Company: **FBI ACS Only account**

Conference Title: **President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice**

Conference ID: **6387592**

Moderator: **Dennis Stoika**

Date: **July 1, 2020**

Operator: Good day and welcome to the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice Conference Call. Today's conference is being recorded. At this time, I would like to turn the conference over to Director Phil Keith. Please go ahead.

Phil Keith: Thank you, Michael and good afternoon everyone. And thank you for joining us today. I call the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice to order. And on behalf of Attorney General Barr, we thank each of you for joining us today for this important commission teleconference meeting.

The focus of today's panel is community relations training in law enforcement and we look forward to hearing from today's panel of subject matter experts. Yesterday's hearing was robust and the witnesses provided a great deal of information and facts for this commission to deliberate and discuss. I'm sure today's hearing will be equally robust. At this time, I'd ask the executive director, Dean Kueter to conduct roll call of commissions.

Dean Kueter: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And before I call the roll, would just like to once again remind everyone that this event is open to the press. And for any members of the media on the call, if you have any questions or any clarification on anything, please contact Kristina Mastropasqua in the Justice Department's Office of Public Affairs. And with that, I will call the roll. Commissioner Bowdich. Commissioner Clemmons.

Commissioner Clemmons: Present.

Dean Kueter: Commissioner Evans. Commissioner Frazier.

Commissioner (Frazier): Present, thank you.

Dean Kueter: Commissioner Gualtieri.

Commissioner Gualtieri: I'm here.

Dean Kueter: Commissioner Hawkins.

Commissioner Hawkins: I'm present, thank you.

Dean Kueter: Commissioner Lombardo.

Commissioner Lombardo. I'm here, Dean, thank you.

Dean Kueter: Commissioner MacDonald.

Commissioner MacDonald: Present, thank you.

Dean Kueter: Commissioner Moody.

Commissioner Moody: Good morning, I'm here.

Dean Kueter: Commissioner Parr.

Commissioner Parr: I'm here.

Dean Kueter: Commissioner Price.

Commissioner Price: Good afternoon, I'm here.

Dean Kueter: Commissioner Ramsay.

Commissioner Ramsay: Here.

Dean Kueter: Commissioner Rausch. Commissioner Sanmaniego..

Commissioner Sanmaniego: I'm here.

Dean Kueter: Commissioner Smallwood.

Commissioner Smallwood: I'm here.

Dean Kueter: Vice Chair Sullivan.

Vice Chair Sullivan: I'm here. Thank you.

Dean Kueter: And Commissioner Washington. Mr. Chairman that concludes the roll call.

Phil Keith: Thank you, Dean. Any other announcements today?

Dean Kueter: No sir, we are good to go.

Phil Keith: Thank you. I do want to pass along to all the commissioners that Commissioner Dave Rausch lost his brother last night after a battle with pancreatic cancer. He was a great man and veteran of

our US Navy. We will keep Commissioner Rausch in our thoughts and prayers and will provide you an update by email soon about Commissioner Rausch's brother.

We again want to acknowledge the continuing commitment of our commissioners, the working group members, witnesses that are here today and those who appeared in previous panels as well as the federal staff. Toward meeting the goals of this historic commission on behalf of the Attorney General Barr, we thank each of you.

As noted on previous calls, we encourage commissioners to take notes during the testimony of the panelists and we'll then open it for questions from commissioners after the last witness. We'll make one exception to that today with Dr. Lorie Fridell who has to leave after her testimony.

Our first distinguished panelist today is Dr. Lorie Fridell, Profession in the Department of Criminology at the University of South Florida. Dr. Fridell is recognized as a subject matter expert in the psychology of bias and how bias might impact law enforcement professionals. She speaks routinely on a national basis on this topic and provides consultation and training to law enforcement agencies across the country.

With law enforcement practitioners and national experts on psychology on implicit bias and funding from the cops office, she's developed the docket fair and impartial training, excuse me, fair and impartial policing training program which is the number one training program used by law enforcement in North America.

