



Introduction

“As California goes, so goes the nation.”

California leads other states in the implementation of community-oriented policing. The state’s accomplishments are even the more impressive given the cultural and demographic diversity of its population and its complex organizational and legal regulatory environment. Nonetheless, while pockets of excellence in standardized police-youth interactions exist throughout the state, there remains a strong need for a more cohesive, unified, developmentally-centered approach to policing today’s youth that is clearly stated and robustly enforced.

Youth occupy a unique, often ambiguous, place in families, communities, schools, government services and law. The lack of clarity and consensus around what behavior by this age group is normative and how to legally treat youth often places police departments in difficult situations. Because funding for community social, health and mental health services has been dramatically cut, police are often called upon to settle family disputes and discipline children in school. Problems once perceived as best handled by referrals to social service and mental health agencies, now frequently fall into the laps of police to address—even if the problem is not criminal or safety-based. As a result of these conflicting perceptions, police interacting with youth today are expected to fill a greater variety of contradictory roles for which they receive little training.

California’s law enforcement leaders have the opportunity to build upon strengths and provide urgently needed leadership during a time of turbulence and seismic changes in policing policies, practices, and expectations. This series of issue briefs is designed to arm chiefs and sheriffs with critical information on key factors to consider as they navigate police-youth interactions in the 21st century. This Introductory brief provides an overview of considerations in policing today’s youth, while others in the series offer targeted information on issues such as the Teen Brain; School-based Police Officers; and Public Safety Career Pipeline Programs.

Policing Youth Today

The 1990s ‘tough on crime’ mentality moved the criminal justice system to treat youth more like adults and to increase sanctions for certain offenses. This movement tended to more harshly punish poor youth and youth of color. Since then, the pendulum has begun to swing back toward a less severe view of adolescent behaviors. A growing body of evidence tells us that treating youths like adults not only fails to

correct behavior, but it can also increase recidivism and violence. The pendulum shift is also partly explained by neuroscientists' findings that the teen brain differs significantly from the brain of adults, and therefore requires a different policing approach. For example, the National Institutes for Health and Mental Health (NIHMH) has acknowledged that teens perceive, process, and respond with more primitive parts of their brains than adults. Hundreds of articles have been authored on the implications of these brain differences on youths' capacity to form intent and to understand the consequences of their actions. Today, one fifth of America's teens are estimated to have one or more diagnosable disorders, usually anxiety-related.

In addition, research on the effects of trauma in forming children's perceptions of the world has created a new lens through which we can interpret some of their behaviors. The value and significance of these neuroscientific discoveries should not be underestimated. It is in law enforcement agencies' and their officers' best interest, to implement developmentally appropriate, trauma-informed approaches to responding to children and youth at every interaction—from domestic violence calls involving the arrest of a parent to the arrest of youth for gang-related violence.

The Teen Brain & the U.S. Supreme Court

The U.S. Supreme Court has made the adoption of a developmental approach to policing youth the focus of all Court decisions on juvenile justice issues since 2005. Discoveries about differences in the capacity of teen brains' functioning was given formal judicial notice by the U.S. Supreme Court in 2005 in *Roper v. Simmons*, which outlawed the use of the death penalty for crimes committed by youth under the age of 18.

The *Roper* decision was informed by dozens of friend-of-the-court briefs citing neuro-scientific research. In the majority opinion, Justice Anthony Kennedy wrote, "A lack of maturity and an underdeveloped sense of responsibility are found in youth more often than in adults...often result in impetuous and ill-considered actions and decisions...that 'adolescents are overrepresented statistically in virtually every category of reckless behavior.'"¹ He cited evidence that teens, "are more vulnerable to negative influences and outside pressures, including peer pressure..." and that their character, "is not as well formed as that of an adult." He concluded that, "their irresponsible conduct is not as morally reprehensible as that of an adult."²

The *Roper* case and two that followed, *Graham v. Florida* (2010) and *Miller v. Alabama* (2012), all dealt with legal questions surrounding differential treatment of youth. The Court's decisions reflected the nation's growing awareness of youth's inability to fully form intent and understand consequences.

