Our research on policing in California

- Racial disparities in criminal justice are a pressing issue for state and nation
  - Most notably between Black and white residents
- Policing at center of recent concerns, especially use of force
- Data can inform policy, identify strategies for safely reducing disparities
  - Examine differences across race/ethnicity in interactions with law enforcement
  - Assess limitations and examine existing data on police use of force and misconduct
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CA has mandated that police collect stop data

- Racial and Identity Profiling Act (RIPA) stop data
  - All vehicle and pedestrian stops
    - A "stop" is any detention of a person by a police officer, or any officer interaction in which the officer conducts a search

- Close to 4 million stops conducted in 2019 by the state’s 15 largest law enforcement agencies
Data include demographic info and stop context

- Context includes
  - Reason for stop
  - Actions taken by the officer
  - Enforcement

- Demographic information is as *perceived* by the officer, and reported after the stop
We examine disparities in various stop outcomes

- Likelihood of a search
- Likelihood of discovery of contraband or evidence (such as weapons, property, and drugs) in searches
- Likelihood of various levels of enforcement
- Likelihood of experiencing an intrusive action and/or use of force
- Focus on differences between Black and white Californians
  - Report includes analysis of racial disparities across additional groups
Disparities may reflect bias and/or context

- Evidence of bias exists in many occupations and settings, including criminal justice and policing

- Other factors may also explain differences in stop experiences — some are included in the RIPA data
  - Contraband
  - Officer observed suspicious behavior (traffic vs. reasonable suspicion)
  - Individual has an outstanding warrant for an arrest
  - Differences across jurisdictions (policing and/or crime challenges)
We seek an “apples to apples” comparison

- We adjust for differences in plausible factors and contexts across racial/ethnic groups
  - We estimate differences for an individual of given-age, gender, and context, adjusting for agency-level differences
  - As data do not capture all relevant factors and are reported by officers, estimates are not causal, and do not represent estimates of police bias
Search disparities narrow when adjusting for personal traits and stop context
Contraband/evidence found in fewer searches of Black individuals than white
Adjusting for context and enforcement rates across agencies reduces racial gaps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age/Gender/Mental Health</th>
<th>Reason for Stop</th>
<th>LEA/City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Black Californians are more likely than white to experience greater intrusiveness
Black-white gaps are greatest in traffic stops made by local law enforcement agencies.
Summary

- RIPA data show notable racial inequities in law enforcement interactions
- Police racial bias may contribute to inequities, but other factors are relevant
  - Context, type of agency, and jurisdiction
  - Still, inequities remain after adjusting for such factors
- Greatest disparities are in traffic stops made by police and sheriff’s departments
Conclusions

- Data-driven research can inform discussions of and efforts to reduce racial disparity in policing
  - Concerns historically voiced by communities of color about inequities
  - Some disparities may be driven by officer challenges and responsibilities when making stops
Conclusions

- Lower discovery rates and higher shares of stops that do not lead to enforcement suggest a disproportionate share of “unproductive” stops of Blacks
  - To what extent can traffic stops, especially by local law enforcement, be safely reduced?
  - A closer examination could reduce risks and injuries to officers and citizens, and reduce racial disparities
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Public scrutiny over police use of force and misconduct has grown

- Recent state reforms aim to improve transparency and accountability
- Use of force and misconduct differ, but both:
  - May affect trust in law enforcement
  - Should be documented and monitored
  - Are the focus of policy discussions
- What do the existing data tell us?
- How can data better inform policy and practice?
Understanding the available data

- Civilian deaths from police interactions
  - CA Department of Justice (DOJ) Use of Force data
  - CA DOJ Deaths in Custody
  - Fatal Encounters (crowdsourced)

- Non-fatal, serious injuries
  - CA DOJ Use of Force data
  - Hospital discharge data

- Misconduct
  - Arrests of police officers
About 195 civilians die in police encounters each year
In the vast majority of fatalities and gunshot injuries, civilian was armed
Many serious use-of-force incidents start with a call for service

- All deaths
- All gunshot injuries
- All deaths and serious injuries

- Call for service
- Crime in progress
- Vehicle/pedestrian stop
- Pre-planned
- Other
Behavioral health issues are prevalent

![Bar chart showing the share of non-fatal gunshots (%)]

- Any behavioral health
- Any alcohol/drugs
- Any mental health

Legend:
- Hospital data
- Use of Force data
Black people are overrepresented in police use-of-force incidents

% change in likelihood of force, relative to whites
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Information on misconduct is more limited

- Civil, criminal, and employment protections for law enforcement officers
- Prior to SB 2, California was one of three states without a decertification process
- Crowdsourced data on arrests of police officer (2007–2016)
  - Limited to the most serious misconduct
### Assault is the most common reason officers are arrested in California

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total arrests</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>% of total arrests</th>
<th>Official-capacity arrests</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>% of OC arrests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated assault</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Aggravated assault</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple assault</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Forcible rape</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving under the influence</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>False report/false statement</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forcible rape</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>All other larceny</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forcible fondling</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Obstructing justice</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table shows total number and share of arrests of California police officers by top five offense types, from 2007 to 2016.
Recommendations

- Improve existing data
  - Expand data to include vehicle-related serious injuries or deaths

- Develop public CA DOJ database on police misconduct

- Evaluate reforms for their effect on use of force, public safety, and racial disparities
  - Deadly force standard
  - Initiatives to reduce traffic stops or separate them from policing
  - Pilot programs for mental health
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