Commissioners, please again note that Dr. Fridell will need to leave immediately after her testimony and will entertain questions for her following her testimony. Thank you for joining us today, Dr. Fridell and you're recognized. Dr. Fridell?

Operator: Please make sure you haven't placed your phone on mute.

Dr. Lorie Fridell: Okay, can you hear me?

Phil Keith: Yes, we can hear you now, Dr. Fridell

Dr. Lorie Fridell: So Commissioners, President Trump's executive order that this commission was quote "to study ways for American law enforcement the most trusted and effective guardians of our communities". So I speak to you today about an important vehicle producing both community trust and policing effectiveness, and that is implicit bias training for police.

As a brief science backdrop, let me share that society assumed for many years that prejudice took just one form and we now know that as explicit bias. An example of explicit bias is a racist whose biases are conscious and whose discriminatory behavior is intentional.

In 1989, the social psychologists discovered implicit bias. And we learned that even well-intentioned people have biases that can impact perceptions and behavior. So the purpose of implicit of bias training is to bring this science to law enforcement.

There is a range of quality of training programs, but to me, good implicit bias training is not accusatory. Instead, the objectives of a quality training program are to share the science of implicit bias; discuss how implicit bias might manifest in the law enforcement profession; and then provide the officers and deputies with skills to produce impartial policing.

Now regarding this last element, the skills needed vary by whether the training participants are officers, supervisors. Excuse me. Regarding this last element, the skills needed vary by whether the training participants are officers, supervisors, mid-managers or command.

So for instance, for officers, we have to recognize that it's very difficult to eliminate our biases but officers and deputies can be taught science-based skills to manage them. Supervisors need to not only manage their own biases, but they need skills and techniques for monitoring their direct reports for potential bias behavior. And for intervening as appropriate when they suspect that biased behavior.

So evidence of success for implicit bias training comes from two sources. First of all, from officers on report of the impact of the training and second social psychological research on the effectiveness of these programs for various target populations.

In terms of officers on report, then again there is a lot of variation in the quality of the program, but our own program and others, too get very positive reviews from police professionals. Often they enter the classrooms defensive or even hostile but overwhelmingly they rate the training as a four of five on a five-point scale. Overwhelmingly, they report that the training will help them do their jobs better.

We also know about the success of implicit bias training from a significant and growing body of social psychological research that demonstrates its effectiveness. This research documents that people who have had implicit bias training have increased bias awareness and concern about discrimination, have increased motivation to behave in a bias-free manner and they commit to using bias management techniques. Most importantly, an increasing number of studies document changes in behavior. So what could this commission do?

First and quite simply, the commission could recognize the importance of implicit bias training. It could encourage agencies across the nation to train their personnel in this topic. Second, the commission could recommend a federal grant program that will ensure that agency leaders, number one, receive impartial policing training customized for their leadership role and second, technical assistance to help them strengthen their efforts to produce impartial policing. Such a

federal program would recognize that in order to produce impartial policing in an agency, it requires more than just administering implicit bias training to line personnel.

Various police leaders, trainers, academics have identified components of what I'm going to collectively call a comprehensive agency strategy to produce impartial policing. So what are the components of this comprehensive strategy? Just as examples, agency leaders in order to strengthen their efforts to produce impartial policing need to recruit individuals who can police in an unbiased fashion, implement safeguards to reduce internal bias such as what might be associated with promotions and discipline. Provide use of force training that reflect the science of implicit bias and implements safeguard to ensure that operational directives do not inadvertently promote biased behavior.

So a federal program could train agency leaders not just in the science of bias, but a comprehensive strategy for producing impartial policing. And this same program could produce and provide resources to facilitate the implementation of such a strategy.

So for instance, a chief or sheriff in this program would receive the leadership level training and then following that training have access to people or other resources to help him or her, for instance, identify and adopt sample questions to use a hiring; to identify applicants who can police in an unbiased fashion; reinforce the message of impartial policing with rollcall videos; infuse implicit bias lessons into academy and in-service training.

