DARYL FOX: Good afternoon, everyone, and welcome to today's webinar, Equity and Law Enforcement Data Collection, Use, and Transparency, hosted by the Bureau of Justice Statistics and the technology team at the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy. At this time, it’s my pleasure to introduce Karin Underwood with the technology team at the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy for welcome remarks and to begin the presentation. Karin?

KARIN UNDERWOOD: Thank you, Daryl. And thank you everyone to being here with—for being here with us today. My name is Karin Underwood, and I am on the technology team at the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy. And I am glad to start this webinar by introducing my colleague Dr. Alex Piquero to open the webinar today. Dr. Piquero is the Director of the Bureau of Justice Statistics at the Department of Justice and a co-chair of the Interagency Working Group--Working Group. Dr. Piquero.

ALEX PIQUERO: Thanks, Karin. And thanks everybody for making some time out of your Tuesday afternoon or morning, depending upon what part of the world you are watching and listening to us from. It's my pleasure to host this webinar with a great set of folks on the webinar here. And I just wanted to ask people if you can put in the chat, just for fun, where you happen to be in the world right now city-wise, state-wise, maybe country-wise. Maybe you're in the air watching us live on some sort of internet feed, and also what organization you might be representing. It's just really cool for us to kind of see the reach that this webinar is having around the world. And they're just populating like crazy. Look, I know some of these people. It's really cool. So thanks everybody for making the time. So it's my great--my great, great, great honor and pleasure to introduce someone who I think may be the biggest champion for data I've ever met in my entire life, and that's Denice Ross, who was the Chief Data Scientist when we started our work and now is the Chief Data Officer at the OSTP in the White House. So, Denice, I turn it over to you.

DENICE ROSS: Thank you, Alex. And thank you to everyone on the webinar today for joining us as we discuss the work we've been doing as an Interagency Working Group to implement the administration's executive order on advancing effective accountable policing. Today, I'll start by talking about the executive order and our federal Interagency Working Group and the principles that guided our work, as well as our key findings and then an assessment of how detailed data can inform more equitable policing outcomes. And we'll also outline specific steps that federal agencies can and will take to advance police data practices. So the President signed an executive order on advancing effective, accountable policing and criminal justice practices to enhance public trust and public safety, just over one year ago on May 25th, 2022. In that, he mandated the Office of Science and Technology Policy, where Karin and I work--and we are responsible for implementing the Administration's agenda on equitable data. So he required us to collaborate with the Domestic Policy Council and other agencies to issue a report to assess current data collection use—collection, use, and da--and transparency practices with respect to law enforcement activities. We collaborated with 18 federal agencies and components, including the Bureau of Justice Assistance, Community Oriented Policing Services Office, the National Institutes of--Institute of Justice, and agencies like the CDC and GSA. I want to pause and just appreciate the effort of those in the audience today

who are also working to advancing--to advance police data practices and to recognize my federal colleagues. This working group is made up of people who have focused on this purpose of improving data to deliver better at policing outcomes, for years and in several cases decades. So it was quite the honor of my career to be able to work with this group of esteemed professionals inside of federal government. The report was led by three executive leaders: myself, in the role of the Chief Data Scientist; Alex Piquero, Director of the BJS; and Catherine Crump, a Senior Policy Advisor for Criminal Justice at the Domestic Policy Council. And over the last six months, we engaged over 200 stakeholders through requests for information responses, listening sessions, and a vendor engagement event. These stakeholders represented law enforcement, data experts, civil society groups including civil rights and civil liberties, defense attorneys, and prosecutors, and academics, and data journalists. I suspect that many of you on this call today contributed to our understanding of the current status of police data collection, use, and transparency and I--just huge gratitude to the input that we got from the public. We read all of the incoming responses and just so valued them and you could--we--our process literally was informed every time a new response came in from the public, so thank you. We also co-drafted the report itself with several federal agencies, including the FBI, Bureau of Justice Statistics, the DEA, and the Centers for Disease Control. Alex.

ALEX PIQUERO: Thanks, Denice. So we started this work with the premise that better policing data can paint a more complete picture of public safety and community wellbeing. One of the most surprising things that we encountered in this work is that there was remarkable agreement from both law enforcement and civil society that we need better data to improve policing outcomes and that there is a federal role for making that happen. Next slide. So we had a series of guiding principles, kind of like what Denice and Karin talked about, as our north star. Our working group identified that to advance public trust and public safety, we need to do at least four things. Number one, promote accountability and transparency, actions like public data reporting that enable public trust. Second, prioritizing equity. This is a need to identify and address disparities, including in rural, tribal, and territorial communities. Third, protecting privacy. Data practices must protect victim, offender, and officer privacy in accordance with state and local laws. Finally, the use of a whole-of-government approach. Collaboration across federal agencies builds trust in government, and we aim to continue that collaboration across federal, state, tribal, local, and territorial government moving forward. Next slide. So there are a lot of findings in our report, which you can read online. But we're going to kind of put this in a bit of a nutshell so you can have the key takeaways. So based on our analysis, here is what we found. Next slide. It's easy to see where the gaps are when you live and breathe this kind of work throughout most of our lives in professional realms. As a nation, we still need more data and federal reporting and, locally, to paint a complete picture of public safety. Regarding federal datasets, most people know two of these in particular, like NIBRS and the Use-of-Force Data Collection. We believe a higher participation would enable better benchmarks. One way to do this is to follow the lead of like--states like Tennessee, Minnesota, and Oregon, which require federal data reporting, and this has increased participation in federal databases. We also need the inclusion of demographic, geographic, and other variables that can help us understand how to deliver more fair and just policing outcomes. For example, we can use data to see if actions like traffic stops,

