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Overview

► Review SAFE Charlotte Reimagining Policing Recommendations

► Provide updates on:
  • Key Findings
  • Recommendations
  • Next Steps
SAFE Charlotte Reimagining Policing Recommendations

- **Recommendation 1** - Provide $1m from the city’s current budget to help Charlotte-based non-profits address violence in the community.

- **Recommendation 2** – Work with an external partner to develop a comprehensive recommendation to convert low-risk sworn duties to non-uniform officers.

- **Recommendation 3** – Work with an external partner to provide an independent analysis of areas such as police-civilian contact, and police calls and responses.

- **Recommendation 4** – Expand CPCRT and develop a nonsworn officer responder model for mental health and homeless calls.

- **Recommendation 5** – Engage a university or independent organization to evaluate selected youth programs on an annual basis.

- **Recommendation 6** – Enhance recruitment efforts and develop a program to provide additional residency incentives to officers living in priority areas, including down payment incentive.
Recommendations 2 and 4: Civilian Responses to Low-Risk and/or Mental Health Calls

Recommendation 2 (Civilian Response to Low-Risk)

- Analyzed all Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) data from 2015-2020:
  - 3,255,272 calls

Recommendation 4 (Civilian Response to Mental Health)

- Defined low-risk calls as:
  1. Call priority did not change during course of service
  2. Calls did not require more than a single unit on scene

- Identified “flagged” calls as:
  - Mental Health – 163,490
    - Most common: Welfare Check
  - Homelessness – 89,317
    - Most common: Loitering
  - Substance Abuse – 12,732
    - Most common: Overdose

581,226 Routine (Priority 5) Calls: 16% of total CAD calls

261,439 Flagged Calls for Service: 7% of total CAD calls
Low-Risk Calls - Key Findings

- Most frequent low risk calls: noise complaints, traffic accidents/infractions, larceny
- Lowest risk calls: illegal parking, found property, personal property inquiries, road blockage
- Number and proportion of routine priority calls remained relatively constant throughout the year and across the week
- Mixed community support for low-risk civilian response
- This model is relatively new, limited research on impact

Mental Health Calls - Key Findings

- Flagged calls:
  - Reach their peak, both volume and share of all calls, in middle of the day
  - Most likely to occur in the Uptown/North Graham/North Tryon area
  - More frequent during warmer months
- There exists a lack of continuum of care for behavioral health in Charlotte
- CMPD is agency best suited to house initial pilot:
  - Dispatch through 911
  - Streamline data collection through CAD system

Recommendations 2 and 4: Civilian Responses to Low-Risk and/or Mental Health Calls
Recommendations 2 and 4: Civilian Responses to Low-Risk and/or Mental Health Calls

Recommendations: Civilian Response to Low-Risk Calls (Rec. 2)
• Begin collecting officer injury data
• Consider pilot two-person teams in areas with high concentration of calls
• Locate potential pilot separate from pilot for civilian response to mental health calls

Recommendations: Civilian Response Mental Health (Rec. 4)
• Consider pilot of two person teams with one mental health clinician and one EMT:
  • Deploy teams via 911 dispatch system
  • Initially operate from 2pm-10pm
  • Deploy within limited area with a high density of calls
• House pilot program within CMPD
  • Existing capacity and expertise needed to implement pilot
  • Currently oversees Charlotte’s dispatch system
  • Has connections with stakeholders
  • Able to provide emergency safety response if needed
• Convene Community Advisory Council consisting of stakeholders from across the continuum of care

Next Steps
➢ Prioritize implementation of mental health response
➢ Convene Community Advisory Council
➢ Continue to monitor best practices and results from current pilots of low-risk civilian response
## Recommendation 3: Officer-Resident Contacts

