

CALIFORNIA RACIAL AND IDENTITY PROFILING BOARD

EVIDENCE-BASED RESEARCH SUBCOMMITTEE: MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, September 26, 2017, 1:00 PM.

Teleconference Locations: California Department of Justice Offices

Sacramento

1300 "I" Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Los Angeles

300 S. Spring Street
1st Floor Reception
Los Angeles, CA 90013

Oakland

1515 Clay Street
20th Floor, Suite 2000
Oakland, CA 94612

Other Teleconference Locations:

Stanford University
Jordan Hall, Room 106
450 Serra Mall
Stanford, CA 94305

Alliance San Diego
4443 30th Street, 1st
Floor
San Diego, CA 92112

City of Gardena Council
Chambers 1700 W. 162nd
Street Gardena, CA 90247

Subcommittee Members Present: Edward Medrano, Timothy Walker, Andrea Guerrero, Eberhardt, Oscar Bobrow, Pastor J. Edgar Boyd

Subcommittee Members Absent:

California Department of Justice Staff Present: Shannon Hovis, Kelsey Geiser, Randie Chance, Kevin Walker, Jasleen Singh

1. Call to Order

The first meeting of the Evidence-Based Research Subcommittee was called to order at 1:12 p.m. by Shannon Hovis from the California Department of Justice (DOJ). The meeting was held by teleconference with a quorum of members present.

2. Update from Department of Justice

Ms. Hovis provided the subcommittee with a review of the board's purview and the tasks mandated to the board by AB953 including the publication of an annual report. Ms. Hovis then laid out the general agenda for the call.

3. Selection of Subcommittee Co-Chairs

Ms. Hovis provided an overview of the selection process stating that each subcommittee on the board will select two person teams serving as co-chairs to work together, work with Department of Justice Staff, and report their work back to the larger subcommittee and to the public. Ms. Hovis clarified that no member of the board can serve as a co-chair on more than one subcommittee meaning there will be ten total board members serving as co-chair.

Members Eberhardt, Bobrow, and Walker nominated themselves as co-chairs. Member Walker voiced concern over the time commitment and revoked his nomination.

MOTION: A motion was made to nominate Member Bobrow and Member Eberhardt co-chairs of the subcommittee.

VOTE: Member Bobrow and Member Eberhardt were selected as Subcommittee Co-Chairs with all members in attendance voting “Yes”, no “No” votes, and no abstentions. Member Boyd was not present for the vote.

4. Discussion of Proposed Report Content

Co-chair Eberhardt described what she and her team at SPARQ at Stanford have reviewed with regards to their capacity in helping the board and the annual report. Co-chair Eberhardt detailed a list of seven potential deliverables that could be completed for the 2019 report.

1. *Stop data report repository.* This repository would be a collection of stop data reports from law enforcement agencies across the country with a heavy focus on California studies and could include a menu that would allow the public to navigate within the electronic repository.
2. *Training repository* – The repository could gather information about trainings and other solutions happening around the state that focus on race and racial profiling and stop data.
3. *Electronic Tutorial On How to Write A Stop Data Report.* This tutorial would be directed toward law enforcement agencies
4. *Electronic Tutorial On How To Read A Stop Data Report* – This tutorial would be geared toward the public to help engage them in how to think about and use the data.
5. *Electronic Tutorial On How To Write About Stop Data For The Media* – This tutorial would be geared toward the media and would provide guidance on how to cover the reports, data, and findings.
6. *Researcher-Practitioner Guide* – This guide would help law enforcement agencies work with researchers on interpreting and utilizing the data.
7. *Implementation Showcase* – This showcase would highlight effective partnerships and programs

Member Medrano commented that many of these deliverables used in the first report to help lay the groundwork before the data is available, particularly with regards to the tutorials.

Co-chair Bobrow asked if it is possible to start populating the stop data repository with data that is being collected, such as the data from the Center for Policing Equity at the University of California, Berkeley. Member Medrano asked if it would be possible to include the collected use of force data or personnel data we currently have.

Ms. Hovis and Ms. Chance clarified that the first wave of data has a reporting deadline of April 2019.

