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Abstract

The United States experienced unprecedented growth after World War II. America in the 60’s began to confront cultural, racial and value issues. Questions regarding brutality and unjust treatment by members of law enforcement towards minorities began to become more observed. March 2015 saw President Barack Obama’s Taskforce on 21st Century Policing begin to address this issue in their interim report. The task force identified law enforcement’s need to use new technology as a tool to improve the relationship with the citizens they are sworn to protect and serve. This finding was supported immediately by the Obama Administration. The goal of this qualitative study is to determine what effect body worn cameras worn by law enforcement have had on society. The use of body worn cameras by law enforcement is relatively new. The researcher felt the need to identify a sample group of a specific faction of law enforcement was important to this project. The sample group selected represented small cities/towns from a specific region in Illinois. Law enforcement executives from this specific region, which have body worn camera programs in place, were than interviewed on the effectiveness of their programs. The effect cameras have had on society is identified as positive. Cameras were shown to reveal negative and positive reactions from citizens as well as law enforcement. The results of this case study research project showed that racial discord and police brutality concerns were overshadowed by the economic constraints body worn camera programs create for small communities.
What Effect Body Worn Cameras Worn by Law Enforcement had on Society

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

American history has shown that over the course of time, the relationship between Law Enforcement and the communities they serve are constantly changing. Ever since law enforcement agencies were first established in the United States, law enforcement has been accused of abusing their power and using excessive force (Rights, 1981). Abuse of power by law enforcement for generations has been viewed as being a major issue. The use of force, lethal or non-lethal, by law enforcement has been seen by many communities as police brutality.

The complicated relationship between law enforcement and the communities they serve has been the focus of many protests, studies, Federal Commissions and Task Forces. Several past-Presidents have observed this divide. Commissions and Task Forces have been created to examine the cause of these problems. Several programs and policies have been created by these Commissions and Task Forces. Very few have been successful due to their inability to provide resolutions to solve the problems.

President Obama in March of 2015, created such a task force. President Obama’s Taskforce on 21st Century Policing was a by-product of recent police shootings involving minorities. A portion of the Task Force’s study was dedicated to the use of current technology for the identification and prevention of abuse and unnecessary use of force by law enforcement (Force, 2015). A significant outcome from the Task Force’s work was the development of programs, one of which included the use of body worn cameras by law enforcement.
November 19, 2014, Barak Ariel, William Farrar and Alex Sutherland published a randomized controlled trial on the effects of police body worn cameras on use of force and citizens’ complaints against the police. The question that was posed in this study was, “do body worn cameras reduce the prevalence of use-of-force and/or citizens’ complaints against the police” (Ariel, 2014). The test law enforcement agency was the Rialto California Police Department. A quantitative methodology was used in this study. Ariel, Farrar and Sutherland were able to provide a numerical conclusion that police body worn cameras reduced the prevalence of use-of-force by police as well as the incidence of citizens’ complaints against the police (Ariel, 2014).

October 18, 2014, Wesley Jennings, Lorie Fridell, and Matthew Lynch published another quantitative study that focused on law enforcement’s use of cameras. Officers from the Orlando Police Department participated in the survey used in the study. Numerical findings were published showing the success body worn cameras had on the officers in the project (Jennings, 2014).

Both studies found that body worn camera programs had a positive effect on the officers and citizens involved in the program. These studies, however, did not provide in-depth explanations by the officers or citizens on why they felt the body worn cameras were effective.

During the researcher’s thirty years of law enforcement experience, human behavior is always a major element in all encounters with citizens and law enforcement. The need to learn how body worn cameras have affected human behavior is just as important as numerical data.
The research that needs to be conducted must focus on participants in the program opinions regarding the success of body worn cameras and the relationship with citizens. The position the researcher has taken is to learn why participants feel the programs are effective or not effective. The data was collected using a qualitative methodology consisting of interviews. The aim of the study is to learn, why and how the program success will assist program coordinators in implementing additional body worn cameras initiatives nationwide.

Problem Statement

The current state of America’s distrust of law enforcement’s performance and the issue of body worn cameras by law enforcement is a highly debated topic. The implementation of body worn cameras by law enforcement has been slowly gaining momentum. Numerous cities have taken a wait and see approach on this controversial matter. A significant reason for this is attributed to the fact that cities do not know if this type of program will be successful. The lack of data and research on the effects body worn camera programs have on law enforcement and the public has not been fully explored. Knowing these effects will determine if more programs should be implemented.

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to discover the effects the use of body worn cameras worn by law enforcement has on society. The use of body worn cameras worn by law enforcement has on society is defined in two areas. The first is the change in behavior of citizens and Police Officers, in communities where body worn camera programs are in place, as observed by Law Enforcement Executives from those communities. The second is the cost-benefits related to these programs.
Research Questions

The researcher utilized a qualitative approach for this project. Research questions were developed in alignment with the problem statement, purpose of the study and to determine how this new trend in policing will affect society. The research questions that are addressed in the study encompass the following:

- **Central Question:** What effects have body worn camera programs had on citizens and the interaction between law enforcement officers?

- **Sub Question:**
  - What effects have body worn cameras had on morale of officers participating in the body worn camera programs?
  - What impacts have body worn cameras had on the public’s perception of law enforcement?
  - What is the cost-benefit that have stemmed from creating a body worn camera program?