So this program could also promote providing bi-monthly updates to chiefs and sheriffs to arise them on promising practices as they are identified and inform them of what their colleagues around the nation are doing to promote impartial policing.

So in closing, commissioners, I return to President Trump's charge to this commission. He asked you to identify ways to promote trust and effectiveness in law enforcement and implicit bias training

is critical to achieving both of those objectives. This commission could recognize the importance of implicit bias training and ensure that agency leaders have the information and resources that they need to implement a comprehensive program to produce impartial policing. Thank you.

Phil Keith: Thank you, Dr. Fridell for your testimony today and certainly for your service. Commissioners, we'll now open up for questions for Dr. Fridell before she needs to leave the call. So we'll entertain questions now, from commissioners.

Commissioner Lombardo: Phil, this is Regina Lombardo with ATF. I have a question.

Phil Keith: Yes, ma'am, you're recognized.

Commissioner Lombardo: Dr. Fridell, I know that I've met you before and I know that you have delivered the training many years ago to ATF executives here. But I know also that you also do quite a bit of training on some of the local law enforcement that's out there. What has been your feedback so far on the training that you have provided to, I think, some of the bigger police departments like NYPD and others on the results and some of the effects?

Dr. Lorie Fridell: Good and so we did just finish a two-year project to implement implicit bias training to all 36,000 NYPD sworn personnel. And, you know, this was a tough implementation. Because it did come on the heels of the stop and first controversy. And so when we have a situation like that, we can expect a little bit of defensiveness or skeptical when we go into the classroom.

And we do, but we made the sale. Because even in that environment over 90% gave the training fours or fives. Over 95% rated the trainers well. And what really stuck in my mind was 80% of the participants, and we did train from top to bottom, said that this training was going to help them do their work and 80% said this training will help them personally.

So yeah, sometimes it tough when we get into the classroom because we've accused police of being racist for so many years. They're defensive. But really the feedback we've been getting has been overwhelmingly positive.

Commissioner Lombardo: Thank you for that. I appreciate it. I appreciate your work.

Dr. Lorie Fridell: Thank you.

Phil Keith: Other commissioners with questions? Other commissions with questions for Dr. Fridell? Thank you, Dr. Fridell for your testimony today and certainly for service. And we appreciate you appearing for the panel today. We hope you have a great afternoon.

Dr. Lorie Fridell: Thank you for this opportunity.

Phil Keith: Our next distinguished panelist today is Chief Daniel Slaughter who is the Chief of the Clearwater Police Department in Florida. Chief Slaughter began his career with Clearwater Police Department in 1992 and rose through the ranks to become chief in August in 2014.

He has earned an undergraduate degree from the University of South Florida and he serves on the Board of Directors with Police Executive Research Forum and is the 12th district director for the Florida Police Chief's Association. Thank you for joining us today, Chief Slaughter and you're recognized.

Chief Daniel Slaughter: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and thank you commissions. Good afternoon. Just a little geography, City of Clearwater is 26 square miles in Pinellas County, Florida. That little peninsula that makes Tampa Bay. We have 245 officers, 125 civilians and we serve a population of about 117,000. Our core organizational principles center around the preservation of life,

commitment to excellence, building community champions and then following the principles of Sir. Robert Peel.

In order to build trust and legitimacy between communities and law enforcement agencies, I respectfully request the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice to consider the following: Promote, encourage law enforcement culture to embrace their role of being a first responder with respect to being the first to defend and protect civil rights and basic human rights; promote and encourage all law enforcement agencies to provide training and implicit bias; and promote and encourage all law enforcement agencies to establish programs that promote an intentional non-enforcement, face-to-face contact between officers and citizens in neighborhoods of the greatest need.

In Clearwater, we continue - we will and we'll always continue to be an agency that seeks to continually improve in the category of community trust. We believe that no level of community trust is enough. That we believe that people trust people and that people build relationships not technology.

And that’s to the organization's benefit. The trust of police is going to be earned through the positive interactions of police officers with community members, one encounter at a time. And we believe that policing that is not bias-free reduces the community trust of the police.

