LECC Data Review Subcommittee Members Present
Scott Akins, Subcommittee Chair, Professor, Department of Sociology, Oregon State University
Major Craig Durbin, Oregon State Police

Other LECC Members Present
None

LECC Staff Present
Brian Renauer, Emma Covelli, and Michel Wilson, Criminal Justice Policy Research Institute, Portland State University
Dr. Jan Chaiken, Consultant

LECC Data Review Subcommittee Members Excused
David Fidanque, Executive Director, American Civil Liberties Union of Oregon
Mike Stafford, LECC staff

Guests
No guests attended this meeting

Welcome / Introductions
Dr. Akins, chair of the subcommittee welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Approve Agenda
The agenda was approved.

Approve Minutes of March 10, 2010
Mr. Akins moved, Major Durbin seconded, and the subcommittee unanimously approved the minutes of the LECC Data Review Subcommittee meeting on May 12, 2010.

Status Update on Analysis of Data from Law Enforcement Agencies
At the last meeting there was discussion about a need to increase agency involvement in the collection and analysis of traffic/search data. Dr. Renauer and Major Durbin had a phone conference since the last meeting and came to the conclusion that a more successful approach may be to self-identify interested administrators and agencies then make personal outreach to them to interest them in data collection and analysis. Previous methods of mass emails and conference presentation have not lead to many leads. In addition, using City Council and/or County Commissions to advocate for data collection and analysis may be a better route to developing partnerships with law enforcement.
Council members may be interested in being “ahead” of any future issues that may happen with data that can examine issues.

The discussions lead to the following work plan:

1) Step 1:
   a. Data Review Committee needs to form agreements on what analyses & data collection they want done and what they see as the benefits.
   b. Develop a PowerPoint or video demonstrating what some departments have gained from stop data analyses and how they've been able to use the analyses to address public concerns, etc.

2) Step 2:
   a. Identify select Administrators or departments that may be must interested in data collection.
   b. Justice Peterson could personally invite the selected administrators to a lunch meeting to create the initial discussion and presentation of our efforts.

3) Step 3:
   a. Discuss with select County Commissioners and City Council members the pros and cons of approaching data collection through their advocacy.

*Action: All members of Data Review Committee*

Dr. Renauer had not heard from PPB regarding any limitations on the inclusion of the PPB technical assistance report in the LECC Annual Report. Dr. Renauer will contact them about this. *Action: Dr. Renauer*

Dr. Chaiken noted that he had received part of his data request from OSP (2008 data) for analysis. Major Durbin said that he will ensure Dr. Chaiken receives the 2009 data soon. *Action: Dr. Chaiken and Major Durbin.*

*Other Business / Open Comments from Data Review Subcommittee*

None

*Public Comments*

None

*Adjournment*

The meeting was adjourned at 10:07 a.m.

Further information on the LECC is available at:
http://www.cjpri.ccj.pdx.edu/LECC/index.php