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If you have ever watched an episode of COPS you know that they show the action that draws people to police work. A typical episode goes something like this; an officer will be talking to the camera as they drive to a call narrating what the call is about. Once they arrive at the call the officer handles the call and the camera captures the incident as it unfolds. Most episodes involve the officer running through yards chasing after a suspect or struggling with a suspect to get them into custody. After everything has calmed down, the officers dust each other off and give a brief commentary on what happened. At no point do you see the officer go to the station and handle the arduous task of completing all the paperwork necessary to properly bring the suspect to justice. Why is this? The obvious answer may be that no one would watch the show because it would be boring. Or, could it be those officers work in a police department that is so progressive, technologically advanced and transparent that they no longer have to write lengthy reports? Though this may not be current practice, it may become commonplace in the not so distant future.

Police Legitimacy & Trust In The Age of Social Media

Recently, law enforcement has taken some significant blows regarding public trust and legitimacy. In a 2014 Pew Research Poll, 65 percent of those surveyed said police departments nationwide do a fair or a poor job in holding officers accountable when misconduct occurs, compared with 30 percent who say they do an excellent or good job (Page, 2014).

Some issues surrounding trust and legitimacy stem from false narratives. Often, this information is distributed through social media shortly after an incident has occurred. These video snippets, tweets, or other communication mediums do not always show the entire incident, do not provide a clear angle, and more importantly, do not show the mindset or perspective of the officer involved in the incident.

Videos are not the only place where law enforcement agencies have experienced public trust issues. There are some instances when the public alleges a police report is inaccurate or false. Regrettably, there have been incidents where this is true. In South Carolina, an officer shot and killed Walter Scott after Scott fled from a traffic stop (Schmidt and Apuzzo, 2015). The officer alleged Scott assaulted him and took away the officers Taser during the altercation. In the official police report, the
An independent video showed a completely different account of what had occurred. The video clearly showed that, at the time Scott was shot and killed, he posed no threat to the officer and in fact had not taken away the officer’s conducted electrical weapon. This officer was eventually charged with murder. (Schmidt and Apuzzo, 2015)

False reports damage the public’s trust, degrade legitimacy, and make policing more difficult. To combat negative perception and increase public trust police departments are increasing their community outreach and turning to technology to defend their actions and provide insight into what police officers face on a daily basis.

How does accountability lead to trust? In Bob Whipple’s article, Accountability and Trust, he writes, “I believe there is a direct link between holding people accountable in an appropriate way and the level of trust in an organization.” (Whipple, 2016) To gain the public’s trust law enforcement needs to show the public that officers are held accountable. Body-worn cameras are now seen as a means of holding police accountable and the American Civil Liberties Union supports the use body-worn-cameras for this specific purpose (Stanley, 2013).


Officer authored reports document the work officers do. This practice can be traced back to 1829 when the first professional police force, the British Bobbies, were established. In 1918, the Police Chief of Berkeley Police Department, August Vollmer, established a police training academy, which included the first department of criminology and trained methods of effective report writing (R. Julia, 2007). Then and now, police reports need to accurately convey what happened during an incident, be objective, make the reader feel as though they were there, and provide the proper context for why officers took action. The detail and accuracy of these reports are key to the successful prosecution of suspects, as well as a defense against civil lawsuits that may arise from an officer’s actions or inactions.

Report writing has been made easier with the advent of dictation, word processing, and voice recognition software. However, nothing has been done to help build the validity to ensure accuracy and reliability so the public can feel confident that what the officer documented in their report is true and unfailing.

Reports that are the most contentious and create the most difficulty for an officer to recall are generally ones involving force, fatalities, or armed suspect(s) who may not have been compliant. These reports require officers to accurately and cogently write why they responded in the manner they did. The report is written from the officer’s perspective, detailing the facts going into the incident, the actions and demeanor of the suspect. The officer also includes feelings and emotions experienced. Despite including this information, people can dispute the document.

As the technology of body-worn cameras evolves, this new technology could be implemented into the report writing process to either supplement or eventually replace report writing. Could body camera footage one day replace the written report and help police departments build community trust?

The likelihood of written reports disappearing in the next 8-10 years does not seem likely, but integrating video technology to improve the writing process.
may be a pathway for progressive departments that want to be more transparent to build relationships with their communities. What if officers who wore body cameras were able to author a very brief synopsis that included their mindset, perception, and concerns and then create a short edited video version of what occurred during an incident to highlight the key points of the incident. The unaltered, original video would be retained as evidence to clear any questions that might be raised by critics who say the edited version would not provide an accurate account of what occurred.

