Brooklyn Park Police Department Scorecard

Overview

The purpose of this Scorecard is to help Brooklyn Park promote transparency, accountability, de-escalation, and positive relationships with Brooklyn Park residents. This Scorecard was developed as part of a study conducted by Wilder Research in 2021 for the City of Brooklyn Park. The indicators were selected for one or more of the following reasons: 1) they are identified as measurable indicators in published research about positive and negative outcomes of police processes or practices; 2) they are identified as measurable indicators in published research about understanding police processes or practices; 3) they are flagged as high priority by the study's Advisory Committee members; 4) they appear in the Brooklyn Park Human Rights Commission's and Multicultural Advisory Committee's work plan; or 5) they are themes that emerged in the study's interview analysis. For more information on the study, as well as the details of how this Scorecard was developed and the interview analysis, visit Appendix A, D, and G in the full report on our website (https://www.wilder.org/wilder-research/research-library/brooklyn-park-equity-in-public-safety).

Instructions for scoring

■ The Scorecard should be completed together as a team of community members, city employees, and representatives from the Brooklyn Park Police Department (BPPD), the Brooklyn Park Human Rights Commission, and the Brooklyn Park Multicultural Advisory Committee. At least two people should score each goal (one representing the community and one representing the city/law enforcement).

■ The Scorecard is set up by goal and provides a list of indicators that should first be scored individually, using the scoring scale. Once the team has completed their individual scores, they should meet with other team members focused on that goal area, discuss the reasoning for their individual scores, and then determine a "consensus score," which should be derived together. ***Find out more information about indicators in bold italics in the "Policing best practices" section and Appendix G in the report linked above.***

■ Once consensus scores are given, team members should discuss actionable next steps in each goal area, and document them in the "Next steps" section at the end of the Scorecard. The Scorecard is divided into 10 goals:

1. Law enforcement policies
2. Training and education
3. Transparency
4. Community oversight
5. Commitment to standards

6. Officer wellness and safety
7. Community policing
8. Data-driven management
9. Quality services
10. Safety

Due to the comprehensive nature of the Scorecard, we recommend a process to score all indicators every year, keeping in mind that some indicators can be assessed more frequently.

Wilder Research.
Information. Insight. Impact.

Goal 1.   Law enforcement policies

Instructions: Review sources, which may include BPPD policy manual, union contracts, sources about police policies (see Appendix B, below, and "Policing best practices" and Appendix G in the full report linked above), and other sources determined by your team (listed here):   Once reviewed, provide your individual score for each indicator below, and then meet with your team to determine the consensus score.

Date: Scoring team members:

Policy indicators	Individual score	Consensus score
Use of force		
Body worn camera		
Union contract		
Stops		
Protest response		
Consent to search		
Social media use by department and officers in unofficial capacities		

Discussion and next steps

Bring the scores to the larger group, and discuss next steps with the team. Record your decisions in the "Next steps" section at the end of the Scorecard.

Discussion items: What partnerships are in place to monitor this goal area or are needed to improve this goal area? What plans need to be made for law enforcement policies to align with best practices? How/when do you plan to monitor these indicators moving forward? How will officers' adherence to policies inform personnel decisions? Are there any changes you plan to make to personnel decisions based on law enforcement's adherence to policies?

Goal 2.   Training and education

Instructions: Review sources, which may include training manuals, policies around number of required hours of training, processes to hold officers accountable for following training, and other sources determined by your team (listed here):   Once reviewed, provide your individual score for each indicator below, and then meet with your team to determine the consensus score.

Date: Scoring team members:

Training and education indicators	Individual score	Consensus score
Implicit bias		
Procedural justice		
De-escalation		
Use of force		
Stops		
Cultural sensitivity		
Adolescent brain development		
Consent to search		

Discussion and next steps

Bring the scores to the larger group and discuss the next steps with the team. Record your decisions in the "Next steps" section at the end of the Scorecard.

Discussion items: What are the plans for requiring this training curriculum? How many hours do officers spend in this training per year? What processes are in place to ensure officer behavior is in alignment with training? What partnerships are needed to improve this goal area?

Goal 3. Transparency

Instructions: Review sources, which may include BPPD open data portals and other sources determined by your team (listed here):   Once reviewed, provide your individual score for each indicator below, and then meet with your team to determine the consensus score.

