

# **Law Enforcement Contacts Policy and Data Review Committee**

## **2012 Annual Report**



**December 1, 2012**

**Prepared by:**

**Criminal Justice Policy Research Institute  
Hatfield School of Government  
Portland State University**

# Contents

---

<u>Executive Summary</u> .....	3
<u>Statement of Purpose and Committee Structure and History</u> .....	6
<u>LECC Activities in 2012</u> .....	13
Law Enforcement Training .....	14
Evaluation of Law Enforcement Training Programs .....	18
Community Outreach Guidebook.....	22
<u>Appendices</u> .....	23
Appendix A: ORS 131.905 et seq .....	24

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## Executive Summary:

---

The year 2012 represented a transition year for the Law Enforcement Contacts Policy and Data Review Committee (LECC). Since 2006 the LECC has had the honor of being funded by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), Section 1906 Incentive Program to Prohibit Racial Profiling. The funding was transferred to the Criminal Justice Policy Research Institute (CJPRI) at Portland State University through Oregon's Department of Transportation Traffic Safety Division headed by Troy Costales. The LECC and CJPRI are indebted to the efforts of Director Costales and Oregon's Transportation Safety Division managers in supporting our efforts with the Section 1906 program. *The LECC has been able to expand its efforts, scope, longevity and impact because of the NHTSA Section 1906 Incentive Program.*

In 2012 the amount of supporting funds for the LECC was greatly reduced from prior years. The federal grant that has supported our efforts ended on September 30, 2012. We are grateful to the Spirit Mountain Foundation and Oregon's Criminal Justice Commission which will be supporting some of our training efforts through the remainder of 2012 and part of 2013. However, without general fund support from the Oregon legislature for the next biennium, or stable grant funding, the efforts by LECC staff and partners to sponsor training, data assistance, and community outreach will end by 2014.

All of our annual reports documenting the activities and successes of the LECC between 2006 and 2012 are available online here:

<http://www.pdx.edu/cjpri/annual-reports>

Despite resource limitations in 2012 our training efforts continued to be successful and we completed and disseminated a community outreach manual for law enforcement.

In 2012 the LECC performed the following:

- Continued training using a new curriculum developed last year by Oregon law enforcement officers entitled, "Diversity and Profiling in Contemporary Policing". The curriculum is intended as both a follow-up training for those who have participated in the LECC/DPSST sponsored "Tactical Ethics: Perspectives on Profiling" program and a stand-alone training.
- Held 4 Train-the-Trainer sessions to get more trainers involved in the new curriculum and deepen facilitation skills. These sessions brought in renowned national and local experts to work with our Oregon law enforcement trainers.

- Delivered “Tactical Ethics: Perspectives on Profiling” and “Diversity and Profiling in Contemporary Policing” at Regional and In-Service trainings to 561 law enforcement professionals from more than 20 Oregon law enforcement agencies. Since 2008 the LECC has trained 1,980 Oregon officers.
- Continued follow-up evaluation of our training efforts to examine the extent to which training has impacted their perceptions, beliefs and job performance.
- Completed a community outreach guidebook entitled, “Decreasing Crime by Increasing Involvement: A Law Enforcement Guidebook for Building Relations in Multi-Ethnic Communities” (see p. 22 for further information). The guidebook is available on the LECC website:  
[http://www.pdx.edu/cjpri/sites/www.pdx.edu.cjpri/files/Decreasing\\_Crime\\_By\\_Increasing\\_Involvement.pdf](http://www.pdx.edu/cjpri/sites/www.pdx.edu.cjpri/files/Decreasing_Crime_By_Increasing_Involvement.pdf)

The following chapters describe the history of the LECC in Oregon and go into more detail on the above activities performed in 2012.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE  
AND  
COMMITTEE STRUCTURE AND  
HISTORY

## Statement of Purpose:

---

“State and local law enforcement agencies can perform their missions more effectively when all Oregonians have trust and confidence that law enforcement stops and other contacts with individuals are free from inequitable and unlawful discrimination based on race, color or national origin.... Demographic data collection can establish a factual and quantifiable foundation for measuring progress in eliminating discrimination based on race, color or national origin....”<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> ORS 131.905 et seq. (See Appendix A)

## Committee Structure and History:

---

The Law Enforcement Contacts Policy and Data Review Committee (LECC) was created by 2001 Senate Bill 415 for a period of six years, ending December 31, 2007. That sunset was lifted with the passage of HB 2102. A copy of ORS 131.905 *et seq.*, which codified HB2102, can be found in Appendix A of this report.