**A Body-Worn Camera-Produced Police Report**

Departments who have deployed body-worn cameras still have officers author a complete police report. For instance, at the Albany, California Police Department, if a body camera video is available from an incident, the officers will note in their report that they had activated their body camera during the incident, and that a copy of the video was created and booked into evidence. The video is available should it be needed for review later. While this procedure may not be universal, it does appear to be a common method of documenting that video of an incident exists.

With the integration of video into report writing, video would relay what occurred. The written report would fill in the information necessary to provide additional insight or emotions not captured on the video. This would allow for a more accurate and less disputable account of what occurred during an incident. As an example, an officer may respond to a call involving a known subject who has an extensive history of weapons possession and violence. The call they respond to on its face value may seem benign, but with the officer’s prior knowledge of the suspect they may go into the call with a higher concern for officer safety and react more quickly to signs of a potential assault. The video which captures this incident would not convey the known history of the subject and would not capture what the officer is thinking. This would need to be documented in the report that the officer writes.

Video would allow departments to better defend officers when they are accused of wrongdoing and could potentially quell any false narratives. Additionally, by integrating video into report writing, incidents of use of force may decrease, which will decrease incidents of conflict that can lead to the mistrust of police.

In the Final Report of the President’s 2015 Task Force on 21st Century Policing, retired Chief of Redlands Police Department, Jim Bueermann referenced the Rialto, California Police Department yearlong study that compared officers who wore body cameras against those who did not. The study found that those officers who wore cameras had 59 percent fewer complaints and 87.5 percent fewer incidents of use of force (U.S. DOJ 2015). While this study could not determine that cameras influenced the behavior of the members of the public the police were interacting with, the police officer, or both, it was clear there was an overall decrease in use of force (Ziv, 2014). Researchers conducting the Rialto study hypothesized that once people are aware they are being monitored, their behavior tends to improve, be more tempered, professional and a more positive end results happens. The lead author of the Rialto study, Dr. Barack Ariel, stated, “With institutionalized body-worn-camera use, an officer is obliged to issue a warning from the start that an encounter is being filmed, impacting the psyche of all involved by conveying a straightforward, pragmatic message: we are all being
watched, videotaped and expected to follow the rules.” (Ziv, 2014) The researchers believe that people knowing events are being recorded creates a self-awareness and makes the body-worn video a preventative treatment, causing people to alter their behavior (University of Cambridge, 2014).

Imagine if Ferguson, Missouri Police Officer Darren Wilson had a body camera activated when he responded to the robbery call. Would Michael Brown or Darren Wilson have acted differently? We will never know, but the false statements made by Brown’s companion, Dorian Johnson, may have immediately been proven false.

As we all know, cities across the country were impacted by this incident. During this tumultuous time, the City of Oakland saw two weeks of protests that cost the city approximately $100,000.00 per day in overtime totaling $1.36 million in overtime alone (Artz, 2015). Had there been video from the Darren Wilson incident, the public may have been less divided.

**Most Likely Future: An Edited Video and Shorter Written Report**

While video will allow the viewer to hear and see much of what occurred, it is important to realize that video will not be able to fully replace the written account an officer can provide of an incident. Video does not capture the thoughts, perceptions or emotions that an officer may have during an incident, and it may not capture the entire environment or scene that an officer may see or experience when they respond to a call. Catherine Wagner, Staff Attorney from the American Civil Liberties Union echoes this concern, saying, “body camera video doesn’t capture everything that an officer is aware of.” Wagner voiced concerns about video being the main part of a report since body camera video is not comprehensive enough to be the sole record of an incident, and because it represents a distinct piece of evidence separate from the officer’s memory. However, Wagner recognizes that the integration of video and report writing is the direction that many departments are going (Wagner).

Conversely, video may show things that the officer did not see or could not recall due to physiological changes in their body brought on by stress (Geis, 2015). During stressful events, the body releases cortisol, neurotransmitters and hormones that can impact memory and narrow an officer’s field of vision. Body cameras provide varying fields of view ranging from 95-170 degrees. The camera will see and record more of an incident than a human is capable of seeing and recalling (Geis, 2015). Officers will still be required to author a short written report to convey to the reader what the camera is unable to capture and what the officer may have perceived.

**Legal Issues and Challenges**

The integration of video into the report writing process will not be a simple advancement to undertake. A panel comprised of law enforcement, information technology, and city government members convened to study this issue in 2015. The overall theme of the meeting was to discuss the development of a better report writing system that included video. The panel discussed whether that would provide more transparency and lead to better community relationships. The panel did not have a clear path for how this could be done, but felt it would be important for law enforcement to bring key stakeholders to the table to determine what legal and
technological issues will need to be overcome (December 2015). Discussions will need to take place between the district attorney’s office, police union representatives, elected officials, community groups and local human rights groups, such as, the American Civil Liberties Union to ensure policies and practices related to the use of video are integrated in a functional manner to help increase the efficiency and credibility of police reports.

