

Chapter 12. Data and Reporting

PULL QUOTE: “Cops on the street need data; sometimes their safety depends on it. And what they need is data that are easy to digest, accurate, and timely.”¹ - Chief William Brooks, Norwood Police Department, Massachusetts

Overview

Effective policing requires comprehensive and credible data to identify criminal threats and determine where to best deploy limited resources. Law enforcement agencies cannot reach policy decisions or allocate manpower based on whim, anecdotes, or the individualized discretion of law enforcement officials. Rather, law enforcement must make a centralized and scientific determination of the state of crime in their jurisdiction, and that understanding can only occur through comprehensive and reliable data.

Foremost, data tells law enforcement the scale of a criminal problem and, no less importantly, the efficacy of operations to combat it. It can be difficult to even identify the existence of a criminal problem without data. Law enforcement cannot ascertain, for example, the magnitude of human trafficking without data of its frequency, location, and other patterns. In the fight against violent crime, moreover, the Commission has determined that law enforcement should no longer simply rely on “street intelligence,” but should use sophisticated crime data analysis, such as “hotspot mapping” and crime gun intelligence, to target the most violent criminal actors and their organizations.

On the macro-policy level, law enforcement officials employ data to distribute resources, including federal grant money, with a proper understanding of criminal activity relative to type, degree, and location.

But the mere acquisition of data is by itself, insufficient. The information must be shared, analyzed, and used effectively. A mosaic of federal, state, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies collect data, and need sound methods of reporting and sharing data for collective analysis and use. As noted elsewhere in this report, this is particularly vital in the realm of homeland security, where there is a pronounced need for law enforcement to share information and data in reliable and effective ways.

Background

Law enforcement has formally collected crime data since the establishment of the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) program in 1929. The need to share vital information about crime trends has not changed much since 1929, but the demand, timing, and types of data have changed. In the twenty-first century, our nation has become a vast consumer of data in nearly all aspects of life and professional sectors. Law enforcement has shifted from taking a reactive stance (i.e., moving from call to call) to a proactive position, such as using data to help reduce crime in their communities.

The use of law enforcement data has evolved from the early days of capturing basic crime counts to rigorous research practice through evidence-based policing (EBP). Data collection is no longer just aggregate counts; it now includes incident-based data, which provide detailed and granular information that fosters better crime reduction strategies. In addition to the analytical flexibility that incident-level data provides, standardized incident-level data provide a platform for law enforcement and other criminal justice professionals to maintain both transparency with and accountability to the communities they serve.

The federal government relies on federal, state, county, tribal, and local law enforcement agencies to enter data accurately. Law enforcement agencies striving to implement EBP strategies will be thwarted if the data analyzed are incomplete, inaccurate, or otherwise unreliable. Even when data have been accurately collected, people may misunderstand or misinterpret them if the context or baseline is unclear in reporting.

¹ William Brooks, Chief of Police, Norwood Police Department, MA, email communication with Shelley S. Hyland, Federal Program Manager, Data and Reporting Working Group, April 30, 2020. ² For this chapter, the terms federal criminal justice data collections and justice-related data collections are used interchangeably and include only statistical data collections where the primary objective is to collect new or existing data in order to provide statistical results. These collections are covered under the Paperwork Reduction Act. It does not include performance measurement data collected through grants, cooperative agreements, and other funding mechanisms.

The same data can be used to both defend and refute the same hypothesis. As such, all government agencies must continue their due diligence in collecting and reporting data that are reliable and objective.

13.1 Federal Data

The United States Government is the largest collector and custodian of data, and it analyzes this information to discern national crime trends and accordingly prioritize federal law enforcement efforts or allocate grant money to state and local jurisdictions. The Executive Branch of the United States government includes thirteen principal statistical agencies whose primary responsibility is to collect essential statistical information for public use. Since 1979, the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) has served as the principal statistical agency for the Department of Justice (DOJ).

The federal government does not have a central system to collect criminal justice data. The Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (OIRA) within the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) coordinates the decentralized federal statistical system. Within DOJ, a number of agencies engage in statistical data collection (figure 13.1). The methodology, size, and scope of these data collections vary widely. BJS oversees 53 percent of federal criminal justice data collections² within DOJ, followed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI; 15 percent), Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (10 percent), and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF; 6 percent). Eleven other DOJ agencies oversee the remaining 16 percent of federal criminal justice data collections (see supplement 13.1).

