Law Enforcement Contacts Policy and Data Review Committee (LECC)
COMMUNITY RELATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
September 6, 2006, 1:00 p.m.
Oregon State Capitol, Salem, Oregon

LECC Members Present
Commissioner Annabelle Jaramillo, Benton County
David Fidanque, Executive Director, American Civil Liberties Union of Oregon
Chief Ron Louie, Hillsboro Police Department
Superintendent Frank Thompson, Santiam Correctional Institution

LECC Staff Present
Brian Renauer, Laura Uva, Criminal Justice Policy Research Institute, Portland State University

LECC Community Relations Subcommittee Members Excused
Associate Professor Keith Aoki, University of Oregon Law School
Dr. Charles Martinez, Oregon Social Learning Center

Guests
Rose Lewis, League of Women Voters

Approve Agenda
The subcommittee unanimously approved the agenda.

Approve Minutes of June 5, 2006 Meeting
Chief Louie moved, Superintendent Thompson seconded, and the subcommittee unanimously approved the minutes.

Update on Oregon Law Enforcement Survey
Dr. Renauer distributed a handout outlining his analysis of responses to Section I of the LECC Oregon Law Enforcement Survey (see Appendix A). The subcommittee agreed to bring this report to the full LECC meeting on September 20, 2006, to finalize and decide how to proceed. Chief Louie volunteered to directly carry the report to OACP once it is finalized.

Update on Department of Public Safety Standards and Training (DPSST) Law Enforcement Curriculum Subcommittee
The DPSST Scenario Development Workgroup met on September 5, 2006. The workgroup has developed a list of learning objectives and has written eleven scenarios. Superintendent Thompson informed the subcommittee that the workgroup requested that a DPSST representative participate in the finalizing and refining of these scenarios. Dr. Renauer is working on a preliminary review of the scenarios in relation to addressing the learning objectives, which will be discussed with the workgroup and DPSST representative(s) at the next workgroup meeting. The subcommittee strongly supported
the invitation of DPSST representatives to the workgroup, and decided to bring this recommendation to the full committee at their meeting on September 20, 2006.

The workgroup recognizes the importance of these topics being covered in training at all levels, as well as in “train-the-trainer” classes. It was also determined that some of the scenarios are more suited to be used as in-class demonstrations to prompt discussion. The Community Relations Subcommittee agreed, and decided to bring these recommendations to the full LECC as well. DPSST also invited the workgroup to give feedback on the curriculum relating to racially biased policing, and the workgroup will be developing recommendations.

The subcommittee also decided that it would be fruitful to invite DPSST representatives to an LECC full committee meeting. It was decided that Commissioner Jaramillo and Justice Peterson should call John Minnis of DPSST to ask him who of his staff he would like to recommend attending an LECC meeting. The subcommittee also decided to invite DPSST Scenario Development Workgroup members to the full LECC meeting in order to acknowledge their work. Superintendent Thompson offered to invite them.

**Simon Wiesenthal Center Training**
The Simon Wiesenthal Center (SWC) received a subsidized grant from the federal government to provide training for leaders in the law enforcement community from around the country. The following LECC and/or DPSST Scenario Development Workgroup members are registered to attend the "Leadership Initiatives for Command Staff" training on October 18-20, 2006 in Los Angeles, California:

- Sheriff Todd Anderson, Tillamook County
- Chief Frank Grace, Gladstone Police Department
- Sheriff Raul Ramirez, Marion County
- Lt. Henry Reimann, Hillsboro Police Department
- Frank Thompson, Santiam Correctional Institution

Some DPSST staff have also shown strong interest in attending this training. Although the training sessions in October are now full, the same sessions will be offered in January of 2007.

**Racially Biased Policing Videos**
DPSST sent LECC staff copies of two videos on racially-biased policing: “Racial Profiling: A Town Hall Discussion” and “COPS: Mutual Respect in Policing.” Claudia Black had already briefed the subcommittee on the latter video at their meeting on June 5, 2006. Dr. Renauer stated that he will review the other video in order to discuss it at the LECC meeting on September 20. Chief Louie strongly encouraged this, as chiefs and sheriffs are looking for a model on community outreach in a town-hall or non-crisis forum.
**LECC 2006 Annual Report**
Dr. Renauer distributed a draft table of contents for the LECC 2006 Annual Report. It was decided that the report should offer a summary of the work done this year with an emphasis on next steps.