### Moving Forward: Research & Begin Implementing Video-Produced Report

According to Vievu Regional Sales Director, James Hillary, the technology to implement this change currently exists. Vievu has an Automated Video Redaction Solution that allows an original video to be kept, but permits a copy of the video to be made and later edited (Hillary).

Law enforcement needs to be proactive in integrating video into the report writing process. Since the technology exists, agencies should develop pilot programs to see how it can be integrated into the report writing process and evaluate the results. As part of this integration, law enforcement should educate their communities on the changes they are making so their communities can see they are taking steps to help build and strengthen positive relationships within their communities.

### Conclusion

Reporting writing is one of the most important tasks an officer completes. At times, reports will need to clearly document the emotions, mental state, actions and reasons an officer needed to take definitive action. Reports can make or break a case. Errors or conflicting statements can be detrimental to the case, the officer’s career, their freedom, the reputation of a department and law enforcement in general.

Over the years, technological changes have made the report writing process easier. However, law enforcement should look at report writing as another opportunity to make positive changes within our organizations that will increase the public’s trust. Law enforcement has a responsibility and duty to reexamine all of our practices and determine how we can improve upon them to make them function better for our officers and help build trust among the communities we have been sworn to protect.

While the written report will not disappear soon, the ability to fully integrate video from body-worn cameras and lessen the amount of written documentation needed for an incident is likely to happen. Officers will still need to document their actions in writing, so that others can make a determination that the decisions made by the officer in a rapidly unfolding situation were reasonable and lawful.
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Augmented Reality: The Future Looks Bright!

By: Captain Rainer Navarro, Santa Rosa Police Department

Forget about looking at life through rose-colored glasses. In the future, people will look at objects through a new lens. Information is just a blink of an eye away. Interested in a particular landmark? Your computer can download geocoded information and display it on a pair of glasses. Forgetting names may be a thing of the past when facial recognition supplies the identity of an old acquaintance.

In police work, imagine a world where preventing crime is the norm, rather than a reactionary force. Officers will conduct quick, efficient scans at public events to look for potential weapons. Facial recognition software is used to get the bad guys off the street before they commit another crime. The technology that brings all of this together?

Augmented Reality

Augmented reality (AR) is a field of technology that enhances users’ awareness of the area around them. It will simplify everyday life (Breeze, 2012). Benefits include improved driver safety, enhanced experiences in learning environments, and better information to address issues throughout the day. AR will interact with other technology such as cellular phones, vehicles, eyeglasses, and computers. It can also enhance how law enforcement serves the community.

Not all opportunities of this technology, though, will be beneficial. As AR is coupled with other systems, malicious information could be sent to anyone using it. As police use AR to enforce the law; they will also be challenged with investigating the negative implications of AR. Problems may arise with new criminal acts, invasion of privacy, and other dangerous activity. The task for the police is to prepare to use AR to protect the public, and also to protect the public from its use. It is important to understand what augmented reality is, how it works, and how it engages other technologies to inform the user.

Augmented Reality: Merging the Virtual and Physical Worlds

Augmented Reality overlays information about the environment onto the real world. It has been around for decades, and concepts have been seen in
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movies over the last 30 years. L. Frank Baum, author of the Wizard of Oz, wrote in another of his stories about a similar technology back in 1901 where his protagonist used spectacles to see a person’s character on their foreheads (Baum, 1901). AR systems have become smaller, more mobile, and easier for people to use in business and personal life. The most common application of AR is the Heads-Up-Display or HUD, which is used widely in aircraft. The HUD was one of the first and widest implementations of AR (Radu, 2010). AR is now found in smartphone applications and video gaming, glasses, and concepts are often seen in futuristic movies.

Augmented reality uses a projects images onto a screen to provide information without diverting eyesight. Data may include instructions, names, photographs or any transmittable information. Software allows integration with maps or the internet similar to a smartphone. AR is already being used for real time translation for many languages with a smartphone application (Gershgorn, 2015).

Smaller augmented reality systems being developed are integrated into headsets, glasses, and smart phones, which are compact and able to be worn. AR is now used in the psychology. Patients view an image of insects through a headset to desensitize them from their fear (Technology Quarterly, 2007).

Two Categories of AR

AR is categorized into two general areas: marker-based/image recognition and location (or GPS) based applications. Marker or image recognition uses a camera to recognize an image and encodes the pattern. It then overlays an image to create a new or augmented image. Location based applications utilize tools such as GPS and find relevant data regarding a point of interest such as a location or people, or maps to help with directions (AppFutura, 2015). This data could include temperature, time, speed or a schematic of a building.