Theory

Research questions used in a qualitative research project, are utilized to substantiate the validity of a theory within the project. The theory utilized in this project is deterrence theory. Deterrence theory can be traced back to the Classical school of criminology. Dating as far back as 1764 with Beccaria, 1789 with Bentham and 1748 with Montesquieu, the deterrence theory placed more emphasis on the certainty of punishment than on the severity of punishment. Gary Becker, in the late 1960s, stated that the theory’s components—certainty and severity of punishment—are more or less influential than the others depending on the risk. The certainty of punishment is more influential than the severity of punishment in the decision of whether or not
to commit crime if an individual is risk acceptant (Mendez, 2004). This theory indicates that an individual will not commit a crime because they are afraid of getting caught. As applied to this project, this theory holds that the independent variable of law enforcement’s use of body worn cameras to influence or explain the dependent variable of reducing negative effects on citizen’s and law enforcement officer’s interaction.

The issue of police brutality has been a problem since law enforcement organizations were created. The use of new technologies, such as body worn cameras, limits this researcher’s abilities to use data generated from other studies. The use of interviews of current law enforcement executives were the major source of new data for this project. The researcher provides historical background and significant facts through other sources. The literature utilized during this research project has been summarized in the following literature review.
CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

This literature review has been divided into three categories. The first area will focus on relevant historical situations that have shown the need to improve how law enforcement engages with their communities. The second portion entails recent and current events that have brought attention to the need for body worn cameras by law enforcement. The third part concentrates on opinions, research and factual documentation on the effects that could have resulted from the use of body worn cameras by law enforcement.

U.C. Rights’ *Who is Guarding the Guardians?* in 1981 discusses that since law enforcement agencies were established, they have been accused of abusing their power to include the use of excessive force (Rights, 1981). Cao Liqun and Bu Huang refer to a study conducted by Chevigny in 1969 on the prevalence of police abuse of power. Chevigny’s study concluded that citizen complaints about excessive physical force constituted a substantial proportion of all complaints reviewed in the study. Studies conducted on the incidences of excessive physical force, estimated that such incidents are infrequent (Liqun, 2000).

The torn relationship between law enforcement and the public was noticed as far back as the 1930s. The third degree and other forms of torture were employed by the police to combat the Prohibition and Depression induced “crime wave” of the twenties and thirties (Steinberg, 2007). Society never fully addressed the problem of police brutality due to the Great Depression and World War II. The 1960’s social protests brought police brutality back to the forefront. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., utilizing the media, brought attention to his nonviolent protests. Dr. King strategically manipulated situations that were consciously designed to provoke violent
white countermeasures that television and the press would translate into irresistible pressure for federal rights laws. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 was created to include protecting citizens from police brutality (Graham, 1980).

The 1970s and 1980s were seen as a time of free spirits. Equal rights regarding sex, race, and disability came to the forefront. Though trends in crime rates have continuously decreased over the years, America has become more aware of specific crimes to include Police brutality (Vick, 2015). The Los Angeles Police Department became imbroiled in police brutality allegations after the Rodney King incident in 1991. The results of the events were the creation of the Christopher Commission. The Christopher Commission was created to conduct a full and fair examination of the structure and operation of the Los Angeles Police Department, including the internal disciplinary and citizen complaint systems. The Christopher Commission found the existence of approximately 1800 officers with allegations of excessive force or improper tactics filed against them. The presence of such a large amount of complaints drove a wedge of distrust between Los Angeles Police and the community (Commission, 1991). A U.S. Civil Rights Commission report published after the King incident also found that blacks experienced a perceived pattern of widespread, endemic racism and physical and verbal abuse by law enforcement (Lawrence, 2000).

Research conducted on law enforcement’s actions began to focus on developing ways to prevent police brutality while it attempted to repair the relationship between law enforcement and their communities. Post-Rodney King resulted in Congress’ 1994 Crime Bill. A major portion of the crime bill was the implementation of Community Policing. Community Policing focuses on Philosophical, Strategic and Programmatic dimension on how law enforcement
interacts with society (Cordner, 1995). Even though citizens generally appreciated the “hands-on” approach used by officers, police brutality remained a concern.

President Clinton and U.S. Attorney Janet Reno in 1999, held the Strengthening Police-Community Relationships conference. The conference took the position that racial profiling was the cause for police actions. This position was supported through a poll that more than half of Americans believed that law enforcement actively engaged in racial profiling. Eighty one percent of the same people said that they disapproved. Northwestern University was given the responsibility of collecting data on all traffic stops conducted by law enforcement (Ramirez, McDevitt, & Farrell, 2000). The program is still active and reports of racial profiling have significantly been reduced. Nevertheless, police brutality has remained an issue.

The Chicago Tribune conducted an examination on thousands of murder cases filed in Cook County from 1991 to 2002. Two hundred and forty seven of these cases exhibited some form of police brutality was used to coerce confessions (Armstrong, 2002).

Steven Drizin and Marissa Reich in 2004 attacked police brutality from a more specific place. Drizin and Reich criticized law enforcement’s brutality during interrogations. The Innocence Project identified 142 cases where confessions were obtained through police beatings (Drizin & Reich, 2004). Studies on interrogation tactics by law enforcement have had a positive result on police brutality issues. Several states have learned from these studies and created laws that mandated all interrogations conducted by law enforcement must be video taped. The use of technology to regulate law enforcement’s actions was a by-product created by these studies.

Since early 2000, the issue of police brutality remains a major concern between law enforcement and society. The Cincinnati Police Department was the next major law enforcement
agency to take center stage on the topic of police brutality. A Cincinnati Police Officer has an encounter with an unarmed man named Timothy Thomas. The encounter results in Timothy Thomas becoming the 15th male black to be killed by the Cincinnati Police in five years. Three days of rioting, to include burning and looting, preceded federal intervention and the usual promises to improve relations between police and black residents.

