

Black Voices in Policing—Texas Southern University's Center for Justice Research

Voiceover

00:00

Welcome to *The Beat*—a podcast series from the COPS Office at the Department of Justice. Featuring interviews with experts from a varied field of disciplines, *The Beat* provides law enforcement with the latest developments and trending topics in community policing.

Gilbert Moore

00:16

Hello, and welcome to another episode of *The Beat*. I'm Gilbert Moore. Our guest today is Dr. Howard Henderson. Dr. Henderson is the Director of the Center for Justice Research at Texas Southern University in Houston. He also serves as the chair for the MacArthur Foundation–funded Houston Racial/Ethnic Disparities Committee Data Working Group. In addition, Dr. Howard is leading a research team in the large-scale evaluation of the Houston Police Department's body-worn camera program. He is a former member of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice's multi-disciplinary advisory board, and he has served as an instructor for the U.S. Department of State's International Law Enforcement Academy.

Dr. Henderson, welcome to *The Beat*.

Dr. Howard Henderson

01:00

Good afternoon. Thanks for having me, and I'm looking forward to such a spirited conversation.

Moore

01:04

We think it's going to be an interesting conversation, but before we get started, just help me understand a little bit about Texas Southern University, the Center for Justice Research, and how Texas Southern came to be involved in the evaluation of criminal justice data. In other words, set the stage for us.

Henderson

01:21

Texas Southern University is a unique university in the country because it is uniquely situated in an urban center. The beauty of the university is it has a history of dealing with urban issues. It has special urban designation from Texas legislators, a historically Black college located in Third Ward Houston. There are several research institutes on campus, and the university is known for solving problems that the world is facing in real time. The beauty of the institution is that they wholeheartedly support the work that faculty do, they are engaged in projects, and they make sure that we have the time that we need to address issues as they may occur.

And so, it was pertinent that we began to engage in the national conversation about criminal justice reform because we understood that those individuals who are closest to the problem, oftentimes, are closest to the solution, and because of that we've been able to have a fair success in a short period of time. And so, we appreciate that. And, again, we thank you for the opportunity to have a conversation today and hopefully say something that helps push the conversation further in the right direction.

Moore

02:30

There seem to be a lot of things that are unique about Texas Southern, or the work of the Center for Justice Research, and one of them is an approach that appears somewhat uncommon during the current discourse about issues of police reform and re-imagining policing. And that uniqueness is that there's a readiness to consider and incorporate an approach that's supported by law enforcement, as well as those presented or supported by community. And that's occurring rather than just looking at issues through a binary lens. Is that an accurate interpretation?

Henderson

03:03

No, I think it's fairly accurate. I thank you for bringing it to everyone's attention. We follow what we call a translational model. And in that model we don't make any decisions without engaging members of the community—without discussing with community partners, decision-makers, policy-makers, and other researchers—because we understand, as an academic research institution, we need to cover as many different perspectives as we can about an issue before we engage in the research.

What we found is that a lot of academic entities conduct research as if they have the answer on the front end. We don't assume that. We make sure that we talk to the folks who are on the ground dealing with the issues, and we engage all parties. We talk to police officers. We have a team of officers who advise us, who are at every level from chief down to line-level officer. We have community advocacy groups. We bring all of these folks to the table, because we understand that the solution cannot be arrived at unless you have all the perspectives there. And so, I think that's what separates us from what everyone else is doing around the country.

Moore

04:14

I saw an interview you conducted following the death of George Floyd and what I thought was very interesting... Well, with all of the issues that resulted after the death of George Floyd, what I thought was interesting is that you indicated that you looked at proposals from Democratic elected officials, Republican elected officials and the former administration's executive order on law enforcement, and you identify those areas that represent agreement, you run them past the community, and then you focus first on the low-hanging fruit, those things that represent universal agreement. What are some of those issues where everyone seems to be on the same page?

Henderson

04:54

Listen, chokeholds are an obvious place to start. That's what made us put out the Chokehold Action Brief first, because when we talked to folks—both liberals, conservatives, Republicans, Democrats, Independents, advocacy groups, police departments—they all said chokeholds was a good place to do it because there aren't many people around the country who would say we still need those to do our job. They understand the historical legacy of slavery rooted in many police practices today. And we want to be able to say, "Listen, let us identify the points where you all agree, and as academics that's our job, to help solve a problem. Let's go where we know we're going to have the greatest level of agreement, and spend the rest of the time working on issues that would improve police accountability but are going to be more contested."