The availability of data will change human behavior and simplify lives. Computers will interpret and personalize data collected through social media and communicate information to the user. This efficient communication may equate to improved service to the public (Havens, 2013).

The future holds promise for augmented reality. Through its use, anyone can receive immediate feedback. Examples include the ability to look at a car and obtain maintenance instructions on the eye wear. Customers will see what they look like in clothing before they make a purchase (Tamarjan, 2013). Contact lenses and projectors displaying information on the eye will be unidentifiable to others (Parviz, 2009). With augmented reality, information will be immediate and discreet.

So far, applications are limited by cost, hardware size, and the integration of information systems. Future applications may be constrained by lack of creativity. The most significant areas for policing in the next ten years will be training officers on the technology, using AR in field operations, and maintaining the safety and trust of the public as potential new crimes are born out of the new technology.
Augmented reality will have a direct implication on training in public safety. Some of these areas include simulations, crisis intervention and active shooter trainings. Mandated training takes a significant amount of time, money and resources. AR systems can replace force options simulators, which require rooms to store the equipment and be regulated by a specific room temperature.

Once AR becomes widely used, simulation training can move into the field. Information will be downloaded to the user’s headset or glasses to allow officers to train in real world environments. Venues can be schools, businesses, or government buildings to enhance active shooter trainings. Data and images overlaid onto the user’s field of vision similar to a video game can replace personnel and reduce the risk of injury during training. The company Magic Leap has already developed a first person shooter game that can be played in a real world environment (Dredge, 2015). Taken into a police environment, training in this setting will build muscle memory and reflex in tactical situations. Desensitizing officers to outside stimuli while in a controlled environment can contribute to the safety in the field.

Mental health and crisis intervention simulations can improve tactical communication. Current technology in force options simulators should be examined to determine how it can be used through augmented reality. Combining AR with these technologies will bring realistic training to officers and cadets. It can also be used to enhance the hiring process with simulations to test skills such as communication and critical thinking. Three universities in the United Kingdom have experimented with AR as learning tutorials. They report AR is a “promising and stimulating tool for learning” and may provide a “less stressful way to evaluate the learning ability of the students.” (Liarokapis, Fotis, Anderson, Eike, Falk, 2010)

Augmented reality can enhance awareness in patrol and critical responses. Worn AR systems with automated plate readers will allow officers to read license plates looking for vehicles that have been stolen or used in criminal activity. It will enhance community-policing efforts by sending pertinent information to the officer to better understand the needs of a beat. AR with facial recognition software will reduce the amount of false identifications. It will also increase clearance rates for wanted individuals and locating missing persons (Agrawal, 2015).

AR will deliver data regarding the officer’s environment to enhance officer safety. AR can provide schematics of buildings during high-risk operations allowing officers to be more efficient during building searches. Video feeds from cameras, drones or aircraft could be fed to officers through AR headsets, increasing awareness of a particular incident. Rescue workers currently use thermal imaging when searching open areas. The same technology is capable of finding people hiding or missing, and locates evidence or hidden compartments (Harvey, 2006). Officers will be able to better prepare for contacts with people by providing quick and efficient intelligence. Information and data can be tactically relayed back onto the officer’s headset without fear of a suspect overhearing radio traffic.
Police vehicles will also benefit from the integration of AR. Head-up displays are commonly used to provide speed conditions and temperature readings. In the future, information such as oncoming traffic, live road conditions and blind spots could increase traffic safety. This may reduce traffic collisions, allowing departments to reallocate officers. It may increase the safety of officers in “Code-3” responses by improving their awareness, thereby reducing the number of crashes. Toyota has just patented an AR windshield with dynamic technology. The data can be moved based on the driver’s viewpoint (Moscaritolo, 2016).

Observing suspicious activity, contacting subjects, and stopping criminal activity before it occurs prevents crime. It should improve the quality of life and have a positive influence on public trust. Of course, any technology is value-neutral. It can be used for noble or criminal purposes. AR is no different.

The Dark Lens

As AR becomes available, malicious information could be sent to anyone. A report from Digi-Capital, estimates that AR technology revenue will reach $150 billion by 2020 due to consumer use (Digi-Capital, 2015). Osterhout Design Group, a company providing smart glasses for the military, announced that it will provide AR glasses for consumers. (Tilley, 2015).

Police may be challenged with investigating the dark side of AR. Internet pornography is already a problem with predators. There is a potential for new types of illegal activity and privacy issues (Shane, 2014). Augmented reality could possibly be used to expand how illegal pornography is distributed and accessed.