Table 13.1

Table 1. Federal data collections by criminal justice area and federal agency.

	Total	BJS	FBI	Other DOJ Agencies	Non-DOJ Agencies
Total	100.0 %	39.5 %	10.9 %	23.5 %	26.1 %
Crime	35.3	4.2	7.6	10.9	12.6
Law Enforcement	25.2	11.8	3.4	2.5	7.6
Courts	18.5	10.1	0.0	4.2	4.2
Corrections	18.5	12.6	0.0	5.9	0.0
Expenditures	2.5	0.8	0.0	0.0	1.7

Source: Supplement #.

The most prominent federal data collections that measure crime are the FBI’s Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) program and BJS’s National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS). The UCR focuses on collecting data regarding crimes reported to police, whereas the NCVS is the main data source that captures crimes not reported to police.

The FBI’s UCR program has existed since 1930, when the Summary Reporting System (SRS)³ was created. In 1988, the FBI then created the National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) to move from the aggregate crime counts of the SRS to detailed incident-level crime information.³ Effective January 1, 2021, the FBI will retire the SRS and will transition exclusively to the NIBRS data collection.⁴ The NCVS is a

² For this chapter, the terms federal criminal justice data collections and justice-related data collections are used interchangeably and include only statistical data collections where the primary objective is to collect new or existing data in order to provide statistical results. These collections are covered under the Paperwork Reduction Act. It does not include performance measurement data collected through grants, cooperative agreements, and other funding mechanisms.

³ Paul Wormeli, “Criminal Justice Statistics: An Evolution,” *Criminology and Public Policy* 17, no. 2 (2018).⁴ “National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS),” Federal Bureau of Investigation, accessed July 21, 2020, <https://www.fbi.gov/services/cjis/ucr/nibrs>.⁵ National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, *Modernizing Crime Statistics: Report 1: Defining and Classifying Crime* (Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, 2017), <https://doi.org/10.17226/23492>; National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, *Modernizing Crime Statistics: Report 2: New Systems for Measuring Crime* (Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, 2018), <https://doi.org/10.17226/25035>; and National Research Council, *Ensuring the Quality*.

⁴ “National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS),” Federal Bureau of Investigation, accessed July 21, 2020, <https://www.fbi.gov/services/cjis/ucr/nibrs>.⁵ National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, *Modernizing Crime Statistics: Report 1: Defining and Classifying Crime* (Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, 2017), <https://doi.org/10.17226/23492>; National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, *Modernizing Crime Statistics: Report 2: New Systems for Measuring Crime* (Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, 2018), <https://doi.org/10.17226/25035>; and National Research Council, *Ensuring the Quality*.

residential survey of victims and captures both reported and unreported crime. NCVS estimates have largely only been available at the national level. However, BJS is currently undergoing an extensive redesign of the survey to produce subnational estimates.

While BJS collects the majority of criminal justice data, a number of other federal agencies also capture justice-related data. More than 30 federal agencies collect criminal justice data through over 100 data collections (see supplement 13.1). One benefit of multiple agencies collecting data is that agencies with established access to certain types of subjects are better equipped to collect data from these agencies or persons. For example, the FBI has been collecting crime data from law enforcement agencies for 90 years with a well-established infrastructure to capture these data. It would take millions of dollars and years for another government agency to set up a similar frame to accomplish the same task. Additionally, the CDC is the primary collector of data on injury and death, with an established series of data collections in hospitals. These collections provide access to data on injury and death involving law enforcement officers that may not be tracked through law enforcement agencies.

However, there are a number of issues with this current structure of decentralized data collection, one primary being the difficulty of identifying the potential duplication of data collected. In addition, with decentralization there is a lack of communication among federal agencies about the programs they implement. OIRA oversees and reviews all information collected from the public, but it relies on federal agencies themselves to identify potential sources of duplication. Additionally, decentralization makes it difficult to identify gaps in the data being collected. A lack of clarity in what is being gathered across agencies and data collections makes it increasingly difficult to identify the knowledge gaps. There has never been a systematic review of all criminal justice collections by the federal government.⁵

This recommendation offers a way to address the issues caused by the decentralization of federal criminal justice data.

13.1.1 The president should direct the Office of Management and Budget to conduct a one-time review of criminal justice data collections across the government to identify duplication of data collection.

