

ROOT OF CONFLICT

Root of Conflict Podcast

Episode: Police Violence in America

featuring

Sam Sinyangwe, Co-Founder, Mapping Police Violence

interviewed by

Sonnet Frisbie, Pearson Fellow

Mwangi Thuita, Pearson Fellow

Thursday, April 30, 2020

Full Transcript

University of Chicago Introducer: This is Susan Kraken and you're listening to University of Chicago Public Policy Podcast.

Aishwarya Raje and Mwangi Thuita: You're listening to Root of Conflict, a podcast about violent conflict around the world and the people, societies and policy issues it affects. You'll hear from experts and practitioners can conduct research, implement programs and use data analysis to address some of the most pressing challenges facing our world. Root of Conflict is produced by UC3P, in collaboration with the Pearson Institute for the Study and Resolution of Global Conflict, a research institute housed within the Harris School of Public Policy at the University of Chicago.

Aishwarya Raje: For the last several years, police violence in America has come to the forefront of public consciousness. It's an issue that can polarize the country, but for years, there lacked a data-driven analysis of police violence on a national level, and concrete policy recommendations on the issue were hard to come by. On this episode of route of conflict, Pearson Fellows, Sonnet Frisbie, and Mwangi Thuita speak with Sam Sinyangwe, activist, data scientist, and Co-Founder of Mapping Police Violence, which is the most comprehensive database of people killed by police. Sam discusses the evidence-based approaches to measuring police violence in America, and the importance of conveying the data to the public and to policy makers in a way that can affect real policy change.

Mwangi Thuita: Sam, thank you so much for being with us today.

Sam Sinyangwe: It's great to be here.

Mwangi Thuita: So, when you spoke to us at Harris last fall, you said that your trajectory changed on August 9th, 2014, which was the day Mike Brown was shot and killed in Ferguson, Missouri. Can you tell us a bit about how you got involved with this issue and why you founded Mapping Police Violence?

Sam Sinyangwe: Sure. So, rewind back to 2014 in the context of the Ferguson uprising. At that time, I was working as a researcher in a research Institute in Oakland, focused on issues of educational inequity. So, really helping to support 61 federally funded communities to build out data systems that could hold all of the different institutions, from schools, to healthcare providers, to afterschool programs, accountable to a common set of metrics and outcomes and results for kids and families. And as you said, my life changed on August 9th when

ROOT OF CONFLICT

Mike Brown was killed, because what became clear in the days and weeks and months following the outpouring of protestors and communities outraged in the wake of police violence, what became clear was that there was very little data on the national level to help us better understand where police violence is most acute, in terms of which communities are most impacted, which cities have the highest rates of police violence, which cities have the lowest rates of police violence.

And that's sort of the baseline information. That's critical to understanding what's working, what's not working, how you can effectively address this crisis in an evidence-based way. And so that's why I co-founded Mapping Police Violence to be a database. Now it is the most comprehensive database of people killed by police. and the goal of the database is to track every case in which somebody is killed by a police officer in the country. So far, we track between 1100 and 1300 cases a year. We have data now for between seven and eight years of data. And that's why I've been doing the work, because 1) we need the data to better understand what types of solutions can be effective in addressing the issue of police violence and 2) we need the data to hold institutions accountable to actually implementing those solutions and making sure those solutions get results.

Mwangi Thuita: And can you tell us a bit more about how you organize such a large grassroots effort to collect this amount of data? What kind of logistical hurdles did you have to overcome? How do you mobilize this whole effort?

Sam Sinyangwe: Yeah, so, I mean, first of all, Mapping Police Violence stands on the shoulders of a number of crowdsourced efforts that have emerged over the past several years to try to answer this question of how many people are killed by police in America. And one of the first of those initiatives was Fatal Encounters. At that point in 2014, there were these two databases that existed. One was Fatal Encounters, and the other was killedbypolice.net. Other than those two, the only other sources of data on this issue were the federal government's data, and the federal government only collected data on about a third of the total number of people killed by police, because they were entirely dependent on agencies reporting the data in a consistent and reliable way every single year, across all 18,000 police agencies in America. That methodology was just not an effective methodology.

So Fatal Encounters and killedbypolice sort of filled that gap by just posting the spreadsheet online and updating it every single day. They had a system of Google Alerts where if there was an article that had keywords, like "officer involved shooting" or "police shooting" or "killed by police" it would identify those articles. They would then log basic information about what happened in each of those cases. So, the date, the age of the person, name of the person that was killed by police, a link to the article, and then what I did was merge those two databases together, because neither of them had all the records of the other, and then fill in the gaps that neither database actually addressed. So, at that time, still about half of the total number of records in either database were not quoted by race.