In the 2011 decision of *JDB v. North Carolina*, the U.S. Supreme Court spoke directly to police and juvenile courts about the role age plays when police need to determine custody, and states that youth are entitled to *Miranda* warnings. Writing for the Court, Justice Sotomayor states that stakeholders, starting with police, need to treat youth differently:

"[O]fficers and judges need no imaginative powers, knowledge of developmental psychology, training in cognitive science, or expertise in social and cultural anthropology to account for a child's age. They simply need the common sense to know that a 7-year-old is not a 13-year-old and neither is an adult."³

State courts are applying the "reasonable child standard" identified in *JDB*, namely asking how a youth would perceive their circumstance, to ensure that officers take into account a youth's age in determining whether or not the youth believes they are free to go—or not. This requires officers to be aware that while youths' fear of

1. Supreme Court of the United States. "Opinion of the Court, *Roper vs. Simmons*." (2005). <http://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/04pdf/03-633.pdf>

2. Ibid.

3. Supreme Court of the United States. "Opinion of the Court *J.D.B vs. North Carolina*." (2011) <http://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/10pdf/09-11121.pdf>

authority and incarceration are useful leverage for obtaining information, compliance and confessions—they also lead youth to be unaware of their right to due process protections and need to be *Miranda*-ized earlier and often. Since 2011, state courts have interpreted police conduct to use youths’ statements using *JDB v. North Carolina* in over 20 cases nationally—half of those cases have been heard in California.

Together, these four U.S. Supreme Court decisions are impacting key aspects of police/youth interactions, including:

- adequacy of *Miranda* warnings provided to youth;
- interview and interrogation practices used by law enforcement⁴; and
- use of force, including restraints, especially in schools, and especially with children with special needs and mental health issues.

The Role of the Chief in Establishing Police/Youth Interactions

Perhaps of all groups, youth are best served by agencies’ adoption of the community policing model triad—problem solving, community partnerships, and organizational reform. Law enforcement leadership must demonstrate in word and deed the importance of using effective practices with youth. To meet communities’ changing expectations, and to adhere to state and federal law, the Police Foundation suggests law enforcement leaders consider the following when determining their approach to policing youth.

1. Develop a Vision for Positive Police-Youth Interactions.

Leadership should begin by envisioning and articulating, with the community (including youth), the qualities of a **positive police-youth interaction**. Communicating expectations enables both police and community advocates to be aware of each others perspectives and how those affect interactions. The exercise of envisioning this ideal has the added benefit of enabling both police and community advocates to perceive each other’s point of view and experience, and to search together for common ground.

Leaders must clearly articulate how officers can integrate the agency’s vision of best outcomes with the unique characteristics and special demands of policing a group of citizens who are not fully formed, highly regulated, and often poorly supported. It is essential that police departments view youth as resources, not problems, in need of connection, not isolation, and help to steer them toward opportunities to build mastery and competence. As the table below illustrates, this represents a significant, and urgently needed, departure from traditional policing of youth:

	TRADITIONAL JUSTICE	POSITIVE YOUTH JUSTICE
TARGET	Youth Deficits	Youth Strengths
GOAL	Control	Attachment to Adults/ Peers/Social Contract
STRATEGY	Deter, isolate, punish, treat as ill	Connect & Engage
TACTICS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sanctions • Supervision • Services • Isolation/Marginalize 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-establish youth bonds with community • Connect youth and family with pro-social activities • Build on youth assets and strengths

Source: Jeff Butts et al., *Positive Youth Justice: Framing Justice Interventions Using the Concepts of Positive Youth Development* (2013)

4. Departments are well advised to ensure their *Miranda* warnings are written at a developmentally appropriate level, and to conform their interview and interrogation practices with those set forth by the International Association of Chiefs of Police in their Training Key 652 and their outstanding report on interrogation practices, *Reducing Risk*.

2. Institute Policies and Practices that Reflect a Developmental Approach to Interacting with Youth.

Department policies and procedures are key to ensuring adoption and consistent use of practices. Policies and procedures must reflect the Chief's vision for youth interactions. They must reflect both the letter and intent of the current jurisprudence on treatment of juveniles.

