Hilliard Division of Police

2018 Bias-Free Policing Report

Prepared by Jeffrey A. Pearson
Professional Standards Coordinator
March 15, 2019

Introduction

The purpose of this report is to provide an overview of the Hilliard Division of Police commitment to bias-free policing. The Division is committed to ensure the trust and respect of the community by operating on the philosophy of transparency. Open dialog and communication with all groups and members of the community is key to sound Police and Community relationships. Considered the father of modern-day policing, Sir Robert Peele indicted on the principals of policing was "The police are the people and the people are the police." It's imperative, as law enforcement professionals, that we truly understand this basic principle and uphold this trust relationship by providing fair, impartial and objective services.

This report takes a look at the Division's practices and bias-based policing data for the purposes of proactively identify potential training and policy issues, potential patterns of conduct or other community concerns related to bias-based policing.

Mission

We, the employees of the Hilliard Division of Police, are committed to serve the Hilliard Community to enhance the quality of life by working cooperatively with the public to prevent crime, preserve peace, enforce the law with respect to the constitutional rights of all citizens, reduce fear and provide a safe community environment. The mission is based on a foundation of integrity, commitment, cooperation and professionalism.

Officers strive to achieve the mission of the division through actions which are guided by our core values. The division core values are:

Integrity – We dedicate ourselves to serve without bias or prejudice and hold ourselves accountable to the highest professional and ethical standards.

Commitment – We dedicate ourselves to excellence and unity for the purpose of improving the quality of life in our community.

Cooperation – We dedicate ourselves to developing a partnership with our community by working together in a spirit of trust and mutual respect.

Professionalism – We dedicate ourselves to develop high quality, efficient and courteous service through innovative techniques, strategic plans and team work.

All the members of the Division of Police accept responsibility for their part in supporting the Mission and Core Values and are committed to giving the maximum effort in creating an environment in which all can be proud.

Division of Police Policy on Bias-Free Policing

Policy 401 *Bias-Free Policing* was written in compliance with the Ohio Collaborative Law Enforcement Agency Certification (OCLEAC) standard 03.2017.6. The policy provides guidance to division members that affirms the division's commitment to fair, impartial and objective policing and establishes appropriate controls to ensure employees do not engage in bias-based policing or violate any laws while serving the community.

The policy covers all aspects of bias-free policing to include; definitions, prohibition against bias-free policing, training, corrective measures and administrative review of division practices. All division employees must read and sign for a copy of the policy and the policy is available to all members through the division's document management system (DMS).

Bias-Free Policing Policy Training

Division personnel receive bias-free policing training annually. The training includes aspects of profiling related topics to include field contacts, traffic stops, search issues, asset seizure and forfeiture, interview techniques, culture diversity, discrimination and community support.

The Bias-Free Policing policy was updated and re-issued to all members of the division on December 7, 2018. Members were required to pass a test to demonstrate knowledge of the policy.

In addition, sworn officers received roll-call training in November 2018 on *Racial or Bias Based Profiling.*

Bias-Based Citizen Complaints

All allegations of bias-based policing by citizens are thoroughly investigated by the Division. Additionally, the division uses video recording systems in marked police vehicles to assist in the investigation of alleged bias-based policing by officers. A three-year look back of complaints received by the division was conducted and there were no complaints of bias-based policing.

Traffic Stop Data Review

The division collects data from self-initiated traffic stops by recording the race, gender and disposition of the interaction. The data denotes the perceived race and gender of the driver of the involved vehicle once contact is made, as well as the actual disposition of the traffic stop (arrest, citation, or warning).

The data collection process was reviewed and clarified in 2017, Supplemental Order SP-21017-19, to ensure division personnel were recording proper race and ethnicity codes. This process was again refined with the issuance of the updated *Biased-Free Policing* policy in 2018 which requires officers to record the race and gender of the driver on all self-initiated traffic stops.