The committee is charged with the responsibility to report annually on its efforts to:

- Solicit demographic data concerning law enforcement stops and other contacts between state and local law enforcement agencies and individuals;
- Publicize programs, procedures and policies from communities that have made progress toward eliminating discrimination based on race, color or national origin during law enforcement stops and other contacts with individuals;
- Provide technical assistance to state and local law enforcement agencies that desire to begin collecting demographic data, including refinement of the minimum data elements as necessary for effective analysis;
- Provide technical assistance to communities and state and local law enforcement agencies that desire to engage in local efforts to involve individuals in the establishment and implementation of programs, procedures and policies that will advance the goal of the act;
- Obtain resources for independent analysis and interpretation of demographic data collected by state or local law enforcement agencies;
- Accept and analyze demographic data collected by a state or local law enforcement agency if requested by a state or local law enforcement agency and if resources are available; and
- Report to the public the results of analyses of demographic data.

The committee is composed of eleven members appointed by the Governor. The current members of the committee, as of November 2012:

Hon. Paul J. De Muniz, LECC Chair (Chair-Elect – starting January 2013) Senior Judge and Distinguished Jurist in Residence, Willamette University College of Law	
Edwin Peterson, LECC Chair (Interim) Distinguished Jurist in Residence, Willamette University College of Law	
Jason Myers Marion County Sheriff	Annabelle Jaramillo(**) Benton County Commissioner
Gilbert P Carrasco Professor of Law Willamette University College of Law	Richard Evans Superintendent Oregon State Police
Kevin Díaz Legal Director ACLU of Oregon	Suzanne Isham Captain Department of Public Safety Standards and Training (DPSST)
Scott Akins (***) Professor of Sociology Oregon State University	Pete Kerns Chief of Police Eugene Police Department
David Fidanque Executive Director ACLU Oregon	Frank Thompson former Superintendent Santiam Correctional Institution

The LECC would like to thank Sheriff Todd Anderson (Tillamook County Sheriff) and Chief Gary Boldizar (Corvallis PD) who both resigned from the LECC in the summer of 2012. Tremendous gratitude also goes to Edwin Peterson who has chaired the LECC since 2005 and resigned this chair position in September 2012. Judge Peterson’s leadership and motivation played a strong role in expanding the LECC accomplishments during his tenure.

\*\*Chair of the Community Relations Subcommittee

\*\*\*Chair of the Data Review Subcommittee

Current LECC staff, consultants, and additional subcommittee members in 2012:

- Dr. Jan Chaiken, Consultant
- Major Craig Durbin, Data Review Subcommittee member, Oregon State Police
- Lt. Henry Reimann, Community Relations Subcommittee member, Hillsboro Police Department
- Angela Hedrick, Community Relations Subcommittee member, Salem Police Department
- Craig Prins, Executive Director, Oregon Criminal Justice Commission
- Dr. Brian Renauer, Director, Criminal Justice Policy Research Institute, Portland State University
- Emily Covelli, Research Assistant, Criminal Justice Policy Research Institute, Portland State University
- Lauren Brown, John Lehr, and Joelle Symkowski Graduate Research Assistants, Criminal Justice Policy Research Institute, Portland State University

## **BACKGROUND:**

Efforts to address charges of racially biased policing on the part of law enforcement officers became a statutory mandate during the 69<sup>th</sup> Legislative Assembly in 1997. During that session, a top priority of law enforcement agencies was a revision of the statute regulating stops of citizens by police. The debate stirred by that issue resulted in House Bill 2433. That bill included several provisions intended to provide a compromise between law enforcement agencies that sought to make stops more effective and safer for officers, and community groups that sought to protect the civil rights of those stopped.

