

# Hilliard Division of Police

## Bias-Free Policing Analysis 2023

January 17, 2024

Prepared by Jeff Pearson  
Professional Standards Administrator

**Michael Woods**  
Chief of Police



Real People. Real Possibilities.

Division  
of Police

**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 community-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 purpose of proactively identifying 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 protecting and enhancing the quality of life in the community through exceptional service while upholding the constitutional rights of all.

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

**Integrity** – We dedicate ourselves to serving 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 developing 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 Division's 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 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.

In 2023, Bias-Free Policing training was addressed through roll call training (23-RC-002), a review of the Division's Discriminatory Harassment Policy 314 was administered through DMS, a Supervisor's review of Bias-Free Policing Analysis (Feb. 2023) and published legal updates in DMS.

### **Bias-Based Citizen Complaints**

All allegations of bias-based policing are thoroughly investigated by the Division. There were no bias-based complaints filed against the division or its officers in 2023.

A five-year look back of personnel complaints indicated that the division received three bias-based complaints. The incidents were investigated and determined to be unfounded. The complaints details are as follows:

- 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).
- 2021 – a complaint was filed claiming an officer stole an arrestee’s car keys. The complainant was a Black female and indicated her race was a factor for the officer’s actions.

### **Video Recording Systems**

The Division equips all marked patrol cars with Mobile Video Recording (MVR) systems. The MVR is designed to provide records of events and assist officers in the performance of their duties.

The Division implemented a Body Worn Camera (BWC) program in 2023. The purpose of the program is to enhance the mission of the Division by accurately capturing contacts between members of the Division and the public. The Division’s BWC program complies with the standards set forth by the OCLEAC Board.

### **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.

### **Community Survey**

In 2022, the City commissioned a community survey. All survey items relating to safety received high praise, and ratings were either higher than or on par with national benchmarks. Approximately 9 in 10 respondents to the survey felt safe or very safe from violent crimes and property crimes (National Research Center Powered by Polco. (2022) *Hilliard, OH The National Community Survey*. <https://hilliardohio.gov> ).

### **Traffic Stop Data Review**

Policy 401 *Bias-Free Policing* requires officers to collect data from self-initiated traffic stops by recording the race, sex, and disposition of the interaction. The data denotes the perceived race and sex 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).

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. Sex 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 analysis focuses on 2023 data collection, professional 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 Sex of drivers cited in traffic crashes from Hilliard Division of Police Traffic Crash Reports.
- A review of division historical traffic stop data.
- Professional Judgement: A member of the Command Staff conducted an administrative review of bias-based policing data.

### 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 4668 self-initiated traffic stops.

The following charts illustrate the traffic stops by race and sex.

**Table 1: Data Set and Percentages of Traffic Stops by Sex**

Sex	Count by Sex	Percentage
Female	1669	35.8%
Male	2959	63.4%
Unknown	8	.2%
Not Listed	32	.7%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>4668</b>	

**Table 2: Data Set and Percentages of Traffic Stops by Race**

Race	Count by Race	Percentage
Asian	109	2.34%
Black	933	19.99%
Hispanic	327	7.01%
Native American	20	.43%
Middle Eastern	299	6.41%
Other	1	.02%
Unknown	120	2.57%
Not Listed	43	.92%
White	2816	60.33%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>4668</b>	

**Table 3: Data Set and Percentages of Traffic Stops by Race and Sex**

Race	Female	Female %	Male	Male %	Unk	Unk %	Not Listed	Not Listed %	Grand Total	%
Asian	41	0.88%	68	1.46%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	<b>109</b>	<b>2.34%</b>
Black	291	6.23%	642	13.75%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	<b>933</b>	<b>19.99%</b>
Hispanic	88	1.89%	237	5.08%	1	0.02%	1	0.02%	<b>327</b>	<b>7.01%</b>
Native American	8	0.17%	12	0.26%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	<b>20</b>	<b>0.43%</b>
Middle Eastern	71	1.52%	227	4.86%	0	0.00%	1	0.02%	<b>299</b>	<b>6.41%</b>
Other	0	0.00%	1	0.02%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	<b>1</b>	<b>0.02%</b>
White	1139	24.40%	1676	35.90%	0	0.00%	1	0.02%	<b>2816</b>	<b>60.33%</b>
Unknown	26	0.56%	86	1.84%	7	0.15%	2	0.04%	<b>120</b>	<b>2.57%</b>
Not Listed	6	0.13%	10	0.21%	0	0.00%	27	0.58%	<b>43</b>	<b>0.92%</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1670</b>	<b>35.78%</b>	<b>2959</b>	<b>63.39%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0.17%</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>0.69%</b>	<b>4668</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