Race and Gender Categories

Below is the list of approved race codes for traffic stop contacts. These race/ethnicity categories are derived from the National Incident Based Reporting System (NIBRS) and are available in the division's Records Management System. Gender is recorded as male, female or other.

A = Asian
B = Black/African American
H = Hispanic
I = American Indian/Alaskan Native
M = Middle Eastern
P = Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
O = Other
U = Unknown
W= White

Data Analysis

This is the first documented review of traffic stop data, therefore there is little historical data to compare and contrast. This analysis focuses on 2018 data collection, observations and the use of appropriate benchmarks to ensure proper and responsible conclusions.

The primary guiding document for this analysis is a study published by the U.S Department of Justice Officer of Community Policing Services titled *How to Correctly Collect and Analyze Racial Profiling Data: Your Reputation Depends on It!*

The publication provides a summary of the many important methodological issues surrounding this topic. In addition, it provides advice to law enforcement practitioners on how to more accurately collect and analyze racial profiling data.

The greatest challenge with data analysis is how to establish comparison benchmarks. The fact of the matter, there are no standardized formulas or benchmarks that will automatically point to a culture of bias based policing. There are too many variables to create a "one size fits all" approach, as each jurisdiction is unique. With that being said, a few different methodologies were employed to administratively review and compare the bias-based policing data. The following methodologies were employed as a frame of refence to apply context to the bias-based data collected. When combined with community input/concerns and division practices, proper conclusions and recommendations can be made to ensure bias-based policing does not exist.

Methodologies used for this report:

Population Estimate Report: 2018 population estimate for Hilliard 37,055, broken down by race and gender; source was Jobs Ohio, http://ohio.zoomprospector.com/

Traffic Crash Data: Race and Gender of drivers cited in traffic crashes source was Hilliard Division of Police Traffic Crash Reports.

Professional Judgement: An administrative review of bias based policing data was conducted by members of the Command Staff.

Note: Since this is the first bias-based analysis, historical data was not used; however, future reports should include comparisons of historical data.

Data Collection Criteria for Traffic Stops

Criteria used to select the data to be analyzed included:

- The traffic stop had to be self-initiated by an officer
- The data collected was listed in the call for service as an "Operator"
- The data used was from 01/01/2018 to 12/31/2018

The data was received by Dublin Division of Police Law Enforcement Planner Tom Hirschy. The Dublin Division of Police maintains the computer aided dispatch (CAD) data for the division. The data included all self-initiated traffic stops. The original data set included 7227 entries; however, only 4375 were identified as an "Operator." Other identifiers not used included information from passengers, owners or the category was blank.

Data Set and Percentages of Traffic Stops by Gender

Total	Female	% Female	Male	% Male	Unk	% Unk	Not Listed	% N/L
4375	1613	36.87%	2681	61.28%	2	0.05%	79	1.81%

Data Set and Percentages of Traffic Stops by Race

Race	Count by Race	Percentage
Asian	98	**2.24%**
Black	586	**13.39%**
Hispanic	111	**2.54%**
Indian	3	**0.07%**
Middle Eastern	81	**1.85%**
Other	9	**0.21%**
Unknown	50	**1.14%**
White	2994	**68.43%**
Not Listed	443	**10.13%**
Grand Total	**4375**	**100.00%**

Data Set and Percentages of Traffic Stops by Race and Gender

Race	Female	Female %	Male	Male %	Unk	Unk %	Not Listed	N/L %	Grand Total	Race Total %
Asian	32	0.7%	66	1.5%					**98**	**2.24%**
Black	178	4.1%	407	9.3%			1	0.02%	**586**	**13.39%**
Hispanic	26	0.6%	85	1.9%					**111**	**2.54%**
Indian	2	0.05%	1	0.02%					**3**	**.07%**
Middle Eastern	19	0.4%	58	1.3%			4	0.1%	**81**	**1.85%**
Other	4	0.1%	5	0.1%					**9**	**.21%**
Unk	11	0.3%	37	0.8%	2	0.05%			**50**	**1.14%**
White	1185	27.1%	1802	41.2%			7	0.2%	**2994**	**68.43%**
Not Listed	156	3.6%	220	5.0%			67	1.5%	**443**	**10.13%**
Total	**1613**	**36.9%**	**2681**	**61.3%**	**2**	**.05%**	**79**	**1.8%**	**4375**	**100%**