HB 2433 included several provisions intended to foster the protection of the rights of citizens by requiring:

- All state and local law enforcement agencies in Oregon to adopt policies prohibiting the practice of racially biased policing.
- All law enforcement agencies to adopt means to facilitate the filing of complaints by citizens who felt that their rights had been violated, and to develop a process to resolve those complaints.
- All law enforcement agencies to report to the Asset Forfeiture Oversight Advisory Committee the number and type of complaints filed during the first year after the adoption of HB 2433.
- Initiation of data collection in an effort to move away from anecdotal information.

Implementation of HB 2433 was coordinated by a workgroup under the auspices of the Governor's Public Safety Policy and Planning Council. At its inception, this workgroup comprised over 60 members from diverse groups and backgrounds who were able to come to agreement on three basic principles:

- All law enforcement agencies should be responsible for their actions.
- No person should be subject to improper law enforcement conduct.
- Every person has the right to a fair and prompt response to a complaint.

The first action of the workgroup was the adoption of a model policy for law enforcement agencies that was distributed to all law enforcement agencies in Oregon. That policy, or one similar to it, was adopted by every Oregon law enforcement agency.

The workgroup identified three purposes for data collection: 1) to evaluate the implementation of the new stop and search law; 2) to ensure the fair and equitable implementation of the law; and 3) to increase public awareness and confidence in the application of the law.

The data collection effort itself focused on two activities. The first was a public perception survey to ascertain how the general public and two specific minority groups viewed the new law and to determine the perceived extent of racially biased policing in Oregon. The second was to encourage the development of a full traffic stop data collection effort.

In the furtherance of those efforts, the workgroup made its report to the 1999 Legislature along with several recommendations for further work. The Legislature did not act on those recommendations at that time.

In 2001, Rep. Vicki Walker introduced HB 2441 which would have required law enforcement agencies to collect traffic stop data and report the data to the state. A broad spectrum of interested parties deliberated on HB 2441. These discussions ultimately resulted in the passage of SB 415, which provided for voluntary data collection by law enforcement agencies and the formation of the LECC. The bill was supported unanimously by all interested parties and passed the Legislature without a dissenting vote.

The LECC officially convened February 5, 2002 and quickly established two subcommittees: Data Review and Community Relations. During the following year, the LECC received testimony and information from a variety of sources, including communities working to address data collection and community involvement issues, entities conducting state and national surveys related to racially biased policing, and agencies working on developing law enforcement training.

The Data Review Subcommittee solicited and received data from law enforcement agencies and did some preliminary analysis of that data. Methods to merge data contributed by individual agencies into a statewide database were developed and appropriate conclusions were drawn from the combined data.

However, due to the lack of data from a broader base of agencies, it was not possible to draw statistically valid inferences from the data at that time.

The Community Relations Subcommittee, which was co-chaired by Commissioner Annabelle Jaramillo and Chief Walt Myers, focused on involving police agencies and communities in discussions on racially biased policing issues. The committee also received information on a variety of approaches to community involvement activities, worked with experts in the field, and began the process of identifying methods and information.

As with many other agencies, budget reductions and the related state employee hiring freeze hindered the Committee's efforts to fulfill its statutory responsibilities. The level of staffing at the Oregon Criminal Justice Commission (CJC) was not adequate to support the work of the LECC. Thus, the LECC suspended its efforts in February 2003. The hiatus lasted until early 2005 when the CJC contracted with the Criminal Justice Policy Research Institute (CJPRI) at Portland State University for staff support. The LECC formally began meeting again on March 2, 2005.

The LECC was scheduled to sunset on December 31, 2007. The LECC, in partnership with the Oregon Criminal Justice Commission, helped draft House Bill 2102. HB 2102 made the LECC permanent and removed restrictions on data that the committee may receive and analyze. HB 2102 transferred administration of the committee from the Oregon Criminal Justice Commission to Portland State University.

In 2006-2007, the LECC, in partnership with the Criminal Justice Policy Research Institute and the Traffic Safety Division of the Oregon Department of Transportation, were awarded two grants from the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA-2006-23772). These grants will fund the activities of the LECC through 2011. The grant program is called the "Incentive Grant Program to Prohibit Racial Profiling" under section 1906 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (Federal Register, Vol. 71, No. 22, pp. 5727-5729).

