

National Law Enforcement Statistics Webinar – June 3, 2026

Koi Gouahinga

Hello and welcome to the Bureau of Justice Statistics webinar on National Law Enforcement Statistics. My name is Koi Gouahinga. I'm a public affairs specialist here at BJS. I will be facilitating this session.

Please be aware that this event is being recorded and there is a way for you to activate closed captions if you need them, at the bottom of your screen. You may use the chat function at any time to ask your questions and then the panelists will handle them at the end in the Q&A session. Before we hear from our presenters, it is my pleasure to welcome our acting director, Kevin Scott, for some introductory remarks. Dr. Scott, the floor is yours, sir.

Kevin Scott

Thanks, Koi. Welcome to the Bureau of Justice Statistics' first webinar for 2026 on national law enforcement statistics. We are delighted that you are able to join us today. I'm Kevin Scott, the acting director of the Bureau of Justice Statistics. I'm really excited that we get to lead off our 2026 webinars with an array of data on local, state, and federal law enforcement that address a wide variety of questions, including those I hope you've brought to this webinar.

And we have additional webinars we'll be announcing in the near future to stay up to date on what we are doing at BJS. I encourage you to go to bjs.ojp.gov/subscribe and join our email list. That and checking back regularly on our webpage are the best ways to keep up with what we are doing.

It is my pleasure to introduce BJS's Chief of Law Enforcement Statistics, Alexia Cooper, who will talk a little bit more about the work of BJS, and particularly her team. She will also introduce the other presenters for today's webinar.

Alexia Cooper

Thank you, Kevin. As Kevin said, my name is Alexia Cooper, and I oversee the Law Enforcement Statistics unit at the Bureau of Justice Statistics. I will echo everyone is very grateful for all of our attendees today and we hope you will enjoy our presentation and have lots of questions.

We'll go ahead and get started today by presenting a little bit of an overview of BJS. I know not everyone who's on the webinar today might be familiar with the kind of work that we do, and so I'd like to have just a little bit of time to introduce you to what we do, how we do it, and why we do it. Then we'll go ahead and present a number of different presentations focusing on our recent law enforcement releases over the last couple of years, as well as some information from one of our victimization surveys. We're going to look at data from our federal deaths and custody collection as well as our federal law enforcement collection, then we'll move on to data about our local and state participants in looking at health and wellness and hiring and retention, and we'll close it

out with information from individuals from our victimization survey looking at our police-public contact survey.

But to get started, what is BJS? Well, BJS is the United States primary source of criminal justice statistics for the Department of Justice. And to put it another way, we're the statistical arm of the Department of Justice. Our mission is to collect, analyze, and release information on crime, criminal offenders, victims of crime, and the operations of the justice system across all levels of government.

You're going to hear a lot about our website today and we'll have a slide at the end that will provide information on where you can go for different types of information, as well as how you can reach out to us.

But why BJS? Why should you be interested in the work we do and why should you trust the work we do? Well, first, BJS as a statistical agency is bound by the requirements of a statistical agency, and that means that we are required to operate in an objective way to ensure scientifically rigorous data. We are bound to release trustworthy reliable statistics with rigorous quality control, with multiple levels of review to ensure that every statistic we release has been double checked and can be relied on. In addition, we use detailed vetted methodologies that have been tested over numerous iterations. We have a long history with most of our collections and spend a lot of time and effort making sure that everything that we do is as scientifically rigorous as we can be, and that we're using the most updated appropriate methodologies that we have access to.

In addition, all of the data that we collect is available freely to the public. That includes all of our reports that we publish online and any data tools that we have available, but we also release almost all of the data that we collect and it is archived to the public. How to get access to it can vary depending on whether or not you're an academic or have different sorts of access and whether or not it is a highly confidential source of data, but in one way or another, everything that we do is available to the public.

Our data is a source of national data because of our focus, which is fairly unique. We focus at releasing national level estimates for the most part on a wide variety of information which is very different from a lot of other sources of information. Our estimates are traditionally and typically representative, which means that they are counted on to be national and can give you information about national trends, as well as releasing many different types of data collections. And we have many different types of surveys, some of which you'll hear more about today.

And finally, last but certainly not least, we have standardized measures and standardized surveys. That means that we use information from our surveys over time so that the measures that we use can be re-compared over time. But we also release all of those measures to the public so that if you are conducting research and are interested in asking the same kinds of questions that we ask on a different population.

All of our information is freely available for your use, so you can go online, download it and use it in any way that you choose.

Now who makes up BJS? Now that I've talked to you about what we do, who are we? We are officially the second smallest of the statistical agencies. Internally, we call ourselves small but mighty. We are made up of approximately 60 professionals split across a number of different programs areas, including corrections and judicial statistics groups. We collect information on law enforcement, which is the group that you'll be hearing from today, including both reported crime and administrative statistics. We have data collections on recidivism, victimization, as well as having a unit that focuses on statistics and methods. And we couldn't get any of all of this done without the support of our policy planning, publications, and operations individuals.

I also thought it would be useful to provide information on how a BJS statistic becomes a BJS statistic. So, the information that you'll be hearing about today, how does it get from start to finish? And it takes a long time to produce the data that we produce because of the quality that we produce it at. Developing our instruments, figuring out what we want to collect, how we want to collect it, and what those surveys should look like takes anywhere between 12 and 24 months. That includes figuring out who is going to be a participant, whether or not we're going to do it as a sample or a census, and getting approvals for all of the things that we do. Then, we have to actually field the survey or send the survey to the participants. That can take anywhere from 6 to 12 months, sometimes it can take even longer. Because we are a statistical agency, we're bound by certain minimum requirements for participation or else we can't use the information that we produce, so we strict as hard as possible to ensure that all of the information that we're producing has a very high response rate. Once we then finish the data collection, all of the data comes in-house and our statisticians are responsible for reviewing it, cleaning the data to make sure that any oddities are corrected, ensuring that we have statistical corrections for missing, as well as handling any weighting, or any other issues that might occur.

We produce documentation for the data so that anyone who wants to use it can understand what our variables are and how they came to be. And then we run analyses on those data so that we can produce our reports, figuring out what kind of information the public might be interested in and how to best display that information. Then we draft our reports, including text, figures, tables. We have to send all of that for editing to make sure that the language makes sense and is clear to anyone who might want to read it and making sure that all of the data and numbers in it are correct. We check and double check all of that information to make sure that anytime someone opens one of our reports that any number that you pull out of that is accurate and correct.

And then finally we release the information to the public. We release that in a number of different ways, including our online reports, both static hard copy reports as well as online data tools. And finally, most, if not all, of our data is archived through to the public, through the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data, or NACJD.