Data Set and Percentage of Traffic Stop Disposition by Gender

Gender	Traffic Stops	Citation	Citation %	Advised	Advised %	Warning	Warning %	Other	Other %
F	1613	468	10.7%	316	7.2%	787	18.0%	42	1.0%
M	2681	734	16.8%	564	12.9%	1252	28.6%	131	3.0%
U	2		0.0%	2	0.05%		0.0%		0.0%
Not Listed	79	19	0.4%	30	0.7%	23	0.5%	7	0.2%
Total	**4375**	**1221**	**27.9%**	**912**	**20.8%**	**2062**	**47.1%**	**180**	**0.0%**

Data Set and Percentage of Traffic Stop Disposition by Race

Race	Traffic Stops	Citation	Citation %	Advised	Advised %	Warning	Warning %	Other	Other %
Asian	98	22	22.4%	28	28.6%	47	48.0%	1	1.0%
Black	586	182	31.1%	145	24.7%	224	38.2%	35	6.0%
Hispanic	111	59	53.2%	8	7.2%	37	33.3%	7	6.3%
Indian American	3	2	66.7%	1	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Middle Eastern	81	23	28.4%	19	23.5%	34	42.0%	5	6.2%
Other	9	2	22.2%	1	11.1%	6	66.7%	0	0.0%
Unknown	50	15	30.0%	13	26.0%	20	40.0%	2	4.0%
White	2994	770	25.7%	628	21.0%	1486	49.6%	110	3.7%
Not Listed	443	146	33.0%	69	15.6%	208	47.0%	20	4.5%
Total	**4375**	**1221**	**27.9%**	**912**	**20.8%**	**2062**	**47.1%**	**180**	**4.1%**

