

## **Data Collection, Analysis, and Quality Subcommittee MINUTES**

Thursday, September 21, 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 10:04 a.m. and members introduced themselves.

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

A motion was made and properly seconded to approve the minutes from September 13, 2023. The minutes were approved by members via voice vote.

### **III. Old Business**

#### **a. CT State Police Data Audit update**

Ken Barone provided an update to the Data Subcommittee on the CT State Police Data Audit. He reported that in the past month and a half since the audit's release in June, they have conducted a thorough examination of the data. During this analysis, they identified 130 instances of troopers with discrepancies that met the overreporting thresholds outlined in the report. Moreover, there were additional instances of underreported records found among both troopers and constables.

The State Police began a thorough review of the 130 troopers who had overreported records. As a result of this investigation, they confirmed 19 cases with badge-related issues. These issues were readily apparent when attempting to match records in the data. Ken explained that when an individual's badge number changed within the dataset, such as transitioning from 1000 to 200 upon their promotion to the rank of Sergeant, it was this updated badge number that served as the tracking identifier within the infraction system. The review showed that instances of overlapping badge numbers were most common during hiring and promotion cycles.

Furthermore, the State Police have undertaken a systematic review of an additional 20 individuals. They have provided the IMRP with identification numbers, along with detailed explanations concerning the underlying data and the discrepancies they are addressing within the system. The State Police have established a process where they meticulously examine their databases, cross-reference information with other sources, and analyze case notes or additional data to comprehend and clarify the discrepancies. Following this analysis, they share their findings with IMRP for assessment.

Stacey Manware inquired with Lieutenant Colonel Mark Davison whether, during their examination of discrepancies, they had come across errors in the court records. Lt. Colonel Mark Davison noted input errors, primarily on paper tickets, are a major concern, especially regarding badge input errors. He mentioned some uncertainty about the information entered annually at CIB, but age is one of the metrics used, making it likely that input errors may occur, primarily due to unclear or hard-to-read handwriting.

Stacey stressed the importance of preserving CIB records for potential inaccuracies due to data entry errors and making necessary corrections in court records. She highlighted the need to decide the scope of historical record corrections, as failure to do so may result in continued incorrect reporting, depending on the nature of the errors.

Ken explained that the State Police have been documenting each case in an Excel sheet based on the information provided. They isolate the issue, link it to a specific record, and then assess whether their audit had accounted for it. For example, they are investigating situations where an error might be related to badge numbers or age reporting. In the case of age discrepancies, they noticed that some troopers were rounding when converting from birth date to age, leading to discrepancies often within a five-year range. This led to issues with troopers trying to approximate the age, sometimes falling outside of the two-year window.

Regarding badge issues, they found a few cases where troopers would receive credit if the clerk only made a badge number mistake on one ticket out of a series of ten. However, there were instances where only one ticket from a series was recorded in the court system, so if an error was made on that single ticket, the trooper received no credit. Ken noted that they are methodically addressing these complex issues, and it is a time-consuming process to resolve them. In terms of record preservation, the State Police are sending an Excel sheet to those they are rectifying, identifying the specific issue for each record.

#### IV. New Business

a. Annual departmental audit proposal

Ken introduced a set of proposals that he and Jim had developed to the Data Subcommittee. These proposals are intended to enhance the accuracy and verification of data related to traffic stops. The first proposal involves the certification of records. Ken recommended that every department should be required to annually review their records to ensure accuracy, cross-referencing the data with other sources and providing an explanation of their verification process. The second proposal pertains to a data review policy. Ken suggested that departments should establish a policy for regular data record checks, to be integrated into state accreditation. Supervisors should be responsible for conducting random reviews of officer records to verify data accuracy.

The third proposal emphasizes the timely reporting of discrepancies. Ken proposed that departments must promptly report identified data discrepancies within 14 days of discovery. Furthermore, they should provide a complete copy of any internal affairs reports or reviews related to traffic stops, irrespective of the case disposition. The fourth proposal involves an obligation to rectify incorrect data. Ken recommended that departments should rectify known data errors whenever possible, instead of leaving them uncorrected. These proposals collectively aim to enhance the accuracy of data and bolster the accountability of law enforcement agencies in the reporting and verification of traffic stop data.

Additionally, Ken introduced two more proposals during the meeting. The first proposal suggested the need to explore the establishment of a random auditing system for the project, focusing on deviations in department data as potential triggers for audits. The second proposal revolved around the idea of conducting random audits of various agencies each year. Furthermore, Ken mentioned the importance of developing an automated system to compare data reported to the court system with data from the RMS system, which would involve requiring departments to report a ticket number for every interaction.

James McGennis supported the proposals and suggested implementing an annual 15-minute refresher training on data integrity. This training would emphasize the expectations for data integrity and acceptable system use, providing an additional measure to enhance data accuracy and accountability.

Lt. Colonel Marc Davison stressed the need for a comprehensive document that explicitly defines racial profiling, addressing various categories and evolving definitions to reduce interpretation issues. These guidelines would serve as a reference for field personnel, and all involved in the process, promoting clarity and consistency.

Ken proposed converting the training PowerPoint used since 2013 into a comprehensive manual. This manual would describe data fields, their definitions, and proper collection methods. It aims to provide departments with a valuable resource for roll call training and policy integration, similar to use-of-force guidelines. The manual would be made accessible on the website and distributed to departments, periodically updated to reflect improvements in racial profiling definitions and commercial vehicle criteria.

Marc Pelka recommended creating a draft document for the chiefs and committee members to review and provide input. This collaborative approach would ensure that all stakeholders are informed about the meeting's discussions and allow for valuable input to enhance implementation efficiency and effectiveness.

Ken emphasized the need to maintain a specified timeframe for reporting issues but recognized that the proposed 14-day window might be inadequate for rectifying problems. He suggested modifying the language and removing the day requirement while ensuring that departments address bad data, especially technical errors. The precise timeframe for rectification would be discussed in detail for each concept. The goal is to present an outline of the plan, even if details are incomplete, to work towards a consensus.

Stacey emphasized the importance of implementing policies alongside legal requirements and raised concerns about the timeliness of electronic citations. She recommended departments conduct self-audits and chiefs certify compliance within their departments. Stacey stressed the need to address immediate issues and promote communication among law enforcement agencies to ensure legal compliance.

Ken acknowledged the need to automate the data cross-referencing process and emphasized the importance of E-citations and E-warnings. He mentioned the necessity of mandating these processes, ensuring that all departments adopt them, and reducing reliance on paper records. Ken also touched upon the need to limit verbal warnings, emphasizing the importance of paper trails for verification and validation. He suggested that seeking feedback on the recommendations from the chiefs and reconvening in a few weeks to work toward a reasonable product would be the next steps in the process.

## V. General Discussion

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

The topic was postponed for discussion at the next meeting.

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