The Law Enforcement Statistics Unit is the one that I'm representing today, and we collect data on the administrative side of the law enforcement arm. We focus on data on federal, state and local law enforcement agencies including things like staffing, budget policies, and the like. We also collect special collections on data collections, such as training academies, law enforcement officers, and schools, and even forensics such as crime labs, medical examiners, and coroner's offices. Most of our studies are conducted every two to four years and include both census or collections that include every possible participant as well as sample-based collections. Our collections are typically settled within the administrative area, which occurs post-crime occurrence but pre-court filing.

And now I'm going to go ahead and move on to the actual data collections that we want to talk about today. The first one I'm going to start with is our Federal Deaths in Custody report from 2023. I want to preface before I go into this that this, as well as the next talk that I'll be giving, are not data collections that I have done the work for. I'm presenting on behalf of my colleagues, Sean Goodison, who you'll hear from later, and Charlotte Lopez-Jauffret, who could not be here today, but I want to make sure that you understand that all of the hard work you're seeing is actually from them and any mistakes I make are simply my own.

I'll go ahead and give you guys a background on the FDCRP with an overview and the scope, including select findings from the most recent report and just some final thoughts on where we're going. The Federal Deaths in Custody Reporting Program, or FDCRP as we refer to it in this presentation, began in 2013 as a result of the Deaths in Custody Reporting Act. This particular act requires that the head of every federal law enforcement agency in the United States submit to the attorney general, in this case us, information about the death of any person who is either under arrest, in the process of being arrested, or in custody, such as being transported, incarcerated, or detained at a facility. I want to preface that BJS manages the collection of deaths in custody from federal law enforcement only, and that the deaths in custody collections for state and local agencies are handled by our sister agency, the Bureau of Justice Assistance.

Now, the FDCRP is an annual data collection, and unlike many of our data collections, it is collected on the fiscal year, which means the year that starts October 1st and ends at the end of September. The FDCRP originally started in 2016, followed by some testing programs and some precursors. The report that we'll be talking about today covers the end of federal fiscal year 2023. We are currently reviewing and finalizing the 2024 report, which we hope will be out sometime in the next couple of months, and we're working on completing the 2025 data collection while we plan for the 2026 collection.

In terms of the scope of this data collection, as I said, this is a mandatory collection for federal law enforcement agencies, and that we do collect data from all 137 federal agencies that are potentially respondent. I say potentially because not all agencies have federal law enforcement with arrest or firearm authority or detention authority and so there are a few that of that total end up being excluded because they're not eligible,

but we do reach out to all of them every year. We have a very high response rate for this collection, which makes sense since it is mandatory, and have had a 100 percent response rate since 2020.

It's a web-based format, which means that we have an online platform that participants will go into and provide the information. And it consists of three separate forms, one for detention-related deaths, one for arrest-related deaths, and one for summary counts and general summary information.

Now I'd like to give you some select findings from the most recent report. I do want to emphasize this is far from all that's actually in the report and we're just trying to give you sort of some highlights of what's available. The first thing we look at for these is the overall counts, and what we find is that, in 2023, out of the 137 federal law enforcement agencies that provided data, generally few federal agencies report any deaths. Overall, only about 7%, or ten agencies, provided any custodial deaths, with the majority of these coming from three agencies: BOP, the Marshals Service, and CBP. This is fairly consistent over time as these are some of the largest agencies. We only had five agencies report any detention-related deaths, and only two reported both.

Looking more specifically at the arrest-related deaths. We collect information on the deceased's characteristics for every death that is reported, and what we found is that generally most arrest-related deaths are of males who are white, with non-Hispanic ethnicity, and who are between the ages of 25 and 34. Very few deaths involve older individuals.

In addition to the demographic information of the decedents, BJS also asks for information on the reasons behind the initial contact between the law enforcement officers and the decedent, as well as any alleged offenses the decedent may have committed that brought the individual into contact with the federal law enforcement officers. And what we find with this is that nearly all of the initial contacts between the law enforcement officers and the decedents in 2023 were due either to a warrant service or in response to a general patrol or responses. When we look at what offenses are alleged in these cases, about 80% of the decedents' most serious alleged offenses were for a violent offense such as a homicide, attempted homicide, aggravated assault, and things of that nature, or for an immigration violation.

Agencies also report on the characteristics around the deaths and the nature and manner of these deaths. In 2023, just over half of all decedents' cause of death was a suicide or an accident, and about 41 % of arrest related decisions were killed by another person, most commonly a law enforcement officer. When we ask about weapons involved, we find that over half of arrest-related deaths were caused by weapon, almost all of these were a firearm.

The final part of the survey asks agencies to report on the actions of the decedent and officers during the incident. Here we've highlighted a few of the items asked about from the decedent. Given the context, we find that about 85% of deaths involve a reported

use or brandishing, either discharged or displayed, firearm used by the decedent. About a third of cases reported that the decedent attempted to injure law enforcement officers. We also have information on the perceived decedent's conditions such as whether or not there was intoxication apparent or mental health and additional decedent actions as well as officer-related actions in the full report.

Now I'd like to talk a little bit about the detention-related deaths. Looking at these compared to the arrest-related deaths, we find that they're still overwhelmingly male, although it is a larger percentage than for the arrest-related deaths, and overwhelmingly white. But detention related deaths have far more non-Hispanics, and they're considerably older, with the majority being 55 years or older in age. Similarly, in contrast, when we ask about the manner of death, around 72 % of detention-related incidents involve an illness or a natural cause of some nature, with only 6% of decisions dying due to a homicide. When we asked about where these deaths took place in the detention-related incidents, we are told that 43% occurred outside a medical facility, with 24% incurring at a medical facility within the detention center itself. Very few deaths occurred in other places.

We ask for detention-related deaths about the most recent case or a criminal case that the decedent was involved in, and most involved the most serious charge for these individuals related to either a drug offense, with the next most common being weapon or sex offenses. Most of the decedents were involved in an active conviction or they were serving an active conviction at the time of their death, and the majority, over 70%, had been in a detention facility for more than one year before their death.

Now I went through that a little bit quickly, but I think that the highlights of this are that the majority of deaths are driven by three agencies: the Bureau of Prisons, the Marshal's Service, and CBP, which are the largest federal agencies. The decedents are largely white and male, and detention-related deaths are split between accidents and illness while arrest-related deaths are split between homicides and accidents or suicides. The report is currently available on our website, and we're hoping to archive the data soon. We are working on archiving the data for '21 through '23, but the data for '16 through '20 is actively available online. As I said before, the '24 report will be available soon and we're working on the '25 collection right now.

In addition to making the data that we have available to the public, we're also looking at, for the future, how we might be able to better display this data so that the public can have access to more of the information in an easier way. One of the things we're looking at, for example, is producing either an online report so that the data can be more quickly updated or possibly even a data tool.

I'm now going to move on to another aspect of our federal law enforcement, specifically our Census of Federal Law Enforcement Officers, 2023. Again, as with the previous presentation, this particular data collection is overseen by Charlotte Lopez-Jauffret and Sean Goodison. I am simply presenting on their good work.