Another concern is the possibility of criminal conduct such as stalking. Locations could be disseminated and available to anyone. Criminals could identify targets for theft or retaliation. For example, gang members could use geocoding to identify the residence of an officer. Criminals accessing AR technology could drive down the street and information would populate their system similar to current mapping applications on smart phones. The degree to which the police want to examine ways to use AR for safety should also include these considerations to ensure those preying on the public do not overwhelm the legitimate uses of AR.

Preparing for the Future

Moving into the next ten years, law enforcement professionals need to embrace AR as a mode of retrieving and disseminating information. Technology to efficiently provide data while conducting operations will make high-risk incidents safer for officers in the field. Law enforcement is often ill equipped for the next generation of technology. In order to adhere to a desirable future, agencies will need to ensure that the proper infrastructure is built to support the technology.

High speed streaming and intranet connectivity will be vital to disseminate the information in an efficient manner. Dedicated servers are needed to store data. A new breed of law enforcement professionals will be needed to maintain the infrastructure. This staff may be civilians with the knowledge and expertise to maintain the technological backbone of the department and its security.
The RAND Corporation completed a futures workshop in 2015. Its findings show that technology will be a major component of law enforcement’s future. Transparency with the public will be vital and law enforcement must address technology to create a desirable future. Progress must be made in the following areas; practice, education, and training, information sharing, development and adaptation of current technology. Augmented reality can be used for translation, identification of illegal drugs or biological agents, and identifying impaired subjects (RAND, 2015). Agencies need to prepare for how AR will impact daily operations.

**Strategic Planning: Incorporating AR into Police IT Systems**

To implement augmented reality into everyday operations, planning needs to occur now. Agencies have learned through body worn cameras that issues quickly arise with equipment, programs, and policies. Agencies should assign staff to monitor developments in AR and related technology. These representatives need to provide periodic updates to the Department’s Command Staff and be responsible for scanning relevant publications and websites to gather information.

Departments should be active in helping formulate new legislation by educating legislators about augmented reality and its impacts to law enforcement and the public. It is imperative to draft sensible and effective laws to maintain public safety and respect the constitutional rights of citizens. Agencies should also work with law enforcement organizations to advocate for the long-term positive benefits of using new, efficient technologies that benefit both policing and the community. Agencies should consider funding to improve technology. In California, the Board and State of Community Corrections (BSCC), provides support to agencies in several areas including the six pillars in the President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing. One recent grant is specific to police and accountability, including programs related to social media and technology (BSCC 2016). Mid-size agencies should consider partnering with larger agencies to invest in regional systems. Departments need to create a sustainable budget to implement and operate augmented reality systems as they invest in technology. In Sonoma County Ca., agencies are already working together to invest in shared communication systems and accessing radio technology (Sonoma County I-LEADS Consortium).

Finally, departments will have to incorporate the principles of procedural justice when implementing augmented reality and have a robust communication plan. Outreach should be done through regular community meetings and social media to allow the public an opportunity to experience the technology. Perhaps agencies will gain insight and input from the citizens on the effectiveness of AR technology and be viewed as one more step towards respect and transparency. Participants in Citizen Police Academies would have an opportunity to wear the technology and experience what an officer would to help demystify the technology.

**Conclusion**

Augmented reality is said to be “...the glue that brings many technologies together and connects them to the human brain at a very personal and intimate
level” (Tamarjan, 2013). Advancements point to potential concerns and hopes that AR brings as it weaves its way into law enforcement and the community. AR systems will become commonplace for the general public and available to public safety, integrating with other systems, becoming more effective and responsive. Most AR concepts appear to be bright; however law enforcement leaders should examine these systems from all directions. As the technology becomes accessible, public safety leaders have to prepare instead of standing idle. Developing a desirable future through research and partnerships is the best way to address issues before they occur. It will allow public safety to create a vision of the future and prepare for questions that will come from both internal and external stakeholders.

Walt Disney once said about his organization, “We keep moving forward, opening up new doors and doing new things, because we’re curious ... and curiosity keeps leading us down new paths” (Disney, n.d.). Public safety will need to be curious and well versed in augmented reality to understand how it will impact the work officers will be tasked with in 2023. Understanding the technology will provide a desirable future for the guardians in our communities across the nation.
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If Neighborhoods Are Audio and Video Recorded 24 Hours a Day, How Would That Impact Community Trust?

By: Captain Frederick H. Bobbitt, Jr., Fremont Police Department

From the early years of law enforcement, police officers have patrolled the streets of neighborhoods to protect life and liberty. As the years have come and gone, the concept of policing in America has remained largely the same. Police officers patrolling suburban neighborhoods across the country interact with the members of the communities they serve, contact and detain suspicious persons, arrest violators of the law, and respond to a variety of calls for service; some routine and others dangerous. One additional and very important concept to successful law enforcement is officers building solid partnerships with the people they serve.

