Essay 3 Outline

**Introduction Section**
- Working Title: In the Line of Duty: Protecting Law Enforcement Officers
  - Introduce background statistics about law enforcement deaths from article “Officer Deaths in 2015”
  - Introduce the question of protecting law enforcement officers who already do a dangerous job in addition to litigation about police brutality that allegedly happen on the job.
  - Introduce body cameras and define them.
  - Working Thesis: Law enforcement officers should be made to wear body cameras so that they are protected against senseless accusations and prosecution. They should wear them because it helps clarify and sometimes support testimonies of cops, gives cops a sense of security that there is a recording of arrests in the event of a dispute or allegations of abuse, and it helps citizens feel comfortable knowing that cops are being monitored.

**Body Section**
- Body Paragraph #1
  - Topic of Paragraph: Brief description of debate about body cameras.
  - Assertion: Body cameras have been a controversial topic for many law enforcement departments and civilians, particularly after numerous, consecutive allegations about police abuse and brutality.
  - Evidence: Bring up here how police departments are under heavy scrutiny because of Ferguson, Eric Garner, Kelly Thomas, Sandra Bland, and other police-related confrontations.
  - “Law enforcement officers, particularly in social media, have been portrayed as corrupt and abusive, leading to increased tensions between police and citizens in many confrontations. Mandating body cameras have and, in many cases, can endanger police officers because it already suggests the potential or possibility of abuse” (Devine 67). This is the anti-body camera side.
    - Explanation: Devine speaks for the protection of law enforcement officers and cites that body cameras encourage the aura or the perception of police misconduct by their very presence in police-related interactions with civilians.
    - Significance: Other groups such as law enforcement support organizations that feel that body cameras only endanger police officers because they can appear to “dare” criminals to attack or be hostile to cops support her position.
  - “The increased focus on police-related interactions with civilians necessitate a method by which accountability can be monitored and ensured, while also offering a way to investigate officer behavior when allegations are brought up” (Patinkin 196). This is the pro-body camera side.
• Explanation: On the other hand, Patinkin suggests that body cameras can protect law enforcement officers because it gives one way of knowing how police interactions went.
• Significance: By recording audio and video, if the interaction is lawful and appropriate, it can save the police officer, as well as the department, time and money in negotiating or resolving allegations of police abuse.

○ Body Paragraph #2, #3, #4…. Etc.
  ▪ Topic: Supporting body cameras for cops because it helps clarify and support testimonies
  ▪ Assertion: Mandatory outfitting of body cameras for police officers can help clarify testimonies or claims of police abuse by providing audio and video evidence.
  ▪ Some options to develop this part of the outline: select quotes from your sources; include your reasons for your stance; add commentary.
  ▪ You can also add what kind of information you need to find to support your points.
  ▪ ALWAYS have EXPLANATION & SIGNIFICANCE

○ Body Paragraph #5 etc…
  ▪ Topic: Counterargument
  ▪ Assertion: Critics, however, of mandatory body cameras have voiced their disapproval and concern for such a measure. Some critics cite that the use of body cameras invades the privacy of the police officer and the civilian he or she may be interacting with.
  ▪ Find quote here about privacy of law enforcement officers and how body cameras might infringe on it.
  ▪ Rebuttal: The concern is valid, however, it presumes that when and where body cameras may be worn cannot be negotiated within the police department. It is important to remember that many police officers already use dash cameras while on duty and there does not seem to be a violation of privacy when it is in use. When and where body cameras can be used can be limited or negotiated within the police department. Blanket usage of such technology does not have to be the only option. When officers are on duty, they must wear and turn on the body camera, the same way that dash cameras are operational when police officers arrive at a scene. The same safety and privacy guidelines and laws can still be applied with body cameras.

• Conclusion—Sum up your points QUICKLY; Tell your reader WHY THIS TOPIC MATTERS.
  ▪ Body cameras can be extremely beneficial for police officers. It can ensure that law enforcement is functioning lawfully, which protects both civilians and police officers. Given the intense attention focused on police action and conduct, it is to the police departments’ benefit to assure civilians that the police are here to serve and defend and that they have nothing to hide. This can begin to mend the frayed relationship between police and the American people by showing that the police can be transparent in all aspects of its interactions with people.