So, to start out, how do we collect the Census of Federal Law Enforcement Officers and what is it? The CFLEO, as we usually call it, collects data from all federal law enforcement agencies with arrest and firearms authority. The data collected are administrative in nature, and we ask about things such as the number of officers working in areas of criminal investigation, law enforcement, patrol response, protection, court operations, corrections, and we ask that by agency.

This particular data collection is one we've done multiple times over the years and has been collected periodically since 1996, with the most recent one you'll hear about today, having been finalized from 2023. Unfortunately, this particular collection is not mandatory. However, it did include all known federal law enforcement agencies of which there were 94 agencies that we identified that had personnel with arrest or firearm authority. This included Offices of Inspectors General. We did exclude a few federal agencies including some from the U.S. Armed forces, and some agencies with confidentiality restrictions such as the CIA. We also excluded officers stationed overseas. It was collected through a fillable PDF and had a very high response rate. Admittedly, not a hundred percent, but we did get a 95% response rate with 89 of the 94 eligible agencies responding.

So, to provide you some of the highlights of the findings from this particular report, which was released about three weeks ago now. Looking at the distribution of federal agencies, in 2023, federal law enforcement agencies employed just over 130,000 full-time federal law enforcement, with almost half of these working at DHS and 30% working for the DOJ. Within DHS, CBP employed the greatest number of officers with about 46,000 officers.

Looking at the demographics of these officers, what we find, and this we can look at over time, is about 15% of the officers were female in 2023, which is fairly similar to what we see over time; 57% were white and 20% were Hispanic or Latino. And you can see that this is a little lower than it has been in the past depending on which one, but overall, this has been fairly consistent over time. I will say that the Supreme Court of the United States and the IRS Criminal Investigation Division have the largest percentage of female officers, with 25% of their officers being identified as female.

Another thing that we wanted to do with this particular report is look at hires and separations. The wave of potential retirements in federal law enforcement is one that is of major concern across the federal government, and so we wanted to look in a little bit more detail at that and understand a little bit more of what might be going on there.

When we asked federal agencies about how many hires or separations they had, they reported that they had just over 10,500 or 10,600 hires, with just under 9,000 separations. And this does mean that, overall, there were more hires than they were separations, which is good. However, we do find that when we look at that by size of agency, you see a little bit of a different story. With the majority of these focusing on the larger agencies, those with 250 officers, with the smallest agencies, those with 50 or fewer officers, actually seeing a net reduction in staff. We do see that DHS yet again

is one of the largest reported, hiring the most agencies with a net increase of almost 500 officers in 2023.

New to this iteration of the FLEO was the reasons for separations. We wanted to understand more about why officers were leaving and whether or not it was due to normal retirement or whether or not there were some other things going on. For the 78 agencies that provided the reasons for separations, we found that 44% were for non-medical based retirements, 24% were voluntary resignations, and less than 10% were for dismissals. Again, though, when we look at this by size, we see a little bit of a variability here with agencies in the smaller areas, those with 50 or fewer officers, with voluntary resignations making up a larger proportion of the separations for these agencies. Non-medical retirements were more common in the larger agencies than they were in the smaller agencies.

We also wanted to understand a little bit more about the equipment, weapons, and authorized techniques that federal law enforcement use. So, we asked about what kinds of chemical equipment, manual techniques, physical instruments, and restraints that federal agencies are authorized to use, and generally just shy of 60% of agencies reported authorizing the use of OC, or pepper spray as more commonly known, and about one fifth, or 21 %, authorized the use of chemical agent projectiles, otherwise known as tear gas. Agencies that were larger, those with 250 officers or more, authorized chemical projectiles more often than those with 50 or fewer.

Another thing that was new to this iteration of the FLEO was a focus on wellness programs and policies around health and wellness. This is a major area of interest for the federal government as we want to understand more about how to support our federal officers and where we're lacking in those areas. And so, we added a number of questions related to this issue. 85 agencies provided information on at least one wellness program that was offered, and we asked all of the agencies whether or not their agency offered the program, whether or not it was directly managed within the agency or whether or not it was offered through an external party, or whether or not it was not offered at all. What you're seeing here is whether or not it was offered in any way, yes, either directly or indirectly. And what we find with this is that on the positive side almost all federal law enforcement agencies that responded indicated that they offered at least one formal wellness program for use by full-time personnel with arrest or firearm authority, and 62% of agencies reported providing resources for expectant mothers with 50% reporting providing childcare programs. One of the things that we found that was very interesting is that there's a lot of variability in what programs are offered and the size of the agency. We did see that childcare programs were the lowest and least most offered, but it was offered almost 50% of the time which, is great.

One of the last things we're going to talk about today has to do with training and agencies' responses during critical incidents. Given this focus on health and wellness, we wanted to understand what kind of policies federal agencies have with regards to how they handle critical incidents for federal officers and protections of federal officers. And so, we asked them about things like whether or not they reduce access to service

weapons during a case or suspicion of suicide, whether or not there's administrative leave policies when there's concerns about suicide, and things like response protocols after on-duty or off-duty critical incidents. And what we find is that very few agencies, only 6%, indicated that they required regularly scheduled psychological evaluations for their officers; 85% indicated that they required response protocols of some sort after a critical incident that occurred on-duty, but far fewer had such things for off-duty incidents. And just under half, or 48% of agencies, indicated that they had administrative leave policy to collect weapons on when there might be concerns of suicide or self-harm by officers.

We also wanted to look at training of federal officers. Post-academy training is an area that is highly understudied amongst law enforcement, and I will admit we shamelessly stole some of these questions from a different local study that you'll be hearing about a little bit today. And we asked federal agencies to tell us a little bit about the kinds of training that they require. We found that the vast majority, almost all of them, 97%, required firearms or weapon qualifications two or more times a year. And just over half, 58%, indicated that they required training on the use of force, control tactics, and or some form of arrest techniques. Amongst all of the types of trainings that we asked about, vehicle qualifications were the least likely type of training to be required across any type of law enforcement.

So where are we going with this? And what are our next steps? I showed you this a minute ago, because this is an area we're really interested in and one of the things we're curious about is understanding more about separations. We asked about why people were separating, the reasons for separation, and one of the things we're interested in understanding is more about who the individuals are who are separating with this. For example, asking about age at type of separation so that we can understand whether or not these non-medical retirements are individuals who are hitting the mandatory age of retirement or something else is going on. We're also interested in finding out more about the age of hire and whether or not we're getting older individuals or younger individuals coming in, to sort of help scope how we reach out to potential officers in the future.