Departments are well served by adopting clear guidelines about how to identify age-appropriate practices for conducting interviews, interrogations, serving *Miranda* warnings, use of force, and otherwise interacting with youth. In an effort to reduce biased policing and promote procedural justice, some departments' preambles to juvenile policies identify factors that officers may not consider during their interactions with youth.

Beyond instances where officers must interact with youth in response to calls for service for youth offending, policies and procedures must also guide officers' approach to interactions observed by youth. Adopting trauma-informed policies and practices is key for ensuring positive police/youth interactions. In this realm, California law enforcement agencies have distinguished themselves nationally for recognizing the importance of ensuring protection, care, and support for youth who observe a parent being arrested, and for youth who are exposed to domestic violence (DV). The Fresno Police Department's protocol for involving child welfare staff and domestic violence advocates to address the needs of children at DV incidents have become a national model. Chief Suhr of San Francisco has worked with community advocates and children of arrested parents to adopt policies and procedures that direct officers on ways to help mitigate the trauma of DV and parental arrest situations. The California Peace Officers Standards and Training Commission (POST) has developed an excellent 2-hour training module on this topic.

3. Provide Training to Equip Officers to Work with Youth.

Despite scientific findings and specific recommendations for integrating them into police practices from the courts, police officers—the gatekeepers and first responders in the system—are rarely trained to use this new information or properly handle resulting legal constraints. A 2011 survey of police chiefs conducted by the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP), found that few agencies provide in-service training on the topic of juvenile justice.

Similarly, a survey conducted by Strategies for Youth in 2013 found that about 1% of all academy training, or an average of 6 hours, focuses on juvenile justice. Rarely does this training include any instruction on ways for police to effectively communicate with youth, calm them down, reduce the risk of violence, increase likelihood of cooperation, or make use of best practices that include community based organizations. This represents a glaring and dangerous omission in officer preparation that should be addressed immediately. The National Academy of Sciences noted that “developmentally informed” policing is a “key step” for ensuring effective police/youth interactions.

The current challenge is to translate contemporary understanding of teen brain and behavior into practical responses and tactics for officers to use routinely. Effective training for police officers working with youth should include the following components:

- Understanding the impact of teen brain changes on teens' perceptions/processing & responses;
- Recognizing mental health issues & recognizing traumatic responses;
- Trauma-informed practice: Responding to trauma and avoiding causing it;
- Demographic and cultural factors that influence youth behaviors;
- Partnering with youth-serving community-based organizations; and

- Juvenile law for law enforcement, including understanding the workings of the juvenile court system, and how U.S. Supreme Court law is interpreted by state courts adjudicating youth at key junctures of police interactions with youth.

4. Develop and Sustain Community Partnerships.

In too many communities, social control of youth is considered to be the sole responsibility of law enforcement. Yet, effective social control also includes family, schools, social, health and mental health services, recreation, and business. In an ideal world, community members are committed to serving, supporting, and correcting youth through a variety of partnerships, and police are called in as a last resort. Police involvement of communities can make this ideal a reality.

In light of the fact that 80% of juvenile arrests are for non-violent offenses, and that 50% of incarcerated youth come from the child welfare system, police departments are well served when they make partnerships with community organizations a priority. These partnerships offer police departments opportunities to support youth and effectively correct behavior —without criminalizing or saddling youth with a juvenile record. Partnerships can increase community trust in, as well as cooperation with, their local police.

As communities increasingly turn away from arrest and incarceration, law enforcement partnerships with youth-serving community-based organizations help to develop a network of supports that address problems before they arise, thereby reducing calls for service. In addition, these types of outreach allow police officers to connect positively with youth, community leaders, and parents, and provide them with an opportunity to be viewed as mentors and role models.

Police, perhaps more than any other group of stakeholders, often view the juvenile justice adjudication system with frustration. Aside from not being routinely informed by prosecutors about the outcomes of cases, officers frequently complain that the system is either too lenient or too harsh. They typically cite long intervals between arrest and court appearances; youths' incomprehension of their experience in court; and inadequacy of post-adjudication oversight to argue that court interventions are not meaningful to youth.