And we believe we need to promote tools that build an organizational culture that seeks to be bias-free. We know implicit bias will exist and we all have it. But we also know if we become aware of implicit bias, we can adjust our behavior and adapt around it.

Simply put, a police organization must have an awareness of and accept the presence of implicit bias and use that knowledge to look for it and address it aggressively. A police department must

make it clear during the hiring process and onboarding process of the organizational commitment to fair and impartial policing.

Questions presented to police candidates are just as important to elicit a response as they are to communicate to the candidate the organizational values of the police department. The curriculum presented to the police candidates during an onboarding process also communicates to these new hires and these new police officers what the organization's values are.

For the Clearwater Police Department, this includes introducing new police officers to implicit bias training and the history of police work early on in the process. During the onboarding process, a new police officer with the Clearwater Police Department has provided a publication by Chuck Ramsey, titled, the Challenge of Policing a Democratic Society, a Personal Journey towards Understanding.

In this publication, Chuck Ramsey educates the reader on the obligations of the police to be first responders when basic human and civil rights are threatened or denied. New police officers are required to write an impact statement on this article which facilitates a discussion on ensuring these new officers understand their highest responsibility is to protect all life, treat people with dignity and be first person to object to violations of civil liberties or civil rights including policing that is not bias-free.

New Clearwater police officers are introduced to the concept of implicit bias. They're also the training is reinforced by department policy and scenario-based training. The department conducts fair and impartial policing administrative reviews annually to review our policies and potential improvements and evaluate police activity data.

However, police administration must recognize that data should drive more questions and do deeper levels of analysis to search for problems and identify corrective actions. Additionally, at

Clearwater, the management staff of the Clearwater Police Department receives regular reoccurring training and implicit bias at the command level.

Law enforcement agencies have the responsibility to evaluate the potential damage to public trust that can occur when implementing a crime-fighting strategy and to know that implicit bias exists is only part of the equation. Commanders and managers need to evaluate how this implicit bias could play role in the crime-fighting strategy and ensure that strategy is in full agreement with the policy of bias-free policing.

Law enforcement leaders cannot simply provide implicit bias training to staff, check a box and suspect that it will improve community trust. Interestingly, but not surprising, certain strategies can reduce both or can both address bias and improve community trust.

Contact theory indicates bias can be reduced by having positive contacts with counter stereotypes and research has also shown that face-to-face non-enforcement interaction between police and community members in the area of greatest need can build trust and satisfaction with the police. And in Clearwater, we accomplish both by a dedicated program where officers park their vehicle, walk the neighborhood and talk to citizens and they must do so in a non-enforcement manner.

So in conclusion, the community's trust is required for police departments to be effective, public approval, respect of the public and cooperation are words prevalent in the principles of Sir Robert Peel. Organizations need to continually evaluate the impact of the strategies and operations in how they can reinforce or reduce implicit bias in their workforce and in the public.

And educating law enforcement on the history of policing and core principles of the profession and implicit bias will empower police officers to be the instrument of positive change to the community continues to demand.

Law enforcement leaders will need to be surgical in their policing strategies continually evaluating those strategies to ensure they are bias-free and procedurally just. So I, therefore, reiterate my request the commission consider, promote and encourage law enforcement agencies to build healthy organizational cultures by training officers in their role as protector of the constitution providing training in implicit bias and implementing programs that create intentional non-enforcement engagements in communities with the greatest need.

The current environment may have some believing that law enforcement profession is permanently broken and I continue to believe that almost all police officers are the most noble people on the planet and willing to do a very complicated job for the betterment of our communities and I thank you for your time, Mr. Chairman.

Phil Keith: Thank you Chief Slaughter for your testimony and certainly for your service to law enforcement. Our last distinguished panelist is Dr. David Klinger who is Professor of Criminology and Criminal Justice at the University of Missouri in St. Louis.

Prior to pursuing his graduate degree, Dr. Klinger worked as a patrol officer for the Los Angeles Police Department and the Redman Washington Police Department. In 1997, he was the recipient of the American Society's Criminology's Inaugural Ruth Cavan Young Scholar Award for outstanding early contribution to the discipline of criminology.

