

Hilliard Division of Police

Bias-Free Policing Analysis 2020

February 26, 2021

Robert A. Fisher, CLEE
Chief of Police



Real People. Real Possibilities.

Division
of Police

Introduction

In 2020, there was nationwide civil unrest and protests aimed at police reform. This unrest was primarily based on a social justice movement that focused on police policy and practice. While the majority of the protests and riots were centered in large urban areas, the City of Hilliard did experience local protests. The events of 2020 highlight the responsibility community leaders have to ensure all members of the community are treated in a fair and impartial manner.

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 community and police relationships. It is imperative, as law enforcement professionals, that we truly understand and uphold the 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 teamwork.

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 6 - Bias Free Policing*. The policy provides guidance to division members and affirms the division's commitment to fair, impartial, and objective policing. The policy also 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-based 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).

Ohio Collaborative Law Enforcement Certification (OCLEAC)

The OCLEAC was established for the purpose of implementing recommendations from the Ohio Task Force on Community-Police Relations. This community-based law enforcement advisory board was tasked with establishing statewide standards to guide law enforcement agencies with policy development.

The advisory board specifically established *Standard 6 - Bias Free Policing* and the Division has met all standard requirements and has received certification for this standard.

Additionally, the Division complies with, and is certified in all standards established by the Ohio collaborative Community-Police Advisory Board.

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 reviewed and re-issued to all members of the division on August 10, 2020. In addition, Bias-Free Policing training was addressed through roll call training and legal update in-service training.

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 five-year look back (2016 – 2020) of personnel complaints received by the division indicated two bias-based complaints. Both incidents were investigated and determined to be unfounded.

- 2019 – a citizen complained that an officer did not take appropriate action at a crash scene and indicated that race (complainant was a black male) was a factor.
- 2020 - a complaint was filed out of an incident that occurred in 2016. The complainant felt a case was not appropriately investigated and race was a factor (complainant was Asian female).

Administrative Review of Bias-Free Policing Data

A member of the command staff was tasked with reviewing the traffic stop bias-free policing data to determine if there were any patterns of bias-based policing or concerning practices.

The administrative review did not find any indications of biased based policing that required further inquiry.

Local Social Justice Events

The City of Hilliard experienced several social justice protests in and around the Old Hilliard area. The protest drew crowds of up to 300 people (estimated). The platform for the protests were centered on police reform and racial discrimination.

The City and Division worked with protest organizers to ensure peoples first amendment rights were protected and the events were peaceful. Although there were several events and the platform was aimed at police reform, there were no incidents between the protesters and the police.

Traffic Stop Data Review

Policy 401 *Bias-Free Policing* requires officers to collect 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 (advised, citation, or warning).

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

Data Analysis

This analysis focuses on 2020 data collection, observations, and the use of appropriate benchmarks to ensure proper and responsible conclusions. (See Data Analysis Commentary at end of this report)

Methodologies used for this report:

- Traffic Crash Data: Race and Gender of drivers cited in traffic crashes from Hilliard Division of Police Traffic Crash Reports.
- A review of division historical traffic stop data.
- Professional Judgement: An administrative review of bias based policing data was conducted by members of the Command Staff.

Data Collection Criteria for Traffic Stops

Traffic stop data for this analysis was pulled from the division's computer aided dispatch (CAD) system. The data includes 4,539 self-initiated traffic stops.

Data Set and Percentages of Traffic Stops by Gender

Gender	Count by Gender	Percentage
Female	1744	38.4%
Male	2730	60.1%
Unknown	3	0.01%
Not Listed	62	1.4%
Grand Total	4539	

Data Set and Percentages of Traffic Stops by Race

Race	Count by Race	Percentage
Asian	132	2.9%
Black	672	14.8%
Hispanic	182	4.0%
Indian	17	0.4%
Middle Eastern	277	6.1%
Other	7	0.2%
Unknown	43	0.9%
Not Listed	123	2.7%
White	3086	68.0%
Grand Total	4539	