Studies indicate that 60 to 70% of youth go to court once and only once in their life-time. For these youth, the experience of standing before a judge in juvenile court plays a deterrent role. But for other youth, the court system is wholly inadequate to address their needs or help them to make necessary changes in their lives. In essence, sending them to juvenile court drives these youths deeper into the system and makes it harder for them to get out. In contrast, diversion programs can capitalize on recent research regarding the positive impact of mentoring and structured programming, and on the strategic value of reducing the number of youth with juvenile records.

Law enforcement agencies from Oakland to Reedley are demonstrating the tremendous power and effectiveness of restorative justice and diversion as viable and effective alternatives to juvenile court. Restorative justice practices (RJPs) are increasingly being adopted because the response links a youth's behavior to the victim, whose voice must be heard by the offender, and specific, concrete actions are required for reparation. Key to RJPs are youth development approaches that require "re-knitting" the youth's tearing of the social fabric; inclusion and re-establishment of bonds; and action to repair the harm. The Reedley Police Department Peace Building Initiative, "repairs the damage caused by crime, and reduce[s] the frequency and severity of future offenses." As Lieutenant Leronne Armstrong of Oakland PD described the OPD's restorative justice and youth mentoring programs, "When you care, you find solutions." These approaches are more developmentally appropriate and more effective for youth than simple punishment, exclusion, or isolation.

California features one of the most effective approaches to addressing these elements—outreach, partnership, restorative justice and diversion programming—through its Police/Criminal Justice Magnet Academies in public high schools throughout the state. Being a national model, these academies appear to primarily offer students a highly structured environment in which to learn about policing—if they want. But the academies also offer a tremendous boon to youth who seek support and a way out of destructive peer groups; who need help developing a sense of purpose and structure. The academies require students to maintain good—but manageable—grades and are taught by public school teachers with police officers. In addition to the California core curriculum, students have opportunities to focus on law enforcement, constitutional law, criminal justice system practices, and community involvement. Whether students choose to become officers or not is of less importance than the opportunity to engage with officers in non-incident settings and benefit from their mentoring and leadership.

5. Identify Sources of and Work to Eliminate Racial Bias in Policing Youth.

The federal Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act (JJJPA) requires police departments to reduce disproportionate minority contact (DMC). Strong data collection systems, leadership from department Chiefs, and additional training for police officers can help departments meet these requirements.

In 2002, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) of the U.S. Department of Justice expanded states' obligations to address disproportionate minority treatment of youth. From 1988 to 2002, the Department directed states to reduce disproportionate minority *confinement* (i.e. detention, commitment); and in 2002, states were required to reduce disproportionate minority *contact* (i.e. from interactions with police to adjudication and commitment). A reason for this expansion was the Justice Department's growing awareness that racial disparities in confinement of youth of color would not be substantially reduced until the racial disparities of the youth coming "through the front door" were similarly reduced.

Youth of color who come in contact with police are significantly more likely to be arrested, detained, or referred to juvenile court than white youth for identical offenses.⁵ These wide disparities in arrest and referral rates in turn lead to disparities in confinement. Disparities are measured by a relative rate index (RRI), which looks at rates of representation of youth versus their membership in the general population at specific stages of involvement in the juvenile justice system. When the RRI exceeds 1.0 for a racial minority, such as African Americans or Latinos, it indicates overrepresentation of youth of color. When the RRI demonstrates a disparity pursuant to the requirements of the JJJPA, states are obligated to address the disparity.

Eliminating these disparities and addressing racial bias among police officers is among the most challenging and critical tasks that all police chiefs face and is key to a departments' legitimacy within a community. Few dispute that police interactions with youth of color are often confrontational, and marked by mutual distrust. Some studies have shown that automatic assumptions about youth of color could influence police interactions. Those assumptions include:

1. "Aging up" youth of color, believing them to be, on average, 4 years older than they are;
2. Assuming youth of color are already court-involved and inclined toward criminality; and
3. Believing that youth of color come from families that do not value their children.⁶

5. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP). US Department of Justice. "Disproportionate Minority Contact." http://www.ojjdp.gov/mpg/litreviews/Disproportionate_Minority_Contact.pdf

6. Goff, Phillip Atiba; Matthew Jackson; Brooke DiLeone; Carmen Culotta; and Natalie DiTomasso. "The Essence of Innocence: Consequences of Dehumanizing Black Children." *The Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 2014, Vol. 106, No. 4, 526-545. Accessed via <http://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/releases/psp-a0035663.pdf>