Analyzed Traffic Stop Data, Arrest Data, Complaint Data from 2015-2020 to identify **racial disparity**; Included neighborhood factors into analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome of Interest</th>
<th>Highlights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision to Use Force at a Traffic Stop</td>
<td>Black drivers nearly 2x as likely to experience force at a traffic stop relative to white drivers. RAND identified 250 instances of force in total (out of 538,399 traffic stops in six years of data) (<a href="#">Executive Summary, Page 9</a>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result of Vehicle Stop</td>
<td>Black drivers 1.7x more likely to have the result of a stop be an arrest relative to white drivers. All groups less likely to have the result of a stop be a written warning relative to white drivers (<a href="#">Executive Summary, Page 13</a>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates of Pedestrian and Vehicle Stops</td>
<td>Both Black (almost 3x) and Hispanic (1.5x) individuals are more likely to be stopped than white individuals. When accounting for neighborhood characteristics, the rate a Hispanic person is stopped is similar to likelihood for a white individual (<a href="#">Executive Summary, Page 11</a>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates of Pedestrian and Vehicle Stops – Daylight Savings Time</td>
<td>No individual group is more likely to be stopped in high visibility conditions; no evidence that disparity in stop rates is due to department wide racial profiling (<a href="#">Executive Summary, Page 13</a>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of citizen complaints in communities</td>
<td>For every additional 500 stops in a neighborhood, the number of complaints is estimated to increase by about 16% (<a href="#">Executive Summary, Page 14</a>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial profiling complaints in communities</td>
<td>Too few racial profiling complaints to conduct analysis (29 complaints in six years of data) (<a href="#">Executive Summary, Page 14</a>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for Consent to search</td>
<td>Both Black (2.6x) and Hispanic (1.5x) drivers were more likely to receive a request for consent to search relative to white drivers. When accounting for neighborhood characteristics, result for Hispanic individuals is no longer significant (<a href="#">Executive Summary, Page 15</a>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield rates of contraband</td>
<td>Yield rates were relatively consistent across all groups (<a href="#">Executive Summary, Page 14</a>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severity of Force</td>
<td>Rates of force (lethal and less lethal) are higher for all minorities relative to white, but precision of estimates and rates are low due to limited sample size (~3,000) (<a href="#">Executive Summary, Page 12</a>).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Recommendation 3: Individual Officer Analysis**

**Analysis 1:** Controlling for officer shift, beat, experience etc., does an officer act disproportionately towards one group relative to their peers?

- Black and Asian Officers are less likely to record an arrest
- Black and Asian Officers are more likely to issue a citation
- Hispanic Officers are less likely to issue a citation
- Black Officers are less likely to receive a complaint about an arrest, search, or seizure

**Analysis 2:** Comparing officers based on officer race/ethnicity, do certain officer groups have different frequency of policing outcomes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Driver Race</th>
<th># of Officers that stopped more frequently than peers</th>
<th># of Officers that stopped less frequently than peers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compared to a peer group of nearly 900 officers:

- Black and Asian Officers are less likely to record an arrest
- Black and Asian Officers are more likely to issue a citation
- Hispanic Officers are less likely to issue a citation
- Black Officers are less likely to receive a complaint about an arrest, search, or seizure
- Male Officers are more likely to record an arrest; less likely to issue a citation; more likely to receive a complaint about an arrest, search, or seizure and use of force
Recommendation 3: Officer-Civilian Contacts, Individual Officer Analysis Recommendations and Next Steps

- Improve and enhance the data that is collected in the Internal Affairs Case Management System (IACMS)
  - Improve CMPD’s Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA) reporting for a more holistic view of use of force, including the race/ethnicity of civilians involved and more context on the circumstances preceding uses of force
  - Enable linkages between IACMS and other data sets, mainly calls for service, traffic stops, and arrests/charges, to provide a more holistic view of an officer-resident interaction
  - Add data validation checks to the Traffic Stop Data Collection system

- Conduct further analysis into findings that warrant more understanding, and use this analysis to develop next steps:
  - Use of Force at Traffic Stop
  - Individual Officer Analysis

- Continue to refine the model used in the Individual Officer Analysis to improve the accuracy of the model, and establish an outlier review process within CMPD’s Professional Accountability Bureau
Recommendation 5: CMPD Youth Programs Review

Organized 21 CMPD Youth Programs into five categories:
• Law Enforcement Career Pipeline
• Community Relationships and Perception
• Public Safety:
  • Youth Development
  • Gang, Violence, and Conflict Prevention
  • Youth Diversion