As previously discussed, the collection of criminal justice statistics is highly decentralized in the federal government. With more than 30 agencies collecting data pertaining to criminal justice issues, certain topics, such as victimization, have data that are collected through multiple studies by multiple organizations.⁶ For example, BJS collects information on victims of intimate partner violence through the NCVS regardless of whether the violence was reported to law enforcement.⁷ Information on victims of intimate partner violence can also be obtained from the CDC's National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey.⁸ To ensure the federal collection of criminal justice data does not unduly burden nonfederal entities, the government must be able to identify duplications of data collection efforts. An evaluation and report by OMB would identify overlap in efforts and help guide resource distributions going forward. OMB should consider the Department of Justice as the agency to advise and oversee federal justice-related data collections going forward to reduce duplication.

13.2 Data Collection and Reporting Methods

The 1967 President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice (Johnson Commission)

⁵ National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, *Modernizing Crime Statistics: Report 1: Defining and Classifying Crime* (Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, 2017), <https://doi.org/10.17226/23492>; National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, *Modernizing Crime Statistics: Report 2: New Systems for Measuring Crime* (Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, 2018), <https://doi.org/10.17226/25035>; and National Research Council, *Ensuring the Quality*.

⁶ See supplement 13.1.

⁷ Shannon Catalano, *Intimate Partner Violence: Attributes Of Victimization, 1993–2011* (Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2013), <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/ipvav9311.pdf>.

⁸ S.G. Smith et al., *National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS): 2015 Data Brief – Updated Release* (Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2018), <https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/2015data-brief508.pdf>.

noted that the greatest obstacle to the work of that commission was the lack of data.⁹ The Johnson Commission recommended the development of improved systems to collect data that would inform all aspects of the criminal justice system.

Since the Johnson Commission report, the federal government has made great strides to improve data collection and reporting. The creation of BJS a decade after the Johnson Commission report greatly expanded justice-related data collection and statistical reporting for DOJ. In addition, the FBI has adopted methods to improve and continually enhance its capabilities for data collection and publications.

Federal data collection and reporting would not be possible without the cooperation of states, counties, local, and tribal agencies. Similarly, these criminal justice agencies collect a myriad of data. Data sharing and reporting may be the most important aspect of data collection. There is little need to collect data if it will not be used. Law enforcement agencies collect data daily and use these data internally to help inform operations, policies, and procedures. The benefits of sharing and reporting data outweigh the negatives. Agencies may be rightly concerned about privacy issues, but data can be shared and reported so that sensitive information is not released. Sharing data with other agencies assists with investigations. Additionally, reporting data to the public can help build police-community relations and increase transparency and public trust. Researchers can also use these data to build EBP practices.¹⁰

Data collection and sharing among all criminal justice agencies is essential for day-to-day operations. Data reporting at all levels of government is necessary for maintaining transparency, informing policy, and understanding the current state of the criminal justice system. Two primary issues occur with data collection and reporting: mandatory reporting and standardization. These issues have an impact on all levels of government and its ability to provide reliable justice-related statistics.

Although the federal government cannot mandate participation, most respondents comply with data requests. BJS survey collections typically have a response rate of between 80 percent and 90 percent.¹¹ Additionally, 91 percent of law enforcement agencies report to the FBI's UCR program.¹² Crime reporting to the FBI is successful because the FBI has been collecting these data from agencies for 90 years; as of 2018, 43 states have legislation mandating local agencies to report crime data to the states.¹³ While crime reporting to the UCR is high, 51 percent of law enforcement agencies report via NIBRS, which has been in existence since 1988.¹⁴ NIBRS requires a significant system conversion from submitting monthly crime counts to providing detailed incident-level case data. The resulting slow adoption rate led to the development of BJS's National Crime Information Exchange (NCS-X) program in 2012, which provides funding to 400 law enforcement agencies and states to convert to NIBRS in order to achieve national representation.¹⁵ In addition to NCS-X, the FBI offers data integration support and provides technical assistance on NIBRS data specifications and reporting requirements. Since the implementation of these additional programs, agencies that report to NIBRS increased 46 percent (from 6,835 agencies in 2012 to 10,011 agencies in 2020).¹⁶ The FBI's goal is to have all 18,000 law enforcement agencies in the United States reporting crime to NIBRS by 2021. Based on state-reported agency commitments, the FBI forecasts that 75 percent of law enforcement agencies will be

⁹ U.S. President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, *The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967), <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/42.pdf>.