searches, and use-of-force happen without bias when looking--without looking at different demographic characteristics. Third, beyond federal reporting, we consistently heard about the value of local reporting for a range of datasets, including departments that self-publish the data they report to NIBRS or the National Use-of-Force Data Collection, to enable local action. For example, Seattle, Baltimore, and Portland published data on 911 calls and officer-involved shootings. Next slide please. Easy to identify those obstacles, but you have to work back and see why we have those obstacles, and we can point to certain barriers that exist that get in the way. Through our stakeholder engagement, we heard five clear barriers to improving collection and public sharing of policing data. First, there remains a need for national data standards and guidance, including a patchwork of data requirements from federal and state agencies. For example, we heard from Chief Gardner in Corinth, Texas, who shared that, and you can read the quote right there—I put on my glasses to read the quote—"Greatly simplifying the reporting process in virtually every category of reporting would result in more data being submitted." Second, departments, especially those in rural and lower resource areas, need technical and data resources. For instance, law enforcement can partner with academics and other technical experts to enable research and analysis. In addition, software vendors need to lower the friction to the use of their tools so that agencies--make it easy for agencies to share reports and dashboards. We had a very important meeting with a lot of software vendors at the White House. We shared a lot of these challenges, but also opportunities. Third, law enforcement are often reluctant without sufficient context. For example, when reporting officer-involved shootings, sources should contextualize this with data on the total number of police-citizen interactions. This is the age-old denominator question. As we got in the quote from North Carolina, "In recent years law enforcement has shown to be very open to collecting new data. … We need to somehow learn to incorporate accurate and robust data collection into the common workday of law enforcement." Fourth, policing data is not always easy to access. As a criminologist before I became the Director of BJS, I know this full well. It can be challenging for law enforcement to extract data even from their own systems. Community stakeholders and researchers scrape data off of PDFs oftentimes. They file public records requests, or they try to make sense of very complicated datasets. Finally, the fact that federal reporting is voluntary, combined with the patchwork of state data-reporting mandates, means that we have data graphs across the entire United States in this realm. We found that states that mandate reporting in NIBRS or use-of-force data have, not surprisingly, higher participation rates in voluntary federal data collection. Next slide. This is a really cool slide, so I thank the smart folks at the OSTP White House who put this together. Data needs to be shared locally and reported nationally. If you take a look at this little, it's not a Venn diagram, but the point here is where we recognize that federal reporting is not the end-all be-all. Right, just because you submit data to the federal government doesn't mean that the work is done. In fact, the work we did over the last several months of our careers has taught us the value of local reporting, including departments that self-publish the data that they report to NIBRS to enable action. You can see there from the graph there's both local dashboards that you and me would want to see from our community, but also what we want to see as a nation overall. These things are not mutually exclusive. Denice, back to you.

DENICE ROSS: Thanks, Alex. So that being said, we understand that there's a burden in reporting data amidst the daily priorities of law enforcement. And police departments can't and shouldn't collect all the data about all the things. But we do believe in asking our stakeholders which data are most important to them, and here is what we recommend to address the barriers that we identified. There are five actions that we identified based on our analysis, including the robust public engagement, including with law enforcement and civil society. The first is that local leaders should encourage law enforcement to collect detailed data and use it to design more equitable policies and practices and regularly share data to promote accountability. The second is that states should mandate and support detailed data collection and sharing about police activities. The third is that federal agencies should collaborate to simplify, standardize, and modernize the collection of law enforcement data. Fourth is that state, tribal, local, and territorial law enforcement agencies should build the technical capacity to consistently report data to federal collections and share data publicly with their own constituents. And lastly, all levels of government should consult with data and technical experts and civil society as appropriate to inform decision making about law enforcement data collection and sharing. That last point is really important, especially if you're trying to prioritize what datasets will give the highest value to your communities. So given that, the challenges that we've laid out are bigger than any one law enforcement agency could fix. And we did hear loud and clear that both law enforcement and civil society believe that there's a significant role for federal agencies to play in helping to reduce the barriers. And upon reflection, we agree as well. We identified 13 specific federal levers that agencies can take to address the barriers and gaps in police data practices in the near, medium, and long term. The first step in the--is the rollout, and here are some of the actions. So we launched this report. The near-term actions that we'll be taking, the Bureau of Justice Assistance will be creating a one-pager on using federal funds to build data capacity. We'll be hosting and participating in convenings on equitable data in law enforcement to spread the word about the value of disaggregated data to inform more equitable policies. And another example is DOJ will create a guide for derisking police software procurement so that it's easier for state and local and tribal and territorial law enforcement to choose the software that's going to serve their needs the best. Medium-term actions, some examples are that OMB (Office of Management and Budget) and BJS will assess the total burden of data collection on law enforcement agencies, with the idea of, like, how can we identify ways to modernize that data collection and reduce the burden there. The second is to collaborate with the advisory policy board that--and add a member to their UCR subcommittee, someone who's very data-focused. The third is grant makers, federal grant makers exploring, giving priority considerations for data reporting. Another lever is for agencies to take steps to increase access to federal statistics for the wide range of users that we have, including those of you in this audience today. And lastly, federal agencies can further standardize data collection use and sharing practices. And then, thinking longer term, there are a few key actions that we identified. One is that the inter--our interagency process can identify mechanisms to support state-level data centers, recognizing that state data capacity can really fill in the gaps with some of those smaller, lower resource jurisdictions. And secondly, encouraging leaders like Congress and the National Conference of State Legislatures to increase incentives for reporting—for data collection use and reporting. So next slide please. I wanted to just do a quick deep dive into one opportunity that we have