# LECC ACTIVITIES 2012

## LECC Activities 2012:

---

### Law Enforcement Training

---

The Law Enforcement Contacts Policy and Data Review Committee (LECC) partners with the Simon Wiesenthal Center and the Oregon Department of Public Safety Standards and Training (DPSST) to offer regional and in-service trainings related to biased-based policing throughout the state of Oregon.

Since 2008, the LECC has offered “**Tactical Ethics: Perspectives on Profiling**” trainings to Oregon law enforcement. Tactical Ethics: Perspectives on Profiling, taught by Oregon Law Enforcement officers, is an interactive virtual learning experience from the Simon Wiesenthal Center’s Museum of Tolerance that compels users to make critical choices in testing situations. It utilizes an interactive training video and group dialogues to confront a number of complex issues that surround traffic stops, such as when race is an inappropriate factor in a profile and what can be done to avoid escalation in racially-charged stops.

In response to requests from training participants, our trainers, and agency command staff, the LECC began the process of developing additional curriculum for Oregon law enforcement in 2010. On June 22-24, 2010, thirteen Oregon Perspectives on Profiling trainers plus our project manager attended an additional training from the Simon Wiesenthal Center’s Museum of Tolerance. This training entailed being introduced to new materials and exercises that could be used in developing our follow up curriculum, methods for increasing group involvement, development of core objectives, and several presentations and resources for deepening our understanding of the history of racial oppression and our current racial tensions. Following the training, a subgroup of these trainers and our project manager worked together to establish a set of core objectives and needs for the new curriculum, reviewed and discussed additional videos and case studies, and created a new lesson plan and powerpoint for Oregon law enforcement. The core people involved in developing this training were: Lt. Sam Kamkar, Corporal Mike Araiza, Captain Suzanne Isham, Lt. Terry Moss, Sgt. Marc Shrake, Sgt. Rick Graham, Lt. Henry Reimann, and Emily Covelli. In addition, Dr. Brian Renauer, Dr. Yves Labissiere, Chief Ron Louie, Mike Stafford, Sgt. Willie Halliburton, Sgt. Clay Stephens, and Sgt. Jim Zessin served as reviewers or consultants for this project.

In the spring of 2011 the new training curriculum for Oregon law enforcement was completed and entitled, “**Diversity and Profiling in Contemporary Policing**”. Although this curriculum is advertised and presented as a training to follow up on the Perspectives on Profiling curriculum, it was also designed as a stand alone training to ensure that new officers to an agency can still find value and fully participate in this training session along with their peers. The curriculum was pilot tested and revised as needed during the summer of 2011, and then

officially launched in the fall by Lt. Sam Kamkar, Sgt. Rick Graham, and Corporal Mike Araiza. The feedback from the participants has been very positive (see the Training Evaluation section for further information).

In 2012 we hosted four Train-the-Trainer sessions to assist trainers who want to participate in the new curriculum and help all of our trainers with facilitation skills and deeper reflection of the training content. These train-the-trainer sessions brought in outside experts to spotlight a variety of issues that the training addresses. Dr. Joseph Graves the author of *The Race Myth: Why We Pretend Race Exists in America* was brought in to help trainers better understand the biological and social construction of race. Dr.'s Yves Labissiere and Kimberly Kahn were on hand to help the trainers better understand the science behind unconscious biases. Captain Tracie Keesee was consulted regarding her experiences with the Denver Police Department efforts to understand the impact of implicit biases.

In addition to the trainings for law enforcement, the trainers and the LECC have utilized this training in various settings to promote awareness of this training effort, to increase understanding of decision making process that law enforcement officers face, and to create an environment for discussing community concerns. Some of these additional presentations have been conducted for the Corvallis and Eugene Police Citizen's Academy, St. Helens' Rotary Club, the Tribal Public Safety Cluster, and the ACLU of Oregon. These presentations and community discussions have been very well received. Citizen's have felt that these opportunities have given them a greater understanding of the complexity of decision making in police work and have been impressed that Oregon law enforcement engages in this type of training.