Moore

05:44

So, you mentioned, kind of, the impact that the nation's past has had on perceptions of policing by communities of color, African-American communities in specific. What do you say to those officers who are listening to these issues, or are looking at these issues, and, quite frankly, they had no part in, kind of, how America arrived at the disconnect that we find ourselves in—

Henderson

06:09

Right.

Moore

06:10

—who are out there trying to do the job? What would you say to them?

Henderson

06:13

First of all, I'd like to thank them for doing the work that we need done. And I also have to admit that we need police in this country. There's no way that we're ever going to have a functioning society without police.

The challenge is that a lot of the disconnect between certain segments of the community and the police is based on the historical legacy, as rooted in local realities of oppression, of slavery, of racism, and though it had nothing to do with that individual officer who may have not been born during those periods of time, it affects the relationship. And we have to understand that in individual relationships in the community, if you don't understand what's motivating the behavior, then you can't solve it. And sometimes you respond to it as if you know the rationale behind it. But until we are able to train officers on the disconnect that exists in the community, then we're going to continue to have these problems. And so, you essentially destroy the social contract, and the ramifications of that have been far-reaching. And we've seen those most recently around the country.

Moore

07:23

And so, what's your interpretation of what that social contract is and how it plays out at the local level, day in and day out?

Henderson

07:32

Well, I mean, you think about the work of theorists such as Thomas Hobbes and John Locke and they talked about the social contract where the citizens consent to be governed by and submit to laws in society in return for the protections and benefits of an organized governmental structure. And so, the community says, "Okay, listen, we're going to step back so that the state—the police department—can protect the will of the community." And so, essentially, the police work for the community. There are some departments around the country, as we talked about before we got on the air, that don't train their officers in that theoretical perspective, and so that's where you see the disconnect. Ultimately, the police work for the community and the community has the ultimate say-so in the way in which they want to be policed. And I think that's what we're experiencing now, is a paradigm shift in American policing because that social contract, in some cases, has been violated.

Moore

08:40

How does that happen, right? So, we've had a previous conversation and you've mentioned the current commission report on 21st century policing and a number of other indicators that have been done over various periods of time, or let's say a broad period of time, and all fundamentally are getting at the same points. That being said, like, why are we as a society having trouble taking the recommendations of all this work that has been done on these issues?

Henderson

09:13

Well, let's just think about the history of policing and our understanding of policing as individuals. Most of us are raised to believe that the police are infallible, that they're perfect, they do no wrong. And so, it's very difficult for people who don't live in these communities, or they don't see community policing, to experience it the way that they claim they're experiencing. And we've seen some videos in that regard. The challenge is we find it very difficult to be empathetic when we have not experienced that style of policing.

And so, what has happened is with the videos, with George Floyd, with the Breonna Taylor case, we've been able to see some fundamental problems in policing that have always existed. You see, now, for the first time in the history of this country, a bipartisan push to change policing and move it in the right direction. The country now says that they understand that something needs to be done about policing, that we need to be able to hold policing more accountable. Policing is responding and saying, "We agree with you, but we need resources to make sure that we're able to focus in those spaces." We are now having the conversation that you should have in policing in a democracy where all parties are engaged.

Before this point in history there's only been one side having a conversation. That was at the policing side saying, "This is the way we're going to police you all." Fortunately, now, we have society saying, "No, that's not the way you're going to police. This is the way we want you to police." And I think we're going to end up in the right spot, and much better than we were 10, 20 years ago.

Moore

10:57

Does your research suggest that the law enforcement community, writ large, is accepting of that position, or ready for that kind of change?

Henderson

11:06

I think, for the most part, we've found through our numerous conversations with officers—interviews and whatnot—they accept that there are some change that needs to happen, the challenge is in understanding the degree to which that change needs to occur.

For example, they agree the chokeholds need to go, they understand that, but the notion of qualified immunity is a sticky point. They seem to feel as if qualified immunity provides them protections to do their job. Community and society are saying otherwise. And so, that's going to be a very sticky point that's probably going to have to work its way through our Supreme Court system before we even see any changes, if at all.

Moore

11:45

Well, I know that you or the Center has had a project that takes a look at that, the project on qualified immunity, and what I found interesting about it is it's not just looking at qualified immunity in how it protects officers, other governmental officials, from frivolous lawsuits, but looking at how qualified immunity in cases where I guess you could say there's a general agreement of wrongdoing—

Henderson

12:12

Correct. So—

Moore

12:14

—reduces the amount of trust and confidence in law enforcement.

