

Data Collection, Analysis, and Quality Subcommittee Minutes

Wednesday, October 25, 2023

10:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.

Zoom

Attendance: Stacey Manware, Allison Beas, Lt. Col. Mark Davison, James McGennis, Marc Pelka, Jackie McMahon

Staff: Ken Barone, Jim Fazzalaro, Erica Escobar

I. Welcome & Introductions

Stacey Manware called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m. and members introduced themselves.

II. Approval of the September 13, 2023, meeting minutes

The approval of the meeting minutes from September 13, 2023, was tabled due to a lack of a quorum.

III. Old Business

a. CT State Police Data Audit update

Ken updated the subcommittee on the CT State Police data audit. Of the 130 troopers identified using the more conservative identification criteria, 27 had badge issues, with 25 not meeting specific identification criteria. This reduced the list to 105 troopers for identification. CSP provided additional information for 20 other troopers. 15 additional troopers were recently sent to the IMRP for consideration based on additional review by CSP.

IV. New Business

a. Annual departmental audit proposal

Ken presented a staff proposal for an annual audit protocol, highlighting two primary aspects: one focusing on departmental responsibilities and the other on project oversight. The initial aspect involved departments certifying their records annually, aimed at ensuring agencies are accountable for accurate data. Ken detailed a process where departments would receive their yearly total stops per month and could request more detailed data if necessary. They would then confirm the accuracy of the information provided to the best of their ability. This approach aimed to emphasize that while the project

manages the data repository, it's a department's responsibility to ensure the accuracy of its submitted data. The proposal aimed to encourage departments, often reliant on automated systems, to actively verify and validate their records on an annual basis.

The staff recommended a more involved process, encouraging departments to thoroughly review their records monthly. This would entail examining systems, cross-referencing dispatch calls, and ensuring data accuracy beyond just quickly scanning summary emails. Ken also proposed offering guidance for these checks, stressing the significance of comprehensive monthly reviews to address potential missing data.

Stacey Manware expressed concern about adding further audit requirements to police departments, citing that the current law already mandates most of these requests. She highlighted the potential for escalation if discrepancies arise due to non-compliance. Stacey stressed the importance of random audits triggered by specific incidents or internal investigations that might indicate broader issues with traffic stop records. She cautioned against potentially reshaping departmental priorities, suggesting that focusing excessively on this specific data might overshadow other crucial tasks. Stacey acknowledged the significance of routine procedures mentioned in the report but suggested that these are likely already required and conducted regularly.

Regarding vendor engagement, she emphasized that police departments often rely on vendors for record maintenance, pointing out potential conflicts of interest if vendors can rectify errors without involving the police. Stacey recommended that if recommending or mandating annual department audits, these should focus on specific non-legally mandated aspects. She highlighted the need for a balanced approach that doesn't overburden departments with redundant requirements.

Jim Fazzalaro suggested reassessing the group's consensus on how frequently a Police Department should take the extra step to verify the accuracy of the data they submit to the system. He emphasized that currently, there's no formal obligation for them to do so. Jim highlighted the importance of efforts to ensure data accuracy, proposing potential intervals like during submission, every 60 days, or perhaps every 90 days, as internal checks to guarantee that the information sent to the system accurately portrays real occurrences.

Ken proposed that departments institute regular policies for reviewing traffic stop data, including periodic checks every 30 or 60 days and random body camera footage inspections. He advocated for these standards to become part of the state police accreditation process, mandating departments' compliance by 2026. This strategy intends to enforce accountability by assessing policy

adherence during accreditation evaluations. It surpasses mere data certification, encouraging departments to actively verify the accuracy of their reported information.

Ken suggested that engaging with the POST council to establish a model policy for reviewing traffic stop activity would significantly improve accuracy in data reporting. This policy, once approved, would become mandatory for accredited departments, ensuring a more comprehensive and regular review of data. He mentioned that the development of such a policy requires collaboration and time, typically taking several months for approval.

The responsibilities outlined are interconnected: ensuring data accuracy (points one and three) and prompt reporting and resolution of data discrepancies (points two and four). Adjustments to specific timeframes, such as the proposed 14-day window for reporting, might be necessary for practical implementation. Ken emphasized the primary goal: departments certifying, routinely checking, promptly reporting discrepancies, and rectifying issues whenever feasible, establishing a robust approach to data accuracy.

Jim emphasized the need for timely notification of significant data issues within agencies or with vendors, highlighting instances like data backlogs due to various reasons. He stressed the importance of informing about problems promptly to prevent extended gaps in the system. Jim underlined the necessity for an intermediate step that keeps the oversight group informed without triggering a comprehensive audit.

Ken proposed discussing the group's stance on these initial four general recommendations. If these are deemed suitable, he suggested endorsing these recommendations at the next board meeting. His recommendation was to inform the board of this endorsement and outline the next steps, which involve crafting a model policy and guidance for agencies.

Ken emphasized the necessity of integrating infraction numbers into the CJIS system for all types of stops, including electronic and paper tickets. He recommended moving forward with these adjustments and proposed postponing the discussion on the specifics of random auditing to the next meeting due to time constraints.

V. General Discussion

a. Legislative recommendations- E-citation and E-Warning

Ken proposed discussing two legislative recommendations at the upcoming meeting: the adoption of E-citation and E-warnings, especially for the 28 agencies not using E-citation and considering a timeline for mandating or

recommending it to the legislature. Additionally, he suggested addressing the controversial topic of potentially eliminating verbal warnings and opting to provide all stopped individuals with a documented piece, such as a ticket or a warning. He emphasized the importance of this discussion for improving tracking and auditing processes through documented interactions.

Stacey proposed reaching out directly to departments to identify the hurdles hindering E-citation and E-warning system adoption. She noted that convincing departments of these systems' benefits might not be the issue but rather the challenge lies in coordinating and integrating with existing systems. Stacey suggested potential solutions like creating separate systems initially and then integrating them into a larger effort. She emphasized the crucial need for resources—people, funding, and time—to implement these changes.

There was no further discussion, and the meeting was adjourned at 11:12 a.m.