So, in working with looking at information in obituaries and criminal records, databases information, online, social media, we're able to fill in the gap around race. So, 90% of the records in our database are now coded by race, similarly coding for the circumstances of what happened, so was a person armed or unarmed. and that really was working to find everything that was available online, as well as working through public records requests, getting data directly from agencies and getting data in collaboration with the volunteers and organizations across the country that were tracking what was happening in their communities, and putting all that in one place and then visualizing the data, analyzing it and better using it to address the crisis at hand.

Sonnet Frisbie: I'm really glad you mentioned data visualizations. I mean, many of us are either current policy makers or will be in the future. And so, we're often trying to figure out how to make visualizations that convey

ROOT OF CONFLICT

a really difficult point. I've seen some of your visualizations, you have some really, really striking ones. How have you figured out what worked, has that been an iterative process? How do you figure out what actually impacts a policy maker?

Sam Sinyangwe: Yeah, so, I mean, first of all, just being clear about who your audience is and who you are trying to impact or inform with your data? And for me, it has been not producing content that is strictly accessible only to policymakers or data scientists and researchers, but rather producing content that everybody can understand, that is accessible to a mass movement. Right? I think what's been so different about the protest in 2014 and 2015 and 2016 and the resulting mass movements, not only within Black Lives Matter, but a number of movements that have emerged since then, have been how many people who, weren't involved in this work before suddenly got involved in the work after witnessing an injustice. In order to leverage that enthusiasm, that participation from millions of people across the country, and to figure out how to translate that energy and then organizing into policy, it requires producing information that is important to convince policy makers, but producing it in a format that everybody can understand and use in their own advocacy efforts, in their own local campaigns, in their own conversations with policymakers and other folks in the community.

And so that has been the goal with visualization is to make it as accessible as possible, to as many people as possible, who have now gotten involved in this work. And so, in terms of principles, I think first and foremost recognizing that the way that people access information today is different than it has been in the past. People have a lot of competing influences for their time. They don't have a lot of time. They are most likely getting information from social media, from Facebook, from Twitter. They're getting information on their phones. So that means you really only have two or three seconds to hook them, to teach them something that is important and can help them in their own understanding of the issue and then advocacy to address it. So that's really been the goal of the visualizations is to be able to reach that person who's scrolling up their timeline, has two or three seconds to interact with your content, and to immediately teach them something about this issue in those two or three seconds.

So, if you look at the website at mappingpoliceviolence.org, there's one interactive map of the country with about 1200 different pins on that map, each one representing a person killed by police. And it's actually an interactive map that flashes. It has a series of flashes that go across the map that correlate with the date at which the person was killed. And the purpose of the map is quite straightforward. It's to demonstrate how widespread this issue is, how it is not limited to any one city or state, how this really is a national crisis that demands a nationwide mobilization to address it.

Mwangi Thuita: Yeah, and I'm one of those people. I follow you on Twitter. I checked yesterday and I think you have 173,000 followers. So, in merging activism and data science, it's clearly important for you to make your research accessible and usable and actionable as well. I just wanted to ask you more about this intersection between activism and data science, with, the group you were talking about Black Lives matter with, with groups like those which have created a movement that's brought the issue of police violence to the forefront of our national consciousness. Do you think more needs to be done for these groups in their efforts to be coalesced into two institutions and a policy agenda?

Sam Sinyangwe: You know, I think that the challenge with this particular issue is that there is not one federal standard for policing. There's not one federal police agency that, if you just change policy in that one agency, or even at that one level of government, if Congress passes a bill, it's just not going to be sufficient to change policing outcomes in all 18,000 departments across the country, each with their own policies and practices and outcomes and leadership. And so, necessarily, in order to get to change at scale, it's going to require equipping people and organizations and initiatives in as many of those jurisdictions as possible with the tools and the

ROOT OF CONFLICT

resources and the analyses that it will take them to actually change policy locally. and that will affect the trend line at the nationwide level. We haven't yet seen, as you sort of alluded to, we haven't yet seen change in terms of substantially reducing the number of people killed by police nationwide.