¹⁰ "5 Things You Need to Know About Open Data in Policing," National Police Foundation, accessed June 3, 2020, <https://www.policefoundation.org/5-things-you-need-to-know-about-open-data-in-policing/>.

¹¹ National Research Council, *Ensuring the Quality*, 81.

¹² Trudy Ford, Section Chief, Criminal Justice Information Services, Federal Bureau of Investigation, email communication with Data and Reporting Working Group, February 28, 2020.

¹³ National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, *Modernizing Crime Statistics: Report 2*, 63.

¹⁴ Amy Blasher, Unit Chief, Criminal Justice Information Services, Federal Bureau of Investigation, email communication with Data and Reporting Working Group, May 7, 2020.

¹⁵ Kevin J. Strom and Erica L. Smith, "The Future of Crime Data: The Case for the National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) as a Primary Data Source for Policy Evaluation and Crime Analysis," *Criminology & Public Policy* 16, no. 4 (2017).

¹⁶ Amy Blasher, Unit Chief, Criminal Justice Information Services, Federal Bureau of Investigation, email communication with Data and Reporting Working Group, May 13, 2020.

submitting to NIBRS by January 1, 2021, which will account for 83 percent of the population.¹⁷

The second issue that plagues data collection and reporting across all levels of government is the lack of standardization in the data being collected. This is largely due to the decentralized record management systems (RMS) kept by criminal justice agencies. Officers can query their own agency systems and separate federal and state systems, but often cannot access the RMS of neighboring departments. In cases where access is granted to the systems, they are not integrated, which means that separate queries must be run in each system. These software issues make it difficult for criminal justice agencies to share data with each other and nearly impossible to share data in real-time.

13.2.2 States should enact legislation that requires criminal justice agencies to collect standardized criminal justice data for reporting to the state and federal governments.

Because RMS systems are decentralized and vary widely across law enforcement agencies, data fields should be standardized so they can be collated at the state level. States and agencies that have converted to NIBRS will have standardized crime data that will be collated at the state and federal levels. However, law enforcement agencies also need to collect other key criminal justice data, such as those on use of force.

States should therefore enact legislation that, at a minimum, requires all law enforcement agencies within the state to report to the Federal Bureau of Investigation's National Incident Based Reporting System and National Use-of-Force Data Collection. The legislation should also include the collection of key data elements on a person from courts and corrections that covers their interaction with the criminal justice system from arrest to release. The legislation should include funding appropriations for the collection and reporting of these data.

While most state and local agencies report their crime data based on the FBI's Summary Reporting System (SRS) of the UCR program or NIBRS specifications, such reporting is not required because the federal government cannot mandate it under federal law. However, states can mandate that local agencies report to the state. At least 43 states have legislation that requires local law enforcement agencies to report crime data to the state.¹⁸ For decades, U.S. law enforcement agencies reported crime data to the FBI under the SRS of the UCR program. Effective January 1, 2021, all agencies will report under the NIBRS, as opposed to summary reporting through the SRS. However, as of April 2020, only 51 percent of law enforcement agencies in the United States were reporting to NIBRS.¹⁹ States should mandate NIBRS reporting so these data can be shared with the federal government and participating agencies for a comprehensive look at crime in the nation.

The lack of required reporting in all 50 states creates data voids that limit the full and accurate view of crime in America. The same holds true for use of force reporting. The FBI's National Use-of-Force Data Collection was developed to fill this void, but agencies are not required to submit their use of force statistics. As of April 2020, 40 percent of agencies were reporting to the National Use-of-Force Data Collection.²⁰ To provide accurate statistics on law enforcement use of force, states should mandate that all law enforcement agencies report to the FBI's National Use-of-Force Data Collection.²¹ Agencies benefit from reporting use of force as it increases transparency, which can build community trust.

¹⁷ Trudy Ford, Section Chief, Criminal Justice Information Services, Federal Bureau of Investigation, email communication with Shelley S. Hyland, Federal Program Manager, Data and Reporting Working Group, July 15, 2020.

¹⁸ National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, *Modernizing Crime Statistics: Report 2*, 63.

¹⁹ Blasher, email to Data and Reporting, May 7, 2020.²⁰ Amy Blasher, Unit Chief, Criminal Justice Information Services, Federal Bureau of Investigation, email communication with Data and Reporting Working Group, April 22, 2020.