August 2014, two Cincinnati Police Officers shoot Donyale Rowe to death during a traffic stop. Cincinnati’s Police Chief immediately publishes performance reviews of the officers, describes how Rowe had pulled a gun on the officers and releases video of the incident from the squad car’s camera. This incident results in minimal news coverage (Fisher, 2014).

August 2014, an unarmed Michael Brown is shot and killed by a Ferguson, Missouri police officer. Tension, due to years of acts of alleged police brutality, erupts into widespread violence and protests (Frankel, 2014). April 2015, Freddie Gray is arrested by Baltimore police officers. Freddie Gray sustains injuries during this incident that ultimately leads to his death. Hundreds of protesters march to Baltimore’s City Hall in protest of Gray’s death. Police Commissioner Anthony Batts during a press conference ultimately admits that his officers failed to follow procedures that could have prevented Gray’s death (Golgowski & Silverstein, 2015).

The fall-out from the latest social protests on police violence caused President Obama to create The President’s Task Force on 21st Century Police on December 18, 2014. The Task Force is Co-Chaired by Charles Ramsey, former Commissioner of the Philadelphia Police Department, and Laurie Robinson, Professor at George Mason University. The mission of the task force was to examine how to foster strong, collaborative relationships between local law enforcement and the communities they protect and to make recommendations to the President
on how policing practices can promote effective crime reduction, while building public trust (Force T. P., 2015). Baltimore Mayor Stephanie Rawling-Blake, during her testimony before the Task Force, stated that there is a need to build trust between communities of color and law enforcement. The need to stay vigilant to ensure police officers are respectful and accountable—while maintaining focus on providing safe communities (Rawlings-Blake, 2015). The Task Force separated their mission into six areas. Pillar three was dedicated to the use of technology by law enforcement. Findings by the Task Force were published on March 1, 2015. Recommendations for Pillar three included the use of Body-worn cameras by law enforcement. President Obama’s administration did not stop there. The U. S. Department of Justice on June 2, 2015, announced that applications for grant BJA-2015-4168, Body-Worn Camera Pilot Implementation Program. The purpose of the grant was to competitively solicit law enforcement agencies to seek funding to establish or enhance Body-Worn Camera Policy and Implementation Programs (Justice, Body-Worn Camera Pilot Implementation Program FY 2015 Competitive Grant Announcement, 2015).

Immediate interest emerged on all sides of the body-worn camera discussion. Utility, the leader in critical connectivity and mobile video for first responders, responded from the business stakeholders position on the issue. Utility commissioned a quantitative study to be piloted. The study, The American Sentiment toward Police Body-Worn Cameras, entailed a nationally representative survey conducted by ORC International. Completed December 11 -14, 2014, using 1007 randomly selected adults, 18 years old and older, living in the continental U.S. found that 71 percent of respondents were aware of President Obama’s recommendation. The greatest concern was when the cameras should be used. Eighty-two percent of Blacks, 77 percent of
Whites, and 74 percent of Hispanics felt that individual officers should decide when a camera should be manually started and stopped (Utility, 2014).

Discussion and debate over when, where, why and how body-worn cameras should be used, brought criticism and support from law enforcement as well as civil rights groups such as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU). Law enforcement proponents of the program felt that the devices could improve the behavior of both officer and citizen, while increasing officer safety, reducing use of force complaints. A study conducted by Jennings, Fridell and Lynch (2014) relied on baseline data of officers’ perceptions on the subject. The study found that officers were generally supportive of body-worn cameras, and that the devices could be beneficial in positively affecting relevant outcomes (Jennings, 2014).

The American Civil Liberties Union, ACLU, at the on-set of the discussion, announced their support for the use of cop cams for the purpose of police accountability and oversight (Sledge, 2013). However, the ACLU disclosed concerns about when the cameras needed to be turned off (Stanley, 2015). The need for the programs to be transparent was also a major concern of the ACLU (Roubini, 2014).

Time has shown that as our country has grown ethically, spiritually and technologically, laws and government regulations were always in a catch-up mode. Ignited by the social protests and new statistical findings, research was never conducted on law enforcement’s use of body-worn cameras until 2014. A quantitative study was conducted on Police Body-Worn Cameras in 2014. The study, utilizing the deterrence theory, tried to answer the question: do body-worn cameras reduce the prevalence of use-of-force and/or citizen’s complaints against the police?
The results of this study found that the number of complaints filed against officers dropped from 0.7 complaints per 1,000 contacts to 0.07 contacts per 1,000 contacts (Ariel, 2014).

The use of body-worn cameras by law enforcement is still in its infancy stage in regards to analysis. The limited amount of research that has been conducted was completed using a quantitative method. The research conducted for this study will take a qualitative approach. The researcher conducted interviews with high ranking police officials in law enforcement organizations that currently have body-worn cameras and policies in place. The researcher’s intent is to learn what each program is doing and how has the program affected society.
Methodology

Scholars contend that qualitative research can be distinguished from quantitative methodology due to numerous unique characteristics that are inherent in the design. Some of the common assumptions for using the qualitative method are;

1. Qualitative research occurs in natural settings, where human behavior events occur.
2. The researcher is the primary instrument in data collection.
3. The data emerges from a qualitative study are descriptive.
4. The data collected will be on participant’s perceptions and experiences and the way the phenomenon effects their lives.
5. The researcher is interested in understanding how things have occurred.
6. Objectivity and truthfullness are critical in both research methods. They differ in that the researcher seeks believability and truthfulness through a process of verification rather than through validity and reliability measures (Creswell, p. 205).