## **TRAINING LOCATIONS AND ATTENDANCE FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT**

The LECC began offering the "Tactical Ethics: Perspectives on Profiling" regional and in-service trainings in 2008 and had a total of 113 officers from 14 different law enforcement agencies attend. In 2009, a total of 612 law enforcement professionals from over 52 different agencies were served through the regional, academy, and in-service trainings. In 2010, a total of 413 law enforcement professionals from over 56 agencies were served. In 2011, a total of 281 law enforcement professionals from 48 different agencies using both the "Tactical Ethics" training and the new "Diversity and Profiling in Contemporary Policing" curriculum.

In 2012, we served a total 561 law enforcement professionals from over 20 agencies (see Table 1 below), which brings our total number of attendees up to 1,980 since 2008. These training sessions were led by the following Oregon law enforcement personnel: Corporal Mike Araiza of the Woodburn Police Department, Lt. Wendi Babst of the Clackamas County Sheriff's Office, Captain

Eric Carter of the Albany Police Department, Sgt. Rick Graham of the St. Helens Police Department, Captain Suzanne Isham, Lt. Sam Kamkar of the Eugene Police Department, Lt. Ryan Keck of the Department of Public Safety Standards and Training, Deputy Chief Carolyn McDermed from the University of Oregon Public Safety Department, Lt. Terry Moss of the St. Helens Police Department, Detective Bryan Rehnberg of the Corvallis Police Department, Sgt. Marc Shrake of the Troutdale Police Department, Sgt. Clay Stephens of the Benton County Sheriff's Office, and Officer Jim Quackenbush of Portland Police Bureau. These trainings were staffed and organized by Captain Suzanne Isham of the Department of Public Safety Standards and Training, and Lauren Brown and Emily Covelli of Portland State University.

**Table 1. Perspectives on Profiling and Diversity and Profiling in Contemporary Policing Trainings: October 1, 2011 – September 30, 2012.**

Date	Location	Number of Training hours	In-Service	Number of Participants
October 3, 2011*	Lake Oswego	4	Yes	20
October 5, 2011	Portland	6		14
October 6, 2011*	Lake Oswego	4	Yes	18
October 10, 2011	The Dalles	6		10
December 19, 2011*	Lake Oswego	4	Yes	14
January 5, 2012*	Woodburn PD	4	Yes	27
January 10, 2012	Albany PD	6	Yes	19
January 12, 2012*	Woodburn PD	4	Yes	11
January 30, 2012**	DPSST	5		25
February 14, 2012	Albany PD	6	Yes	26
February 25, 2012	Eugene PD	6		16
March 19, 2012*	DPSST	5		8
May 8, 2012	Metro Reg. Sgt. Academy	6		35
May 29, 2012*	DPSST	5		13
August 8, 2012	Portland Reserve Police Officers	6	Yes	16
September 7, 2012	Eugene PD new recruits	6	Yes	15
September 12, 2012	DPSST new recruits	6		5
October 6, 2012	Metro Regional Reserve Academy	4		23
October 8, 2012	SunRiver	6		10
October 9, 2012	SunRiver	6		12
October 25, 2012	Junction City PD*	4	Yes	6
November 7, 2012	DPSST	3		25
November 7-21, 2012	Eugene PD*	4.5	Yes	193
<b>Total Number of Participants October 1, 2011 to November 21, 2012</b>				<b>561</b>

\*These trainings utilized the new curriculum: Diversity and Profiling in Contemporary Policing.

\*\*This training consisted of a demonstration of the new curriculum: Diversity and Profiling in Contemporary Policing to both police and the general public.

## FUTURE TRAININGS

The LECC, in cooperation with DPSST, will continue to organize and conduct “Tactical Ethics - Perspectives on Profiling” and “Diversity and Profiling in Contemporary Policing” trainings in 2012 and 2013, as funding permits.

## Evaluation of Law Enforcement Training Programs

---

The LECC, in partnership with DPSST and the Criminal Justice Policy Research Institute (CJPRI) at Portland State University, delivers the “Tactical Ethics: Perspectives on Profiling” trainings and the new follow up training implemented this Fall entitled “Diversity and Profiling in Contemporary Policing” to Oregon law enforcement. Post-training feedback is evaluated on an ongoing basis.