Compared evidence based best practices vs. current program practices for each category

Assessed data currently collected, capacity of CMPD program administrators, and evidence-base for each program to determine evaluability

Key Findings
• CMPD’s coordinated cross-referral of program participants has been successful
• 21 programs examined:
  • 11 are evidence-based and could be evaluable with improved data collection
  • 4 are partially evidence-based and are potentially evaluable with changes to implementation practices
  • 6 are not evidence-based or evaluable; all are “Community Relationships and Perceptions” programs
  • Youth Diversion—currently collects enough data to be evaluable
• CMPD lacks the capacity resources to collect data, share data, or design and implement program evaluation processes
Recommendation 5: CMPD Youth Programs Review

Recommendations: CMPD Youth Programs

- Invest in staff and technology to support program evaluation
  - Explore data and analytic resources to support data collection and evaluation
  - Consider adding civilian program coordinators or case managers to provide administrative and evaluation support
- Implement practices to address the identified gaps between “evidence-based” and “program-based” impact frameworks. Examples of common gaps include:
  - Ensure equitable access to programs by using screening, assessment, and eligibility tools
  - Target resources to the youth who are at the highest risk
  - Involve peer leaders to recruit youth and facilitate programming
- Consider scaling CMPD programs in high-need areas
- Prioritize building evaluation capacity in the Youth Diversion program, Reach Out, Envision Academy, REACH Academy, and Career Pipeline programs; these programs are most aligned with best practices and collect some data relevant to evaluation

Next Steps

- Explore the addition of civilian positions to support youth programs through existing CMPD civilianization efforts
- Collaboration between CMPD and the city’s Innovation and Technology department to prioritize programs for enhancements and identify specific metrics associated with each program’s goals and objectives
Recommendation 6: Review of Training Curriculum

Job task analysis to identify frequency and criticality of over 1,200 tasks officers are expected to have competency in

Reviewed curricula, training objectives and teaching materials for new recruits, lateral transfers, intermediate transfers, and in-service training

Identified potential training gaps and opportunities for improvement in both curriculum and administration of curriculum

Key Findings

- CMPD does a commendable job of delivering state-mandated BLET coursework
- Insufficient agency data to support the need for additional CMPD-specific training for new recruits (331 hours)
  - The state’s mandated training adequately cover 1,200+ tasks
  - Identified 93 critical tasks; provides supporting data for some CMPD-specific training
- CMPD-specific courses lack defined curricula, learning objectives, testing materials, or ROI metrics
- CMPD-developed in-service training is often reactionary
- Staffing at the Training Academy has not substantively increased since 2004
  - CMPD has grown by 425+ officers in that time
- Training staff do not have the capacity or expertise to develop training materials

Identified potential training gaps and opportunities for improvement in both curriculum and administration of curriculum
Recommendation 6: Review of Training Curriculum

Recommendations: Training Curriculum Review

- Implement a centralized process to aggregate and analyze officer performance data, use this data to determine training needs and develop learning objectives for CMPD-specific training
- Use the 93 critical tasks identified in the job-task analysis as a basis for determining in-service training needs
  - Duty to intervene training was determined to be especially critical
- Begin using ROI metrics to quantify the overall value of CMPD-specific training and inform future changes to training priorities
- Create a Training Advisory Committee comprised of staff and community stakeholders to review relevant internal data and prioritize training needs
- Conduct a staffing study for the Training Academy
- Employ at least one full-time civilian curriculum developer to support CMPD’s training staff
  - Develop evidence-based, data-driven, and justifiable learning objectives and training materials for all CMPD-specific courses

Next Steps

- Create three civilian positions to support CMPD Training Academy staff – Curriculum Developer, Learning Development Manager, and Training Specialist
  - Training Specialist has been hired
- Review course-specific recommendations and prioritize courses for enhancement
- Conduct training academy staffing study
- Explore the development of a structured process for identifying and prioritizing future training needs
- Develop a plan to strengthen “duty to intervene” training in in-service and new recruit curricula
Moving Forward

- Working with external consultant to review recruitment and residency
- Publish all reports and summary documents online
Questions?