The qualitative strategy of inquiry used was Case Study. Case studies are a design of inquiry found in many fields, especially evaluation, in which the researcher develops an in-depth analysis of a case, often a program, event, activity, process, or one or more individuals. Cases are bound by time and activity, and researchers collect detailed information using a variety of data collection procedures over a sustained period of time (Creswell, p. 14). This research project analyzed the effect of body worn camera programs currently in place by law enforcement agencies and their effect on society.
The use of body worn cameras by law enforcement has not been implemented by all law enforcement agencies. Economics, politics and the fear of the unknown have become major factors in body worn camera programs not being implemented across the United States. Knowing this fact, the researcher was aware of the limited population for this project.

The participants are law enforcement agencies that currently have a body worn camera program within their agency. Since the research is a case study, the researcher explored the process, activities, and events related to the subject. The sample population consisted of four participants.

The task of identifying and creating a sample group of law enforcement executives to interview for this project was a significant challenge. The researcher began by setting parameters that would be used to help identify the sample group.

The parameters used for this study were;

- The number of law enforcement agencies eligible in the United States needed to be identified.
- The law enforcement agencies eligible, currently having body-worn camera programs, would then need to be identified.
- The selection of eligible agencies that have comparable demographics.
- Selection of agencies regionally located within the State of Illinois.

The responsibility of protecting and securing communities across the United States has been given to voluminous amounts of Federal, State and local law enforcement agencies. The everyday, boots on the ground, responsibilities fall to state and local agencies. A 2008 study by Brian Reaves found that 20,048 state and local law enforcement agencies and the 1.1 million law
enforcement members they employ took on these responsibilities. Table 1 represents these agencies by the number of employees.

Table 1 further provides a breakdown of the total number of sworn officers and non-sworn employees are in each category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of agency</th>
<th>Agencies</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Sworn</th>
<th>Nonsworn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All agencies</td>
<td>17,985</td>
<td>1,133,915</td>
<td>765,246</td>
<td>368,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 or more officers</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>326,197</td>
<td>230,759</td>
<td>95,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>94,168</td>
<td>60,124</td>
<td>34,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250-499</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>133,024</td>
<td>83,851</td>
<td>49,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-249</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>174,505</td>
<td>115,535</td>
<td>58,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-99</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>136,390</td>
<td>89,999</td>
<td>46,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-49</td>
<td>2,402</td>
<td>124,492</td>
<td>83,349</td>
<td>41,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-24</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>98,563</td>
<td>67,132</td>
<td>31,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>3,446</td>
<td>32,493</td>
<td>23,107</td>
<td>9,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>3,225</td>
<td>11,498</td>
<td>9,470</td>
<td>2,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>2,125</td>
<td>2,585</td>
<td>1,920</td>
<td>665</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Excludes agencies employing less than one full-time officer or the equivalent in part-time officers.
*Based on number of full-time sworn personnel.

Table 1 (Reaves, 2011)

Reave’s study also recognized the role of the local Sheriff’s Office. Table 2, also illustrates each Sheriff agency by the number of sworn officers, the total number of sworn officers and non-sworn employees as being 3063. An analysis of the data provided by Tables 1 and 2 shows that 21,048 or 84.8% of the State, Local and Sheriff agencies consist of agency size of 0-49 officers.

The Bureau of Justice Statistics noted, in their publication of Frequently Asked Questions, approximately 25% of law enforcement agencies in 2013 had implemented body
worn camera programs. The Bureau of Justice Statistics goes on to note that a body worn camera vendor estimates that 4000 to 6000 law enforcement agencies are planning to adopt or implement body-worn camera programs (Statistics, 2015). Identifying agencies, out of the 21,048 identified, that currently have body worn camera programs would have been an enormous task. Utilizing what has been learned from the President’s 21st Century Policing Task Force, the researcher was able to minimize the number of law enforcement agencies. The Bureau of Justice Assistance, a part of the Department of Justice Office of Justice Programs, announced a $20 million Body-Worn Camera Pilot Implementation Program in May 2015 to respond to the immediate needs of local law enforcement organizations. The program was able to provide funding to 73 agencies. Figure 1 provides the names of the law enforcement agencies and amounts awarded.

Table 3 illustrates the demographic information used. Law Enforcement Agencies that received awards and whose size was between 0 and 49 officers and have similar demographics, per City-Data.com (City-Data, 2016), were Andalusia Alabama, St. Mary’s Georgia, West Lafayette Indiana, and Waynesboro Virginia.
Table 2 (Reaves, p. 5)