Partnerships between law enforcement and the community are built through trust. Over the past few years, however, the audio and video recording of officers by their citizenry have revealed acts of misconduct. Additionally, police body-worn and in-car camera systems have also recorded contacts with the community. These recordings assist with criminal investigations, and have also recorded instances where the police may have acted inappropriately. In times when police misconduct is alleged, the same systems help determine the veracity of the complaint to defend against false complaints against police officers.

The video and audio posted on social media and shown on the evening news have contributed significantly to a growing disconnect between law enforcement and communities where trust has been lost. How can law enforcement and community members rebuild trust? If video was expanded, if neighborhoods were audio and video recorded 24 hours a day, could that restore lost trust?

How Trust Between Law Enforcement and the Community Was Lost

After attending and successfully completing a police academy, newly appointed police officers are given an opportunity to meet and interact with the members of the communities they serve. Some of these first contacts allow officers to build trust with community members. As trust builds,
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communities become safer. When trust is lost, crime will rise. A 2013 article by Mike Riggs in The Atlantic discussed what happens when residents stop trusting their local police department (Riggs, 2013). Riggs recounted an experience that exemplified this phenomenon. On a Wednesday afternoon in November 2013, officers from the Wilmington Police Department in Delaware were questioning a woman suspected of selling stolen merchandise out of her car when someone opened fire on the group, wounding one of the officers. When witnesses refused to provide information about the suspect, Wilmington Police Chief Christine Dunning attributed the inability of officers to identify who was responsible for shooting one of her officers as a symptom of a trust gap between the community and the police (Riggs, 2013).

When community members do not trust the officers who have taken an oath to protect them, everyone suffers. The more lack of trust is defined and displayed; the more likely communities will deteriorate. Police are charged with the responsibility of protecting citizens and enforcing laws thus placing them in a position of power. In 2002, The Trauma Foundation discussed how a high level of trust between the community and police is a fundamental necessity for a civil society (Trauma, 2002). The article referenced a case in Sacramento, California where a police officer was accused of raping a 16 year old girl in his police car, thus abusing his power and violating trust (Trauma, 2002). Even as these tragic incidents might occur, it does not diminish the desire for those served by the police to want to trust them. According to Wilton Manors Florida Police Chief Paul O’Connell, the law enforcement system is under debilitating stress. Poor hiring practices, inadequate training, and the ability to cleanse the profession of those who do not deserve to wear the badge have fueled this strong belief that there is a lack of accountability (O’Connell, 2016). Investigating instances of police misconduct is a cornerstone of eliminating future misconduct; it also adversely affects community trust.

**Police Misconduct**

Police misconduct generally leads to a depletion of trust that community members have in the police officers who are called upon to protect them (U.S. Department of Justice). While police misconduct is not new to law enforcement, the availability of recording devices has exposed criminal incidents against the public at the hands of police officers. For instance, while most would agree that children should feel safe and secure while at school, in March 2016, Baltimore schools police officer Anthony Spence was charged with second-degree child abuse, second-degree assault, and misconduct after cell phone video caught him allegedly slapping, kicking, and yelling profanities at a 16-year-old student (Tan, 2016). The incident involving Officer Spence is a clear indication that police misconduct, once unimaginable, is being captured and shared across the country.

While recording devices can generally capture all levels of police misconduct, there have been incidents where an officer unlawfully takes the life of another captured on recording devices. When an officer is captured on video
murdering a member of the community, this is when all trust in law enforcement can be lost. In April 2015, North Charleston police officer Michael Slager was arrested and charged with murder after a video surfaced showing him shooting and killing Walter Scott as he ran away from Officer Slager after an altercation. Officer Slager fired eight shots at Scott hitting him five times. A bystander filmed the incident with his cell phone. The cell phone evidence contradicted Officer Slager’s original statement as to how the incident unfolded. The video also shows Officer Slager allegedly placing an object near Scott’s body making it appear that Scott possessed this object when he was shot and killed.

North Charleston Mayor Keith Summey commented that the case involving Walter Scott and Officer Slager could have ended differently if it wasn’t for the video footage (Knapp, 2015). Mayor Summey’s comments can be supported by the fact that in 2015 the number of United States police officers charged with murder or manslaughter for on-duty shootings tripled to fifteen; ten of the cases involved video evidence (Babwin, 2015). Although the unlawful acts of police officers must be uncovered whenever it occurs, so too must a balancing effort be made to uncover instances where the public intentionally files false complaints.