Henderson

12:18

So the qualified-immunity piece is tricky because it applies to many governmental actors, and the challenge is that officers are telling us that without qualified immunity they're set up for failure because they can't do their job, and talking to advocacy groups, community members that say, "Listen, we don't need qualified immunity."

The position that we take is there's got to be some compromise there. Can we identify situations in which qualified immunity would be appropriate? Can we earmark those instances in which qualified immunity would not be? I think we have to go there first, because to take one extreme over the other is to show that there is no need on one hand, and that there's absolute need on the other, but I think that any reasonable officer and any reasonable citizen could agree that there are some instances in which qualified immunity should not protect an individual who has engaged in otherwise criminal conduct. And I think that any reasonable officer and any reasonable citizen would agree that there are situations in which qualified immunity should be applicable. And so, I think that we need to be able to sit down at the table and have a constructive conversation about what's necessary.

Moore

13:39

And so, a lot of our listeners are practicing law enforcement officers—patrol-level officers, first-line supervisors, command-level officers, police chiefs and sheriffs, and the like. And I would imagine that some of them would hear that conversation and one of the first things they would think is, “Hold on, now I’m going to be subject to judgment driven by politics. I’m going to be subject to judgment driven by a community that may not understand the rigors of the job, the challenges that are faced on the street, and the instant nature of the decision-making process and, quite frankly, may not be able to contextually understand how some of the things that an officer confronts on the street do in fact influence their response.” What would you say to that perspective, or point of view?

Henderson

14:29

I think that there has to be an education campaign for officers, just like they’d need an education campaign for the general society on the instance in which qualified immunity is necessary. There are... I would estimate that most police officers do their job the way it’s supposed to be done, day in and day out. There’s a small proportion of those officers who are engaged in behaviors that would challenge the assumptions of qualified immunity, or the need of qualified immunity. But I understand the concern.

The challenge being, though, ultimately, the police have to understand that the community is in charge of dictating how they want to be policed. And I know it’s fundamentally different from what many officers are trained or taught, but unless the community is supportive of police activity, we end up in these places every time there is a high-profile case. And legitimacy or illegitimacy challenges the ability of a community to believe in a system that it’s supposed to support in order for it to work.

Moore

15:36

Addressing issues of qualified immunity, I think everybody will agree, is a heavy lift. What are some of the other issues that the Center has found of importance, but maybe where there’s not agreement across the board, issues that still need to be dealt with, and we still need to make progress on?

Henderson

15:52

I think the bigger elephant in the room is dealing with police unions, understanding that they began as benevolent organizations that were designed to protect the employment interest and the pay of officers, and now they have become entities that also protect officers who are engaged in this conduct, in some cases.

I think the other elephant in the room is this whole notion of defunding the police. We understand that that is a highly controversial statement, and many don't understand why you would even want to defund the police. I think we need to have a national conversation about what that means, if there's any movement, or any room for negotiation there.

I think those two issues, looking at defunding the police and looking at what it means to reformulate what police unions do, and their functioning role, those two are going to be more controversial, if not much greater than the whole notion of qualified immunity.

Moore

16:52

So given the controversies surrounding the issues of defunding, re-imagining policing, I've heard it all. I mean, I've heard people say, "Hey, look, most cops will tell you that mental health issues are overwhelming for them. Domestic issues or calls for service can be overwhelming and very dangerous." But at the same time, they might not be supportive of approaches that engage other professionals, or even if they are supportive, they're not seeing that in the language that is currently being used around police funding. What does it mean? Because I've talked to many people and the perspectives are all over the board on it.

Henderson

17:29

So you made a couple points and I want to address those first before I define how I see qualified immunity. Since 2013, almost a quarter of all the people killed by police had some known mental illness. And police are put in a very difficult position. We understand that. Many police departments have yet to train their officers on how to deal with mental health, as well as substance abuse crisis and calls. When you look at defunding the police you have different factions within that realm.

On one hand, there are some people in the defund the police conversation who totally want to get rid of police as we know them today, and they want to create a new entity that is focused on public health. You have another faction that says that there is no way that we could ever defund the police, in fact, police need more funding. I think, and those researchers in our circle and in a part of our group, we believe that the answer is somewhere in the middle. We understand that the defund the police conversation at least captured people's attention. But we also know that defund the police, getting rid of them, is not practical.