The factor in identifying the sample group was trying to find law enforcement agencies in Illinois that are similar to these agencies. Employing the elements learned, the researcher was able to identify four law enforcement agencies. The need for total truthfulness on why and how these law enforcement agencies created and implemented their body worn camera programs is vital to this project. Due to this reason alone, the names of these organizations have been withheld. Table 4 illustrates the demographics of these agencies.
## Body-Worn Camera Pilot Implementation Program
### 2015 Awards List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Locality</th>
<th>Federal Award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>Andalusia, City of</td>
<td>$87,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Glendale, City of</td>
<td>$449,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Peoria, City of</td>
<td>$53,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian...</td>
<td>$193,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Imperial County Sheriff’s Office</td>
<td>$74,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Los Angeles Police Department</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Pasadena, City of</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Richmond, City of</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Sacramento, City of</td>
<td>$599,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>San Bernardino, City of</td>
<td>$546,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Colorado Springs, City of</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>New Haven, City of</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Stamford, City of</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Metropolitan Police Department</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Apopka Police Department</td>
<td>$43,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Miami-Dade County</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Orlando, City of</td>
<td>$497,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Pensacola, City of</td>
<td>$64,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Newton County Sheriff’s Office</td>
<td>$89,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>St. Mary’s Police Department</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Wilkinson County</td>
<td>$9,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Dubuque, City of</td>
<td>$61,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Twin Falls, City of</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Chicago, City of</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Elgin, City of</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Lake County Sheriff’s Department</td>
<td>$73,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Fort Wayne, City of</td>
<td>$126,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>West Lafayette, City of</td>
<td>$12,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>Dodge City Police Department</td>
<td>$45,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>Wichita, City of</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>Wyandotte County/Kansas City</td>
<td>$352,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>New Orleans Police Department</td>
<td>$237,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>Dearborn, City of</td>
<td>$59,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>Detroit Police Department</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe</td>
<td>$41,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>Minneapolis, City of</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>Saint Paul Police Department</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Fayetteville, City of</td>
<td>$530,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Omaha, City of</td>
<td>$67,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>Cherry Hill Police Department</td>
<td>$82,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>Albuquerque Police Department</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Las Vegas Metropolitan PD</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>Albany, City of</td>
<td>$133,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>Rochester, City of</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>Spring Valley, Village of</td>
<td>$11,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>White Plains, City of</td>
<td>$31,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Akron, City of</td>
<td>$367,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Hamilton County Sheriff’s Office</td>
<td>$139,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Tulsa, City of</td>
<td>$399,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Beaverton, City of</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Eugene, City of</td>
<td>$249,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Allentown, City of</td>
<td>$249,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Carlisle, Borough of</td>
<td>$43,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Central Bucks Regional PD</td>
<td>$52,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Johnstown, City of</td>
<td>$53,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Pittsburgh, City of</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Charleston, City of</td>
<td>$25,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Greenville, City of</td>
<td>$93,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Spartanburg, City of</td>
<td>$184,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Corpus Christi, City of</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Laredo Independent Sch. District</td>
<td>$46,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>New Braunfels, City of</td>
<td>$31,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>San Antonio, City of</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Webb County</td>
<td>$18,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>Greater Salt Lake, Unified Dept.</td>
<td>$181,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Dinwiddie County</td>
<td>$16,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Fairfax, City of</td>
<td>$28,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Lynchburg, City of</td>
<td>$205,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Newport News Sheriff’s Office</td>
<td>$209,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Waynesboro, City of</td>
<td>$36,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Seattle Police Department</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>West Allis, City of</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV</td>
<td>Ranson, City of</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Award: $19,312,397

Figure 1 (Justice, Body-Worn Camera Program Fact Sheet, 2015)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>POPULATION</th>
<th>MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME</th>
<th>MEDIAN HOUSE VALUE</th>
<th>RACE BY PERCENT.</th>
<th>COST OF LIVING INDEX</th>
<th>AWARD AMT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andalusia, Al</td>
<td>9,083</td>
<td>$19,770</td>
<td>$90,548</td>
<td>69% WHITE 26% BLACK 2% HISPANIC</td>
<td>81.9 LOW</td>
<td>$87,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary’s, Ga</td>
<td>17,755</td>
<td>$50,406</td>
<td>$156,668</td>
<td>67% WHITE 24% BLACK 5% HISPANIC</td>
<td>85.1 &gt; THAN AVG.</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lafayette, Indiana</td>
<td>30,875</td>
<td>$32,294</td>
<td>$177,699</td>
<td>72% WHITE 19% ASIAN 3% HISPANIC</td>
<td>92.1 &gt; THAN AVG.</td>
<td>$12,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waynesboro, VA</td>
<td>21,263</td>
<td>$47,655</td>
<td>$168,068</td>
<td>79% WHITE 13% BLACK 4% HISPANIC</td>
<td>82.6 LOW</td>
<td>$36,445</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 (City-Data, 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>POPULATION</th>
<th>MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME</th>
<th>MEDIAN HOUSE VALUE</th>
<th>RACE BY PERCENT.</th>
<th>COST OF LIVING INDEX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>25,035</td>
<td>$35,550</td>
<td>$73,000</td>
<td>75% WHITE 15% BLACK 5% HISPANIC</td>
<td>78.1 LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2,054</td>
<td>$62,473</td>
<td>$168,484</td>
<td>93% WHITE 5% HISPANIC</td>
<td>97 NEAR AVG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>7,327</td>
<td>$39,239</td>
<td>$106,000</td>
<td>74% WHITE 25% HISPANIC</td>
<td>80.1 LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>6,470</td>
<td>$48,571</td>
<td>$108,171</td>
<td>96% WHITE 2% HISPANIC</td>
<td>84.8 &gt; THAN AVG.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 (City-Data, 2015)
The researcher spoke with the Chief of Police at each of the Law Enforcement Agencies. The Chiefs were briefed on the focus of this case study project. Utilizing a consent form, (see attached Addendum A,) the researcher scheduled a date and time to individually interview each Chief of Police for this project. Upon the completion of this project, the researcher expected to learn whether the participant’s programs were implemented due to a significant event. What were the changes in behavior of citizens and officers participating in the body worn camera programs? What were the changes in the morale of officers since the program was implemented? What economic effects body worn cameras have had on the agency, and the financial obligations incurred to implement the program?