Note: Percent is based on total traffic stops

Table 4: Data Set and Percentage of Traffic Stop Disposition by Race and Sex

Race and Sex	Advised	% of Stops	Citation	% of Stops	Warning	% of Stops	Other	% of Stops	Grand Total
<b>Asian</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>47.7%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>15.6%</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>33.9%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>109</b>
F	15	36.6%	7	17.1%	18	43.9%	1	2.4%	41
M	37	54.4%	10	14.7%	19	27.9%	2	2.9%	68
<b>Black</b>	<b>416</b>	<b>44.6%</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>16.5%</b>	<b>291</b>	<b>31.2%</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>7.7%</b>	<b>933</b>
F	132	45.4%	52	17.9%	86	29.6%	21	7.2%	291
M	284	44.2%	102	15.9%	205	31.9%	51	7.9%	642
<b>Hispanic</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>56.6%</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>17.1%</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>22.6%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>3.7%</b>	<b>327</b>
		0.0%		0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	1
F	48	54.5%	14	15.9%	24	27.3%	2	2.3%	88
M	136	57.4%	42	17.7%	49	20.7%	10	4.2%	237
U	1	100.0%		0.0%		0.0%	0	0.0%	1
<b>Native American</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>30.0%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>25.0%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>45.0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>20</b>
F	4	50.0%	2	25.0%	2	25.0%	0	0.0%	8
M	2	16.7%	3	25.0%	7	58.3%	0	0.0%	12
<b>Middle Eastern</b>	<b>168</b>	<b>56.2%</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>13.7%</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>27.4%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2.7%</b>	<b>299</b>
		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%	1	100.0%	1
F	31	43.7%	10	14.1%	29	40.8%	1	1.4%	71
M	137	60.4%	31	13.7%	53	23.3%	6	2.6%	227
<b>White</b>	<b>1187</b>	<b>42.2%</b>	<b>394</b>	<b>14.0%</b>	<b>1054</b>	<b>37.4%</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>6.4%</b>	<b>2816</b>
	1	100.0%		0.0%		0.0%	0	0.0%	1
F	475	41.7%	149	13.1%	458	40.2%	57	5.0%	1139
M	711	42.4%	245	14.6%	596	35.6%	124	7.4%	1676
<b>Other</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100.0%</b>		<b>0.0%</b>		<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>1</b>
M	1	100.0%		0.0%		0.0%	0	0.0%	1
<b>Unknown</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>45.8%</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>19.2%</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>27.5%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>7.5%</b>	<b>120</b>
	1	50.0%		0.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	2
F	11	44.0%	4	16.0%	10	40.0%	0	0.0%	25
M	40	46.5%	18	20.9%	20	23.3%	8	9.3%	86
U	3	42.9%	1	14.3%	2	28.6%	1	14.3%	7
<b>Not Listed</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>32.6%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>23.3%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>25.6%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>18.6%</b>	<b>43</b>
	10	37.0%	8	29.6%	5	18.5%	4	14.8%	27
F	2	33.3%	2	33.3%	2	33.3%	0	0.0%	6
M	2	20.0%		0.0%	4	40.0%	4	40.0%	10
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>2084</b>	<b>44.6%</b>	<b>700</b>	<b>15.0%</b>	<b>1591</b>	<b>34.1%</b>	<b>293</b>	<b>6.3%</b>	<b>4668</b>

Note: Percent is based on total for the particular race/sex category.

### Traffic Crash Data Sample

The division recorded 583 public roadway crash reports in 2023. Out of that number, 452 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 of poor driving behavior and should be used when comparing traffic stop data.

### Crash Citations by Sex

Sex	Crash Citation	Percent	Traffic Stop % from Table 1
Female	189	41.8%	35.8%
Male	263	58.2%	63.4%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>452</b>		

### Crash Citations by Race

Race	Crash Citations	Percent	Traffic Stop % from Table 2
Asian	4	.9%	2.34%
Black	59	13.8%	19.99%
Hispanic	0	0	7.01%
Native American	0	0	.43%
Middle Eastern	0	0	6.41%
Other	0	0	.02%
Unknown	0	0	2.57%
Not Listed	0	0	.92%
White	389	85.3%	60.33%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>452</b>		



### Historical Data Review

When comparing 2021 through 2023 sex and race traffic stop data, the data is relatively consistent.

Sex	2023 Count by Sex	2023 Percentage	2022 Count by Sex	2022 Percentage	2021 Count by Sex	2021 Percentage
Female	1669	35.8%	1393	36.88%	1506	40.9%
Male	2959	63.4%	2355	62.35%	2127	57.8%
Unknown	8	.2%	5	.13%	5	.14%
Not Listed	32	.7%	24	.64%	40	1.09%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>4668</b>		<b>3777</b>		<b>3678</b>	

Race	2023 Count by Race	2023 Percentage	2022 Count by Race	2022 Percentage	2021 Count by Race	2021 Percentage
Asian	109	2.34%	98	2.59%	98	2.7%
Black	933	19.99%	748	19.80%	688	18.7%
Hispanic	327	7.01%	234	6.20%	184	5%
Native American	20	.43%	5	.13%	13	.4%
Middle Eastern	299	6.41%	283	7.49%	216	5.9%
Other	1	.02%	2	.05%	6	.2%
Unknown	120	2.57%	62	1.64%	28	.8%
Not Listed	43	.92%	34	.90%	72	2%
White	2816	60.33%	2311	61.19%	2373	64.5%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>4668</b>		<b>3777</b>		<b>3678</b>	

## 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 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 community – police relationships.

After reviewing the data, complaints, and division practices, this report concludes there is no indication 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.

- While the City's community survey provided general information about public safety, the Division should explore the implementation of an in-depth survey focused on community – police relations. The survey should collect demographic information and provide valuable information of what the community thinks about the police department, behaviors, and goals.
- Continue aggressive diversity 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 consider 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 sex 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 Administrator

**Reviewed by:**

Ronald L. Clark  
Deputy Chief of Police

Signature: DC Clark 605 Date: 01-18-24

**Approved by:**

Michael Woods  
Chief of Police

Signature: Michael Woods Date: 1-18-2024