in terms of data, and that is the upcoming revisions to the minimum race and ethnicity standards that will impact how departments collect and use detailed race and ethnicity data. You might be aware that the U.S. Chief Statistician, and--in the Office of Management and Budget, is currently reviewing recommendations to the federal minimum standards for collecting data on race and ethnicity, which haven't been updated in 25 years. It's currently a two-part question that you all are likely familiar with. First, it asks about are you Hispanic or Latino and then asks for the person to select their race. The Office of Management and Budget aims to release new standards in the summer of 2024. These are new federal standards. And the recommendations currently under consideration make this a single question, including Hispanic as a race and adding Middle Eastern / North African as an option. There will likely be some transitionary period for federal agencies to adopt the new standards, and there will be significant implications for data that local law enforcement agencies report to the federal government. So that means that records management systems, internal accountability systems, and other types of police software vendors will need to adjust what their standard data collection interface is. And this would be a huge opportunity to think about what additional demographic data would be useful for informing policy and practice and to reduce barriers to data entry use and publishing. So that's just one example of what's coming down the pike. And with that, we'd like to open it up for Q&A, and I want to remind folks that I think if you click on the three dots, it should bring up an option for you to ask a question in the Q&A feature. And if you could ask that question to all panelists, then we'll be able to see your questions.

KARIN UNDERWOOD: Great. Okay.

DENICE ROSS: And my colleague Karin will be doing the moderating. So thanks, Karin.

KARIN UNDERWOOD: Yes. Thank you so much, Denice. And thank you for sharing all of the kind of commitment across the federal government to really taking action to address some of the barriers and gaps that we identified. I see a few questions coming in, so as people are sharing Q&A, let me get started and just ask, you know, a lot of the datasets that you discussed today, like calls for service or officer-involved shootings, are not part of federal reporting, and so what did you see in terms of how other jurisdictions are publishing that data?

DENICE ROSS: Ummm----

ALEX PIQUERO: ----I'll start real quick.

DENICE ROSS: Yeah.

ALEX PIQUERO: It's variable, and that's the thing. You know, some police departments will have some subset of calls for service data, but another--a neighboring jurisdiction could have that same dataset, but much larger or much smaller and different data fields in them. So you have a lack of standardization among 18,000 some odd agencies, and then you have different ways of categorizing certain things that they collect in their particular datasets. So it makes it hard not just for community members but also academics and

researchers to really do comparisons across jurisdictions on a--what to a lot of people like my mom and dad would be a very simple question. But it's not that simple because of the lack of standardization.

DENICE ROSS: Yeah. And I'll add, when we convened the software vendors who are serving law enforcement agencies, the lack of standardization creates a real pathological complexity as they're trying to build interfaces for local law enforcement, and that has two effects on the market here. One is that the software vendors spend a lot of time customizing to a specific state or a specific jurisdiction's data structure. And then you can imagine the downside of that is that there's less time innovating and really optimizing the data collection. And so if there were some greater degree of standardization across these high-value datasets, including calls for service or traffic stops or police force demographics, for example, then law enforcement agencies would be able to take advantage of some deeper innovations coming from the software vendors that might reduce those barriers to data collection use and publishing.

KARIN UNDERWOOD: Thank you, both. I have one additional question to open with and then, there's a few great questions coming in the chat that I'll turn to. So there have been several federal efforts around policing and police data. How does this effort differ from previous efforts like the Obama era Police Data Initiative? And I'll turn that question to Denice.

DENICE ROSS: Yeah. Thanks, Karin. And I appreciate that, having been involved in the Police Data Initiative and the 21st Century Policing Task Force Report back in the day. And what is really different about this is the very interagency nature of the work. So we—you know, across agencies, as I mentioned, 18 different components, rolled up their sleeves and identified what they could do in their offices in order to be able to improve police data collection, use, and transparency. And then, the other thing that I--that we did that I think was also very different is just the high degree of engagement specifically around policing data. We know that those of you on this call today, I mean, you're the super geeks of police data, right? And we engaged you and your colleagues and a very broad swath of people who really focus on using policing data to get your input on what recommendations we should make and how we should be--what levers of federal government we should be pulling to improve data practices and policing. Alex, do you have any other thoughts on how this work is different than what you've seen in the field?