Data Collection

Data collection conducted in qualitative studies results from the researcher collecting multiple forms of data and spending a considerable amount of time in the natural setting of the population. The four basic types of collection procedures in a qualitative research project are observation, interviews, documents and audio/video material. The researcher collected data through different types of interviews. Depending on the geographical location of the participants, the interview process was conducted face-to-face or by telephone. Since the sample population is in such a broad geographical area, no one location was convenient for all the participants. The researcher made arrangements with each participant to determine a location for the interview to be conducted.

A series of questions were developed that were asked to all the participants. The questions used are;
Interview Questions

1. Please discuss why your agency has implemented a body worn camera program.

2. Has current media coverage on alleged police brutality played a role in your agency implementing your program?

3. Have there been any noticeable changes in behavior of citizens since the implementation of your program? Please describe what you have observed.

4. Have there been any noticeable changes in behavior of officers since the implementation of your program? What have you observed?

5. Has morale within your agency been impacted? How?

6. What other option(s) did your agency consider than a body worn camera program?

7. How was your program funded?

8. What have you identified as being the biggest challenge when you created your body-worn camera program?

The four interviews, individually, were completed in approximately one hour to one and a half hours. Two of the interviews were conducted face to face. Due to scheduling issues, the other two interviews were conducted via the telephone. Data collection was achieved during the interview process. The researcher conducted data analysis through note taking at the time of the interview. The notes were then organized categorically and chronologically.
CHAPTER 4

Results

President Obama’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing conducted numerous meetings and hearings in an effort to identify and correct the divide between law enforcement and their communities. Keeping this fact in mind, the researcher began each interview by asking each Chief to discuss why they had implemented a body worn camera program for their agency. Collectively, it was surprising to hear that their answers were very similar. All four Chiefs felt that they were doing their communities harm by not acquiring the newest equipment and technology available to perform their duties.

Chief B discussed how she felt that not having the best option for her officers was setting them up for failure. Chief B conducted research on body worn camera as well as in car camera programs for her officers. Chief B came to the conclusion that although the in car camera programs were a quality product, the body worn cameras provided officers with greater coverage while they were out of the vehicle.

Chief A, also mentioned this fact. Chief A felt there was a more important reason, transparency. When asked to elaborate further, Chief A stated:

*Transparency is really the key to my program. Society today has a negative opinion on how law enforcement performs. Cellphone cameras have shown that anyone at anytime can video how officers react. The problem with this is that if only a portion of the event is recorded the complete truth may never be told. Giving my officers body worn cameras, we can record the event in its entirety. Policies have been put in place that mandate when and how our cameras can be turned on and off. When a complaint against an officer is*
alleged, we as an organization will be able to produce an unaltered video. Transparency into how an officer has performed is essential if we in the law enforcement community want our communities to trust us.

Cincinnati, Ferguson, Baltimore, and Chicago not only had national, but worldwide attention brought onto their communities due to similar events. Civil unrest, due to protests and riots, resulting from actions taken by members of their law enforcement agency against a male black offender. Media attention on these events soon became a daily event on all forms of media. Due to this fact, the second question asked, has current media coverage on alleged police brutality played a role in your agency implementing your program? Chiefs C and D stated that their decisions were not based on the recent events in the media.

Chief B also stated her program was already in place, years prior to the incidents. Chief B stated that her research on in-car camera systems versus body worn camera systems was the sole and only factor for the development of her program. Chief B stated:

Economics, economics, economics.... Small communities like mine really do not have many civil unrest related occurrences. My program was based simply on economics. The decision I needed to make was purely based on money. Body cameras were about one-third the price of in-car camera systems. It’s the storage that was really the main cost.

Chief A was the only one who stated that race did play a role in his decision to create a program. Chief A stressed that his agency’s issue was based on an event that happened prior to the Michael Brown shooting in Ferguson, Missouri. Chief A proceeded to described an incident involving a male black attacking a white female. During the course of this incident three of
Chief A’s officers responded. In the course of the events unfolding, the black male was shot. Department A, fortunately, never had to experience the social unrest and media coverage that Ferguson Missouri had endured.

When the situation finally concluded, Chief A stated he reviewed the cause and effect of the incident. Chief A at this time felt it was of the utmost importance for him, as the leader of his organization, to get ahead of these types of events. Chief A proceeded to develop his program and had it in place prior to the Michael Brown shooting.

The interviews progressed on the effects the body camera programs had on human behavior. The Chiefs were asked if they noticed any changes in the behavior of citizens toward their officers since the implementation of their programs. All the Chiefs provided similar answers to the question. The body worn camera programs did not really play a meaningful role in a behavioral change of their citizens. Chief C provided this explanation:

Prior to developing our body worn camera program, we (the department) had an in-car camera program in place. Our citizens’ behavior, previous to the body cameras, had already demonstrated a change. Since the start of the in-car camera program, we noticed that many of the complaints about officer behavior began to take a noteworthy decline. A complainant, not knowing the officer was being video taped, would make allegations of improper behavior on the officer’s part. The supervisor of the officer involved would investigate the matter. This included the supervisor reviewing the video associated with the matter in question. The supervisor, upon telling the complainant what the video recorded, in a matter of a few seconds would watch the complainant rescind their complaint.
The word quickly got out that my officers had video cameras recording everything they did. The amount of citizen complaints we received began to reduce to a very small amount, over time. Our citizens, having already experienced being recorded by our in-car cameras, really experienced no positive or negative changes in how they behaved.