So what does that mean? That means that an opportunity has now come to the forefront where police chiefs can now justify their needs. They can use this opportunity to educate the public about what they need. And the public now has an opportunity to voice their concerns about how they're policed, and what resources should be allocated to the policing of the 21st century. We look at this whole notion of defunding as a great opportunity to talk about what policing looks like in the 21st century, and we hope that it doesn't go away because we disagree with the terminology as opposed to focusing on the definitions, and the differences, and the commonalities that exist in the conversation.

Moore

19:26

So, that leads me to how your work has been received by the law enforcement field.

Henderson

19:33

Yeah. So, you know, we—as I said earlier when we talked about our research approach, and being translational, and making sure that we have officers at the table—we don't make any moves, or go public with any information, unless we have parties review the information who we think are experts in that space. So police overwhelmingly have supported the work that we're doing, but they also help us understand how what we're doing is seen from that lens. And so, we understand, oftentimes more than the general public understands, that just like the public wants the police to adhere to and to pay attention to what they're saying, we feel that the community also has to participate in some of that listening as well. Because I think that both sides provide expertise on that experience of being in that position.

When they talk, here are a couple things that we've noticed. Number one is that violent crime is a concern of both parties. Number two, resource allocation is a concern of both parties. The challenge is police departments don't have a built-in mechanism for communication. And what I mean by that is, other than filing complaints on an officer, what are the official mechanism that a community member can actually voice their concerns to a police chief without bombarding them with more work? And so, we're pushing for better lines of communication, but also more engagement between the two entities. Because in order for policing to be effective—and officers tell us this—they need community engagement. And so, when you talk to your more seasoned officer, they understand that. When you talk to your more seasoned community member, they understand that. What we're allowing to happen is we're allowing the news to dictate the relationship locally when that may not, in fact, be the case.

Moore

21:41

It's interesting that you would mention this right on the heels of the conversation about the level of resources available to law enforcement. So would this be an opportunity for a conversation about, maybe, there needing to be an increase in funding to support more training, to support more

comprehensive recruitment efforts, to make sure that a department is attracting the right people to the job? There are a lot of things that fall in to the category of potential improvements that require more funds rather than less.

Henderson

22:15

Well, I think that the conversation for more funding should not be had until police departments can justify the proper use of the existing funding. And what I mean by that is you now have a community that's saying, "We want change." And that community is not in a position to respect any conversations of more funding until the existing funding levels are justified. So I think that it's going to take some time, but we're not in a climate where increased police funding is going to be received well by a huge swath of the community. But it doesn't mean that we won't get there. It just means that the police have to justify their needs because, basically, the community is saying, "We want to know what you're using the money for, and if resources can be reallocated."

I think the more appropriate term for all of this would be "reallocation of resources," because I think there are some funds in some places that would be better used in others, and I think having the conversation between police chiefs, city councils, community members on a consistent, continual basis, would be beneficial to everyone. Unfortunately, that conversation and relationship has become so adversarial, as if we're on trial, when they're communicating, and that shouldn't be the case.

Moore

23:41

So in so many departments, officers spend their entire shift running from one call for service to another, and the concept of taking away funding really is a non-starter. In part because, hey, these calls are coming from the community. These calls are coming from communities of color, African-American communities, and the level of response that can be provided by law enforcement agencies is already strained. So when you start thinking about, or having conversations about, "Well, let's stand up some of these mental health or social service providers to support the police," do you think that communities are ready? So even if it's not a conversation that's about increasing funding for law enforcement, if we're talking about maybe addressing the mental health issue and you have service providers respond to calls with, or in lieu of, law enforcement, all of this represents an increase in funding at the local level. Are communities ready for that?

Henderson

24:37

I think that communities can be there. Let me give you an example. We work with our main funder, Thurgood Marshall College Fund, and Gallop on a national poll of individuals who live in these disenfranchised, historically discriminated-against communities and 51 percent of those residents said that they want police to spend more time in their community. Blacks were 52 percent wanted more police in their community, and Spanish 59 percent. Whites were 46 percent. So what that tells us is that, contrary to the media's narrative, people who live in these disenfranchised communities want more

policing. The question is what that policing looks like. And I think the question that you raise about increasing funding on a local level, the caveat there is can you do that without eradicating the system of over-representation in terms of arrests, in terms of incarceration, in terms of conviction?