²⁰ Amy Blasher, Unit Chief, Criminal Justice Information Services, Federal Bureau of Investigation, email communication with Data and Reporting Working Group, April 22, 2020.

²¹ This recommendation is also supported by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc., American Civil Liberties Union, and the Justice Roundtable. These agencies provided public comments for consideration to the Commission.

Federal law should also mandate the inclusion of federal crime data with data from state, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies, in order to provide a comprehensive view of crime in the United States while affording greater transparency and accountability. Congress enacted the Uniform Federal Crime Reporting Act (UFCRA) of 1988 to ensure federal participation in crime data collections.²² However, few federal agencies comply because of the lack of enforcement or a clear implementation strategy. Currently, only 6 of 114 eligible federal agencies (5 percent) submit NIBRS data.²³

Data from law enforcement agencies are important to analyze crime, but data from county jails and the courts are equally important to understand the origins of crime, crime trends, and the effectiveness of the criminal justice system. Standardizing the collection of electronic criminal history, court disposition, and corrections data will enable criminal justice practitioners to study the full impact of crime within our society.

State legislation should require all law enforcement agencies to report to NIBRS and the National Use-of-Force Data Collection; enable the collection of key data elements from courts and corrections on a person from arrest to release; ensure the existence of a clear compliance strategy; and provide appropriations to ensure the collection and reporting of these data.

13.3 Evidence-Based Policing

In 1998, Lawrence Sherman coined the term evidence-based policing (EBP) with the basic principle that “police practices should be based on scientific evidence about what works best.”²⁴ EBP intends to make policing as effective and efficient as possible.²⁵ EBP helps determine what works, what does not, and how to increase professionalism through valid, thorough, and scientific evaluation. Over the past three decades, American law enforcement has slowly moved in the direction of EBP.

Evidence Based Policing (EBP) is an approach used to identify effective solutions to many of the problems faced by police departments, sheriff’s offices and other law enforcement agencies. It is not one-size-fits-all; instead, it is adaptable to the types of issues routinely handled by law enforcement. EBP can be implemented regardless of agency size or type. While EBP emphasizes the use of scientific evidence, organizational evidence (data pertaining to the agency), professional evidence (pooled officer experience), and stakeholder evidence (groups that are likely to be affected by the research) should also be considered in order to develop policy and put it into practice.²⁶ EBP does not diminish experience or professional judgment; it enhances those valuable qualities with outcomes that can be measured and reinforced with data and analysis. Conversely, and perhaps most importantly, EBP can be used to identify ineffective programs and strategies that may actually increase harm.²⁷

There remains a reluctance to incorporate EBP in law enforcement practices today. Change is difficult for a variety of reasons including a cultural shift that threatens the status quo or the intuitive skill set of the experienced law enforcement officer. A common misconception is that EBP ignores or replaces experience; on the contrary, EBP works best when conducted by those who have both law enforcement and research experience,²⁸ or when law enforcement agencies partner with academic researchers.²⁹ EBP requires that

²² Uniform Federal Crime Reporting Act of 1988, 34 U.S.C. § 41303 (1989), <https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?path=/prelim@title34/subtitle4/chapter413&edition=prelim>.

²³ Blasher, email to Data and Reporting, May 13, 2020.

²⁴ Lawrence Sherman, *Evidence-Based Policing* (Washington, DC: Police Foundation, 1998), 2, <https://www.policefoundation.org/publication/evidence-based-policing/>.

²⁵ Gary Corder, *Evidence-Based Policing in 45 Small Bytes* (Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice, 2020), <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/254326.pdf>. ²⁶ Jerry H. Ratcliffe, *Reducing Crime: A Companion for Police Leaders* (New York: Routledge, 2019).

²⁶ Jerry H. Ratcliffe, *Reducing Crime: A Companion for Police Leaders* (New York: Routledge, 2019).

²⁷ Jerry H. Ratcliffe, Professor, Temple University, “Evidence-based Policing” (PowerPoint presentation, Data and Reporting Working Group, virtual meeting, April 23, 2020).

²⁸ Ratcliffe, *Reducing Crime*.

²⁹ Cynthia Lum, *Translating Police Research into Practice* (Washington, DC: Police Foundation, 2009), https://www.policefoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/Ideas_Lum_0.pdf.

police officers at every level possess a fundamental knowledge in research and evaluation. These two components form the foundation of determining what is evidence-based.