A factor that continues to appear in research focused on law enforcement’s treatment of all citizens, is officer behavior. The Chiefs were asked if there have been any noticeable changes in their officer’s behavior since the body camera programs were implemented. A common response was that body cameras did not play a significant role in this change. Officer behavior did have a noticeable change when in-car camera programs were set in place.

Chiefs A and C both described how their officers did not want the in-car cameras. Working through the programs with the officers, the Chiefs were able to show how the cameras were providing protection to the officers. The protection was in the ability to show the officers were not treating people inappropriately. The number of sustained allegations filed against the officers declined drastically.

Chief A attributed his department’s success also could be credited to the age of his department. Department A, during the in-car camera program’s deployment several years ago, was staffed by a much older average aged officer. The years since, Department A’s officer average age became considerably younger. A byproduct of the age difference has been the acceptance and desire to use technology. Department A’s young officers were and are energized and excited to use technology to their benefit.
Chief B provided a different answer. Chief B’s department did not have in-car cameras. Chief B’s department initial experience with any video recorded equipment began with her body camera program. Chief B explained by stating:

*Oh my God!!!! You should have seen the difference when we started the program.*

*you could see how the guys would talk more politely, and professionally. The body cameras really produced a noticeable change in a positive way the guys treated people.*

Officer and department morale was the next subject discussed. The next question posed was how morale in their department had been impacted. For the most part, all replied that morale really did not seem to have changed since their body camera program began. Chief C attributed this to the fact it really was not a big deal. Chief C stated:

*The in-car cameras really had the change on the morale. Morale really changed when the guys appreciated how the cameras were a advantage to them. My guys saw the body cameras as the next step in how we did business. We were just using the newest technology for the same purpose.*

Officers behavior and how they have treated citizens can be traced back to law enforcement’s inception. The Chiefs were asked to describe other options their agency considered before body worn cameras. The Chiefs all spoke about how over time law enforcement has attempted to develop programs and systems to improve communication with their communities. Community Policing programs were very popular in the 1990s. A few of the programs that were highlighted included; COPS program, Beat/Zone meetings, National Night Out for Crime, Youth Programs and Citizen Police Academies.
Federal and State grants were created to develop these programs. All of the Chiefs stated that these types of programs did have some, but limited, success. The need to use the latest technology possible was apparent. Body worn cameras provide the utmost success using today’s technology.

Since the economic down turn during the years of 2007 - 2009, Federal, State and Local governments have had to tackle dwindling revenue. Body worn camera programs were not a hot topic until 2012. Funding for technologically advanced programs such as the body worn camera program can be a weighty task. The Chiefs were asked how their body worn camera programs were funded.

Chiefs B and C went to their Mayors and City Council/Board for funding. Both Chiefs described the numerous meetings they had regarding their programs. During the course of these meetings, the Chiefs had to convince their Mayor and Council/Board the importance of these programs. Officer safety, along with legal liabilities, became their major selling points. Both departments were able to get funds they needed for the programs.

Chief A funded his body worn camera program through a grant received in 2009. Chief A described how once he decided his department needed to get ahead of the times, his toughest challenge was securing funding. Since body worn cameras were the latest and greatest thing going, funding for such a project had limited possibilities. Purely by chance, Chief A found a grant that eventually was used to fund his program.

Chief D informed the researcher that funding was the reason he recently shut down his program. This interview revealed that Chief D was currently an elected official for a state level Chief of Police Association. Chief D recently, along with the association, worked on a project
whose focus was the Illinois Law Enforcement Body-Worn Camera and Management Act. The association backed project enlisted the services of a research group. The findings from this research, at the time of this project, had not been published. The research project targeted only law enforcement agencies in Illinois.

Preliminary findings showed a solid majority of respondents were familiar with the Illinois Law Enforcement Body-Worn Camera and Management Act. Eighty percent (80%) of those respondents whose agencies are not currently using body worn cameras stated that they were not familiar with what is contained in the new legislation. Only 12% of the respondents had a body-worn camera program active. Fifty three percent (53%) of respondents stated that the cameras restore public trust by showing officers are doing their jobs correctly almost all of the time. The main reason for having the programs was due to the advantages that technology has, as far as improving evidence, enhancing officer safety, and increasing the transparency of the department.

The most significant response on why not to have a body-worn camera program was the Illinois legislature made the body camera law so restrictive that it will cost too much money to implement the program. A major reason not to start a body worn camera program was due to the vast cost associated with video storage capabilities, the cost of the equipment, the cost of processing FOIA (Freedom of Information Act) requests and the cost of processing video sound and audio within the scope of current state and federal laws.

Chief D emphasized that he views the benefits to having a body worn camera program are great. Chief D suspended his body camera program because the financial bottomless pit that would be created is another story. Though the law does provide a funding mechanism, a fee
added to every conviction for a traffic violation, the funds that might be generated would not make enough of an impact. Small departments do not have the financial resources in place to buy the equipment, software or personnel needed to make a program successful.

Civil liability lawsuits due to police brutality, filed on behalf of victims and their families, have resulted in hundreds of millions of dollars being awarded. These figures do not include the exorbitant amount of legal fees generated by communities defending these lawsuits. The final question posed to the Chiefs concentrated on this topic. The Chiefs were asked if their body worn camera programs have had any affect on current cases, new filings and awards.