The trendline has remained relatively constant every single year. It was between 1100 and 1300 people killed by police in 2013, the year before the protests. It was about that many people, about 1100 people killed by police in 2019. So, what we have seen are a couple of things that we didn't know five or six years ago that we know now, they're helpful in thinking about how to address this moving forward. So, first and foremost, we know more about what doesn't work. So, we know that some of the initial ideas and proposals that were pretty popular in 2014 have been implemented in many places have been studied and have not achieved the desired result in many of those jurisdictions. So, things like body cameras, there was an incredible randomized controlled trial looking at body cameras and in Washington, DC, the largest ever such study looking at body cameras, they found no impact on reducing police use of force.

So that wasn't a solution. Similarly, implicit bias training is something that's being implemented into police departments across the country. We have yet to see research showing that it actually changes police behavior. At the same time, because now we have the data and we are tracking these outcomes and we're tracking what policies are being passed, what impact those policies are not having, we've identified things that do work. Changing police use of force policies, making them more restrictive, requiring de-escalation, banning shooting at moving vehicles, restricting deadly force to only be authorized as a last resort after officers have exhausted all other alternatives available to them. Those policy changes actually substantially reduced police violence, and we've been tracking that. I mean, you look at the largest cities in the country. many of which implemented these policies. Among the 30 largest cities in the country, police shootings have dropped 40% since the protests began and that's huge, right?

40% is a huge number of people who are alive today that would not be alive if not for reforms that have been implemented, and those reforms occurred because of the protest, because of the pressure, because of the research, because of all of those things coming together and impacting policy at the local level, and in some places, even at the state level. If you look at places like California, they've changed their deadly force standard in part based on the research that we've produced, linking use of force policies to use of force outcomes in terms of killings by police. So, all of that matters, all of that is making an impact in the places that have begun to implement those changes. The problem is, again, this is just a massive scale issue. There are a whole bunch of smaller police departments across the country that have just simply not changed at all, if anything, their outcomes have gotten worse. So, if you look at suburban and rural communities, rates of police violence are actually going up, as they're going down in the cities, which produces that flat trend line nationwide. So there's a lot more work that you have to do.

Sonnet Frisbie: So, I'm glad you mentioned RCTs and body cams, which incidentally, I know are used here in Chicago, which is a bone of contention I believe between the police union and Mayor Lightfoot. But you mentioned there was an RCT, which is not really something that you can do for use of force policies. So, from a statistical standpoint, bit of a wonky question, I guess, but how do you find a valid counterfactual to endeavor to establish some kind of causality when you're looking at use of force policies, since there could be a lot of unobservable attributes of the cities which introduced these limits or don't?

Sam Sinyangwe: Absolutely, it's a huge question. and there's no easy answer to this, right? I think you guys in social science, there are many things that we just simply can't know for sure, because of the number of intervening variables. but what we do know is this: over the past 40 years there has been a thread of research, study after study that has looked at the impact of administrative restrictions on police use of force, in particular

ROOT OF CONFLICT

deadly force. So, these are the restrictions and use of force policies and the impact that that has on police shootings, early on in that research. So, this really started with a professor in New York named James Fife who studied the NYPD and their changes that they made to their use of force of policy, again, in response to high profile police shooting and massive protests that actually happened in the early 1970s.

And this was really was one of the first, like a landmark study that began to look into changes that NYPD implemented, banning shooting at moving vehicles, requiring officers to use alternatives rather than deadly force, but as soon as those changes were implemented in, I believe, 1974, we saw police shootings, which had gone up every single year before that, began to decline and actually declined ever since in New York. So, now, it's a far smaller number of people shot at by police every year, then were back then. Since then, there've been studies that have looked at a number of other jurisdictions. So, Philadelphia, Cleveland, Detroit, LA, a range of different jurisdictions, and I've shown that after implementing stronger use of force policies, there have been declines in police shootings following that implementation. Again, this isn't a randomized controlled trial, there could be a range of different intervening variables.

What we then showed in 2015 and 2016, we looked at the hundred largest cities in the country. So, this was really just expanding on the existing research literature by applying it to a larger number of police departments, and looked at the level of restrictiveness of the use of force policy, taking into account the restrictions that were recommended by the Police Executive Research Forum of Department of Justice, a range of other standard restrictions that there has begun to have a consensus emerging around, and found that the police departments that had more restrictions in their policies were significantly less likely to kill people in those jurisdictions that did not have those restrictions in place. What we actually have been able to show now, because we've added a lot, and a number of additional years of data to work with, is that those jurisdictions that implemented changes to their use of force policy to make them more restrictive, since 2013, have had the largest reductions in police shootings, both fatal and nonfatal, and many of those restrictions occurred as part of either participating in the Department of Justice Collaborative Reform Program, having a Department of Justice intervention, through a DOJ pattern practice investigation and consent decree, or were departments that just on their own initiative, often in response to community pressure, changed substantially their use of force policies, and made them much more restrictive.