**Citizen Misconduct**

Law enforcement officers understand that they must work diligently on a daily basis to maintain a high level of trust between them and the communities they serve. While the above is true, police officers have been known to lose trust in the citizens they serve when false accusations are reported against them. In a 2014 article, Stephen Owsinski wrote that despite the philosophical ebb and flow surrounding body-worn cameras used by law enforcement, one benefit of this particular technology is that false accusations against police are weeded-out (Owsinski, 2014). As police agencies opt for utilizing audio-video recording devices, erroneous allegations against police plummet. Recent reports and a growing number of stories from media outlets across the nation bear-out the fact that recorded audio and video footage is exonerating police officers falsely accused of misconduct and wrongdoing. Body-worn cameras provide checks-and-balances for both citizens and the police (Owsinski, 2014). President Barack Obama weighed in by stating that the Ferguson shooting has exposed the “gulf of mistrust” between law enforcement and communities in America, a gap that proponents say could be bridged with police body-worn cameras (Hall, 2014).

Based on how society currently views law enforcement due to the plethora of cases of misconduct being captured on recording devices and memorialized nationally, law enforcement and members of the community need to work together to rebuild partnerships with the hope of gaining back trust. Building trust starts with transparency and accountability, both with police officers and members of the community. Transparency and accountability could be accomplished through community meetings and the ability to video record the actions of citizens and the police who serve them.
Where Mistrust Between Law Enforcement and the Community Stands

In an article in the June 2016 edition of Police Chief Magazine, Stephanie Covey mentioned that policing is a duty of the highest honor - also of the highest responsibility, the highest visibility, and the greatest challenge. Excellence in carrying out the policing mission to protect and serve inspires trust. The people of law enforcement are and must be the best, the brightest, and the most dedicated in defending the laws, the ideas, and the citizen that make this country great. Law enforcement must be trusted to carry out these duties with the highest level of ethics and character. Covey added that the foundation on which trust and credibility is built contains four cores: Integrity, Intent, Capabilities, and Results (Police Chief Magazine, 2016). As the police fail to act, however, others are willing to step in to provide a process to report police misconduct.

Based on the lack of trust in law enforcement and the emerging trend of citizens capturing police misconduct on their smart phones, the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) has created a cell phone application to record police conduct. According to the ACLU, the app empowers citizens to hold law enforcement agencies accountable for their actions in light of several controversial incidents regarding police across the nation. Hector Villagra, executive director of the ACLU in Southern California, stated they wanted to multiply the number of cameras that can be trained on police officers at any time. Villagra added that police officers need to know that anything they do could be seen by the entire world (Motti, 2015). To improve relationships between the ACLU and law enforcement, police departments across the country should mirror what took place in Grand Rapids, Michigan, where a panel discussion with community members contained stakeholders including the police chief, ACLU staffer, faith based leader, and community activist (Price, 2015).

Failure to Act

With the number of citizens ready to record encounters with law enforcement and the fact that the public lacks trust in their police officers, encounters with citizens have become an officer safety issue to some officers. Based on police contacts being recorded and media scrutiny, police officers are being injured and even killed due to their failure to act. It is believed officers are hesitating to use justified force in fear of being falsely charged with a crime. In August 2015, a Birmingham Alabama police detective conducted a traffic enforcement stop on a subject named Janard Cunningham. Cunningham became furious that the detective had stopped him so he exited his car and refused the detective’s commands to return to his vehicle. As Cunningham became combative, the detective was justified to use force, but refused to do so as he was concerned that he would be accused of needlessly shooting an unarmed man. As a result, Cunningham took the detective’s firearm from him and pistol-whipped him until he fell unconscious. Bystanders took pictures of the bloodied and unconscious detective who lay face down on the concrete and posted the images on social media (Valencia, 2015).
Recorded neighborhoods could mitigate the trend of police officers failing to act due to the possibility of being recorded. If police officers are aware that the actions of the criminal offender as well as their own actions are being recorded, this could provide internal stability to understand that the entire incident will be captured, which can be used to justify their actions, up to and including the level of force used. If the public and police knew their actions were ubiquitously captured and retained, it could be a cornerstone to work to build and sustain community trust.

**Rebuilding Trust Through Recorded Neighborhoods**

In the Knees and Zimmerman article, the United States Department of Justice commented that there are several things police departments can do to build trust, beginning with transparency. Police officers have to get engaged in non-enforcement activities showing they are the guardian of the people and not a warring faction with the people (Knees & Zimmerman, 2016).