**Other Business / Open Comments from Community Relations Subcommittee**
Dr. Renauer agreed to invite Chief Sizer of Portland Police Bureau, or a representative of her choosing, to a meeting to give a report on the community outreach work they have been doing.

**Public Comments**
There were no public comments.

**Adjournment**
The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

Further information on the LECC is available at:
http://159.121.112.123/Racial_Profiling/LECPDRC.HTM
APPENDIX A

TRAINING RELATED TO RACIAL BIAS IN OREGON LAW ENFORCEMENT
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Section I
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Purpose of Survey

The Law Enforcement Contacts Policy and Data Review Committee (LECC) developed and distributed a survey of Oregon law enforcement agencies in order to gain an understanding of what these agencies are currently doing to prevent racially-biased policing and to offer agencies an opportunity to request specific assistance. The survey questions focus on the types of training, community outreach, and data collection efforts that agencies have undertaken. Another goal of the survey has been to identify implementation obstacles and types of assistance that Oregon law enforcement agencies may require for addressing racially-biased policing.

Description of Survey

The Oregon Law Enforcement Survey was developed by the LECC, with assistance from the Oregon Association Chiefs of Police (OACP), Oregon State Sheriffs Office (OSSA), Oregon State Police (OSP), Dr. Lori Fridell of the University of South Florida, and Dr. Robin Shepherd Engel of the University of Cincinnati. This was a written survey that consisted of two sections. Section I addressed issues of community relations and training, and section II addressed issues of stop data collection and analysis. More specifically, section I requested information on agencies’ community outreach and training addressing racial bias in policing. Section II requested information on agencies’ CAD systems and collection of race/ethnicity stop data. Both sections included an area for respondents to list what assistance they wanted from the LECC. See Appendix A for a copy of the survey.

Methodology

On behalf of the LECC, the OACP, OSSA and OSP distributed the survey by e-mail to all Oregon law enforcement agencies (133 police departments, 36 sheriff’s offices, and the Oregon State Police = 170 agencies) on February 23, 2006. The initial response deadline was March 10, 2006. Agencies were promised that their responses would be kept confidential and that results would be published only in the aggregate. OSP chose to grant the LECC permission to present its responses separately in this report.

The survey was re-sent on March 22, 2006 to all recipients with a reminder and a new deadline of March 30, 2006. It was re-sent again by OACP on April 5, 2006. Claudia Black also called several sheriffs to remind them to respond to the survey.

LECC staff received the last survey response on June 5, 2006. The total number of law enforcement agencies that responded was 82 (59 police departments, 22 sheriff’s offices, and the Oregon State Police). The survey response rate is 48% (82/170 total law enforcement agencies).
Results Summary

Types of Training: The results in Table 1 indicate that the most common form of training received by Oregon Law Enforcement agencies on racially-biased policing is adopting a policy and subsequent internal reviews of such policies and Oregon policies (37%). The next most common type of training was in-service training on stops and searches (29%). The third most common form of training was a more informal training that occurred with roll call, briefings, or newsletters, or during field training with a FTO (28%). Approximately 24% of Oregon Law Enforcement agencies report receiving racially-biased police training from DPSST. Seven agencies (9%) report no training is being provided on the importance of carrying out stops without the inappropriate use of race, color or national origin as the basis for law enforcement action.