And we've seen that even when you control for things like arrests, assaults on officers, crime rates and a range of other aspects, that the actual use of force policy change remains significant as an explanatory variable in the decline in police shootings in those jurisdictions. So, again, this is something that is very, very hard to study. It's very, very hard to say for sure. But there's a lot more evidence that making those policies more restrictive can impact police violence than there is evidence in support of things like implicit bias training or body cameras, and it sort of makes intuitive sense as well. This is almost akin to the broader gun violence conversation where there's a whole bunch of research showing that states and cities that have more restrictive laws on gun ownership have lower rates of gun homicides. And this is not much different here, the cities that have more restrictive laws on police shootings and police gun violence have lower rates of police gun violence. It's just not, it's not like rocket science, the theory, and more and more with each additional study, we're seeing the impact that those policies can have.

Mwangi Thuita: I'm glad you brought that up. I'm very interested in talking about the relationship between debates around gun control and American gun violence in general. America has one of the highest rates of gun ownership in the world. And the 2nd amendment is a uniquely American creation that sets us apart from, I think, most countries. I myself am from Kenya. And so, understanding gun culture and gun violence in America was quite a culture shock. How do you see the link between America's very unique relationship to guns, which results in high gun ownership rates and also very little gun control regulations? And how do you see the

ROOT OF CONFLICT

relationship between that and police violence? Are they part of the same issue, are police killings in your view inherently linked to America's relationship to guns?

Sam Sinyangwe: So, I think that that's a really complicated question. I think there's no doubt that the presence of so many firearms in the U.S. is contributing to higher rates of gun violence in general. And there are a lot of police who will cite the number and the rate of gun ownership in the United States as a reason why they are edge and more likely to pull a firearm and believe that their lives are in danger. There is some emerging research that has also looked into rates of gun ownership and rates of police violence at the state level and have also found that states that have more gun ownership have higher rates of police violence. So, I think there is a connection there. I think it's clear there is some sort of relationship and it becomes more difficult to advocate for things like having police be unarmed, as the vast majority of police in the UK, for example, are.

Just not having a gun, it becomes difficult to fight for those things in a context where there are a lot of people with guns, a lot of civilians with guns. At the same time, I think what is also clear is that there are a whole bunch of police shootings and other deadly force incidents that don't involve people with guns. And there is no excuse for that at all. Right? I think you know, when you look nationwide, about half of the people killed by police had a gun and were alleged to have been using it in some way or reaching for it. And this is predominantly based on the police narrative. So, that's probably overestimating things a little bit.

But you know, the other half of people did not have a gun and in any other country, it would be highly unlikely for the police to kill that person. When you look at a country like Japan, with about 140 million population, a huge country, they haven't had anyone, any civilians killed by police in the past decade in Japan. And it's not like they're not dealing with people who have knives or baseball bats, or who are unarmed and fighting people, like all those things, the police deal with routinely in contexts like Japan and contexts like the UK, in much of Europe. And nevertheless, the police don't kill people. It's exceedingly rare for police to have killed people in those circumstances, whereas in the U.S., it's almost treated like if the person had a knife or if the person had let's say a bat or a stick, or even if they were unarmed, but they were alleged to have been punching somebody or something.

There's almost an assumption that that the police were justified in killing that person. Whereas anywhere else among wealthy nations, it's very rare to see the police actually do that. I was actually in a cab in London and the man who was driving the cab. He asked me what I did. We started talking about policing in the U.S. and he was saying there was this case that I saw recently in the news. And there was somebody who just had a knife and the police shot them, and it didn't make any sense to me. And I think in that moment, I sort of realized how the culture in the U.S. is so different that people really just assume that if the person had a knife, that the police were justified in killing them, and that's not always the way that that things have to be, it's not the way things are outside of the U.S., and it shouldn't be the way that things are in the U.S.