Data Set and Percentages of Traffic Stops by Race and Gender

Race	Female	Female %	Male	Male %	Unk	Unk %	Not Listed	Not Listed %	Grand Total	%
Asian	50	1.1%	82	1.8%					132	2.9%
Black	210	4.6%	461	10.2%			1	0.02%	672	14.8%
Hispanic	56	1.2%	126	2.8%					182	4.0%
Indian	6	0.1%	11	0.2%					17	0.4%
Middle Eastern	80	1.8%	195	4.3%	2	0.04%			277	6.1%
Other	3	0.1%	4	0.1%					7	0.2%
White	1306	28.8%	1779	39.2%			1	0.02%	3086	68.0%
Unk	12	0.3%	30	0.7%	1	0.02%			43	0.9%
Not Listed	21	0.5%	42	0.9%			60	1.32%	123	2.7%
Grand Total	1744	38.4%	2730	60.1%	3	0.07%	62	1.37%	4539	

Note: Percent of Total Traffic Stops

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

Race and Gender	Traffic Stops	Advised	% of stops	Citation	% of stops	Warning	% of stops	Other	% of stops
Asian	132	41	31.1%	39	29.5%	51	38.6%	1	0.8%
F	50	13	26.0%	18	36.0%	19	38.0%	0	0.0%
M	82	28	34.1%	21	25.6%	32	39.0%	1	1.2%
Black	672	268	39.9%	141	21.0%	222	33.0%	41	6.1%
	1	1	100.0%		0.0%		0.0%	0	0.0%
F	210	72	34.3%	56	26.7%	76	36.2%	6	2.9%
M	461	195	42.3%	85	18.4%	146	31.7%	35	7.6%
Hispanic	182	66	36.3%	63	34.6%	51	28.0%	2	1.1%
F	56	25	44.6%	16	28.6%	15	26.8%	0	0.0%
M	126	41	32.5%	47	37.3%	36	28.6%	2	1.6%
Indian	17	4	23.5%	4	23.5%	8	47.1%	1	5.9%
F	6	1	16.7%	1	16.7%	3	50.0%	1	16.7%
M	11	3	27.3%	3	27.3%	5	45.5%	0	0.0%
Middle Eastern	277	99	35.7%	72	26.0%	99	35.7%	7	2.5%
F	80	27	33.8%	24	30.0%	29	36.3%	0	0.0%
M	195	71	36.4%	47	24.1%	70	35.9%	7	3.6%
U	2	1	50.0%	1	50.0%		0.0%	0	0.0%
Other	7		0.0%	2	28.6%	5	71.4%	0	0.0%
F	3		0.0%	1	33.3%	2	66.7%	0	0.0%
M	4		0.0%	1	25.0%	3	75.0%	0	0.0%
Unknown	43	7	16.3%	16	37.2%	18	41.9%	2	4.7%
F	12	1	8.3%	5	41.7%	6	50.0%	0	0.0%
M	30	6	20.0%	10	33.3%	12	40.0%	2	6.7%
U	1		0.0%	1	100.0%		0.0%	0	0.0%
Not Listed	123	37	30.1%	29	23.6%	50	40.7%	7	5.7%
	60	20	33.3%	10	16.7%	26	43.3%	4	6.7%
F	21	7	33.3%	7	33.3%	5	23.8%	2	9.5%
M	42	10	23.8%	12	28.6%	19	45.2%	1	2.4%
White	3086	935	30.3%	647	21.0%	1351	43.8%	153	5.0%
	1		0.0%		0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
F	1306	348	26.6%	293	22.4%	611	46.8%	54	4.1%
M	1779	587	33.0%	354	19.9%	739	41.5%	99	5.6%
Grand Total	4539	1457	32.1%	1013	22.3%	1855	40.9%	214	4.7%

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 4 percent of traffic stops.