ALEX PIQUERO: Yeah, I--the one thing I would add is that this is squarely focused on data and squarely focused on improving data collection practices at the full range of policing activities. And I think that that's really critical because a lot of other things that people think about with respect to reports, they're focused on one specific police behavior or action rather than the data that are generated by police, by citizens, by police-citizen encounters. So that's what makes this one very unique. And not just that it was public, but it was also delivered directly to the President of the United States.

KARIN UNDERWOOD: Great. Thank you, both. And I think--yeah, it's so nice to put this report in context. I want to turn to a question from Lynette in the chat who asked, "What

data are available related to the demographics of the police officers in relation to the demographics of the communities they serve?" And this is one of the datasets that is explicitly covered in the report. So Alex, I'll turn that question to you.

ALEX PIQUERO: Yeah. So BJS publishes data on the demographic characteristics of law enforcement agencies regularly, and you can find those on our website. And then people can actually look to their particular jurisdiction and compare some agencies that publish that on their own websites. So there's a myriad of different kinds of ways that you can do that. You can do it at the national level, and then you can do it at the local level.

DENICE ROSS: And I just wanted to mention that's a great example of why anyone working in criminal justice data should keep--be keeping an eye on those race and ethnicity minimum standards coming out of OMB because the key here, right, is the context, so there's--we have the law enforcement demographics and then the demographics of the communities that they're serving that comes from federal statistics like the U.S. Census.

KARIN UNDERWOOD: Great. And there are a few questions about that, so we might come back to that. I wanted to take a question from Carolyn: "So as we know, rural policing is different than metropolitan policing, and I'm wondering if the full report details how smaller departments can take up this charge without being overwhelmed."

DENICE ROSS: I can start and then, Alex, maybe if you can talk about some of the other assets.

ALEX PIQUERO: Sure.

DENICE ROSS: This--the challenge of technical and data capacity is one that lower resource jurisdictions, especially those in rural America, feel across the board, whether it's education or criminal justice or housing. And there are some effective practices for addressing that, and one is to take more of a regional approach and maybe think about shared services, partnering with local universities, cooperative extension offices, and whatnot to see if you can get some of your technical and data capacity maybe pooled for the region or with the help of university partners. And then, Alex, I know that DOJ has a couple of state-level capacity resources as well.

ALEX PIQUERO: Yeah. So there's DOJ, you know, the FBI, BJS. We do a lot of technical assistance to help a range of law enforcement agencies. We don't focus just on large agencies. We focus on every single agency. And so it--the difficulty some of these agencies have with their resources, they're not just computers and technology. At some of these agencies they’re still using paper, you know, but there are also people issues that are involved because they--a lot of times agencies are looking not necessarily to hire data scientists. They're looking to put people on the street, those are--that's the tension that a lot of these agencies have, but they can be overcome. So the lack of data at those levels is not because they don't want to participate and they don't want to share. They do. They just need the resources and assistance. But there is movement in that direction. There are

good success stories where agencies have started to collect those data and then are transmitting that data going forward. We just got to keep at it.

DENICE ROSS: We also did hear from some law enforcement agencies who said that it was just--it was burdensome doing the data entry and the submitting the data to the federal government, so there's obviously a lot of opportunity there to take a more human-centered approach in the software that law enforcement agencies are using. And that's where I'm really excited about this partnership with GSA to help law enforcement agencies procure software that is more human centered and can allow law enforcement to focus on their main job rather than burdening them with difficult-to-use data entry.

KARIN UNDERWOOD: Okay. Wonderful. Thank you, Denice. And Alex, building on your comment about resources, so as a researcher, as I know you have done this in the past, is it recommended to reach out to assist local or state law enforcement agencies or wait for them to reach out for assistance?

ALEX PIQUERO: No, it should be proactive. I'll give you a personal story on this. My first academic job was at Temple University over 25 years ago, and one of my senior colleagues, Jack Greene, who was a very influential policing scholar said, "Let's go take a ride to the Roundhouse." And for the people on the call who know Philadelphia Police Department well, the Roundhouse was where we met Chief Kennedy who was Chief of Police at that time. And one of the doctoral students who was working with Jack and myself, a guy named Matt Hickman who's the Chair at Seattle University in Criminal Justice, came along for the ride. And we started doing a lot of work with them, such that they opened up their internal affairs database. We helped them understand their own data that they were collecting and made recommendations to them. So I think from an academic and a researcher's point of view, you know, the articles and the--and research and grants, and the currency that, you know, we with--we--within which we operate and get rewarded on, but I have found everywhere I've been when I've worked with local law enforcement agencies, I actually go there and say, "What can I do to help you?" Because they don't always have the experience or the expertise or the people or the time to do this work. But a lot of goodwill can come out of those kinds of relationships. And it's not always about the researcher getting stuff and getting data and then parachuting in and then jet-setting out. There has to be long-term, established relationships that work on both sides of the equation.