Mwangi Thuita: So, recently researchers at UChicago received \$1.2 million from the National Collaborative on Gun Violence research to develop a police training program. And some of that is spearheaded by Harris professors like Oeindrila Dube, and they're working with the Chicago Police Department to increase police safety and community safety by training officers to process high-stakes situations more completely and more accurately. So, this is supposed to allow officers to make better decisions and reduce the extent of excessive use of force, including officer-involved shootings. What are your initial thoughts on this approach, in terms of training police officers on situational decision-making?

Sam Sinyangwe: So, it's tough. I don't know. I think the problem with training is it's very difficult to study the impact of police training. Methodologically, it's very tough because there are so many different training models.

ROOT OF CONFLICT

The qualities of the trainings vary, the things that are required to be a part of that training depend, like the modules depend by city, they depend by state. It's very hard to isolate the impact that participating in a training for a particular officer would have versus another officer. We do know the trainings can change police attitudes, implicit bias trainings can impact police attitudes on race and other issues. But we just haven't seen conclusive evidence that trainings are changing police behavior in ways that reduce use of force doesn't mean it's not happening.

It's very hard to establish methodologically. I'm hopeful that this training can make a difference. I am also mindful that one of the things that we know we can do right away is actually scaling back the role of the police and responding to a range of types of situations, that can be handled by other providers, mental health providers, social workers, community gang intervention, outreach workers. So, if I were making an investment in addressing police violence and reducing police violence, that investment wouldn't go towards training the police, it would go towards scaling up models, first responder models that don't involve the police. They just have no likelihood of escalating to deadly force because the people intervening are not using deadly force. So, you look at the cahoots model in Eugene, Oregon, for example, and they have a huge number of their 911 calls are now diverted to mental health providers who are the first responders. For instance, that may involve someone having a mental health crisis or homelessness or range of situations that police currently are involved with and often times involve themselves in ways that escalate the situation further.

Sonnet Frisbie: That's really helpful, really interesting. I wanted to go back a little bit to, talking about driving change and getting buy-in, and you mentioned our federal system and how it makes it often difficult to get sort of large changes. Although on the other hand, you have the possibility potentially to get quicker change on a smaller scale. I'd love to hear where you feel like you've seen real differences being made and whether you've come up with like a theory of change over the last few years that you've been doing this.

Sam Sinyangwe: Yeah. So, I think first and foremost, what is important for people to know is that there have been cities, there have been large areas of the country that have made substantial progress in reducing police violence, particularly when it comes to deadly force. And that is true in places like Oakland where the city went from an average of between seven and eight police shootings a year, just six or seven years ago, and every single year prior to that was between seven and eight police shootings, and then dramatically reduced it now to between zero and one police shootings a year over the past three or four years. And that's substantial progress. Lives saved. As I said, in the largest cities, the largest 30 cities in the country, there's been a reduction of police shootings by 40%.

So, change can definitely happen and is happening in some places, some places more than others, even Chicago. Chicago police shootings have gone down, I believe about 70% since 2011, which is huge. And looking at all of those changes, looking at the places that have reduced police violence and examining some of the factors, sort of the ingredients, as you're referring to, that actually can produce change. There are a couple of things that come to mind, first and foremost, organizing matters, right? I think when you look at the places that have made changes, there are cities that have a pretty sustained and dedicated organizing base, where they can get people out into the streets. They can pack the city hall, and the city council chambers with people who are testifying and holding elected leadership accountable.

So that matters. so resourcing investing in those efforts and sustaining that organizing is a critical ingredient. I think the other piece is an analysis of the policies and practices of the department and being willing to actually change those policies and practices to do a couple of things. 1) Strengthening the use of force standards of the department 2) strengthening the accountability structure within the department. We're seeing some departments begin to do that at the individual officer level, through the use of early warning systems and using a predictive

ROOT OF CONFLICT

technology to actually identify which officers will be using force at higher rates, or the next officer to shoot somebody, and intervening before that happens. Also, at the department level establishing oversight structures that have the power to effectively hold police accountable and discipline officers and subpoena documents and witnesses in order to get to the bottom of misconduct cases.

I mentioned earlier the role of the Department of Justice in forcing departments to implement changes that they otherwise would not have. As I mentioned, many of the departments that have actually reduced rates of police shootings substantially over the past six or seven years have been departments that have had a Department of Justice intervention. So, Vice News did a great investigation of this. and they got access to all the police shootings data for a group of the largest law enforcement agencies, 40 or 50 largest in the country. And they found that those departments like Oakland, like Seattle, like Chicago, like Baltimore that had Department of Justice interventions that were required to change their policies required to strengthen their accountability systems, actually did see some results from that saw a reduction in police shootings following those interventions.