Studies suggest that youth of color enter into police interactions with a high level of fear and distrust, informed by traumatic personal experiences and America's racial history. They see these as lose-lose encounters, resulting in "damned if you do, damned if you don't."⁷ Their distrust, anxiety, and hostility can be heightened by some police practices, including the use of stop and frisk practices. They are further complicated by officers' response to calls for service from people who want police to investigate "suspicious" youth of color who may be assembling, walking, or parked in a car, but are not violating the law. It is critical that police departments take these issues into consideration when responding to calls for service and interacting with youth.

Many officers easily overcome the logjam of distrust and anger by relying on their charisma, explaining the reasons for their interactions with youth, and making efforts to reach out to youth throughout the year, instead of just at times of incidents.

However, some officers need support and oversight to more accurately read young people's responses and to overcome biases—even unconscious ones—that may affect their policing decisions. The growing scholarship on implicit racial bias—suggests that many individuals harbor biases about which they are unaware. This offers a new avenue for changing the quality of officers' interactions with youth of color. Some departments now offer workshops on implicit bias and require all officers to take the Implicit Association Test (IAT) online.⁸ Those departments that have shown a willingness to acknowledge and confront the reality of bias within their ranks often register significant improvements as a result of corrective actions. This is an area where leadership on the part of the police chief can lead to dramatic improvements in police/community relations.

Policing Youth in School

In no single area of policing is the use of a developmental approach more important than in the ever-expanding field of school-based policing. Placement of police in schools was initiated first in the 1980s to reduce drugs on campus and later as a safety measure in response to high visibility school shootings. Many good officers effectively police schools, develop strong mentoring relationships with youth, use arrest as a last resort, and protect youth from themselves and outsiders.

Others, however, lack critical knowledge about the unique aspects of a learning environment and the "teachable moment," and treat the school halls like any other "beat." Criminalizing student behaviors like shoving in the hall or defiance of authority can unnecessarily push students out of school and into the court systems. Often, little to no oversight of officers is provided, nor is collection of data on their conduct. Territorial tensions can develop between school administrators and police about whether certain behaviors should be handled by school disciplinarians or by law enforcement. These challenges can lead to school based officers who are criticized by students, parents, and youth advocates for overuse of arrest, and for unreasonable and excessive use of force and restraints on students, especially students of color and students with learning and emotional disabilities.

Increasingly, Chiefs are realizing that interactions with SROs (School Resource Officers) can have a powerful impact on how a community perceives its police department. Many studies have found that harsh, zero tolerance, disciplinary policies in public schools increase conflict and disorder and contribute to students' dropping out.⁹ At their 2013 Youth Summit, the IACP reported that chiefs recognized that a key role of police and public safety is to ensure youth complete their education and that school-based arrests must be a choice of last resort.¹⁰

7. Wiley & Finn-Esbensen, Tyler & Fagan articles.

8. International Association of Chiefs of Police. "Law Enforcement's Leadership Role in Juvenile Justice Reform: Actionable Recommendations for Practice & Policy." July 2014. Accessed via <http://www.theiacp.org/portals/0/documents/pdfs/JuvenileJusticeSummitReport.pdf>

9. American Psychological Association. "Are Zero Tolerance Policies Effective in the Schools: An Evidentiary Review and Recommendations." Vol. 63, No. 9, 852-862. Accessed via <https://www.apa.org/pubs/info/reports/zero-tolerance.pdf>

10. International Association of Chiefs of Police. "Law Enforcement's Leadership Role in Juvenile Justice Reform: Actionable Recommendations for Practice & Policy." July 2014. Accessed via <http://www.theiacp.org/portals/0/documents/pdfs/JuvenileJusticeSummitReport.pdf>

When law enforcement, school administrators, and youth advocates work together to find common ground and establish clear guidelines about police authority and conduct in schools, school policing can be effective. It is essential that police officers who are in daily contact with hundreds of adolescents be steeped in an understanding of adolescent psychology, focus on diffusing tensions, and be trained to work in sync with the disciplinary approach used by school officials.