KARIN UNDERWOOD: Thanks, Alex. Another question. I think there's a few questions here about some of the standardization. One is, "Are there efforts to improve the definitions that distinguish a common definition for an arrest and reporting of events such as citations and tickets?"

ALEX PIQUERO: That's always the issue----

KARIN UNDERWOOD: Alex, can you take that?

ALEX PIQUERO: Yeah. That's always the issue in crime data, not just in the United States, but across the world. You know, we're really consistent on the very, very serious offenses across most jurisdictions, but then it gets much more cloudy. You know, it ranges from partly cloudy, to mostly cloudy, to very cloudy depending upon the less-seriousness of the offense. Remember, every--in every state, there is the annotated legal code, and that denotes what the crime and the offense is in a particular jurisdiction as opposed to a different jurisdiction. And so the standardization level is very difficult unless someone can come and say, "Okay. We need some bare minimum," and at least start with a structure that every agency is already collecting so they don't have to reinvent the wheel yet again. So we have to move in that direction, and I think actually the Census potential change in race and ethnicity categories offers us the opportunity to do just that. If we're going to be doing that anyway, this is that opportune time to start rethinking how we go about gathering all types of data in agencies.

DENICE ROSS: Yeah. And I do want to give a shoutout to the state of Missouri, which does regular crosswalking between their state-level codes and the NIBRS codes, and I think that type of crosswalking is a way to have that standardization that Alex is saying but also the local, you know, contextually relevant categories as well.

KARIN UNDERWOOD: While we're talking about the OMB race and ethnicity standards, Denice, do you want to talk again about that timeline and if there have been any plans on how that might roll out for law enforcement?

DENICE ROSS: Yeah. So I'll talk about the timeline, and let me make sure I get the website right. I think it's S--yeah, SPD15revision.gov has all of the information they use. So that's Statistical Policy Directive, SPD 15, that's number 1-5, revision.gov, and that's where OMB and the Office of the Chief Statistician are doing a really good job of keeping stakeholders updated on the process. So you can see the pr— initial--the current recommendations and sort of the direction it's trending, and what they're saying is it's summer of 2024 is when any recommendations would be announced. And there hasn't—there hasn't been an implementation plan announced yet. But just speaking as somebody who's a tech person, right? You know, I would love to get ahead of this a little bit if I'm working in software or I'm thinking about my next, you know, software procurement as a local law enforcement agency, and thinking about that summer 2024 date, when you're going to get a very strong signal about how race and ethnicity categories should be collected moving forward. I did speak to one data analyst in southern Arizona who was saying that every one of their data systems collected race and ethnicity differently. So this is a real pain point, even within a single jurisdiction, not to mention comparability if you want to compare it to, for example, Census data about the demographics of the community. So I think having a--the modernization and the clarity on these race and ethnicity categories is a big opportunity. But I'd keep an eye on SPD15revision.gov and peg that summer 2024 as an opportunity to look at your contracts with your software providers. If you're a software company, think about, you know, updating your default offering so that you're in compliance with these--you're ready to be in compliance with these new standards in summer of 2024.

KARIN UNDERWOOD: Thanks, Denice. A question: "What consideration is being given to"--and this is from Mark; thank you, Mark--"is being given to increasing capacity of the state level to improve data collection and reporting. Many state-level entities like UCR Programs have limited resources in terms of staff and budget, and it feels like the importance of state entities get lost between the focus on the local agency and the national focus, for example BJS and FBI."

ALEX PIQUERO: Yes is the simple answer to that. You know, resources are strained, and resources isn't just technology. It's the maintenance of that technology. Right. Everybody think it's so simple: just throw things up on a cloud. But, you know, the cloud runs out of space eventually, like most of us who have phones understand that if we save every photo or music song that we download. I can say that, you know, BJS does work through JRSA, the Justice Research and Statistics Association, to help. This would--they're called SACs, Statistical Analysis Centers, that work at the state level and sometimes at local jurisdictions to aid in data collection, technical assistance, specific types of analyses. And there are good success stories of the kind of work at the--that some of those SACs do. I think that we are seeing--you do see--because the FBI does a lot of this work together when they convene their APB or when they do their outreach. I mean, they are working really hard. I can assure you that these--the statisticians and the people who work with state and local agencies to improve the data collection, to get them the resources that they can get them. But there also has to be a commitment, and we know this as well in any kind of domain that you're in, there has to be a commitment from the top in leadership, whether it's local, state, county, whatever that is, that says, "We are going to prioritize this, and therefore we're going to invest resources." And that's not just computers. It's also people. People are your most important resource when you're doing this kind of work. So the more we can train and enhance data scientists into the full range of criminal justice operations, I think you'll see those results over time. But it's not like a software update. This isn't going to be fixed tomorrow morning. This is going to be an investment. We'll see the returns on that investment. It's just going to take some time.