Data Set and Percentage of Traffic Stop Disposition by Race and Gender

Race and Gender	Total Stops	Citation	Citation %	Advised	Advised %	Warning	Warning %	Other	Other %
Asian	**98**	**22**	**22.4%**	**28**	**28.6%**	**47**	**48.0%**	**1**	**1.02%**
F	32	6	18.8%	10	31.3%	16	50.0%		**0.00%**
M	66	16	24.2%	18	27.3%	31	47.0%	1	**1.52%**
Black	**586**	**182**	**31.1%**	**145**	**24.7%**	**224**	**38.2%**	**35**	**5.97%**
N/L	1	1	100.0%		0.0%		0.0%		**0.00%**
F	178	68	38.2%	41	23.0%	62	34.8%	7	**3.93%**
M	407	113	27.8%	104	25.6%	162	39.8%	28	**6.88%**
Hispanic	**111**	**59**	**53.2%**	**8**	**7.2%**	**37**	**33.3%**	**7**	**6.31%**
F	26	15	57.7%	2	7.7%	9	34.6%		**0.00%**
M	85	44	51.8%	6	7.1%	28	32.9%	7	**8.24%**
Indian	**3**	**2**	**66.7%**	**1**	**33.3%**		**0.0%**		**0.00%**
F	2	1	50.0%	1	50.0%		0.0%		**0.00%**
M	1	1	100.0%		0.0%		0.0%		**0.00%**
Middle Eastern	**81**	**23**	**28.4%**	**19**	**23.5%**	**34**	**42.0%**	**5**	**6.17%**
N/L	4	1	25.0%	1	25.0%	2	50.0%		**0.00%**
F	19	7	36.8%	4	21.1%	8	42.1%		**0.00%**
M	58	15	25.9%	14	24.1%	24	41.4%	5	**8.62%**
Other	**9**	**2**	**22.2%**	**1**	**11.1%**	**6**	**66.7%**		**0.00%**
F	4	1	25.0%		0.0%	3	75.0%		**0.00%**
M	5	1	20.0%	1	20.0%	3	60.0%		**0.00%**
Unknown	**50**	**15**	**30.0%**	**13**	**26.0%**	**20**	**40.0%**	**2**	**4.00%**
F	11	6	54.5%	3	27.3%	2	18.2%		**0.00%**
M	37	9	24.3%	8	21.6%	18	48.6%	2	**5.41%**
U	2		0.0%	2	100.0%		0.0%		**0.00%**
White	**2994**	**770**	**25.7%**	**628**	**21.0%**	**1486**	**49.6%**	**110**	**3.67%**
N/L	7	1	14.3%	2	28.6%	3	42.9%	1	**14.29%**
F	1185	307	25.9%	241	20.3%	604	51.0%	33	**2.78%**
M	1802	462	25.6%	385	21.4%	879	48.8%	76	**4.22%**
Not Listed	**443**	**146**	**33.0%**	**69**	**15.6%**	**208**	**47.0%**	**20**	**4.51%**
N/L	67	16	23.9%	27	40.3%	18	26.9%	6	**8.96%**
F	156	57	36.5%	14	9.0%	83	53.2%	2	**1.28%**
M	220	73	33.2%	28	12.7%	107	48.6%	12	**5.45%**
Total	**4375**	**1221**	**27.9%**	**912**	**20.8%**	**2062**	**47.1%**	**180**	**4.11%**

An observation of the data shows that Hispanic drivers are cited at a relatively higher rate than other races. Generally, Hispanic drivers are cited for licensure violations. The preferred course of action with these types of violations is citation and officers have little discretion. It should also be noted that Hispanics only represent 2.54% of traffic stops.

Hilliard Demographics

2018 population estimate: 37,055

Gender Distribution

Gender Population	Total	Percent
Male	18,177	49.05%
Female	18,878	50.95%
Traffic Stops		
Male	2681	61.28%
Female	1613	36.87%
Unknown	2	.05%
Not Listed	79	1.81%

Race/Ethnic Distribution

Race	White Non-Hispanic	Black	Indian	Asian	Hawaiian Pacific Islander	Hispanic	Middle Eastern	Multi-racial	Other	Unk	Not Listed
Race %	83.06%	3.69%	.14%	8.08%	.03%	3.0%	NT	1.93%	NT	NT	NT
Stops %	68.43%	13.39%	.07%	2.24%	0	2.54%	1.85%	NT	.21%	1.14%	10.13%

NT = Not Tracked

At first glance, the data shows some disparity in the population data compared to the traffic stop data. This is not uncommon, as census data often fails to provide an effective data analysis benchmark or baseline. The census shows the percentage of citizens residing in a city; it does not provide the number or demographics of the actual drivers or traffic violators, which by most accounts yield the most effective baseline.

According to the publication *How to Correctly Collect and Analyze Racial Profiling Data*, most analysis will show that police stops are not proportional to population data. The reason for this is the residential population does not take into account variables such as the visitors traveling through the city, the daytime motor vehicle transportation population, the number of traffic violations being committed, and the race and gender of the driver of those vehicles (84).

The comparison does give insight into the racial and gender make-up of the service population as well as the subset of the community the police have contact with through traffic stops. This information is valuable for developing programs aimed to maintain and improve relationships within the community.

Traffic Crash Data Sample

The division recorded 1008 crash reports in 2018. Out of that number, 811 at fault drivers were cited. Issuing citations to at fault drivers is the preferred course of action and officers have little discretion which makes this category desirable for data comparison. Dr. Richard Johnson (2016) indicated in an article, *8 Tips for Writing Biased-Based Policing Reports*, that crash data is one of the best benchmarks' measures of poor driving behavior and should be used when comparing traffic stop data.