He has published scholarly manuscripts that address best practices, the use of force, how features of the community affect the actions of patrol officers and terrorism. His book, Into the Kill Zone, A Cop's Eye View of Deadly Force was published in 2004. Thank you for joining us today, Dr. Klinger. You're now recognized.

Dr. David Klinger: Thank you for having me. Can everybody hear me?

Phil Keith: Yes, sir.

Dr. David Klinger: Very good, the previous two panelists talked about aspects of culture in American Law Enforcement and I want to talk about different aspects of culture. And the primary goal of my testimony today is to further understanding amoung the commissioners and others who might have already looked at my written testimony about the need to develop something called safety culture in American Law Enforcement via developing mindfulness in police agencies and police officers. And the reason I think this is so important is that the flashpoint for so much of the tension between American Law Enforcement and the American polity is when police officers exercise their coercive powers.

And one of the things that we know from both research and experience and I outline some of the research in my opening paragraphs in my written testimony is that when police officers practice sound field tactics, they can reduce the levels of violence between themselves and citizens. Everything from minor levels of violence all the way up through and including the use of deadly force.

And one of the problems that we have is that despite we understand - despite the fact we understand that sound field tactics and when I say field tactics, I mean how police officers deploy the words that they choose. How they work together to resolve a potentially tenuous or violent situation. We know that there are certain things they can do.

But officers don't always do this well for whatever reason. They tend to slip. They tend to make mistakes and sometimes these mistakes that they make lead to tragedies where they can be injured or innocent citizen can be injured or a suspect could be injured unnecessarily.

And so I think the key to improving the performance of police officers in terms of reducing the levels of violence between themselves and citizens is figuring out ways to ensure that on a regular basis police officers exhibit the highest level of sound tactical performance in the field.

And one of the things that need to happen in terms of the cultural shift in terms law enforcement being able to move forward with improving the performance of line officers which after all are officers who are most regularly interacting with citizens is a need to make sound tactical practice a priority of the police organization.

And in my written testimony I point out that this notion of safety culture and the notion of mindfulness is rooted in some literature that explains how it is that people who are working in very high-risk environments can have low levels of negative outcomes.

And I just want to briefly talk the five principles of mindfulness and then the four aspects of safety culture and then I'll wrap up. Mindfulness consists of five inter-related attributes among members of organizations and organizational units.

And the first of these is something called a preoccupation with failure, and that means not resting on your laurels and not staying gee, everything went well in this interaction so therefore I don't need to improve it. But trying to figure out what could have gone wrong. Looking for the mistakes that were made instead of patting oneself on the back.

A second thing is something called reluctance to simplify interpretations. And oftentimes what happens in police fieldwork is officers have to figure out what is going on in a given situation. And they put their imprint on the definition of the situation early on and then don't get additional information that might shift their understanding of what's going on, which leaves open the possibility - excuse me, which excludes the possibility of figuring out alternative ways of resolving something.

Then the notion of sensitive to operations, paying attention to changes in the environment when officers are interacting with citizens and so that they can then adapt to what is going on in the moment as opposed to hueing to this initial definition of the situation.

And then something called commitment to resilience which means always being alert to the possibilities that problems can arise and then having a mindset and the capacity to address problems before they propagate. So for example, if a police officer senses that an individual is starting to get aroused and upset about something, seeking to calm them. That's a commitment to resilience. Being able to build into your models with how you're going to interact with people, the possibility that you're going have to use multiple methodologies to resolve a situation.

And then finally deference to expertise. And deference to expertise is simply making sure as a police organization that you have the right people in the given interaction between police officers and citizens. So for example, if the line officers understand that they're dealing with someone who has - in a mental health crisis, and there are mental health services available either from a crisis intervention trained officer or outside the police organization. Getting those people there to assist.

And then shifting out of this notion of developing mindfulness and directly into safety culture. And this aligns a little bit with what Chief Slaughter was talking about. This developing a culture that insists that you do the right thing. And one of these things is the notion of a reporting culture.

