

# **DEVELOPING AN ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK FOR ASSESSING BIAS-FREE POLICING IN THE CITY OF CINCINNATI**

Update Memo

November 25, 2020

**To:** Mr. Jason Cooper, City of Cincinnati, Division Manager - Criminal Justice Initiatives  
Office of the City Manager

**From:** Drs. Cory Haberman, Ebony Ruhland, James Frank, University of Cincinnati, School of Criminal Justice, Institute of Crime Science (ICS)

This memo provides the timeline of completed and anticipated work for the “Developing an Analytical Framework for Assessing Bias-Free Policing in the City of Cincinnati Project”. Previously reported milestones have been omitted from this memo for brevity.

## ***Phase 2: Design Process***

Within the context of Phase 1, Phase 2 marked the start of the design process. The crux of the design process was a systematic search for scientific studies of bias in police traffic stops, arrests, and use of force.

The Working Group was briefed and asked to provide feedback on the parameters of the literature search process as well as the preliminary interview results in a meeting on January 29, 2020.

Between January and July, 2020, the ICS wrote the preliminary report.

On July 17, 2020, the preliminary report was delivered to the Working Group. The preliminary report included the following chapters:

1. Chapter 2: Stakeholder Interviews described the stakeholder interviews that made up the core of Phase 1.
2. Chapter 3: Literature Search Process described how scientific studies were identified and why they were included in this report.
3. Chapter 4: How to Review an Analytical Technique provided guidance for how to read about the analytical techniques summarized in Chapters 5 – 8.
4. Chapter 5: Traffic Stops Analysis described how (1) external benchmark analysis or (2) multivariate regression analysis could be used to assess bias in “who” gets stopped in vehicles by police.
5. Chapter 6: Post-Traffic Stop Analysis described how the (1) outcome test, (2) multivariate regression analysis, or (3) propensity score analysis could be used to assess bias in who gets searched, cited, and so on after being stopped in their vehicle.

6. Chapter 7: Arrests describes how (1) external benchmark analysis or (2) multivariate regression analysis could be used to assess bias in who gets arrested. Particular attention was paid to the nuances of deciding which crime types and situations to focus on when conducting assessments of bias in arrests.
7. Chapter 8: Use of Force describes how (1) external benchmark analysis or (2) multivariate regression analysis could be used to assess bias in who experiences police use of force. Particular attention is paid to how use of force is defined and measured in assessments of bias.

On August 07, 2020, the ICS delivered a presentation of the preliminary report via videoconferencing due to the on-going Covid-19 pandemic. This presentation provided an overview of the report and was mostly focused on understanding the different analytical techniques included in the report as well as a draft rating system that would be used by Working Group Members to assess the reviewed analytical techniques.

After the preliminary report presentation, Mr. Jason Cooper sought to convene some Working Group Members and the ICS Team to further discuss feedback provided during the presentation, particularly in the context of community education for understanding the preliminary report. After several attempts, it was not possible to schedule an initial meeting.

On September 2, 2020, an online ratings system, revised based on feedback from the preliminary report presentation, was distributed to all Working Group Members. The rating system had a submission due date of October 18, 2020.<sup>1</sup> Although two CPD employees were Working Group members, CPD decided internally that it would submit one set of ratings. Therefore, ratings from 8 Working Group Members were expected.

After the October 18, 2020 due date, only three preliminary report ratings were received. All three ratings were from City employees. In an effort to increase the response rate, Mr. Jason Cooper and Lt. Elena Comeaux directly approached several Working Group Members to provide ratings. Two Working Group Members representing community stakeholder groups agreed to provide ratings. The preliminary report online rating system was reopened until November 13, 2020. One additional rating was received. **Overall, 4 out of 8 Working Group Members provided ratings of the analytical techniques presented in the preliminary report.**

### ***Phase 3: Refining the Analytical Framework***

The project will now move into Phase 3.

First, the ICS Team will process the ratings/feedback submitted by Working Group Members and write a summary report detailing the ratings/feedback. **The anticipated delivery date for the ratings/feedback summary will be December 18, 2020.**

---

<sup>1</sup> During the preliminary report rating period, two changes were made to the Working Group. First, Mr. Gabriel Davis was appointed as Executive Director, Citizen Complaint Authority and subsequently replaced previous Executive Director Ms. Kim Neal (who left the City for another position). Second, Lt. Col. Lisa Davis replaced Lt. Col. Paul Neudigate (who also left the City for another position).

Second, the ICS Team will work with Mr. Jason Cooper to distribute the ratings/feedback summary report to the Working Group Members for any additional feedback. At Mr. Cooper's discretion, the ICS Team will present the results of the ratings/feedback summary report to the Working Group Members. Given the time of the year, it is anticipated a presentation would take place in early January, 2021.

Therefore, the project will move into Phase 4 around February, 2021.

***Phase 4: Dissemination of the Framework***

During Phase 4, the ICS Team will prepare and deliver a final report detailing the development process and any agreed upon analytic techniques for implementation within the City's ongoing business practices. Based on the limited feedback provided during Phase 2, agreed upon analytical techniques may not be determined and the ICS Team may have to use the information available to make more informed recommendations possible in the final report. As necessary, recommendations will be made for implementing and potentially revising the analytical framework in the future. It is anticipated that the final report would be delivered on or around March 1, 2021.