We're also looking to continue to better align our federal law enforcement collections with our other law enforcement collections. This includes, as I mentioned, stealing shamelessly from some of the collections and grabbing other questions that might be of interest, and making sure that our definitions better align to allow users of our data to be able to more clearly and cleanly compare between federal law enforcement and state and local. We are intending to repeat this survey every four to six years, possibly sooner if we can get away with it, but we do hope to do it at least every four years. We're going to try and ask more questions about officer wellness and like I mentioned a minute ago, more on age and more about separations.

I'd now like to turn it over to my colleague, Sean Goodison, who's going to speak on a number of his data collections. Thank you for your time.

Sean Goodison

Hello, everyone. Thanks for joining us.

I'm going to start talking about health and wellness resources available to law enforcement. Here's the thing: what we're going to talk about is some of the collections that were shamelessly stolen for the federal side. But I don't think it counts as stealing since I'm working on all of them. So, it's more a leveraging experience.

As an overview, I'm (gonna) going to talk about the LEMAS PATOW. We are a federal agency, so we love acronyms. I will tell you what these acronyms mean in just a moment, cover some select findings and highlight some of the next steps that you can look forward to related to PATOW and have a cut, a picture right there of our report that's available on our website right now, released a few months ago, that that will have far more detail than what our, our select findings have today.

LEMAS PATOW is a supplemental survey within the LEMAS survey program. LEMAS is a Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics program. LEMAS itself has been around since 1987, has been fielded roughly every four years or so.

But about a decade ago, we transitioned a little bit to add supplemental surveys, and the supplemental surveys within LEMAS program go into more detail on very specific topics. Our first one was on body-worn cameras, and our second one was on Post-Academy Training and Officer Wellness, and that's where we get PATOW from.

It's, uh, important to note is that the LEMAS PATOW are the only representative data to provide a national baseline on these topics. That's why we think it's so important to, to get this information out there because it is of, of, of critical importance and critical interest, but these are the, the only representative national baseline source of information. And for our purposes today, it, it focuses on some of the, what wellness programs are being offered by law enforcement, how agencies assess program use and effectiveness, resources that are dedicated towards officer wellness programs. And the PATOW was collected actually as part of a companion effort with the FBI. The FBI has launched the Law Enforcement Suicide data collection. That focuses on individual incidents, whereas the PATOW is focusing on the establishment statistics, on the administrative statistics to understand what state and local law enforcement agencies have in place in terms of wellness programs and policies associated with suicide prevention and awareness.

PATOW started as just an idea back in May 2021, and as Alexia covered in her early presentation talking about how a BJS statistic is created, we had a lot of front-end work. We were creating this from not much of just beyond an idea, so a lot of expert panels, cognitive interviews, revising, revising, revising, and putting a lot of effort to, to, to make a, an instrument that's going to be, that would be worthwhile for the field. So, we had to do a lot of buildup for that.

It didn't get into the field until November of 2023 and it stayed there through July of the following year. But one thing that we didn't have to reinvent or rebuild or create out of new was our sampling methodology, which is the same as the prior LEMAS waves. So, we take a stratified random sample and stratified by agency type and agency size of 3,500 general-purpose agencies. General-purpose agencies are your local police departments, your sheriffs with a law enforcement and patrol, patrol function, and primary state police. And then within that we have self-representing agencies. So those are the largest agencies in the country among the state and locals. They have a hundred or more FTE, which is full-time equivalent sworn personnel, and we select those agencies with, with certainties. There's no way to possibly replicate say, you know, from a random sample, say NYPD. They're a one of one. They need to be in, in our sample when we are looking to establish national baselines.

Our final response rate was just about 71% and there's some differences across the, the agency types. The sheriffs were the lowest, but with that said, the sheriffs were still at about 64%. We did some nonresponse bias analyses just to check to see if there are any significant differences between our responders and nonresponders and we didn't find anything, so we are pretty confident in these data and estimates going forward.

So, the officer wellness portion of PATOW made up the very end of the survey. You can see it says Q58 through 64. It was a long survey. We're really appreciative of the agencies who took the time and answered all these questions. When you have a really long survey—and especially at the end of that survey—there's always a concern you're going to have respondents drop off, you're (gonna) going to have items that aren't really filled in all that well. We were, again, very lucky and are appreciative of the agencies. Generally, we only had kind of nonresponse issues at the item level about 2% across the board. So, people stuck with it and provided some really good information.

All of our questions are framed around formal wellness programs, and we provide a specific definition of that, which is a program intended to reduce factors that interfere with employee physical and/or mental health by providing resources, training, and/or intervention services. Generally, we focus on the resources that are offered to full-time sworn personnel during the calendar year 2022. As I said, we were in the field from 2023 to 2024 and wanted to have a, a full reference year to, to, to kind of understand what was happening. But as you'll see, we, we do have some questions that deviate from that time frame.

So, for our presentation here, there are four main research questions we're (gonna) going to touch on. So, first, all within answering within 2022, which formal wellness programs were offered by general purpose agencies? Were they offered with potential of confidentiality? And did agencies use, collect data from these formal wellness programs? And one final question we're (gonna) going to touch on is, were the form, were there formal policies in place that address suicide risk and prevention during the collection period? And this is slightly different than our 2022 time frame. This is kind of

an overlap with some of the FBI work, so we wanted to have a little bit more contemporaneous measure of the formal practices related to suicide risk and prevention.

So, for some of our select findings—and again, we have far more findings on our report, on our website—but one of the big takeaways is that officer wellness is a tale of two agency sizes. Many of the findings that we have both in this presentation and our report, the results are divided into two categories. So, your 100-plus FTE sworn, which is that self-representing group of agencies that we talked about earlier, and then agencies that have less than a hundred FTE sworn.

So, you might wonder, well, why we split it at, at about a hundred, and it sounds like a nice round number, so maybe that's the reason. But if you are up to date on your 2020 LEMAS survey—and the reports associated with that, also available on our website—you'll know that only 7% of general-purpose agencies are in that self-representing group that employed a hundred or more FTE. So that seems like a big skew. Wonder why we do that? The answer is because those 7% of agencies employ about two-thirds of all the FTEs sworn. So, it's really a concept thinking about what's your average agency. So, a lot of people, when they think about what's the average, you know, law enforcement agency in the country and, oh, well, it has about 10 sworn personnel in it. And yes, that's by size, that will be roughly the median, that will be the 50% mark. But if you look at it by officer, the two-thirds of officers are working for that small, that 7% of the largest agencies. So, your average agency from the perspective of an officer is actually a very large agency at the state and local level. So, as a result of this, we present findings both of the percentage of agencies and the percentage of sworn personnel to provide kind of some additional context, and I think the, the next slide will, will highlight that a little bit.

So, these are the, this is the listing of the offered programs. We, we asked about 13 different wellness programs. I'm not (gonna) going to read off the entire slide, but I, I do want to highlight a few specific findings.