The community wants to make sure that if you're receiving more funding, that doesn't mean that we're going to see more discriminatory stops, that we want to be more likely to be arrested, convicted, charged, and sentenced to prison, and that's a kind of a piece because the police, in essence, are becoming representatives of portions of the criminal justice system that they aren't necessarily engaged in. But we do know, the research has been very clear about, that members of these communities want to see more police spend more time in those communities. What that looks like is debatable.

Moore

26:18

Yeah, and so, given that dynamic, right, and I do understand what you said about the media influencing public perceptions on all of the issues, but given that dynamic, if we know that so many of these calls for services are coming from communities, White, Black, and otherwise—how do we align that with a conversation about police funding levels being decreased?

Henderson

26:39

As I was saying earlier, I think that we need a national campaign to educate everyone about the needs of a police department. It would help us if we understood how many police were necessary to deal with certain segments of society.

A lot of policing is impacted by the lack of social services and support in a community. If someone has a mental health crisis, that oftentimes ends up in the hands of police. If someone has a domestic violence issue, that oftentimes lends itself into the hands of the police. A lot of these issues are really outside, or should be outside, the purview of a police department. But because the city or county has not properly funded the necessary infrastructure, then the police have been charged with dealing with that.

And so, I think that the police are also going to have to let the power brokers know that 40 percent of their phone calls are for issues that are outside of the necessary purview of the department. And so, we need to be able to restructure that. Until we educate people about what the day-to-day job looks like of an officer, then we're going to miss the opportunity to get services and support that we may need. And that's why I think that a conversation about reallocation of services is the most fruitful.

Moore

27:58

So with all of these sometimes competing priorities and competing realities, where do we start? I mean, how... So much of this stuff is handled at a local level. I can foresee a situation where you're driving between jurisdictions and the level or the type of police service you get is vastly different, depending

upon what side of a given street you cross, or what side of a given street you're on. Given all of that, given the public discourse right now, the aftermath, everything we've seen following the death of George Floyd—what are the Center's thoughts about where we go from here?

Henderson

28:34

I think—in talking to various groups around the country, advising various state-level committees, local-level committees—the first thing that we have to do is we have to bring to the table all of the parties who have a vested interest in seeing positive solutions to the problem. We're going to have to spend some time with what we call affinity groups, and that is figuring out where these issues are and how close we are to solutions. So they're going to have to work together. There's just no way around that.

We have to get rid of this adversarial relationship between the police and the community because we can't do anything with that approach. Once we do that, we are able to strategically identify the areas that need attention, and we have the evidence to help us move in the right direction appropriately, at the deliberate speed that we need to be able to move forward in. Once we do that, then we have structural issues at play that we need to be able to focus on. And that is identifying where police attention really needs to be. If you look at a police chief around the country, they know where their hot spots are. Give police departments the opportunity to focus on those hot spots, and you delegate those other areas that are not hot spots to other entities in the city that are best situated to deal with that. We've got to allow the police department to focus on what they need to be doing because we've expanded the scope of work, but at the same time we don't want to expand funding and so those are contradictory. I think if we do that, we'll be in a better position to be more effective and, ultimately, improve the relationship between the police and the community.

Moore

30:14

So in your work, as you suggested, you bring people from various sectors to the table—law enforcement, community, presumably elected officials. What would you say to them about how to move forward so that these conversations can take place in a collaborative and productive manner?

Henderson

30:31

Well, I think one is you need to be able to say that, ultimately, we want to change police culture. That in order to address that there are some systematic changes that need to take place. You're going to have to get rid of this mentality as if the police has all the answers. You're going to have to be able to understand that in a democracy everyone has a vested interest in making sure that that relationship works. And it's going to take time. And so, the police are going to have to understand that they don't have the answer to everything. And I think doing that, they're better situated to find the solution because the community, if for nothing else, they understand their perception, and I think that's where we need to be looking at. It's finding out what perceptions and experiences do individuals have with a police department so that we can improve.

Moore

31:27

The Center has looked at a lot of different issues surrounding law enforcement in urban and minority communities, issues such as the root causes behind gun violence, gun usage among African-American males in urban communities, and so forth. What would you say are some of the other things that the Center is focused on, in terms of recommendations for moving forward? I just want to make sure that we bring that out.

I've heard you say things in the past such as we need to look at bringing officers into the profession who are college educated. There are a number of other things that the Center has suggested would be helpful. What are those facts that you would want our listeners to understand about what you guys are supporting and promoting?