DENICE ROSS: Yeah. And I'd also like to suggest that sometimes the state or even local government IT capacity is underutilized by law enforcement. And that could be a--three-quarters of the states have a chief data officer now who's in charge of the enterprise data management for the state. And sometimes you've got capacity there that you might be able to tap into, especially on that side of things with using the data, doing the analytics, and in making the data available to the public. So even with the as-is conditions, sometimes a jurisdiction can just get more data capacity if they lean on the enterprise capacity that their state or local government may have. And by the way, speaking as somebody who worked in city of New Orleans, I was--I led data for Mayor Landrieu and, you know, worked in the basement as most data people do. And we were always so happy when law enforcement would come to us and want help with a data problem, and sometimes, they're afraid to reach out to law enforcement and offer their services. But if law enforcement comes to the data and tech teams, I think they will find that they bend over backwards to provide support.

KARIN UNDERWOOD: Thank you, Denice. And I am going--I think you've seen our experts here, so I'm going to stop sharing my screen so you can see them even more closely. Please keep the questions coming. I'll go through a few more Q&A and then, towards the end of today, we will talk about when you will--when you can hear from us next and what will be happening in the next few months. So I also wanted to add quickly to the question about the UCR Programs, that that is explicitly mentioned as a federal action in the report and that we recognize the critical role of state data programs to help scale some of the standards and the efforts that are happening federally. So that was really something that we heard across the board from our colleagues in the FBI and others--is something that we want to prioritize in terms of thinking about what federal resources could support that level of action. And speaking of federal resources, a question came in from Janet. "How might federal grant makers prioritize data reporting? Would this require new federal legislation?" And Denice, I'll turn that to you to start us off.

DENICE ROSS: Yeah. One relatively light way that grant makers can incentivize, especially voluntary reporting to the federal data collections, is to make that a policy preference in their notice of funding opportunity. So not necessarily a requirement of the grant, but you might get extra consideration if you are participating in NIBRS or Use-of-Force Data Collection.

ALEX PIQUERO: And the other thing I would add to that is at some point, there has to be goodwill of everybody that we're actually, you know, populating these databases is good for not just your own agency, but it's good for the country. And I think that, you know, there is that sort of social contract that we have to have with respect to what we want to understand at the national level, and it really is upon every agency to populate. And I can say that, you know, the NIBRS transition was very difficult early on. It talked to--we're basically starting an entire new process that was started in 1929. And so, you know, not many people would want to fly an airplane that was built in 1929. So we're building this high-profile airplane now, but the value of the NIBRS data is that it carries and includes so much more information that was available in the previous data collection system, in the UCR. And we’re starting to see more and more agencies make that transition. So the numbers are getting better and better and better. And I, you know, there’s a light at the end of the tunnel, and the tunnel's not getting longer, which is always an important thing. The light is getting brighter. So I'm very positive on where we're headed with that. And, you know, and also there are a lot of police chiefs who champion the importance of NIBRS. We heard from them on, you know, in our feedback in their participation in the stakeholder meetings, in the RFI comments, as well as, you know, things that we have seen be said online at Major Cities Chiefs Association. You know, they see the value of this too. And so as more and more of them, you know, join the club, so to speak, I think that we're going to get to that point.

KARIN UNDERWOOD: Great. Thank you, Alex. And I have a question here that I think we've received a few times throughout our deliberations internally. So, you know, what are the challenges (from Bob) with the FBI releasing use-of-force data publicly from the data that the FBI has collected so far? And the note here is that also in response to FOIA requests, sometimes this data is not released and it's an extremely valuable data that

could be useful for public use and should be made public. And I know we've kind of touched on this even in the report and in some of our future actions. So, Alex, do you want to start us out, and then, Denice, do you want to add to that?

ALEX PIQUERO: Yeah. We have to remember that the Use-of-Force Data Collection is voluntary. So that's, you know, that's first things first. The second thing is, you know, it also--the FBI's data collection is a small subset of the Use-of-Force. It's more on the serious side of the use-of-force as opposed to the less serious side use-of-force. The other thing I would say about that is we have to bear in mind that the Use-of-Force Data Collection populates differently across jurisdictions because of investigations that are done in police departments. So if there is an incident, there has to be a data collection involved, there could be an investigation involved, and that could take time before they may report something because there may have not been something founded as a result of a particular event. So all of those things take into consideration before something then gets populated and reported up.

DENICE ROSS: Yeah. And even given that, we have seen many jurisdictions publishing different degrees of detail on use-of-force, just self-publishing it on their website, looking towards state and local privacy laws about how much detail they produce, and sometimes to Alex's point, they will add to the data as, for example, the investigation goes on and then they might even include a link to the final report of findings. And so I agree that that local publishing is just so robust and so important for community engagement and for refining and optimizing local policies and protocols to deliver more equitable outcomes. And so I--it does seem like, sort of, the best of both worlds is to participate in the National Use-of-Force collection, especially so we can get those numbers up so that, from a privacy perspective, that more data can be released, more detailed data, and then secondarily to self-publish so that you have that immediate benefit for community engagement and building trust. I will say there is some confusion among agencies about what they are allowed to release in terms of their data. And so this is an area where I think federal government can provide some clarity on what type of data can be released or not released with regard to CJIS.