And a reporting culture is a culture where everybody in the organization feels emboldened to notify the powers that be above them if something isn't being done correctly, not ratting out an officer necessarily. But rather saying hey, this didn't work itself out well, sergeant, let's talk to the lieutenant and the captain about how we can do things better.

A just culture is a culture with the police organization where punishments for mistakes are rare because you don't assume that an officer who made a mistake, excuse me, did so intentionally.

Punishments that are meted out when an officer makes a mistake are fair and organizational members are rewarded for providing information about problems. And that loops back into the notion of reporting culture.

And then a flexible culture is a culture where the organization subunits and individuals within the organization have the freedom to use the power that they have to adapt to changing circumstances whether that is in a given situation in the field. Or whether that is something more generally about how the organization is going to more toward as it recognizes that it's not doing as well as it could bringing in new policies, procedures and the Chief alluded to.

And then finally, a learning culture is one where safety-relevant information is available to all organizations, members who might benefit from it. And the key point here is that if a lesson is learned by a small group of officers, let us say under Chief Slaughter's command who are working a particular shift, they don't share that with the rest of the police department then that lesson gets lost for the rest of the police organization. And so this notion of a learning culture is one where the organization is constantly calling upon the line officers to explain to each other and then to the supervisors throughout the organization and then it goes to the managers so that it is - the organization is constantly learning how to do a better job.

I get into some fine-grain detail in my written testimony and then in some of the citations that I listed about how it is that police organizations can develop review panels and how perhaps states and regions could develop review panels to look at situations where police officers engage in forceful action, particularly the use of deadly force, to see if we can learn from things.

So not only would the learning environment, excuse me, the learning organization be just Clearwater but throughout the state of Florida and throughout the nation when Clearwater learns something vital about how to improve its performance.

And I think that if we can get policing to shift its gaze towards the notion of mindfulness and developing safety culture that over time the performance of the police will be better. The effectiveness of police in terms of resolving potentially violent situations with either no violence or the least amount of violence will go up, and that this will then increase the trust between the police and the polity, which are the two goals of the commission in terms of figuring out ways to increase trust and effectiveness.

And finally, if we are able to increase trust, increase effectiveness what we're going to be able to do is reduce the level of violence between officers and citizens and ultimately save a host of lives, which is what I and many other people in law enforcement have been trying to accomplish for many, many years: figuring out how to reduce the volume of violence, figuring out how to save lives. Thank you.

Phil Keith: Thank you Dr. Klinger for your testimony and certainly for your service. Commissioners, we're now open for questions for Chief Slaughter and Dr. Klinge). Commissioners with questions please state your name prior to your question and direct that question to the specific panelist or to both panelists.

Just as a reminder to the Commissioners your mics are hot at all times. Thank you. And with that, we'll open up for questions for Commissioners - questions from Commissioners for our panelists.

The Chair has a question in general for our panelists. A previous panelist had discussed the absence of empirical research to support implicit bias. Can you advise us of your knowledge experience with empirical research that would show implicit bias training does in fact have an impact?

Dr. Klinger: Unfortunately Lorie is the one that's on top of that. What I can say is that in the academic world concerns about the validity and reliability of implicit bias instruments is something that is up for

grabs, and so there is no - by no means a consensus in the social psychology world about the efficacy of any particular implicit bias instrument to identify precisely what is going on.

I don't want to get too deep into the woods but that's from the academic world. In terms of evidence that it actually improves police performance that would be a whole different issue. And on that point, one of the sad things that those of us in the academic world have been struggling with literally for decades is the lack of good evidence about a variety of things.

So, for example, in my written testimony I talk about evidence from the Metro-Dade Police/Citizen Violence Reduction Project and that was conducted back in the mid-1980s - mid- to late 80s.

That was never replicated so we don't have anything other than that from essentially a generation ago about the effectiveness of that type of tactical training. And then until quite recently, we didn't really have a good notion of what I consider to be the most important aspect of police performance, and that is the use of deadly force.