### **TACTICAL ETHICS: PERSPECTIVES ON PROFILING EVALUATION**

#### **Post-training feedback survey**

A voluntary written feedback survey is given directly to the attendees after most of the training sessions. So far, the participants have been very willing to provide us with feedback through this survey, as well as verbally and through email. This year, a total of 204 surveys were completed. The feedback from these surveys has been consistently positive overall. This section offers a summary of the feedback that we’ve received about trainings in 2012.

The survey for this training consists of five open ended questions and seven questions with closed ended responses that can be responded to with a 10 point scale. This scale ranges from 1, meaning that the respondent strongly disagrees, to 10, meaning the respondent strongly agrees.

#### *Closed Response Questions*

The following offers a brief summary of the feedback for the closed ended questions. The results are also shown in Table 1 below.

1) The trainers engaged us in the subject matter.

The majority of respondents found the trainers were capable of engaging students in the subject matter. Ninety-three percent of respondents marked scores of eight or higher. Only one respondent selected a score of five or lower.

2) The trainers were persons we could relate to.

Ninety-one percent of respondents indicated the trainers were individuals they could relate to.

3) The trainers had extensive experience in the subject matter.

Respondents indicated the trainers had extensive experience on the subject matter with ninety percent marking scores of eight or higher. No respondents indicated scores lower than five.

4) The trainers were able to answer participant's questions.

The majority of respondents felt the trainers were able to answer questions. Ninety-six percent marked scores of eight or higher. No scores were lower than six.

5) The trainers and content matter challenged my opinions about race and police.

There was more variation in respondents' scores to this question than others. Still, the majority (fifty-six percent) indicated the trainers and content matter challenged opinions about race and police with scores above eight. Ten percent select scores of three or lower, indicating opinions were not challenged by the training.

6) The training seemed "watered down", meaning it didn't confront the difficult issues of race, police and bias.

Seventy-four percent of respondents selected scores of 3 or below indicating the training did *not* seem "watered down." Ten percent of respondents marked 8 or higher indicating the training did not do enough to confront difficult issues of race, police and bias.

7) I would recommend this training to other law enforcement officers.

The majority (83 percent) of respondents agreed they would recommend this training to other law enforcement officers, with fifty-seven percent of respondents scoring a ten, indicating that they strongly agreed.

Table 1. Survey Results from the Tactical Ethics: Perspectives on Profiling Trainings 2012

	Strongly Disagree									Strongly Agree
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. The trainers engaged us in the subject matter.	0%	0%	<1%	0%	0%	1%	5%	18%	18%	57%
2. The trainers were persons we could relate to.	0%	<1%	1%	<1%	0%	<1%	6%	11%	21%	59%
3. The trainers had extensive experience in the subject matter.	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%	7%	20%	17%	53%
4. The trainers were able to answer the participant's questions.	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%	2%	11%	27%	58%
5. The trainers and content matter challenged my opinions about race and police	5%	3%	2%	2%	12%	7%	13%	16%	15%	25%
6. The training seemed "watered down", meaning it didn't confront the difficult issues of race, police and bias.	35%	26%	13%	6%	3%	4%	3%	5%	2%	3%
7. I would recommend this training to other law enforcement officers.	0%	1%	0%	1%	4%	4%	7%	11%	15%	57%

*In summary*

The feedback from the participants has been extremely beneficial for gauging whether or not the training has been successful in meeting the needs of law enforcement. Overall, it appears that this training is important for law enforcement and is being conducted in such a way that is appealing to the participants. We have gained valuable feedback regarding how the training could be improved to increase its appeal and effectiveness. We also receive continual feedback regarding the importance of continuing to offer this training and related trainings to law enforcement.

Prior feedback from a follow-up survey and follow-up discussions with individuals and agency leaders suggest that this training program is not only well-received but is having a valuable impact for attendees (see 2011 Annual Report). Over half of attendees reported noticing positive changes in themselves or others since the training. While to date, we are pleased with the results from the follow-up survey, we would certainly like to see even higher percentages of respondents reporting noticeable changes to the above questions. However, even in hindsight, eighty-four percent of the respondents still felt that this training is valuable and should be continued. While some may not have noticed, or at least reported, changes in the types of issues we offered questions for, it is apparent that the vast majority of respondents still found the training valuable.