Date: Scoring team members:

Transparency indicators	Individual score	Consensus score
Arrests (including custodial, citations, etc.), by type of crime (person, society, property initially; possibly defined in partnership with community later)		
Use of force incidents, aggregated if necessary		
Civilian complaints, aggregated if necessary, including results (where reportable)		
Calls for service by type of crime		
Stops, by type of stop (vehicle or pedestrian/subject), race of person stopped, reason for the stop, de-escalation or use of force tactics used		
Demographics of officers compared to Brooklyn Park residents		
Response time to calls, by type of call, and/or geographic area		
Clearance rate by type of crime (person, society, or property, initially; possibly defined in partnership with community later), where denominator is the number of reported crimes and numerator is, of those reports, the number cleared with arrest, citation, referral to charges, or referral to diversion, by race		
Diversion outcomes, by type of crime		
Vehicle pursuits, including why pursuit was initiated, outcome (collision, etc.), and driver demographics		
Annual department cost		
Report of SWAT actions		
Scorecard results		

Discussion and next steps

Bring the scores to the larger group and discuss the next steps with the team. Record your decisions in the "Next steps" section at the end of the Scorecard.

Discussion items: What are plans for publicizing these data? How accessible and understandable are any websites where data are published? How will these indicators be used to inform management and personnel decisions?

Goal 4.   Community oversight

Instructions: Review sources, which may include community oversight ordinance(s), research about community oversight, recommendations from the National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement, and other sources determined by your team (listed here):   Once reviewed, provide your individual score for each indicator below, and then meet with your team to determine the consensus score.

Date: Scoring team members:

Community oversight indicators	Individual score	Consensus score
There is a community oversight board that adheres to best practices for civilian oversight of law enforcement		
Civilian complaints are public		
The community oversight board is consulted when BPPD seeks to adopt, implement, or evaluate surveillance, crowd control, and/or "militarized" techniques, technology, weapons, or vehicles		

Discussion and next steps

Bring the scores to the larger group and discuss the next steps with the team. Record your decisions in the "Next steps" section at the end of the Scorecard.

Discussion items: What are the plans for implementing the indicator(s) above? What policies and ordinances govern the oversight board, and how do those compare to best practices? How are oversight board openings advertised, and what efforts are in place to ensure contribution from communities over-represented in police contact/crime victimization? What processes are in place to monitor indicator(s) and use results to drive improvements? What partnerships are needed to improve this goal area?

Goal 5. Commitment to standards

Instructions: Review sources, which may include demographic data on <u>Minnesota Compass</u>, results from BPPD surveys, BPPD policy manual, research into community-based interventions, officer social media posts, and other sources determined by your team (listed here):   Once reviewed, provide your individual score for each indicator below, and then meet with your team to determine the consensus score.

Date: **Scoring team members:**

Commitment to standards indicators	Individual score	Consensus score
Staff reflects the diversity of Brooklyn Park		
Officers are regularly surveyed on their ethics, values, and cultural fluency		
Crisis intervention teams or community-based specialists are first responders when appropriate		
Officers, staff, and volunteers are prohibited from affiliating with hate groups and groups that advocate for violent suppression of political opposition, and are prohibited from contributing to these groups' ideologies		
Officers are regularly surveyed on knowledge of department policies and criminal law		

Discussion and next steps

Bring the scores to the larger group and discuss the next steps with the team. Record your decisions in the "Next steps" section at the end of the Scorecard.

Discussion items: How do department demographics compare to resident demographics? How were officer surveys developed, how frequently are they administered, and what are the results? What processes are in place to understand whether officers, staff, and volunteers contribute to prohibited hate and/or violent groups? How are indicator(s) monitored and results used to drive improvements? What partnerships are needed to improve this goal area?

Goal 6.   Officer wellness and safety

Instructions: Review the sources, which may include aggregate injury reports, officer survey results, and other sources determined by your team (listed here):   Once reviewed, provide your individual score for each indicator below, and then meet with your team to determine the consensus score.

Date: **Scoring team members:**

Officer wellness and safety indicators	Individual score	Consensus score
Officers are surveyed on satisfaction and morale, including their perceptions of procedural justice within the department		
Officers are surveyed on department leadership		
Officer workplace injuries are tracked		

Discussion and next steps

Bring the scores to the larger group and discuss the next steps with the team. Record your decisions in the "Next steps" section at the end of the Scorecard.

Discussion items: How were surveys developed? What are survey results? How are survey results used to make personnel decisions, possibly including identifying personnel or training needs? Are there patterns to officer workplace injury? What processes are in place to monitor indicator(s) and use results to drive improvements?