The problem is that again, all of this is happening at different levels. So, at the federal level now, with the current administration, they're not willing at all to engage in those investigations, those consent decrees. So, we sort of lost that tool. Now it's at the state level, we're relying on AGS to do that and except for in a few cases, they refuse to do so. So, it's a mix of things that are important. Organizing, policy change, and then interventions from the federal government that have all come together in some places to get results.

Mwangi Thuita: So, a lot of your work in the area of police violence, it seems like it's motivated by, our overarching goal of addressing structural racism in the United States. And we know that there is an element of structural racism in the way that police departments handle use of force disproportionately, in a way that negatively affects African Americans and other minority groups. So, while it's important to collect data and do rigorous analysis and present this to the public and policymakers, do you think that's enough to convince people to pursue change? It's still hard for some people to believe that racism is an issue in the United States, even today. So, is there an ideological factor that makes arguments based on data, and sufficient on their own and in your work, how do you see the two things, the activism addressing America's legacy of racism working with your data analysis?

Yeah, so, I mean, first of all, we don't have to convince everybody, right? I think this idea that everybody has to understand and acknowledge racism in order for us to make progress, it's just not true, right? We've never been in a place where across the board, people understood and rejected racism. It's always been hard fought. It's always been something where there has been an opposition that's been highly organized, with a lot of people on their side who've been resisting any effort to move forward any type of racial progress. At the same time, I think we have more than enough people who are willing to not only accept that racism is real, but also willing to do something about it. We have more than enough people to actually make progress. Right? And I think the challenge is less convincing new people – I mean, if you're not convinced by now, after all that's been happening, I don't think our resources are best spent trying to convince you, right?

I think you are by definition at this point, difficult to convince, even despite all of the both emotional and data-driven arguments that have happened over the past several years. At the same time, if you look at survey research, it's actually a majority of Americans that believe that racism not only still exists, but that we still need to implement further change in order to achieve racial equality in this country. And those numbers have been increasing over time since the movement began. When the movement began, it was actually not a majority of Americans who believe that. Now it's about 59%. And we're talking about a shift of about 40 million white Americans and their attitudes and beliefs about this issue that have happened since the movement began.

ROOT OF CONFLICT

And that's important. Now the question is how do we organize the people that we already have, and the people that are willing to listen, so that we can actually build power together and achieve these changes? And that's an organizing challenge, right? It's a challenge that you see in many different mass movements, where you have millions and millions – if you think about climate change, for example, you have billions of people who support the need to address climate change, and yet how many people are actively being organized and engaged in advocacy for climate justice on a daily basis? Not even a fraction of that total number of people. It's the same for police officers, the same for other forms of gun violence, for any of these issues, immigration, same thing.

There are always more people out there than are current that would be involved in the work that are willing to get involved in the work, that might have unique skills and capacities, that could add value to the work. More people that are interested in getting involved than are currently involved, or the existing infrastructure of organizations has the capacity to onboard. I think solving that problem is actually the more important problem than figuring out how to convince more people to get involved. I think people are already convinced, they're reaching out, they're sharing content, they want to get involved, but they're just not enough pathways for people to get involved in meaningful and actionable ways to address issues that are often complex and are localized. So, you may be interested in addressing police violence, but in order to make progress on that in your community, that requires understanding what are the key levers of power and change in your city or in your county, and what are the key outcomes that need to be changed with policy?

So, it's different by community. In some places, you may actually have relatively lower rates of death before, so, police use of force in general, but much higher rates of arrests in particular drug arrests and drug arrest disparities by race, or ticketing and fines and fees, civil asset forfeiture. There are a range of different dimensions to this problem. And so, part of this is making information as accessible and actionable as possible to help people in each community understand how they can get involved in the most meaningful ways that are driven by an analysis of, what are the biggest problems? And data is a tool to help us do that analysis.

Sonnet Frisbie: All right, Sam, you've been very generous with your time. Thanks so much. Thank you.

Aishwarya Raje: Thank you for listening to this episode of Root of Conflict, featuring Sam Sinyangwe. To learn more about the topics discussed on today's episode, visit policescorcard.org, or mappingpoliceviolence.org. Thanks to UC3P and the Pearson Institute for their continued support of this series. For more information on the Pearson institutes, research and events, visit thepearsoninstitute.org and follow them on Twitter.