KARIN UNDERWOOD: Great. Thank you. Thank you both. And when--one of the next questions I want to take is from Connor. So what data should law enforcement agencies not collect? Or what does too much data collection look like?

DENICE ROSS: I'll get very specific for a second and mention that we, in January I think it was, we released an LGBTQI+ evidence agenda. And it has some really good guidance on when and how to collect data on sexual orientation and gender identity. There's some contexts where it's very appropriate and some contexts where it's not. And so, Daryl, I'll send you the link for that. If you could put it in in the chat, that would be a great resource. I would say, before you add any detailed demographic data to your collection, it's always worth asking, like, how will we use these data to change our policies and programs. Like make sure that there's a--there's policy relevance to adding the question and then, you know, see what the potential downfalls of the--asking that question are so that you are both asking the question responsibly, and then when you're publishing the data, one really

important thing is to keep in mind what privacy protections you need to have. For example, with domestic violence, we know that fear of having their information made publicly available has a chilling effect on people calling police around intimate partner violence. So we just want to think about the unintended negative consequences in addition to whatever the state and local laws are on privacy.

KARIN UNDERWOOD: Thanks, Denice. "One"--this is from Leonard—"one particular struggle has been identifying mental health-related law enforcement calls for service. It would be worth identifying the scale and frequency of calls where mental health professionals could assist. Is there any movement towards a standardized definition of a mental health-related call for service? And I would love to help echo that guidance to our local law enforcement agencies."

ALEX PIQUERO: Great question.

KARIN UNDERWOOD: Alex, you want to start us out?

ALEX PIQUERO: I think, you know, people have to think carefully about what a call for service is. So a citizen makes a call to a call center and says, "This particular event is happening." The call taker tries to extract as much information as possible, then relays that information to the police officer, who then shows up at a scene, where the scene could have changed dramatically between who was involved, what circumstances are involved, so on and so forth. So, not many call takers are mental health professionals because you can't diagnose someone simply on the phone. A lot of people who may see someone having a mental health episode may have the right diagnosis or may not have the perfect diagnosis. So the key is that the call taker has to extract as much detailed information as possible. The call person needs to give as much detail as possible, and all of that has to get relayed to the police officer to make--or dispatch and then the police officer make the most appropriate decision. Now, that said, there are some agencies that do partner with mental health or social work professionals. There are some, you know, promising practices, some jurisdictions that have gone down this road who have found those to be effective with respect to how the call was handled. Did the person who was experiencing the episode get the kind of service delivery that they need? Was something that could have happened negatively averted? So we're still in a small data collection in this field because a lot of agencies don't have the resources to partner with mental health professionals or social workers. But some agencies are putting those individuals on the street. They don't have them all the time. So if one a--one officer gets dispatched who's a mental health professional, then there's nobody covering that shift who might have those particular require--you know, training requirements. So it's an extremely complicated issue. I'm not punting. That's the reality of it. The data collection on that is scattered at best, is the best way I can describe it. Hence the importance of the need to collecting those types of data in the call-for-service log and then in--with respect to the police officer interaction to the extent possible.

DENICE ROSS: Yeah. And I'll just add, I think there's an opportunity with the rollout of the 988 lines to think about ways to responsibly integrate 911 and 988 data or at least have

similar categories so that you can, you know, you can look at the calls for service, both for 988 and 911 together. And I--and at the end of our report, there's a section on--what did we call it, Additional Opportunities for Data-Driven Policymaking about Policing, that gives a few really compelling examples of where the power of data linking and those integrated data systems, which again, often state and local jurisdictions will have that capacity for doing data linking and integrated data management in a very responsible way. So that might be something where we can really, you know, zoom out and look at the role of policing in the larger goal of enhancing community wellbeing.

KARIN UNDERWOOD: Thanks, Denice and Alex. Okay, a question about data in the bigger ecosystem: “So how do we”--the question from, is again from Lynnette—"how do we address the issue of data being insufficient for creating system-level change?” And I'll start with you, Denice, because I know we talked a lot about data for action, so maybe I'll rephrase this: How might we address the issue of data? How might we make it sufficient enough for creating system-level change and using this data that we have about disparities and biases in policing and ensuring that they're not overlooked?

DENICE ROSS: Yeah. The--I'd say the number one thing that an agency can do is start to use the data it's collecting to answer its own questions, because when you're using your own data, then the people doing the data entry recognize the value. They see the value in the data that's being entered. So your data quality improves rapidly once you start to use the data internally, and then it increases your confidence for sharing it publicly. So if there's like one magic lever, I would say it's using data internally. There are things that software companies can do to make that easier, sort of, templates that allow you to do common analyses, for example, that can have an impact on your policies and protocols. And so I'd say start with using the data.

KARIN UNDERWOOD: Great. And I'll turn this next question to you, Alex, because we're almost at time for transitioning to the next thing. So, there's a few different groups here who do this work on a regular basis and have been working with different agencies and helping produce guidance. So are there further opportunities to partner on improving data collection outcomes and equity and policing outcomes?