So, first, looking again at that, at least one program, so 60% of all agencies, state and local agencies offered at least one of these 13 programs during 2022. But you see the tale of two agency sizes coming up. When it's the largest agencies, that goes up to 93%. If it's a smaller agency, it's a little under 60%. Then, thinking about all sworn personnel, 87% of all sworn personnel worked for an agency that had at least one of these formal wellness programs in place.

And for, for this table—and, again, the, there's even more information in our report on our website—but the differences between your largest agencies and smallest agencies are all statistically significant. So, larger agencies are always more likely to offer any one of these particular programs, or at least one program, than smaller agencies. And I'll just draw your attention further to some of the, the highs and the lows in terms of looking at, say, psychological mental healthcare treatments. About more than 40% of agencies had that nationwide, but when you look at the largest agencies, that's 78%.

When it's the smallest agencies, it's around 38%. And still about two-thirds, three-fourths of officers, of sworn personnel, work in an agency that had a psychological and mental healthcare treatment program in place. And there are others that are high peer support, coping skills to manage trial, but then there are also ones that are, are fairly low—especially when you compare it as we saw in the earlier presentation about federal law enforcement—looking at childcare programs, looking at resources for expectant mothers. Overall, those are going to be less than 10% of agencies across the country. It will be a bit higher in your largest agencies as compared to smaller, but still it's a much smaller percentage as compared to some of these other programs.

So, we also asked about whether these programs could be accessed with confidentiality and—at least personally—this was one that I think was a little bit surprising in that so many of these programs are offered with the potential of confidentiality. And for some of the, the largest percentages you hear, again, psychological and mental healthcare treatment, peer support programs, alcohol and chemical dependency treatment, that's 90, around 90 or even more percent of agencies that offered it, offered it with an option of confidentiality. But you even go to the, these least likely—your physical fitness programs—still a majority of agencies that offer that, offered it with the potential of confidentiality. And I think that bleeds into our next slide.

And here's the slide where we talk about the same programs as before, the same 13 programs, at least one program. But our question was slightly different. Do you, we asked the agencies whether they collected or assess data regularly on these programs. And, again, a tale of two agency sizes: the larger agencies are all significantly more likely to collect and assess data regularly on any of these programs. But the numbers are certainly lower than what we saw with the overall adoption. But we think part of the explanation here is that if so many of these programs are offered with a degree of confidentiality, there may not be a lot of data to collect or assess to really kind of dig down and see how these programs are being used.

And finally, we wanted to highlight some of the, the practices associated with suicide risk, and you saw these particular practices in relation to the federal law enforcement presentation earlier, and it's roughly the same story and, again, here it's a tale of two agency sizes. All the larger agencies, these self-representing 7% of agencies at the state and local level, are more likely to have these practices in place as compared to smaller agencies. And there's certainly a, a very similar hierarchy here in which 80, you know, nearly 80% or more of agencies will have response protocols after critical incidents that occur on duty. But if you say compare that to the same response protocols after critical incidents off duty, the off-duty is going to be much less common in addition to the regularly scheduled psychological evaluations.

In terms of next steps for, for PATOW... So, as I mentioned, yeah, you can access the publication on, on our website, and there are many additional findings, more breakdowns. We look at why agencies don't offer programs. We look at budgets. We look at staffing. So, there's a lot more information there if you're interested in knowing

kind of this national snapshot of, of where state and local law enforcement stood on, on offering wellness programs, the report is, is for you. And additionally, we're going to have a second report planned—we're expecting it for later this year instead of the officer wellness side, though it's going to focus on the post-academy side, the post-academy training, again, touching on a little bit of what you saw with the, the, the federal law enforcement agencies. Except this one will have probably even more detail, really digging into what state and local law enforcement do in that post-academy training, in service training, promotional training, those sorts of things. And as we release that report, our plan is to also archive the full PATOW data, so that researchers, people who are just curious, anyone can, can access it, look, rack and stack things for themselves and, and, and, and see what they find.

And with that, I'm going to pass it to... myself. I'm going to continue on and, and touch on hiring and retention of state and local law enforcement officers. You saw a little bit of this again with the, the federal law enforcement side. But before I get started, I do want to thank Rachael Arietti. She worked as a BJS-funded research assistant for a year, and she spearheaded this publication, this presentation. Fantastic job, we could not have gotten it done without her and we really appreciate all of her efforts.

So, the overall report, again, it's, there's going to be a lot of similarities because a lot of the, the questions were taken from this report and moved to the, the federal side as well. We looked at hiring and separation for general-purpose law enforcement agencies. So, we're talking about those local agencies, your local police departments, your sheriffs with policing patrol responsibilities and primary state police. And this publication is rooted in the 2020 LEMAS data. Now, that data have been available and have been archived for a few years now, since I believe 2023. So, they are available for individuals to take a look at.

On that, there's nothing confidential in that since a lot of it is just administrative data but that's what this report is based on and we are going to touch on just a few of, of the findings here.

So, first, just want to look at the, the overall trends and, and we looked at this with the federal law enforcement, but we just want to see the, the, the net gain or loss. And for 2020, we saw that there was agencies were reporting a, a net loss of about 2,400 full-time sworn personnel. Now, something to keep in context is that even in this series—of which we go back here almost 20 years—that's not the only net loss that we've seen; 2023 also reported a net loss and, also, we're coming off of, of a period, at least within this series, in which we had the greatest count of, of hires. That's in 2016.

So, looking at the hiring distribution by the agency size... So, we talked about the self-represented agencies before, those with a hundred or more full-time equivalent sworn. Well, there's an even smaller subset that we can look at: it's the agency with 500 or more. They only represent about 1% of the state and local general-purpose law enforcement agencies across the country. But that 1% of agencies made about one-third of all the hires in 2020. In contrast, the, the smallest agencies, our smallest

category with 24 or fewer FTEs sworn, they represent about 70% of all the agencies. But they only made about 17% of all the hires in 2020. And you do the quick math: the 32% of hires and the 17% of hires—that's roughly about 50%. That meant all the other agencies that aren't covered in the 500 or more or 24 or fewer, they made the other 50 percent of hires in 2020.

So, what we wanted to do, like you saw a little bit in the, the federal report, is that we wanted to dive into some of the specifics. And we looked at specifically hires, what type of hires were being done. And we look at it across, well, to start off overall, it's mostly going to be entry-level, non-lateral hires, and that's going to be the general theme across agency size. However, there is a little bit of nuance here. So, once you get beyond that, the largest 1% of agencies who, granted, made one-third of the hires in 2020, you start to see significantly more lateral hires happening in the smaller agencies, whereas the largest agencies is, is really dominated by entry-level hires. And that tends to increase as a proportion and you'll see that it's all significantly different than within the smaller categories as compared to the smallest 1% or so of agencies. So, much more lateral hires happening in the smaller agencies, whereas the largest agencies are really dominated by entry-level hires.