Co-Chair Eberhardt also suggested that before the DOJ receives data, the subcommittee could post stop data forms in the repository, explain and define the fields so the public can be aware of what is coming. Co-Chair Eberhardt noted that the subcommittee does not have to wait for the data collection because there are reports out there that people can look at and get a better understanding of what is happening across the state.

Co-Chair Bobrow commented that what was laid out by Co-Chair Eberhardt is a good framework for the report.

MOTION: Bobrow made a motion for the subcommittee to collaborate with SPARQ for purposes of the work of this subcommittee. The motion was seconded by Member Medrano

APPROVAL: The motion passed with all members in attendance voting “Yes”, no “No” votes, and no abstentions.

Discussion of the 2018 Report

Ms. Hovis suggested that this year’s report be an exercise in framing, defining terms such as disparities, profiling, bias, stereotyping, prejudice, racism, evidence, data, evidence based, and a showcase of what agencies can do with the data.

Ms. Hetey suggested that this report is a good opportunity for the board to help prepare law enforcement agencies and media for receiving a massive amount of information and to get all of the stakeholders on the same page. Ms. Hetey commented that this report could also serve as a practical guide to how to establish the infrastructure within agencies necessary to best collect and manage the incoming data. Ms. Hetey noted that the report should be forward looking and ensure that the data is put to good use and can be leveraged to empirically assess the effect of a law enforcement agency’s own policies, practices, and procedures. Ms. Hetey commented that this is an opportunity for law enforcement agencies to be empowered and to analyze what is and what is not working within their department.

5. Public Comment

Michelle Whittig from the Santa Monica Coalition for Police Reform commented that the subcommittee could collaborate with SPARQ and the Center for Policing Equity to begin to analyze the available stop data.

Diana Tate Vermeire from the ACLU urged the board to focus on the solutions to profiling that the data will most likely reveal and that are supported by stories that have been heard during the passage of the legislation and at the RIPA board meetings.

Co-Chair Bobrow asked if the ACLU plans to suggest solutions in analyzing the data.

Ms. Vermeire responded that the ACLU is interested in seeing the data and creating its own analysis and the communities would do the work in many respects but are still hopeful that DOJ and RIPA board will contribute to this work.

6. Approval of Next Steps

Co-Chair Eberhardt commented that the training would improve police relations for the first report and emphasize how important it is to evaluate the training and programs that are already out there and develop a way to measure their effectiveness. Co-Chair Eberhardt commented that the second piece would be a push for better practices and evaluations.

Member Medrano commented the COPS office developed a center called the “problem oriented policing center” that lists guides for any particular crime related problem. This guide allows agencies to look at how agencies across the country are addressing a particular problem and can copy an approach or combine some explained approaches. Member Medrano suggested including this example as a part of the implementation showcase.

Co-Chair Eberhardt suggested that the training repository be renamed to a solutions repository. Co-Chair Bobrow suggested it be called a “training and solutions repository.”

Co-Chair Eberhardt reviewed the seven described deliverables.

1. Stop data report repository
2. Training and solutions repository
3. How to write a stop data report tutorial - LEAs
4. How to read a stop data report tutorial - public
5. How to write about a stop data report - media
6. Researchers practitioner guide
7. Implementation showcase

Ms. Hovis commented that the POST training subcommittee could overlap with some of these deliverables. Co-Chair Eberhardt suggested that that subcommittee locate all of the

relevant information and the SPARQ team could compile it and include it in the online repository.

Ms. Hetey commented that first report can set the stage for all of the deliverables and include a literature review of some of the stop data reports to build a bridge between what is possible now and what is possible going forward. Ms. Hetey detailed a potential framework for the 2018 report below:

1. Explain the issue, why stakeholders should care, why it matters, why we talk about the issues, and define the key terms.
2. Explain why this data is collected and define “evidence-based”
3. Explain the necessary infrastructure for dealing with the data and explain how to analyze and talk about the data going forward.
4. Explain how the data can be leveraged to make change going forward and highlight ways that this data is already being used successfully.

MOTION: Co-Chair Boborow made a motion to adopt the framework discussed by Co-Chair Eberhardt and the SPARQ team as the basis for the 2018 report and future reports. Member Medrano added building out framework for defining terms in the first report and seconded the motion.

VOTE: The next steps were approved with all members in attendance voting “Yes”, no “No” votes, and no abstentions.

7. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 2:35 p.m.