There is a solid body of evaluation and research in law enforcement, but police departments and sheriff's offices have been slow to adopt the translation of this research into practice for a number of reasons.³⁰ One of these may be confusion over what EBP is, because it overlaps with other popular practices: EBP complements intelligence-led policing and problem-oriented policing by providing an evidentiary foundation on which these two strategies are based.³¹ Additionally, rigorous research projects are costly and time consuming, and outcomes can be difficult to understand. Strained budgets can also negatively affect an agency's ability to staff analysts. In addition, law enforcement agencies may be resistant to collaborating with the outside research partners that are often necessary to help with evaluations. These academic researchers publish results in journals that are not accessible and easily digestible to practitioners, which contributes to the resistance.

However, the primary reason for the slow uptake is the limited number of law enforcement practices that have been systematically evaluated. Agencies are more apt to pick what is most commonly being done. The benefits of EBP include research knowledge and increase in academic-practitioner partnerships (see text box) technological advancements, improved police-citizen relations, and decreased crime.³²

Understanding what works and why it works may provide an avenue for increased interest and acceptance of EBP. A growing body of public safety practitioners, or graduate-level law enforcement officers who conduct research in collaboration with academic partners or on their own, appears to be gaining in popularity, as seen with the National Institute of Justice's Law Enforcement Advancing Data and Science (LEADS) Scholars program.³³ It is important to build capacity at the executive level of policing in the basic understanding of research design, bias, and other statistical principles. It is just as essential to imprint EBP at the beginning of the youngest staff members' careers. Familiarity and exposure to EBP through education could be one potential catalyst to overcoming resistance. Legitimizing EBP through education legitimizes policing—much like medical providers—as professionals who target, test, and track policy and strategy for effectiveness and harm.

13.3.1 Evidence-based policing should be incorporated into training curricula, as well as everyday practices, policies, and procedures, by law enforcement academies, state Peace Officer Training and Standards, and law enforcement agencies.

As the U.K. College of Policing describes, “in an evidence-based policing approach, police officers and staff create, review, and use the best available evidence to inform and challenge policies, practices, and decisions.”³⁴ EPB supplements and enhances experience with evidence to challenge assumptions and improve process and policy strategically to achieve better outcomes. As noted by Sherman (2020), “everything police agencies decide, from recruitment to assignments to discipline and dismissal, can be

³⁰ Cynthia Lum et al., “Receptivity to Research in Policing,” *Justice Research and Policy* 14, no. 1 (2012).

³¹ Ratcliffe, *Reducing Crime*.

³² Lum, *Translating Police Research*. ³³ “NIJ’s Law Enforcement Advancing Data and Science Scholars Program for Law Enforcement Officers,” National Institute of Justice, March 4, 2020, <https://nij.ojp.gov/funding/nij-and-iacps-law-enforcement-advancing-data-and-science-leads-scholarships-law-enforcement>. ³⁴ “What Is Evidence-Based Policing?,” U.K. College of Policing, accessed June 24, 2020, <https://whatworks.college.police.uk/About/Pages/What-is-EBP.aspx>.

³⁵ Lawrence Sherman, “Evidence-Based Policing and Fatal Police Shootings: Promise, Problems, and Prospects,” *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 687, no. 1 (2020): 13.

³³ “NIJ’s Law Enforcement Advancing Data and Science Scholars Program for Law Enforcement Officers,” National Institute of Justice, March 4, 2020, <https://nij.ojp.gov/funding/nij-and-iacps-law-enforcement-advancing-data-and-science-leads-scholarships-law-enforcement>. ³⁴ “What Is Evidence-Based Policing?,” U.K. College of Policing, accessed June 24, 2020, <https://whatworks.college.police.uk/About/Pages/What-is-EBP.aspx>. ³⁵ Lawrence Sherman, “Evidence-Based Policing and Fatal Police Shootings: Promise, Problems, and Prospects,” *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 687, no. 1 (2020): 13.