Chiefs A, B and D all answered that their departments at this time have not been involved in any civil liability cases due to police abuse or behavioral related events. Chief A did state:

_I would hope that should that day come where we need to defend such an allegation, the officer involved followed procedure and his/her body camera was working properly. Should that be the case, I am very confident that we will successfully be able to defend the officer and our department. Hell it will be all on tape and that will be hard to beat._

Chief C told me that they never had been in that type of situation. There was a situation where an allegation was made against a member of his department. Chief C had a meeting with the person complaining about his officer. Chief C listened to the complainant’s version of events and made sure what the allegations were. Chief C then produced a copy of the video to the complainant. The complainant, having forgot about the camera, was at a loss for words. The complainant, completely at a loss for words left and a lawsuit was not filed.
DISCUSSION

The study immediately identified the desire of all the Chiefs to provide their officers with the newest, state of the art technology. The Chiefs stated that providing their communities with the best law enforcement service possible as being an important element in achieving that goal.

Body worn cameras have indeed impacted the citizens and officers involved in the study. The change in behavior of the citizens and officers was positive. However, the change can not be accredited solely to the body worn camera programs. Three of the four participating agencies credit the in-car camera programs their agencies had in place prior. Chief C clearly pointed out that cameras did have a positive affect on the behavior, the difference was that body worn cameras were the latest technological improvement to an already established program.

Body worn camera programs also played a significant role in improving officer morale. Though the in-car camera programs had a significant role, officer morale did improve. Once the officers learned how the technology could be used in their favor, they were excited to use them.

The significant role economics has played in body worn camera programs has never been more evident than now. Costs of a body worn camera programs compared to in-car camera programs is substantial. Storage of videos is a challenge for both systems. In-car systems do not have as much as body worn camera systems. The additional storage space needed brings with it increased costs. The original upfront costs favor body worn camera programs. The size of the sample group used in this study, has shown that agencies with 0-49 officers or 84.8% of law enforcement agencies in the State of Illinois do not have the resources needed.
CONCLUSION

During the course of history, law enforcement has maintained a controversial relationship with those they have sworn to protect. Past-Presidents, Federal Commissions and Task Forces have focused their energy on learning what caused the relationship to become so confrontational and how to repair the relationship. Barak Ariel, William Farrar and Alex Sutherland’s 2014 study provided a numerical conclusion that police body worn cameras reduced the prevalence of use-of-force by police as well as the incidence of citizen’s complaints against police (Ariel, 2014).

All the Chiefs agreed that body-worn cameras have played a significant role improving the way their officers interact with citizens. Recent events such as those in Ferguson, Cincinnati, Baltimore and Chicago brought the need for transparency on how law enforcement interacts with citizens. Body-worn cameras have allowed law enforcement to be transparent on all interactions with citizens. Body worn cameras have shown to be an important element for law enforcement to build trust with their communities.

The study did identify that body worn cameras did not initiate these changes. In-car camera programs were found as the origin. The Chiefs discussed how their in-car camera programs were met with great resistance from their officers. Officers quickly learned the benefits of the in-car camera programs. Citizens experienced improved relations with law enforcement. Citizen complaints of officer behavior were seen to have a noteworthy decline since the in-car camera programs inception.

The strongest point that was identified by the study was the economics of body worn camera programs. Since the economic down turn during the years of 2007 – 2009, funding for
technologically advanced programs such as body worn cameras has dwindled. Body worn camera programs do not consist of cameras alone. Essential elements of a body worn camera program include hardware, software, storage and personnel elements to make the program successful. The financial burden that is associated with body worn camera programs has resulted in law enforcement not being able to initiate a program. The lack of funding has also resulted in programs being shut down.

New legislation has been passed in support of body worn camera programs. The legislation however does not address funding for the programs. The lack of economic resources available to agencies wanting to implement these programs is a major stumbling block. New funding sources need to be created and accessible if the legislature and society want to change the relationship between law enforcement and their citizens.
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Protocol Title: What Effects Body Worn Cameras Worn by Law Enforcement had on Society.

Please read this consent document carefully before you decide to participate in this study.

Purpose of the research study: Identify the effect body worn cameras have had on society.

What you will be asked to do in the study: Participate in an interview dedicated to your agency’s body worn camera program.

Time required: One hour

Risks and Benefits: Risks to participants is minimal. Benefits will be a better understanding of the relationship between the public and Law Enforcement.

Compensation: Compensation will not be offered to participants. Participation is voluntary.

Confidentiality: Your identity will be kept confidential. Your information will be assigned a code number, in lieu of any personally identifying information. The list connecting your name to this number will be kept in a locked file in the researcher’s office. The researcher’s office is located at the Sandwich Police Department, 308 E. College Dr., Sandwich, Illinois 60548. When the study is completed and the data has been analyzed, the list will be destroyed. Your name will not be used in any report.

Voluntary participation: Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. There is no penalty for not participating. You may also refuse to answer any of the questions asked.

Right to withdraw from the study: You have the right to withdraw from the study at any time without consequence.

Whom to contact if you have questions about the study: James Bianchi, Chief of Police, Susan L. Gaffney, Ph. D., Associate Professor, College of Arts and Sciences, Governors State University
University, Governors State University
Institutional Review Board (IRB) email: 

Whom to contact about your rights as a research participant in the study: If you have any questions regarding your rights as a participant in this research study or concerns regarding the study itself, you may also contact the Co-Chairs of the Governors State University Institutional Review Board (IRB): Renee Thesis, Ph.D. or Pragyan (Pam) Mohanty, Ph.D. 

The IRB reviews research projects to insure the ethical conduct of research with human subjects.

Agreement: I have read the procedure described above. I voluntarily agree to participate in the procedure and I have received a copy of this description.

Participant: ___________________________________________ Date: __________

Principal Investigator: ___________________________________ Date: __________