When officers interact with the public during consensual contacts and detentions, if the contact is not captured on an audio or video recording device, there isn’t factual data of how the entire interaction occurred, which lacks transparency. The addition of police body-worn cameras could mitigate this issue. A 2015 article by Nick Wong found that equipping police officers with body cameras may be an effective way to improve the behavior of officers and the public. Researchers at the University of South Florida released their report on a yearlong body-worn camera pilot program at the Orlando Police Department in which they randomly selected 46 officers to wear the devices and compared them against 43 officers who did not wear them. From March 2014 through February 2015, use-of-force incidents dropped 53 percent among officers outfitted with the cameras. Additionally, civilian complaints against those officers saw a 65 percent decline (Wong, 2015).

While community cameras could rebuild trust, body-born cameras would also remain a positive resource for police officers. United States Attorney General Loretta Lynch called for stronger “bonds of trust” between law enforcement and the communities they serve following the killing of five Dallas, Texas police officers and continuing protests against police nationwide over shooting of African American men. Lynch stated, “at the same time that we are working to support police and citizens in their efforts to build stronger and more united communities, we remain committed to keeping those communities safe and secure. We will continue to offer our state and local partners funding, training, and technical assistance for critical programs and assets like body-worn cameras, de-escalation training, and education in implicit bias” (Strohm, 2016).

**Neighborhood Recording Devices**

While body-worn cameras can create transparency, neighborhood cameras are an expanded resource as these cameras can provide real-time information to identify police misconduct, reduce crime, and create safer neighborhoods. The City of Toledo, Ohio installed 147 surveillance cameras across the city. As a result, one business owner noted a reduction in crime near his store.
Police crime data showed that in the six months before the camera outside of the store was installed, there were 12 robberies, 13 aggravated assaults, 37 burglaries, 39 thefts, and 6 auto thefts. In the same six-month period the following year, each of the major-crime categories had fewer incidents. The owner stated that during the first month that the camera was installed, business had increased, trouble customers had ceased, and he had gained nicer customers (Dungjen, 2014). Toledo’s camera plan was announced in December 2011. Property crimes dropped in 2012 (Toledo Crime). Expanding this to a national scale could significantly impact crime and disorder. As crime rates drop, the police have time to do what is important - work in collaboration with members of their community.

The Future of Policing

If suburban neighborhoods were capable of being audio and video recorded 24 hours a day, this could create the needed legitimacy and transparency to rebuilding trust. If police officers and community members were aware that all of their interactions would be recorded, this could potentially minimize or even end police and citizen misconduct as well as reduce crime. Additionally, as misconduct evaporated, law enforcement and community partnerships would grow, thus reestablishing the trust and good relationships that were once present.

The ability to audio and video record neighborhoods 24 hours a day could appear too far in the future to become reality, but research has shown that this concept may not be that far away. A state of the art surveillance system housed in a drone can record every moving object across an entire city from an altitude of 20,000 feet. The drone, ARGUS-IS, can remain airborne for years at a time and can track people walking down the street, birds flying in the sky, and objects as small as six inches on the ground. The system can store one million terabytes of video per day, 5,000 hours of high definition footage, while broadcasting live streaming footage to a ground station (Watson, 2013). This type of recording device is capable of capturing police and public contacts, both positive and negative, as well as all crimes committed by offenders.

Recorded neighborhoods could place law enforcement in an unprecedented position where police misconduct is controlled, false complaints against officers are mitigated, crime is reduced, and trust reaches a positive level never experienced in policing.

While city leaders must consider a funding source related to recorded neighborhoods, based on the City of Atlanta’s citywide surveillance system, communities could mirror their process. In 2011, Atlanta installed approximately 500 surveillance cameras around the city with the assistance of a $2.5 million federal grant. Based on the systems success, over the following five years, their goal was to install 10,000 cameras across the city at a cost of $50 million(Blau, 2012). To make recorded neighborhoods a reality, city leaders should advocate to their political leaders that recorded neighborhoods will assist with reducing crime rates allowing communities and law enforcement to take accountability, transparency, and trust to significant levels.
Conclusion

Based on media reports, incidents posted on social media platforms, and comments made by the public and political leaders, members of communities all over the United States have lost the trust they once had in the ability of their police officers to treat the public with respect and dignity at all times. Policing can not be at an accepted and functional level if communities do not feel comfortable working as partners with their police officers. How can this serious phenomenon be corrected? Can audio and video recorded neighborhoods restore trust between communities and law enforcement? It is plausible that recorded neighborhoods could be the solution to reestablished trust.

If recorded neighborhoods aren’t created, community relationships with the police will continue to deteriorate. Acts of serious police misconduct such as the two veteran Los Angeles police officers, James Nichols and Luis Valenzuela who started raping women while on-duty in their police car in 2008 who were eventually charged with several counts of rape will continue (Mather & Rubin, 2016). Law enforcement must take action to rebuild the trust between them and the communities they serve, which could be accomplished with audio and video recorded neighborhoods.
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