Data Collection

As federal and state authorities increase their focus on law enforcement practices, accurate data collection—always important—will become even more essential as a tool for assessing the quality of police-youth interactions.¹¹ Yet many departments do not collect data on important indicators of the police-youth interactions. Analyzing known predictors of youthful offending-- including stop and frisk encounters, children who have witnessed domestic violence and/or the arrest of a parent, and children who have suffered abuse and neglect—predicate development of comprehensive, multi-faceted responses to youth.

At a minimum, every department needs to collect location of calls for service involving youth, arrest and citation data, information on charges and case outcomes, and the numbers of youth in the custody of the state's Department of Children and Family services. This data should be disaggregated by location, time of day, age of youth, race, and gender of offenders.

Data can tell Chiefs as much about *officer interactions* with youth as about juvenile offending patterns. Certain high rates of arrest—such as arrests for disturbing the peace, or for non-specific school-based behaviors—should warrant closer scrutiny, especially if youth of color are being disproportionately arrested for these. This information helps Chiefs identify where and what corrective actions may be required. Without these feedback loops, officers have no evidence of their impact and departments are hampered in oversight of practices, which can result in departments deploying limited resources in a manner that does not improve situations for youth and often, in fact, makes it worse.

Where Next?

Policing youth has become one of the most complicated and challenging areas of law enforcement. In the past year, a national spotlight has focused on policing in this country, particularly on how police interact with young people. This spotlight is likely to accelerate widespread demand for major changes in policing practices, with a focus on making police forces more responsive to the needs of the communities they serve. California has a head start in making these essential transitions, and now has an opportunity to become an even stronger leader in this area.

The Police Foundation recommends that police chiefs help their agencies make several necessary pivots. The first is to adopt a developmentally centered approach to police-youth interactions. This will involve articulating a clear vision of a positive model of police-youth relationships, as well as establishing clear guidelines and protocols. Most critically, Chiefs must ensure that police officers who regularly interact with youth receive the training, guidance, and feedback they need to maintain positive relationships, and reduce the likelihood of escalation or violence.

The second is to establish strong partnerships with community-based organizations. When youth and their families have access to resources and advocates, as they do through participation in restorative justice and diversionary programs, they view police not just as enforcers of the law, but also as members of a larger community.

11. In its guidance to law enforcement and school authorities in January 2014, the U.S. Department of Education made clear that it would focus on data collection reflecting SRO activities.

Finally, police should work diligently to reduce disproportionate minority contact and to wring racial bias out of interactions with youth. In all of these endeavors, strong and rigorous data collection, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, and age can help Chiefs to make necessary adjustments, establish priorities, and hold themselves and their officers accountable to the community they serve.

Policing is a challenging, difficult, and yet hopefully, rewarding profession. Congruously, policing youth can be uniquely frustrating and tremendously satisfying. In no area are the potential risks, and satisfactions, greater than when police interact with youth. These relationships can shape the future outlook of youth toward authority, the community, and the law.

When Chiefs provide their officers with the full range of tools, training, resources and support they need, they will reap enormous benefits in increased public safety, in stronger morale among their officers, in fewer violent or dangerous encounters, and in improved relationships with the community.

About the Project

The Police Foundation, with funding from the California Endowment and with the support of the California State Sheriffs' Association and the California Police Chiefs Association, has developed this series of issue briefs to address various components of a successful Police-Youth-Family-Community Partnership. These briefs are designed for California law enforcement leaders with a tool-kit that helps advance strategies around youth engagement. Other briefs in this series cover topics including the teen brain and school-based police officers.

About the Police Foundation

The Police Foundation is a national, non-profit, bipartisan organization that, consistent with its commitment to improve policing, has been on the cutting edge of police innovation for over 40 years. The Police Foundation's work is informed by available evidence and aims to increase public safety and strengthen communities. The professional staff at the Police Foundation works closely with law enforcement, judges, prosecutors, defense attorneys, victim advocates, and community-based organizations in order to develop research, comprehensive reports, policy briefs, model policies, and innovative programs that will continue to support the work of law enforcement personnel as it relates to increasing strong community-police partnerships.