Note: Race/ethnicity codes are limited for crash reporting; therefore, traffic crash data does not include Middle Eastern, Hispanic or Other.

Crash Citations by Gender

Gender	Crash Citation	Percent	Traffic Stop %
F	363	44.8%	36.87%
M	448	55.2%	61.28%
Grand Total	**811**	**100%**	

Crash Citations by Race

Race	Crash Citation	Percent	Traffic Stop %
A	23	2.8%	2.24%
B	81	10.0%	13.39%
I	10	1.2%	.07%
U	3	0.4%	1.14%
W	681	84.0%	68.43%
Not Listed	13	1.6%	10.13%
M	NA	NA	1.85%
O	NA	NA	.21%
H	NA	NA	2.24%
Grand Total	**811**	**100%**	

As you can see with the review of crash data, there is a difference between the census data and crash data. Crash data provides a better example of the demographic make-up of the motoring public.

Conclusions

This is the first year for a documented review of biased based policing data. The information contained in this report may have far reaching consequences; therefore, conclusions require careful consideration and thought. As stated earlier in this report, one single set of data or observation should not be used independently to conclude whether bias-based policing practices exists. It is imperative and prudent to look at the entire body of work before reaching a conclusion.

Conclusions include:

- The Division reinforces fair, objective and impartial policing in it's Mission and Core Values.
- The Division has Bias-Free Policing policies in place that prohibit bias-based policing.
- The Division has established Community Relations policies in place to promote a culture of sound police – community relationships.
- The division has a formal complaint process where community members may file a complaint for bias-based policing. There have been no complaints of this nature in the three-year look-back period.
- The Division requires annual training on Bias-Free Policing and the training is up to date.
- The Division requires data collection on all traffic stops which is used for analysis.

After reviewing the data, complaints (lack thereof), and division practices, this report concluded there is no evidence of bias-based policing by the division or members of the division.

Recommendations

While this report demonstrates the Divisions pursuit of fair, objective and impartial policing strategies and tactics, it also exposes the complexity of the issue. The following recommendations are intended to improve the analytical process.

- Now that a bias-free policing analysis process has been established, future analysis should include historical data.

- Establish quality control processes to ensure data is being collected and properly recorded in the database. This analysis showed a deficiency in data collection as well as limitations of the systems involved. Specifically, a reduction of "Not Listed" should be the focus of the quality control.

- Establish an administrative review process of bias-based policing data.

- Consider implementing a regular citizen's survey focused on police and community relations. The survey can collect demographic information and provide valuable

information of what the community thinks about the police department, behaviors and goals.

- Continue aggressive minority recruitment practices to ensure the Division demographics represent the community.

- Annually, produce an administrative review that is available to the public of agency practices, data collected and citizen's concerns in compliance with Policy 401 Bias-Free Policing.

References:

Johnson, Richard R., Ph.D., (February 2016). 8 Tips for Writing Biased-Based Policing Reports. *Legal & Liability Risk Management Institute (LLRMI.com)*. Retrieved from https://www.llrmi.com/articles/legal_update/2016_johnson_biasedbasedreports/

McMahon, Joyce, Garner, Joel, Davis, Ronald and Kraus, Amanda, How to Correctly Collect and Analyze Racial Profiling Data: Your Reputation Depends On It!, Final Project Report for Racial Profiling Data Collection and Analysis. (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2002).

Submitted by:

Jeffrey A. Pearson
Professional Standards Coordinator

Signature: _____ Date: 15 MAR 2019

Reviewed by:

Eric D. Grile
Deputy Chief of Police

Signature: _____ Date: 3/15/19

Approved by:

Robert A. Fisher
Chief of Police

Signature: _____ Date: 3-15-19