of the country in recent years to protest the deaths of African Americans who died during encounters with the police.

How much, if at all, do you think these protests have been motivated by a genuine desire to hold officers accountable for their actions?

A great deal 40%
Some 20%
Not much 40%
Not at all -

How much, if at all, do you think these protests have been motivated by longstanding bias against the police?

A great deal 60%
Some -
Not much 40%
Not at all -

In general, have these high-profile incidents involving police and African Americans made your job...

Harder 80%
Easier -
Have not made a difference 20%

Here is a list of things that may have happened in some police departments as a result of these high-profile incidents involving African Americans and the police. For each, indicate whether this has happened in your department or not.

Officers have become less willing to stop and question people who seem suspicious
Yes, has happened 40%
No, has not happened 60%

The department has taken steps to improve relations between police and African Americans
Yes, has happened 60%
No, has not happened 40%

Officers have become more concerned about their safety
Yes, has happened -
No, has not happened 100%

The department has modified its policies or procedures about the use of force
Yes, has happened 60%
No, has not happened 40%
Interactions between police and African Americans have become more tense
Yes, has happened 40%
No, has not happened 60%

Officers have been more reluctant to use force when it is appropriate
Yes, has happened 40%
No, has not happened 60%

Do you think the deaths of African Americans during encounters with police in recent years are isolated incidents or signs of a broader problem between African Americans and the police?
Isolated incidents 60%
Signs of a broader problem 40%

Please read the following scenario carefully before answering the question that follows:
At 2:00 A.M., an officer, who is on duty, is driving his patrol car on a deserted road. He sees a vehicle that has been driven off the road and is stuck in a ditch. He approaches the vehicle and observes that the driver is not hurt but is obviously intoxicated. He also finds that the driver is another officer. Instead of reporting this accident and offense, he transports the driver home.

How many officers in this department do you think would report a fellow officer who covered up for another officer in this way?
All -
Most 100%
About half -
Some -
Only a few -
None -

Please tell me if you would favor or oppose the following policies related to gun ownership:
Laws to prevent people with mental illnesses from purchasing guns
Favor 100%
Oppose -

Making private gun sales and sales at gun shows subject to background checks
Favor 60%
Oppose 40%

A ban on assault-style weapons
Favor 20%
Oppose 80%

Creating a federal government database to track all gun sales
Favor 40%
Oppose 60%

Should local police take an active role in identifying undocumented or illegal immigrants, or should enforcement be left mainly to the federal authorities?
Local police should take an active role -
Enforcement should be left mainly to the federal authorities 100%

Which comes closer to your view about the use of marijuana by adults?
It should be legal for medical AND personal use -
It should be legal for medical use ONLY 40%
It should NOT be legal 60%

Which of these two statements comes closer to your own views—even if neither is exactly right.
Our country has made the changes needed to give Blacks equal rights with Whites 75%
Our country needs to continue making changes to give Blacks equal right with Whites 25%
How much training, if any, does your department offer in each of the following areas?

**How to de-escalate a situation so it is not necessary to use force**
- **4 hours or more**: 100%
- **Less than 4 hours**: -
- **None**: -

**Firearms training involving shoot-don't-shoot scenarios**
- **4 hours or more**: 100%
- **Less than 4 hours**: -
- **None**: -

**How to deal with individuals who are having a mental health crisis**
- **4 hours or more**: 100%
- **Less than 4 hours**: -
- **None**: -

**Non-lethal methods to control a combative or threatening individual**
- **4 hours or more**: 100%
- **Less than 4 hours**: -
- **None**: -

**How to deal with people so they feel they've been treated fairly and respectfully**
- **4 hours or more**: 75%
- **Less than 4 hours**: 25%
- **None**: -

**Bias and fairness**
- **4 hours or more**: 75%
- **Less than 4 hours**: 25%
- **None**: -

**Does your agency engage in community policing?**
- **Yes**: 100%
- **No**: -