The feedback that we have received also reinforces the fact that issues of race within the scope of a law enforcement officer's duties arise frequently and are often complex. Continual training and efforts to further improve the effectiveness of these training efforts are critical for preparing officers for success in their careers.

## Community Outreach Guidebook

---

In early 2010, the Criminal Justice Policy Research Institute (CJPRI) began collaborating with Salem PD to develop a community outreach guidebook or manual. The result of this collaboration is a guidebook entitled, “***Decreasing Crime by Increasing Involvement: A Law Enforcement Guidebook for Building Relations in Multi-Ethnic Communities***”. The purpose of this guidebook is to help law enforcement agencies improve their success in community outreach efforts with communities of color and underrepresented ethnic groups, whether they’re just beginning their community outreach programs or want to build upon an existing program. It was noted through the LECC meetings that some police departments expressed a desire to improve their relations with their ethnic communities but were often unclear on the best way to accomplish that.

Angie Hedrick, from Salem PD, and Emily Covelli, from Portland State University, initiated the development of this guidebook. Throughout 2012 the guidebook was shared with academic and community partners leading to additional chapters, expansion of examples, and formatting changes. Many thanks go to the LECC Board Members and to the following for their work in the development, writing and editing of this booklet: Emma Covelli - Project Manager with CJPRI, Damon Isiah Turner of Know Agenda Consulting, Angie Hedrick - Community Relations Analyst with the Salem Police Department Crime Prevention Unit; and Portland State University CJPRI Graduate Research Assistants Lauren Brown, Jonathan Dabney, and John Lehr. We would also like to thank the numerous law enforcement officers and community members that contributed to this book through interviews and the participation in community meetings. This booklet would not have been possible without the contributions of diverse viewpoints and experiences.

The guidebook is available online at the LECC’s webpage:

[http://www.pdx.edu/cjpri/sites/www.pdx.edu.cjpri/files/Decreasing\\_Crime\\_By\\_Increasing\\_Involvement.pdf](http://www.pdx.edu/cjpri/sites/www.pdx.edu.cjpri/files/Decreasing_Crime_By_Increasing_Involvement.pdf)

# APPENDICES

## ***Appendix A: ORS 131.905 et seq.***

### **ORS 131.905 Legislative findings.**

The Legislative Assembly finds and declares that:

- 1) Surveys of the trust and confidence placed by Oregonians in state and local law enforcement indicate that there are Oregonians who believe that some law enforcement officers have engaged in practices that inequitably and unlawfully discriminate against individuals solely on the basis of their race, color or national origin.
- 2) State and local law enforcement agencies can perform their missions more effectively when all Oregonians have trust and confidence that law enforcement stops and other contacts with individuals are free from inequitable and unlawful discrimination based on race, color or national origin.
- 3) Representatives of community interest groups and state and local law enforcement agencies agree that collecting certain demographic data about contacts between individuals and state or local law enforcement officers will provide a statistical foundation to ensure that future contacts are free from inequitable and unlawful discrimination based on race, color or national origin.
- 4) Demographic data collection can establish a factual and quantifiable foundation for measuring progress in eliminating discrimination based on race, color or national origin during law enforcement stops and other contacts with individuals, but data collection alone does not provide a sufficient basis for corrective action. Proper analysis of the demographic data and enactment of meaningful reforms in response to the results of that analysis require careful consideration of all relevant factors including the context of the community in which the data has been collected.
- 5) It is the goal of this state that all law enforcement agencies perform their missions without inappropriate use of race, color or national origin as the basis for law enforcement actions. This goal may be achieved by providing assistance to state and local law enforcement agencies and the communities that they serve.
- 6) This state shall foster, encourage and support the collection and analysis of demographic data by state and local law enforcement agencies. [2001 c.687 §5]

### **ORS 131.906 Law Enforcement Contacts Policy and Data Review Committee; duties; report.**

- (1) There is created the Law Enforcement Contacts Policy and Data Review Committee consisting of 11 members appointed by the Governor.
- (2) The purpose of the committee is to receive and analyze demographic data to ensure that law enforcement agencies perform their missions without inequitable or unlawful discrimination based on race, color or national origin.
- (3) To achieve its purpose, the committee shall collect and analyze demographic data to:
  - (a) Provide information to assist communities and state and local law enforcement agencies in evaluating the policies, training and procedures of law enforcement agencies regarding the treatment of individuals during stops and other contacts with law enforcement;