On the other side, we wanted to dive into the separations, and we saw some of the separation breakdown within the federal law enforcement, and, and, and here there's some similarities, but really what it ends up being for, for your general-purpose agencies, it's a tale of two categories. It's voluntary, your resignations, and it's and it's non-medical retirements. And between those two, that's about 80% of the separations in 2020 of full-time personnel. And what we want to do in the next slide is break that down again by size because we see some of the same differences that we saw with the hires. So, overall, those are the numbers you just saw on the previous slide. And, but then when you look at that, that's the, the, the largest agencies—that 1% that hired at least 32% of your personnel and had a lot of separations—you see that non-medical retirements dominates that, the majority of, of separations. But that's going to change very quickly when you look at any other smaller agency. It's significantly less in those smaller agencies and significantly more voluntary resignations. We, really, you can just look even at the, the two, the, the upper bound and the lower bound, the, your 500 or more versus the 24 or fewer, and that's a very different profile of, of what's happening in terms of separations within law enforcement agencies.

So, some of the takeaways from these very select findings—again, far more findings on the report on our website; that was just released back in March, so, so pretty new—agencies did lose more personnel than hired in 2020. We've seen it before, but it was the largest amount that we had seen coming off of a considerable amount of hiring. And there were differences in agency size. So, when we're talking about what's happening with hiring and separation in law enforcement, there, there are some nuances here. There's smaller agencies had higher proportions of lateral hires and, and resignations, larger agencies had the higher proportion of, of retirements. So, there's something, you know, definitely, by agency size and especially your largest

agencies, and smaller agencies have some significant differences happening there and an important part of that conversation going forward.

Now, with that, I'm going to pass it off to my colleague Beth Davis to cover Police-Public Contact Survey. Thank you.

Elizabeth Davis

Thanks, Sean. Hi, I'm Beth. I'll be talking about findings from the 2022 police-public contact survey today. And I just want to acknowledge my co-author on this, Susannah Tapp, who is a statistician in the Victimization Statistics Unit at BJS.

So, first off, we'll start with a brief overview of the National Crime Victimization Survey, or the NCVS. The NCVS has been collected annually since 1973. It's the nation's primary source of information on nonfatal criminal victimization. The NCVS is administered to persons age 12 or older from a nationally representative sample of U.S. households. The respondents are interviewed in person or by telephone with new households being interviewed in person. Selected households remain in the NCVS sample for 3.5 years, and eligible persons in these households are interviewed every 6 months. The NCVS collects information on nonfatal violent and property crimes reported and not reported to the police.

In addition to the core NCVS, there are short supplemental surveys that are administered at the end of NCVS interviews to eligible respondents, and the Police-Public Contact Survey is one of these supplements. The PPCS has been administered on a recurring basis since 1999. The sample includes persons age 16 or older in sampled NCVS households who successfully completed their core NCVS interview. Beginning with the 2015 PPCS, persons who completed their NCVS interview in a language other than English could complete the PPCS in that same language. Proxy respondents are not eligible to complete the PPCS.

There's been a lot of interest in interactions between police and the public and a lot of media attention on these interactions in recent years. The PPCS is the sole national source for data on nonfatal police use of force, including excessive force. The PPCS provides high-level estimates on the number and nature of the public's contacts with police. It also provides data on the characteristics of persons who had some type of contact with police during the year. And a unique thing to note about the PPCS is that the data are self-reported, and so they are based on residents' perspectives and their direct contacts with police.

The 2022 PPCS was in the field from July through December of 2022. It was administered to persons age 16 or older who completed the NCVS interview. Around 96,500 respondents completed the PPCS. Among all eligible persons in responding households, 21.5% did not respond to the NCVS, and another 4% responded to the NCVS but did not respond to the PPCS. So, that led to an overall response rate of 74%. To produce national estimates on police-public contacts, sample weights were applied to the PPCS data.

So, now looking more specifically at the types of contacts that are covered by the PPCS, we have three main categories. What you don't see here are contacts related to a traffic accident, and then our two main categories with reasons shown underneath are police-initiated contact and resident-initiated contact. So, when we look at the types of contact that are initiated by police, that are included on the PPCS, we have traffic stops, where the resident was a driver or the resident was a passenger. We also asked residents if they were involved in a street stop, where they were stopped by police while in a public place or a parked vehicle. PPCS also asks residents if they were arrested, excluding an arrest that's related to another type of police contact. And residents are also asked if they experienced any other type of police-initiated contact.

PPCS asks about resident-initiated, resident-initiated contact, including reporting a possible crime, disturbance or suspicious activity. Residents are asked if they reported a non-crime emergency such as a medical emergency. Respondents are also asked about non-emergencies, if they sought assistance for something such as custody enforcement. Also, as part of resident-initiated contact, we asked residents if they were part of a block watch program with police. And lastly, if they had any other type of contact that they initiated with police that was not specifically asked about.

So, next we'll look at some key findings from the 2022 PPCS, and as Sean and Alexia have already mentioned, we have a report available online that has far more information than what I'm about to go through. So, these are just some key highlights that we wanted to share today.

So, first off, we'll look at police contact by year and type of contact, and so here we see that in 2022 almost 19% of U.S. residents age 16 or older had contact with police. This was about 49.2 million persons. This was a decrease from 21% in 2020 and 24% in 2018. Eight percent of persons experienced any police-initiated contact, which was lower than in 2020 or 2018. This decrease was driven by a decline in the percentage of residents that experienced police contact as a driver in a traffic stop or as a passenger in a traffic stop. About 11% of residents initiated contact with police in 2022, and this was not significantly different from 2020, but it was lower than in 2018. And then, lastly, at the bottom we see that about 2.5% of residents had contact with police related to a traffic accident in 2022, and this was lower than in 2020 or in 2018.

In 2022, similar percentages of males and females reported that they had any type of contact with police, with males at about 19% and females at about 18%. Males were more likely than females to have police-initiated contact, while females were more likely than males to initiate contact with police. And then, like we see with any contact, there were similar percentages of males and females that reported having contact with police as the result of a traffic accident.

So, next we'll look at most recent police, police-initiated contact. So, up to this point we talked about any contact. And then after gauging any contact, the PPCS moves into asking residents about their most recent police-initiated contact if they had multiple

contacts. So, moving forward we'll be focusing on the most recent contact. So, here, looking at persons whose most recent contact with police was police-initiated, the majority of those were pulled over while driving. Males were more likely to report being pulled over than females as a driver, but females were more likely than males to have been the passenger in a car that was pulled over. Then we also see that there are similar percentages between males and females that reported a street stop as their most recent police-initiated contact.