Chuck Ramsey and some other Commissioners I know are quite knowledgeable about this fact and have been champions of trying to figure out ways to get better data. We finally are getting some decent data on people who are killed by police bullets, but we still don't have any real good data on the number of people who were shot by the American police or the number of times police officers fire at citizens and miss.

And so I know I'm a little bit far afield from your query about implicit bias, but I'm simply trying to say that the lack of sound information about implicit bias in terms of its effectiveness in field operations is mirrored by a lack of information about a lot of things including the ultimate police action, which is the use of deadly force.

Dr. Lorie Fridell: And this is Lorie Fridell in on the call although...

Dr. Klinger: Okay.

Dr. Lorie Fridell ...I'm in a car. Can I take that? All right. So yes. No, it's a very good question and we do have information on the effectiveness of implicit bias training although not yet with the police population.

I mentioned a couple of things that research has shown and I didn't bring my testimony into the car with me, but people who have had the training are more motivated to be unbiased. They are - and they have the intention to reduce discrimination.

They have intention to manage their skills. And then the last thing I said, which was most important, is there are studies that show that implicit bias training can reduce bias behavior. Again we don't have this information for police populations.

We actually expect a couple of evaluations to come out during the summer and fall, but I want to mirror and reinforce what Dr. Klinger just said because the ability to detect changes in bias behavior in police in the field is an incredibly tough social science aspiration.

So even in those evaluations I - even though I do think that we impact behavior in the field I think it would be very difficult for an evaluation to detect that. I hope that's responsive.

Phil Keith: Yes ma'am. Thank you, Dr. Lorie. Chief Slaughter, we want to give you a chance to respond.

Daniel Slaughter: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I think I would like to point out that although I think your question's got merit, I think the value that I receive as an organization from the implicit bias training is the expanded ability to evaluate and to have valuable discussions not only with the public but internally as an organization about the presence of bias.

And I even - as we talk to our new officers about it I even use it as a mechanism for - help them understanding others. So it - the - a lot of the material is brought forward in the - or presented in a manner that is about the actions police take and how implicit bias may impact their decision-making.

However, I think it's just as important for an officer to understand the person that they're standing across from in the field and the presence that they may have, their own certain implicit bias and not necessarily internalize some behaviors that they may have to deal with in the field.

I just know from looking at certain data that we've had whether or not the bias is accurate and Dr. Fridell's book even talks about just because the data doesn't look - looks bad doesn't necessarily mean it's the evident - a presence of bias. But I think in the community and trying to build trust I think we got to recognize that from the perspective of the community it very well can be creating a level of distrust that we need to always be mindful of.

So the tremendous value that I believe our organization has received from being an early adopter of this training is that it's allowed us from the management perspective to look at our practices and make sure that we don't make certain scenarios or situations worse in the eyes of our community and be very prudent and diligent in making sure we demonstrate our commitment to the advisory. Thank you, sir.

Phil Keith: Thank you, Chief Slaughter. I have one follow-up question to Dr. Klinger. You mentioned the learning culture. Could you cite some examples of agencies that you feel like have a learning culture?

Dr. Klinger: Sure. What I would do is I would drive that down not to a particular agency but rather to units within agencies. And so, for example, special weapons and tactics teams, at least the special weapons and tactics teams that are good, the ones that I've met with over the years and spent a

lot of time with - whenever they have a situation where they are on a call-up and let's just say it's a generic barricaded gunman who is by himself and they utilize their negotiation skills and put a little bit of pressure on the suspect and he surrenders.

What they do after that is over is they sit down as a group and talk about exactly what happened, making sure that, for example, the - that the long rifle person and the observer who's with him or her understands what the entry team was thinking about, understands what the negotiators were doing, so on and so forth and then try to identify points where maybe next time they could do something better so that would be one example of sub-organizational learning cultures.

So far as any particular law enforcement agency that I could point to or up and down the entire chain that is something that goes on. I'm not aware of it.

Phil Keith: Thank you Dr. Klinger.

Dr. Klinger: Yes sir.