Henderson

32:08

Yeah, I think one is we need to, you mentioned, we need to start a serious conversation about the role of college education and policing in this country. We understand the challenges of doing that. You have some departments that don't have the resources to hire or recruit officers with college degrees, and we have some departments that can. If we started in those places that could do that, we should do it. You have small departments that don't have the resources. They don't have the access to available applicants who would have degrees. We understand that. But you would think in 2020 we would understand the need to move forward, and to move policing on the local level to a level of professionalism that the federal government has seen for a number of years. And I think that, ultimately, with the support of the research that shows that officers with college degrees are 40 percent less likely to be engaged in use of force cases, they're more likely to adopt community policing principles, I think we'd be in a better place in the long run. That's what we understand. The data tells us that.

I also think that there's a need for a fundamental overhaul of our system. The mentality, the paradigm, the structure, the theory of American policing is evolving. And because of this evolution, there are some mechanisms within an organization that have to change, fundamentally. Those deal with police accountability, and also transparency.

Moore

33:38

Anything else that has jumped off the page, based on your research, that is different or a new perspective on issues?

Henderson

33:45

Yeah, I think we're going to have to get back to building better leadership. I think that, because of the work that officers are doing now, they've gotten away from leadership development programs in policing. We need to get back there. I think that we need to nationalize a set of prescribed standards for

policing and its administration, because you have departments doing what they want to do and are able to afford. I think we need to have a national conversation about how we can standardize policing standards, and how we move forward in that space.

Moore

34:19

What about on the other side of the coin when it comes to issues of community responsibility? And I don't mean responsibility not to be victimized, but I'm talking about supporting the police. The kind of input that would allow change to occur in a way that works for everybody. What guidance would you give to those corners of the community that are really trying to become involved in driving a different tomorrow relative to policing?

Henderson

34:46

I think the community, you know, they're going to have to do more, if not as much, work as the police are in improving this. They're going to have to organize. They're going to have to understand that you're not able to change an organization overnight. They're going to have to understand that the police see issues that they may not be privy to, as members of the community.

But I think that through organization, through mutual respect, through mutual accountability, they're going to have to start reporting some of these issues that is in the community they don't report. We have a tendency not to want to report certain crimes in certain communities. We're going to have to move in the right direction and begin to have more productive, positive conversation, because in order for the police to do their job they need the community to be there to assist, and in order for the community to feel like they're able to assist, they need the police to help them, and be fair and just. And so, it's a relationship, right? And so, we're invested in this relationship, and it's going to take some work. But it's also going to take conversation and communication between the two parties that we, historically, have not seen in this country.

Moore

35:53

We have been speaking with Dr. Howard Henderson, who is the Director for the Center of Justice Research at Texas Southern University in Houston.

Dr. Henderson, we appreciate you being with us, and before we close I just want to ask you one simple question, and that is: How can people learn more about the work of the Center of Justice Research at Texas Southern University?

Henderson

36:17

Thanks again for the opportunity. It's been great. If they go to our website, www.centerforjusticeresearch.org. They can also visit us on all social media platforms @CJResearchTSU. We're on Twitter, Facebook, Instagram, LinkedIn, YouTube. We have all of the outlets. We try to

disseminate information about work that we have going on. We try to provide resources for the improvement of the overall criminal justice system, pieces for people to think about, pontificate, but overall, improve the communication between the police and the community, but ultimately, moving criminal justice into the 21st century.

Moore

37:01

Dr. Henderson, it has been a true honor to speak with you today, and we are grateful for your efforts and the work of the Center. Thank you so much for joining us on *The Beat*.

Henderson

37:10

Thank you so much for having me.

Voiceover: *The Beat* Exit

37:11

The Beat is brought to you by the United States Department of Justice COPS Office. The COPS Office helps to keep our nation's communities safe by giving grants to law enforcement agencies, developing community policing publications, developing partnerships, and solving problems. If you have comments or suggestions, please email our Response Center at askcopsrc@usdoj.gov, or check out our social media on Facebook (www.facebook.com/DOJCOPS/), on YouTube (www.youtube.com/c/dojcopsoffice), or on Twitter (@COPSOOffice). Our website is www.cops.usdoj.gov.

Voiceover: Disclaimer

38:09

The opinions contained herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice. References to specific agencies, companies, products or services should not be considered an endorsement by the authors or the U.S. Department of Justice, rather the references are illustrations to supplement discussion of the issues.