So, then next we'll look at outcomes and, so, as part of the follow-up questions for police-initiated contacts, residents were asked about the outcome of their contact. In 2022, of those whose most recent contact with police was a traffic stop, 44% received a warning, 43% received a ticket, 9% experienced no enforcement action, and 4% were searched or arrested. For those whose most recent contact was a street stop, the majority experienced no enforcement action as a result of that stop: 14% received a warning, 5% were searched or arrested, and 2 % were given a ticket.

PPCS also asked residents if they experienced the threat or use of nonfatal force in the past 12 months or if they experienced it during their most recent contact with police. Specifically, residents were asked if they were threatened with force, if they were handcuffed, pushed, grabbed, hit, kicked, had a chemical or pepper spray used against them, had an electroshock weapon used against them, had a gun pointed or fired at them, or if any other type of physical force was used against them.

Those who reported that they experienced the threat or nonfatal use of force during their most recent contact were asked whether they thought the force used against them was necessary and whether they felt the force used against them was excessive.

There were about 2% of persons that experienced the threat or use of force during their most recent police, police-initiated contact in 2022. And then this was lower than it was in 2020, where it was 3%. In 2020, 31% of residents felt that the force used against them was necessary and 46% felt that the force was excessive. In 2022, 40% of residents felt that the force used against them was necessary and 38% thought it was excessive.

So, the PPCS also asked residents if the police behaved properly during their most recent contact. Residents who reported that they felt the police did not behave properly were asked follow-up questions about police behavior, including whether the police called them a slur or a degrading name, if the police seemed motivated by prejudice or bias toward them, or if police spoke to them or touched them in a sexual manner, all of which we classified under the umbrella of police misconduct. In 2022, 1% of US residents reported that they experienced misconduct during their most recent contact with police, 1% felt that police behaviors were motivated by prejudice or bias and .2% said police called them a slur or a degrading name.

The PPCS also asked about perceptions of police response. This set of questions was for residents who initiated their most recent contact with police, excluding those who

said their most recent contact with police was as part of a block watch program. For these respondents, 84% said that the police responded promptly, and 63% felt that the police improved the situation; 90% said the police behaved properly. Approximately 86% reported that they were satisfied with the police, and 92% said that they would be more likely or as likely to contact the police again in the future.

So, lastly, we just wanted to recognize some limitations that exist for the PPCS, the first of which is small sample sizes. Fortunately, events like nonfatal force are relatively rare among the general population, and when they do occur, they may result in arrest and incarceration, which would result in exclusion from the PPCS. There's no measure of deadly force in the PPCS, since the PPCS is based on interviews with living persons. And not all persons who have contact with the police are included, such as homeless and institutionalized persons. We also want to note that respondents can report that they had a type of contact with police that is not included on the PPCS, that we don't ask about specifically. So, these are included in our "Other" specified category.

The free text responses for respondents reporting an "Other" type of contact is reviewed during the editing and coding phase. This can result in contacts being reclassified to an existing type of contact. However, the respondent cannot retroactively be given the correct subset of questions. Therefore, we may have some missing data on details of that contact. But despite these limitations, the PPCS provides a very valuable source of data on contacts between the police and the public.

Looking at next steps, we want to note that the NCVS recently underwent an instrument redesign, during which all NCVS supplements were paused. So, with that, the 2022 PPCS is our most recent iteration. The redesigned NCVS instrument was fully implemented in 2025, and it includes a new module on police performance that's administered to all respondents in January to June of each year. Now that the redesigned NCVS instrument is in the field, we are working to determine how to reintegrate the supplements back into rotation.

So, then next we just have some resources and updates. So, as I mentioned, there's a report with a lot more information than, the, then was highlighted in this presentation and that's available on the BJS website. Also available on the BJS website is just more information on the PPCS itself and the methodology.

You can download NCVS and PPCS public use files from the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data. And, lastly, to reiterate what everyone has mentioned as well, you can subscribe to JUSTSTATS to keep up with what BJS is doing.

And with that, we'll open it up for questions.

Kevin Scott

Thank you, Beth and Alexia and Sean for the presentations. I have some questions that have come in, but I also want to encourage participants to continue to ask

questions in the chat if you choose “Direct” and then choose “All Participants” that way we can all see the questions and we can make sure that they get to the right person. My first question, I think, is for Sean. First, when looking at hirings and separations, does BJS ask about vacancies within police departments?

Sean Goodison

Yes, we asked about vacancies and availability. We, we do report on, on that. That is, that is in the report on, on the website. We just didn't cover it here, but we do report out on vacancies.

Kevin Scott

Thank you. And I was going to just ask you to, kind of, probe you just a little bit. You had indicated that there are in hirings and separations there are kind of different stories for smaller departments than larger departments in 2020. Looking kind of at top-line numbers, though, are there, did the story differ by agency size? That is, did we see that large agencies were losing people overall and small agencies were gaining them, or the reverse, or was the effect, you know, the net/negative—marginally net/negative effect—consistent across agency size?

Sean Goodison

Yeah, I mean the, the largest negative is coming from the largest agencies. So, in, in our report we, we provide top-line estimates of just counts of full-time sworn personnel hired and separated with. And for the largest agencies, there, there's a, there's a significant—I don't want to say significant—there's a difference. It's definitely a net loss, whereas some of the smaller agency sizes, particularly 100 to 499 FTE, 25 to 99—other than the smallest. They had net gains. So, they were hiring more sworn personnel than they were losing in 2020. I believe in the, the smallest category, it's, it's roughly the same. It's maybe a slight loss. But, but the story does continue across agency sizes where it's these, the largest, that 1% of agencies, they are certainly losing the most, whereas, and losing, whereas some of the smaller agencies are having, had net gains in 2020.

Kevin Scott

Thank you. And I guess one question, you know, obviously, the staffing levels, kind of across the criminal justice system, continue to be an issue of interest. Does BJS plan to do updates on the hirings and separations for law enforcement agencies?

Sean Goodison

Yes, hiring/separation questions are, right now, are a key part of the, the, the LEMAS core. So, the, the standard LEMAS survey, we had them 2020. We just have a, are wrapping up the fielding of the 2024 LEMAS, of which we will have the same exact questions, and are looking to report on, on those data in the future, and continuing on what we've reported on in the current report based on 2020.

Kevin Scott

Right, Alexia, a quick question for you. Do you collect any Census of Federal Law Enforcement Officers? You got the information on the functions of federal law enforcement officers.

Alexia Cooper

We collect some very, very high-level information in that right now we collect staffing by job series, which is not as detailed as we would like. We are considering whether or not there's the ability to expand upon that and potentially include more of the functions of, of officers such as what we do with the Census of Law Enforcement, state and local law enforcement. If anyone here is familiar, there's a full page where we break things down, like, asking people about being on task forces, whether or not they're involved in domestic violence task force efforts or if they're part of a forensic team, things like that. Right now, we don't have any of that, but we think it would be very interesting, particularly to see what kinds of roles officers are actually partaking in beyond just their job series. So, we're hoping to explore that for the next iteration of the survey.