Table 1. Types of training importance of carrying out stops without the inappropriate use of race, color or national origin as the basis for law enforcement action.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Categories</th>
<th>Police Department Participation</th>
<th>Sheriffs Offices</th>
<th>Oregon State Police</th>
<th>Total Oregon Law Enforcement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Diversity/Cultural Awareness Training¹</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) DPSST Training²</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) In-service Training on Traffic Stops/Search³</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Informal Training⁴</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Special/Outside Training⁵</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Policy Adoption or Training⁶</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) No Training is Provided</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Left Question Blank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Respondents</td>
<td>N = 59</td>
<td>N = 22</td>
<td>N = 1</td>
<td>N = 82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Notes: primarily in-service, includes ethics, discrimination training.
Notes: focused on for new hires.
Notes: includes annual accreditation training, also includes mentions of general or other in-service training.
Notes: includes field training with FTO, Recruit Orientation Training, Reviewing and responding to complaints; Review and discussion during shift briefings of analyses of data collection; reviews at roll call; training bulletins/newsletters; viewed a training video.
Notes: examples include IACP Training Keys; Six Minutes of Training program; Perspectives on Profiling; Special training from the local DA’s office.
Notes: includes adopting policies that declare racial profiling illegal or informal training and reviews of current Oregon policies.

Breadth of Training: Table 2 shows that 53 law enforcement agencies in Oregon (65%) require some type of training on importance of carrying out stops without the inappropriate use of race, color or national origin as the basis for law enforcement action. Most agencies that require training (83%) report that the training occurs for the entire department. Table 2a also shows that most of the training occurring happens on an annual basis.

Table 2. Is this training required and, if so, for whom and how often?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Required</th>
<th>Police Department Participation</th>
<th>Sheriff’s Offices</th>
<th>Oregon State Police</th>
<th>Total Oregon Law Enforcement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes – Required</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No – Required</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who Gets Trained</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entire Department</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subset of Department</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Training</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than Once</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Time / Infrequent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Notes: An example would be only training of new recruits.
Notes: This category involves what appears to be a 1 time training effort (e.g. DPSST for new recruits) or very infrequent training. Whereas, “more than once” involves more frequent training, but not as formalized as an annual training.

Training Obstacles: Twenty-five Oregon Law Enforcement Agencies did report some training obstacles or difficulties. Overwhelmingly, the primary difficulty that was expressed by agencies was a need for more training and better training to be available to them.

Table 3. Difficulties in developing and implementing such training (e.g. finding an effective curriculum or training officers?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Difficulties</th>
<th>Police Department Participation</th>
<th>Sheriff's Offices</th>
<th>Oregon State Police</th>
<th>Total Oregon Law Enforcement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Want Better / More Training</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Training Too Expensive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Officers Don’t See It As Necessary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Need Instructors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How Could LECC Help: Law enforcement agencies were asked how the LECC could be most helpful to their organization. The vast majority of agencies indicated that they would like LECC to assist them in finding and implementing appropriate, low-cost and effective training to address this issue.

Approximately 55 agencies, most of whom had never collected data, indicated in their survey response a request for some sort of technical assistance from the LECC. The vast majority of these requests were for assistance in efficient and inexpensive training relative to Oregon’s issues. Another common request was for the LECC to write and distribute a report on the results of the survey and what the next steps should be.

LECC Community Relations Subcommittee
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Conclusion: The survey represents a broad cross-section of Oregon law enforcement agencies. Roughly half of all law enforcement agencies in Oregon responded to the survey. Although the overall response rate is low, the results can be considered acceptable for analysis and policy consideration. Both the geographic coverage of the state and agency department size was well represented in the results. In particular, almost all major departments responded to the survey as did 61% of the Sheriff’s departments.

The results indicate that Oregon Law Enforcement agencies are attentive to the importance of training related to carrying out stops without the inappropriate use of race, color or national origin as the basis for law enforcement action. Only seven agencies (9%) report no training is being provided. However, there is wide variation in the types of training, breadth of training, and formality that are reported occurring. Thus, there appears to be no uniform consistency to the delivery and content of training related to biased-based policing in Oregon.

Twenty-five of the agencies surveyed (31%) stated that they have difficulties in providing such training. The need for more and better training to be made available to them was expressed as a common difficulty. The survey results reinforce the efforts of the LECC to work with DPSST to examine their training scenarios for incorporation of lessons related to biased-based policing. A number of training options that all have consistent themes should be developed to target the greatest number of agencies and officers (i.e. in service, videos, and DPSST scenarios).

In sum, the results indicate a need in Oregon and a desire by many agencies for consistent, effective, and low cost training programs to address the issue of biased-based policing regarding stops and after stop decisions.