Phil Keith: Commissioners with questions for our panelists.

Dr. Klinger: Could I amend that statement that I just gave sir?

Phil Keith: Yes. Yes sir, Dr. Klinger.

Dr. Klinger: Yes. Yes, there are police departments around the country that are committed to developing learning cultures in terms of their review processes when officers use deadly force but that's a fairly narrow band.

So, for example, the City of Tucson, Arizona, both the LAPD and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department - what they have is they have a group that does a tactical review when an officer-involved shooting occurs to try to find points of learning that they can then pass on.

However, because officer-involved shootings, fortunately, are quite rare events there's a whole slew of situations where officers are involved in either lesser uses of force, or situations where they were able to resolve a situation short of using deadly force that go by the wayside in terms of having an opportunity to learn from them.

And one of the points I make in my - one of my pieces that I cited in my written testimony is the importance of crafting a constant review within the organization about all sorts of things so that you could get true learning culture as opposed to a learning culture that is focused on a narrow slice of the actions of your officers. Thank you.

Phil Keith: Thank you Dr. Klinger.

(Crosstalk)

Daniel Slaughter: Mr. Chairman, its Dan Slaughter. If it's okay with you I wouldn't mind adding a couple of items to this topic.

Phil Keith: Chief you're recognized.

Daniel Slaughter: Thank you, sir. I just - there are some resources that I think are kind of emerging that are available that are implemented in some organizations. There's an - a Web site referred to as LEO Near Miss in which case officers are able to share contacts and incidences from various levels of police action whether it's from - as simple as a citizen contact all the way up to the application of

force, and it does allow for lessons to be learned in a similar format to how the industry in the - of, you know, airline industry and the medical industry share stories.

Many organizations have internal groups that look at a variety of levels or actions of officers. I know in our organization we have what's called an Officer Safety Committee in which case we look at police action all the way from a traffic stop up to the use of force levels of, you know, to the highest level to evaluate them, to share those experiences and keep the organization improving and the individual employee improving so that they can almost get kind of that critique and kind of hone their skills and learn from the experience.

Camden County, New Jersey just - their police department uses body cameras and their strategy to kind of keep the organization learning and moving forward is to evaluate those videos like a professional sports team looks at the game videos or the game tapes. And so there are some really good examples I think of organizations that are doing just that and I think it's - be - going to become more prevalent in the future. Thank you sir.

Phil Keith: Thank you Chief. Commissioners with questions for our panelists. Commissioners with questions for our panelists. Hearing no further questions let me thank our panelists once again for your time and your most valuable testimony and the responses to the questions from our Commissioners.

On behalf of Attorney General and his leadership team of Rachael Bissex and Jeff Favitta and all the Commissioners, your contributions today are most sincerely appreciated and will assist this Commission in their deliberations and work.

Also please check the President's Commission page for additional updates, documents and information on the Main Justice Web site. We'll update it regularly when information is available for posting.

As I had mentioned yesterday we'll be holding an executive session next Tuesday, July the 7th. Commissioners will be receiving the Outlook calendar invite for this two-hour session, and we will only have one additional hearing next week, which will be on Wednesday, July the 8th.

More information on both of these events will be sent later this week. Our last hearing this week will be tomorrow, Thursday, July the 2nd and we'll hear from panelists regarding the topic of respect for law enforcement. Wanted to make sure we note for the record dean that Commissioner Rausch has joined the call. Commissioner Rausch our thoughts and prayers are with you.

David Rausch: Thank you.

Phil Keith: We also want to once again thank the FBI for the use of their teleconference network and for the support for all of our Commission hearings. Are there questions or comments from Commissioners? If there's no further business before us today the President's Commission is adjourned. Thank you again Commissioners for your continued dedication and commitment to the work of this historic Commission.

Male 1: Thank you, Phil. Appreciate it.

(Crosstalk)

Phil Keith: Thank you, guys.

Male 2: Thank you, Phil.

(Crosstalk)

Operator: We thank you gentlemen for your participation. This concludes today's teleconference. You may now disconnect.