ALEX PIQUERO: Yeah, without a doubt. I think that one of the things that a lot of us know full well is you don't know what you don't know. And a lot of police departments, sometimes they don't know what to collect or how to analyze their data. So if there are groups out there who are willing to work with the police department to, you know, and to--and hand in hand to provide services that they need, but also help them answer their own questions, as Denice said earlier. One thing I've learned throughout my entire career was oftentimes they don't know what to do with all of this data they collect. They just collect a bunch of stuff, and then they give it and they put in some report and then it goes to some, you know, somewhere or some person. And so oftentimes, they don't know sometimes the questions--even what to ask or how to ask them or how to analyze them. You know, not a lot of police chiefs are proficient in, say, Python or R to give you a really simple example. They're--that's just not what their training is. So they need the help in understanding what the data that they are collecting, why is it useful for them for their purposes. And I said this

a lot of times, you all are probably tired of hearing it, you know, different people need different data in different ways for different reasons. And so police departments need certain kinds of data for their own decision making, for where to put their patrols, how to allocate, you know, different shift levels, those kinds of things. The only way they can optimize that is the collection of data and then someone to help them not just analyze, but also understand what those data are. You know, not a lot of police chiefs live in a world of standard errors and variances and likelihood functions. We have to remember that is that the data experts are here to help them analyze and translate the data for their purposes.

KARIN UNDERWOOD: Absolutely. Thank you, Alex. And I think that we're almost at time, so I want to give, Alex, you the chance to speak to what some of the next steps are for this work and when you will hear from us again. And as I do that, Denice, any kind of, closing thoughts for today?

DENICE ROSS: Just huge gratitude to everybody on the call and all of our federal colleagues who rolled up their sleeves and put in, you know, shared their wisdom and their passion for this work, and a special thanks to all of you who are the data users, because you're the ones who help us turn these data into action.

ALEX PIQUERO: I will echo that. I've learned so much in this process, not only working with Denice, Karin, and all the people on our working group, but also the people who took the time to send us comments. I mean, people who take time out of their lives and they write 5-, 10-page memos, and we read every single one of them. And a lot of those thoughts are reflected in this report. And the people who visited with us during some of our webinar engagements--and we met with not just the standard academics and researchers. We met with civil rights groups. We met with data people. We met with software vendors. We met with police chiefs. We met with a full range of people who have touched these data.

KARIN UNDERWOOD: Absolutely. So Alex, tell us what's next?

ALEX PIQUERO: A lot. Please share the report. If we could pull a Taylor Swift on Ticketmaster thing, that would be the best thing in the world. We want as many people as possible to read the report. And also we have a nice one-pager, front and back, so technically it's one page, that actually synthesizes the work that is in the larger document. Please distribute that not just to your colleagues, but to law enforcement agencies or people in the data science space. They don't have to be experts in policing data. You know, people who are in the data science space are experts in the data science. You can translate any outcome variable into their world. They can think about educational data, health care data, crime data is another dataset of fields and row and columns for them. So please distribute this information and also let us know if you're moving the needle on a certain agency. It doesn't matter to us if it's a big city agency, a little city agency, or a university agency, or a tribal agency. Let us know what you're doing. Let us know what's working. But also let us know if you did something and it didn't work. You know, we need to know about those kinds of things just as much as we need to know about the things that do work.

KARIN UNDERWOOD: Great. Thank you. And please stay tuned for our next webinar, which we will schedule for some time in the fall. We're continuing to do this work in collaboration with our colleagues across agencies and with state, tribal, local, and territory law--territorial law enforcement agencies. So, we hope that you continue to follow the progress of the Criminal Justice Statistics Interagency Working Group. And Alex, please let us know how we can continue to do that.

ALEX PIQUERO: Shameless plug for the Bureau of Justice Statistics: stay tuned for updates on our end. You can subscribe to us. I like subscribers, so I would like to see more subscribers today. We have a JustStats newsletter that I'm--I try to be in everybody's inbox, probably every day in some capacity. But we also want to share the work we're doing, and BJS has long been doing and being a leader in the collect--collection of lots of different kinds of policing statistics. So our data can be a resource to people. And also let us know if there are things that you think that we should be doing. You know, I think as a director of a federal statistical agency, I also need to think about what our stakeholders want to see happen in this phase too. So please subscribe to our newsletter. We'll be sending stuff out with respect to where we are in progress in terms of the next steps for the working group and what our plan is ahead, as Denice laid out earlier in the presentation. So our work continues, and stay tuned. We'll be doing another one of these webinars--probably not in the summertime; probably in the fall sometime--to give you an update on our progress and hope we'll have some good things to share at that point in time.

KARIN UNDERWOOD: Wonderful. Thank you so much, everyone, for joining us. That concludes our webinar. And it has been an honor to have you with us today. And we look more--forward to more webinars in the future and appreciate all of the wonderful questions, and again, all the work that you're doing every day to make progress on advancing more equitable policing outcomes.