Traffic Crash Data Sample

The division recorded 489 public roadway crash reports in 2020. Out of that number, 387 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 (2019) indicated in a research brief 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	166	42.9%	38.4%
M	221	57.1%	60.1%
Grand Total	387	100%	

Crash Citations by Race

Race	Crash Citation	Percent	Traffic Stop %
Asian	8	2.1%	2.9%
Black	29	7.5%	14.8%
Indian	1	.3%	.4%
White	349	90.2%	68%
Not Listed	0	0	2.7%
Middle Eastern	0	0	6.1%
Other	0	0	.2%
Hispanic	0	0	4%
Grand Total	387	100%	

Historical Data Review

When comparing 2018 to 2020 gender and race traffic stop data, the data is relatively consistent.

Gender	2020 Count by Gender	2020 Percentage	2019 Count by Gender	2019 Percentage	2018 Count by Gender	2018 Percentage
Female	1744	38.45	2249	40.4%	1613	36.9%
Male	2730	60.1%	3284	59.0%	2681	61.3%
Unknown	3	.1%	1	0.02%	2	0.05%
Not Listed	62	1.4%	34	0.6%	79	1.8%
Grand Total	4539		5568		4375	

Race	2020 Count by Race	2020 Percentage	2019 Count by Race	2019 Percentage	2018 Count by Race	2018 Percentage
Asian	132	2.9%	155	2.8%	98	2.2%
Black	672	14.8%	806	14.5%	586	13.4%
Hispanic	182	4%	214	3.8%	111	2.54%
Indian	17	.4%	19	0.3%	3	0.07%
Middle Eastern	277	6.1%	167	3.0%	81	1.85%
Other	7	.2%	10	0.2%	9	0.2%
Unknown	43	.9%	48	0.9%	50	1.1%
Not Listed	123	2.7%	171	3.1%	443	10.1%
White	3086	68%	3978	71.4%	2994	68.4%
Grand Total	4539		5568		4375	

Conclusions

The information contained in this report may have far reaching consequences; therefore, conclusions require careful consideration and thought. One single data set or observation should not be used independently to conclude whether bias-based policing practices exist. 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 through the organizational Mission and Core Values.
- The Division has Bias-Free Policing policies in place that prohibit bias-based policing.
- The Division has Community Relations policies in place to promote a culture of sound community – police relationships.
- The Division has a formal complaint process where community members may file a complaint for bias-based policing and complaints are investigated. This can be accomplished in person, on-line, or by phone.
- The Division properly handled the local protests by ensuring people rights were protected and the events were peaceful.
- 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.
- The Division is certified by OCLEAC, which shows a commitment to maintaining strong police – community relationships.

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

Recommendations

While this report demonstrates the Division's 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.

- Implementation of a regular citizen's survey focused on police – 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.

Data Analysis Commentary

The primary guiding document for this analysis is a study published by the U.S. Department of Justice Office 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 couple of methodologies were employed in this analysis to administratively review and compare the bias-based policing data. The following methodologies were employed as a frame of reference 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.

Commentary on use of population data:

Traditionally, traffic stops data was compared to jurisdictional population estimates. However, census data often fails to provide an effective data analysis benchmark or 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 primary reason for this is the residential population does not take into account variables such as 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).

Additional research by Dr. Richard Johnson supports this conclusion. Dr. Johnson (2019) concluded “Using census statistics as a benchmark, that in no way resemble the driving population or the traffic violator population, is just one of these many methodological errors.”

References:

Johnson, Richard R., Ph.D., (December 2019). Racial Profiling or Bad Research? Why We Should Stop Using Census Data. Dolan Consulting Group. Retrieved from <https://www.dolanconsultinggroup.com/news/racial-profiling-or-bad-research/>


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).

Prepared by:

Jeffrey A. Pearson
Professional Standards Coordinator

Reviewed by:

Eric D. Grile
Deputy Chief of Police

Signature:  _____ Date: 2/26/2021 _____

Approved by:

Robert A. Fisher
Chief of Police

Signature:  _____ Date: 2/26/2021 _____