<http://www.policefoundation.org>

About the California Endowment

The California Endowment is a private, statewide health foundation with a mission to expand access to affordable, quality health care for underserved individuals and communities, and to promote fundamental improvements in the health status of all Californians. Health Happens Here is the core of our work. It challenges us to think about people's health beyond the doctor's office and beyond the good vs. bad choices people make. In reality, our health happens where we live, learn, work and play—in neighborhoods, schools, and with prevention.

<http://www.calendow.org/our-story/>

About the California Police Chiefs Association

Established in 1966, the California Police Chiefs Association is an organization that represents municipal law enforcement agencies in California.

The State has been divided into 16 regions and the police chief representative from those areas is also a member of the Board. Each regional representative acts as the official liaison between the Association and Police Chiefs in the local area regarding issues related to the law enforcement community and the administration of municipal police agencies.

The California Police Chiefs Association is an influential participant in the State of California's legislative process. The Association stretches throughout the state and its membership is comprised of many well respected and nationally recognized Police Chiefs.

The objectives of the association are to promote and advance the science and art of police administration and crime prevention; and to develop and disseminate professional administrative practices, and to promote their use in the police profession; to foster police cooperation and the exchange of information and experience throughout the State; to bring about recruitment and training of qualified persons in the police profession; to encourage the adherence of all police officers to high professional standards of conduct in strict compliance

with the Law Enforcement Officer's Code of Ethics.

The California Police Chiefs Association committees offer involvement in working with peers to assess current issues in law enforcement and develop solutions, ideas and projects in response to those issues. The California Police Chiefs Association committees are active in developing publications, sample policies and guidelines which serve to assist members in their jobs. Standing committees of the Association include: Training, Standards & Ethics, Law & Legislation, Nominations & Past Presidents, Associate Member, Small Agency, Large Agency, Technology, Communication/Membership, and Retired Members. As contemporary issues are identified, ad hoc committees are established to provide guidance to the Association and its membership.

The political environment mandates that The California Police Chiefs Association speak on behalf of police leadership and for the law enforcement community in California. The California Police Chiefs Association provides the opportunity for a voice in the legislature by influencing public safety legislation through The California Police Chiefs Association Government Relations Program.

The California Police Chiefs Association Annual Conference provides the opportunity to participate in educational session, listen to keynote speakers on issues related to the administration of law enforcement agencies and the industry, and interact and network with other municipal chiefs of police.

<http://www.californiapolicechiefs.org/introduction>

About the California State Sheriff's Association

California State Sheriffs' Association (CSSA) is a nonprofit professional organization comprised of the 58 sheriffs along with thousands of law-abiding citizens throughout the state. The association was formed in 1894 for the purpose of giving California sheriffs a single effective voice. It was also formed for the purpose of sharing information and providing assistance to sheriffs and departmental personnel, thus enabling them to improve the delivery of law enforcement services to the citizens of this State.

Every sheriff works diligently with fellow sheriffs through CSSA to improve the profession and to elevate the law enforcement system through cooperation with other law enforcement agencies. As the sheriffs are constitutionally elected officials, the California legislature regulates their duties and responsibilities. The sheriffs serve as upholders for your public safety needs. CSSA functions as a legislative watchdog for the county sheriff and sheriff's personnel as well as for citizens on professional and law enforcement issues.

The California State Sheriff's Association's mission is to support the role of sheriff as the chief law enforcement officer in each California County and to speak as a collective voice on matters of public safety.

<https://www.calsheriffs.org/about-us.html>

Acknowledgements

The development of these issue briefs was led by Police Foundation Senior Policy Analyst Mora L. Fielder and Project Associate Mary Sigler. Also contributing were Police Foundation Vice President Blake Norton, Director of Programs Jennifer Zeunik, and Creative Communications Manager Mary DeStefano.

We appreciate the support and guidance of the following people:

Barbara Raymond, Program Director, The California Endowment

Barrie Becker, J.D., State Director and Special Projects Director for Fight Crime: Invest in Kids California, California Council for a Strong America

Lisa Thureau, Executive Director, Strategies for Youth

Leslie McGill, Executive Director, California Police Chiefs Association

Carmen Green, Executive Director, California State Sheriffs' Association