Kevin Scott

Thank you. Beth, can you give us some examples of police-initiated and resident-initiated contact? I think you had a slide that kind of walked through police-initiated. I don't remember if resident-initiated was its own slide or not, so if you don't mind.

Elizabeth Davis

Of course. So, police-initiated contacts include traffic stops where the resident was a driver or passenger. That included street stops and arrest that is not related to another type of contact. And then we have "Other". So, some examples of "Other" could include someone who's approached by the police because they are seeking information. Or if they're helping someone look for a lost pet. Or if there's contact due to a person's work or volunteering in some effort. For resident-initiated—that's when a resident contacts the police to either report a disturbance or suspicious activity, report a non-emergency, or report a non-crime emergency, participating in block watch—or we have other resident-initiated contact, which may include a resident who accidentally calls 911 or, again, it could be something where a resident is reaching out to police for help with looking for a lost pet or some other sort of animal control issue, or coming into contact with them as a result of their work or a volunteer program.

Kevin Scott

Thank you. And this is, I think, a question maybe for both Sean and Beth. There's some interest in state-level data. So, we're presenting national-level data. Are there ways to get state-level data? Alexia, I don't think that applies necessarily to the federal collections, but to, for the health and wellness, the hiring and separations, and then for the police public contact, can you get data at the state level? And if so, so how does one go about doing that?

Elizabeth Davis

Oh, OK, I can start. So, for PPCS, we have our public-use files, and then we have restricted-use files. So, the restricted-use files have more details, such as geographic

identifiers. And so, with that, there is a process through which you apply to get access to that data, since we want to be very careful with our confidentiality measures. But so, for someone who's interested in that, they can email AskBJS and we can provide more details on how to go about getting access.

Sean Goodison

On the state and local side, we do not have, at least for the LEMAS, we do not have state-level estimates. Our, our sample is derived so that we can generate national-level estimates. However, obviously the selection of agencies—we do have agencies from all 50 states, including the primary state police who will be selected with certainties. They're always in that larger-size tier. So, within the data itself there's a possibility of looking at an individual level, but not a way to generate estimates at a state level.

Kevin Scott

OK, thank you. Sean, since you're talking, we talked a little bit about kind of formal wellness programs and then—first of all, I appreciate both you and Alexia are kind of making the direct connections across the reports on kind of things that police departments can do when they know that there's a risk of suicide, or there's something that may happen either on-duty or off-duty that may directly draw to that. And so, I think it's really interesting that we—I'm biased, of course—but it's great that we asked that question of both federal and state and local law enforcement agencies. When we're asked, when we asked the state and local agencies about their formal wellness programs, did we ask anything about how they're staffing those programs? And is there anything kind of, are there general conclusions that we can draw based on the data that we saw that was provided by those agencies?

Sean Goodison

Yeah. In, in the report we do have staffing findings, and, and, and we did ask how, how these programs in general were staffed, not necessarily individual programs themselves, which would vary across agencies pretty widely. But one of the takeaways that, that we saw is that they're not necessarily staffed excessively. It's, you know, I, I believe in our division, we have a separation of agencies that have one full-time personnel versus otherwise. So, between that and also some of the, the budgets and the spending, it, it, it's relatively small overall. So, you know, all these programs do exist, and many of them, kind of as, as touching what we did in the federal presentation, in, in terms of how it's being offered, a lot of it will be offered through, outside of the agency through a kind of contractual service. But within the departments themselves, we have staffing data available, but the takeaway is there's not necessarily a lot of dedicated staff within specific agencies going towards these programs.

Kevin Scott

Thank you. Beth, maybe let me ask a kind of, or a slightly related question about the Police-Public Contact Survey. You know, this presentation is based on a report, which is based on the survey collection. Is there anything in the report that you didn't have, you know, that because of time you trimmed out of today's presentation? Is there

anything in the PPCS that you have found particularly useful that you would encourage webinar participants to maybe pay attention to on their own time?

Elizabeth Davis

There, there's a lot in the PPCS data. And so even with our long report, there are things that we still didn't even touch on in the report, but that are available with the archived data. So, one thing I think that could be of interest may be just learning more about characteristics of contacts. So, for example, people that are stopped by police are asked if the police gave them a reason for the stop. So, if someone is stopped as a driver in a traffic stop, they're asked questions like, were you, you know, if they gave a reason, did the police say they stopped you because they said you were speeding, or maybe some aggressive, they observed aggressive driving. Or in a street stop, residents are asked if they were stopped because police told them they matched the description of someone they were looking for, questions along those lines. And then if residents were given a reason for the stop, they're asked if they felt that the reason was legitimate. So, I think there's a lot of interesting information that could be looked at there.

Kevin Scott

Thank you. And Alexia, is there anything in the federal law enforcement officer census that you didn't get a chance to present on today that you think is particularly interesting?

Alexia Cooper

I mean, there's tons of things. We didn't talk much about the over-time changes, which I think are interesting. You know, one of the strengths of a lot of BJS data collections is the fact that we ask the questions over a sequence of time. I also think, you know, we did a little bit of it here where we tried to draw some connections between the various collections. But I think that would be by far the most interesting thing that I have, you know, on top of my head that I'm interested in looking at is sort of how we see the differences in the federal landscape from the state and local landscape. And, you know, we know there are changes, but we don't know much about what they are. So, I think that would be a really, really interesting thing.

Kevin Scott

All right. Thank you, all. As we wind down, I think, Alexia, I'll ask the last question of you. There are a lot of questions there in the chat. There are kind of specific questions about either requesting particular assistance from BJS or a particular question about the report. If a person's question wasn't answered today, if a person is reading a BJS report and they find that they have a question, how do they get an answer?

Alexia Cooper

Well, we're about to put up a slide that has a lot of that information but the short version is that as a public agency, any member of the public can reach out to us at any time through our website, we have both a listserv as well as a direct email address that you can reach out and we will have people who route it to the most appropriate

statistician, be that me, Sean, Beth, or one of our other wonderful staff who will do our best to answer any questions that come in. And I think that Koi is going to put that up right now.

Koi Gouahinga

Thank you, Alexia.

Ladies and gentlemen, this concludes our webinar on National Law Enforcement Statistics with BJS. I want to thank our Acting Director, Kevin Scott. I want to thank our wonderful panelists. And I want to thank all of you for participating in this event and for your thoughtful questions.

The recording of this, event along with the slides, will be posted on our website when they're processed and ready, and you'll receive an email with the link. For ongoing updates on BJS research and upcoming webinars— there are quite a few that are still in the pipeline—please visit our website, as everyone has mentioned earlier, at bjs.ojp.gov. And also subscribe to our JUSTSTATS email system.

This concludes our webinar on National Law Enforcement Statistics at BJS. Thank you for joining us and enjoy the rest of your day.