- (b) Inform state and local law enforcement agencies and communities about law enforcement practices; and
  - (c) Provide opportunities for communities and state and local law enforcement agencies to work together to increase public trust and confidence in law enforcement and to enhance the capacity of communities and law enforcement agencies to provide more effective public safety services.
- (4) The committee shall:
- (a) Solicit demographic data concerning law enforcement stops and other contacts between state and local law enforcement agencies and individuals;
  - (b) Publicize programs, procedures and policies from communities that have made progress toward eliminating discrimination based on race, color or national origin during law enforcement stops and other contacts with individuals;
  - (c) Provide technical assistance, including refinement of the minimum data elements as necessary for effective analysis, to state and local law enforcement agencies that desire to begin collecting demographic data;
  - (d) Provide technical assistance to communities and state and local law enforcement agencies that desire to engage in local efforts to involve individuals in the establishment and implementation of programs, procedures and policies that will advance the goal of ORS 131.905;
  - (e) Obtain resources for independent analysis and interpretation of demographic data collected by state or local law enforcement agencies;
  - (f) Accept and analyze demographic data collected by a state or local law enforcement agency if requested by a state or local law enforcement agency and if resources are available; and
  - (g) Report to the public the results of analyses of demographic data.
- (5) In carrying out its purpose, the committee may request and receive data files from participating law enforcement agencies and may analyze data for each reported contact. These data files should contain as many of the following items of information as are collected by the participating law enforcement agency:
- (a) The reason for the law enforcement stop or other contact;
  - (b) The law enforcement officer's perception of the race, color or national origin of the individual involved in the contact;
  - (c) The individual's gender;
  - (d) The individual's age;
  - (e) Whether a search was conducted in connection with the contact, and if so, what resulted from the search;
  - (f) The disposition of the law enforcement action, if any, resulting from the contact; and
  - (g) Additional data as recommended by the committee that state and local law enforcement agencies should collect and submit.
- (6) Data received by the committee for analysis under this section may not identify a particular law enforcement officer or a particular individual whose demographic data is collected by a state or local law enforcement agency.
- (7) Members of the committee shall appoint a chairperson from the members of the committee. Members of the committee are not entitled to compensation or expenses and shall serve on the committee on a volunteer basis.

- (8) Portland State University shall provide administrative support staff necessary to the performance of the functions of the committee.
- (9) All agencies of state government, as defined in ORS 174.111, are requested to assist the committee in the performance of its duties and, to the extent permitted by laws relating to confidentiality, to furnish such information and advice as the members of the committee consider necessary to perform their duties.
- (10) The committee shall make findings and issue recommendations for action to achieve the purpose of this section. The committee shall submit a report containing its findings and recommendations to the appropriate interim legislative committees annually on or before December 1.
- (11) After completion of the analysis of the data from at least two state or local law enforcement agencies, the committee may recommend the collection of additional data elements.
- (12) This section does not prohibit a state or local law enforcement agency from collecting data in addition to the information listed in subsection (5) of this section. [2001 c.687 §6; 2007 c.190 §2]

### **ORS 131.908 Funding contributions.**

Portland State University may accept contributions of funds from the United States, its agencies, or from any other source, public or private, and agree to conditions thereon not inconsistent with the purposes of the Law Enforcement Contacts Policy and Data Review Committee. [2001 c.687 §8; 2007 c.190 §3]

### **ORS 131.909 Moneys received.**

All moneys received by Portland State University under ORS 131.908 shall be paid into the State Treasury and deposited into the General Fund to the credit of Portland State University. Such moneys are appropriated continuously to Portland State University for the purposes of ORS 131.906. [2001 c.687 §9; 2007 c.190 §4]

### **ORS 131.910 Measuring progress.**

The Law Enforcement Contacts Policy and Data Review Committee shall assist the Oregon Progress Board in the creation and adoption of goals as provided in ORS 284.622 to measure progress toward the purpose of the committee under ORS 131.906. [2001 c.687 §10]