³⁴ “What Is Evidence-Based Policing?,” U.K. College of Policing, accessed June 24, 2020,

<https://whatworks.college.police.uk/About/Pages/What-is-EBP.aspx>. ³⁵ Lawrence Sherman, “Evidence-Based Policing and Fatal Police Shootings: Promise, Problems, and Prospects,” *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 687, no. 1 (2020): 13.

supported by better evidence.”³⁵ Protocols, policies, and strategies backed by science and research in areas like collecting, analyzing, and managing physical evidence and eyewitness identification can help investigators avoid arrests of innocent people, which could result in wrongful convictions.³⁶ Additionally, evidence-based practices using psychological testing during the hiring and selection phases have long been established.³⁷ Social science cannot solve all of policing’s problems, but data and analysis, which are the core of EBP, can provide the most logical and rational approach for police agencies moving forward. The state Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) can assist in implementing practical and immediately operational national standards for evidence-based policing in basic academy and in-service trainings. Law enforcement agencies should ensure that civilian analysts have training and experience in EBP topics such as basic statistics and research design. This training should continually reinforced throughout officers’ careers through in-service training and promotional testing.

13.3.2 Congress should provide funding to create a College of Policing to provide and set standards for evidence-based policing education and training for law enforcement officers.

Law enforcement agencies should invest in the education of police personnel, both sworn and professional staff, to provide the essential level of expertise or proficiency in the components of EBP to those expected to use it. Additionally, any investment in the education of police staff will enhance the efficacy with which they fulfill their duties. Modeled after the U.K. College of Policing, the U.S. College of Policing should have three primary functions: developing research and providing infrastructure for improving EBP, setting education standards for law enforcement officers, and drawing on EBP to help set standards in law enforcement for agencies and officers.

The U.S. College of Policing should employ a national curriculum within a university setting to offer either (1) an executive master’s degree in the discipline of policing with an emphasis on EBP or (2) a certification program in the discipline of policing that provides a series of classes appropriate for basic EBP knowledge and application.³⁸ The executive master’s degree should provide police staff at the executive level a part-time, combined online and residential program of study concluding with a capstone or research thesis final and resulting in a master’s degree. The certification program—designed for line-level staff such as officers, detectives, sergeants, and analysts—should provide a professional certification at the conclusion of the course, and possibly credits for an undergraduate degree.

Funding should be provided in the form of grants, ideally administered through the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS Office) or BJA, in conjunction with one or more accredited universities and subject matter experts. Dedicated annual funding should be used to offer a combination of tuition assistance, scholarships, and small grants that could be coordinated in partnership with the COPS Office, BJA, and the

³⁵ Lawrence Sherman, “Evidence-Based Policing and Fatal Police Shootings: Promise, Problems, and Prospects,” *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 687, no. 1 (2020): 13.

³⁶ National Research Council, *Identifying the Culprit: Assessing Eyewitness Identification* (Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, 2014), <https://doi.org/10.17226/18891>.³⁷ Cary Mitchell, “Preemployment Psychological Screening of Police Officer Applicants: Basic Considerations and Recent Advances,” in *Police Psychology and Its Growing Impact on Modern Law Enforcement*, ed. Cary Mitchell and Edrick Dorian (Hershey, PA: IGI Global, 2017); Jonathan Lough and Michael Ryan, “Psychological Profiling of Australian Police Officers: A Longitudinal Examination of Post-Selection Performance,” *International Journal of Police Science and Management* 8, no. 2 (2005); and Geoffrey Alpert, “Hiring and Promoting Police Officers in Small Departments: The Role of Psychological Testing,” *Criminal Law Bulletin* 27, no. 3 (1991).

³⁷ Cary Mitchell, “Preemployment Psychological Screening of Police Officer Applicants: Basic Considerations and Recent Advances,” in *Police Psychology and Its Growing Impact on Modern Law Enforcement*, ed. Cary Mitchell and Edrick Dorian (Hershey, PA: IGI Global, 2017); Jonathan Lough and Michael Ryan, “Psychological Profiling of Australian Police Officers: A Longitudinal Examination of Post-Selection Performance,” *International Journal of Police Science and Management* 8, no. 2 (2005); and Geoffrey Alpert, “Hiring and Promoting Police Officers in Small Departments: The Role of Psychological Testing,” *Criminal Law Bulletin* 27, no. 3 (1991).

National Institute of Justice to ensure equity in participation for small, medium, and large agencies. Curriculum development and standards should be created through a coordinated effort among the COPS Office, BJA, IACP, the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, the FBI National Academy, the National Police Foundation, the Police Executive Research Forum, the International Association of Directors of Law Enforcement Standards and Training, and other leadership and academic programs.

[INSERT SUPPLEMENT 13.1: List of Federal Data Collections]

(see Excel Workbook)