Goal 7. Community policing

Instructions: Review the sources, which may include reports describing BPPD community engagement efforts and results, information about beat officers' assignments and authority, and other sources determined by your team (listed here):   Once reviewed, provide your individual score for each indicator below, and then meet with your team to determine the consensus score.

Date: Scoring team members:

Community policing indicators	Individual score	Consensus score
BPPD officer(s) spend time in non-enforcement activities including strengthening relationships with community members, collaborating with community members and groups to solve problems, and attending open meetings in community		
BPPD convenes forums where community members can interact with police and help influence programs and policy		
BPPD assigns officers to small geographic areas for the long term, these officers have problem-solving authority, and are assessed on indicators such as community satisfaction and reduced fear of crime		

Discussion and next steps

Bring the scores to the larger group and discuss the next steps with the team. Record your decisions in the "Next steps" section at the end of the Scorecard.

Discussion items: What are the responsibilities of beat officers? How is their performance assessed? What community engagement initiatives are there at BPPD, and what are their results? What processes are in place to monitor indicator(s) and use results to drive improvements?

Goal 8. Data-driven management

Instructions: Review the sources, which may include relevant internal BPPD data, data-driven management systems, and other sources determined by your team (listed here):
Once reviewed, provide your individual score for each indicator below, and then meet with your team to determine the consensus score.

Date: **Scoring team members:**

Data-driven management indicators	Individual score	Consensus score
Arrest data by race and/or other demographics		
Civilian complaint data by race and/or other demographics		
Call data by race and/or other demographics		
Stop data by race and/or other demographics		
Early warning system results, including which officers are flagged, why, the results of the disposition, and subsequent flags for that officer's behavior		
Deadly force incidents by race		
Less lethal force incidents by race		
Call response time		
Clearance rate, by crime type		
Officer discipline, re-training, mentorship, and subsequent flags for officer behavior		
Civil suits		
Officer absenteeism		

Discussion and next steps

Bring the scores to the larger group and discuss the next steps with the team. Record your decisions in the "Next steps" section at the end of the Scorecard.

Discussion items: What data are tracked regularly, and how does the department use those data to make decisions? What information goes into the early warning system, and have officer use of force, civil suits, or other key outcomes changed over time? Do the data show that some communities are disproportionately impacted by BPPD activities, and are there recommendations to prevent disparities in crime victimization and police activities? What processes are in place to monitor indicator(s) and use results to drive improvements?

Goal 9.   Quality services

Instructions: Review the sources, which may include relevant survey results and other sources determined by your team (listed here):   Once reviewed, provide your individual score for each indicator below, and then meet with your team to determine the consensus score.

Date: Scoring team members:

Quality services indicators	Individual score	Consensus score
Household survey on satisfaction with police		
Business survey on satisfaction with police		
Community survey/interview on perceptions of BPPD, including procedural justice indicators, BPPD violence and abuse		
Community survey on reporting crime/problems to BPPD		
Survey of people stopped by BPPD, including identification of the officer to the person stopped		
Survey partners and other stakeholders (including community oversight board members, violence prevention program workers, victim/survivor advocacy groups) about experiences with department		

Discussion and next steps

Bring the scores to the larger group and discuss the next steps with the team. Record your decisions in the "Next steps" section at the end of the Scorecard.

Discussion items: How are surveys developed? How are people invited to take surveys? How are survey response rates, and should different or additional outreach efforts be taken? What organizations and/or city departments are responsible for receiving survey responses and ensuring confidentiality? What are survey results? What partnerships are being developed? How are survey results used to drive improvements?

Goal 10. Safety

Instructions: Review the sources, which may include data from BPPD or other official crime, victimization, officer complaint sources, and other sources determined by your team (listed here):
Once reviewed, provide your individual score for each indicator below, and then meet with your team to determine the consensus score.

Date: **Scoring team members:**

Safety indicators	Individual score	Consensus score
Violent crime rate		
Property crime rate		
Crime rate victimization by demographics		
Repeat victimization rate by demographics		
% of officers on force with multiple civilian complaints annually		
% of officers on force who cause death annually		

Discussion and next steps

Bring the scores to the larger group and discuss the next steps with the team. Record your decisions in the "Next steps" section at the end of the Scorecard.

Discussion items: Describe future plans for tracking indicator(s). Are there patterns to crime and/or victimization data? What prevention efforts are underway, and what access to these data do key stakeholders (prevention organizations, survivor organizations, civilian oversight board members) have? What plans, processes, and partnerships are set up to use the information to help prevent violence and disorder?

Next steps

Record the action steps you discussed for each goal in the table below and include the next date you plan to review the sources.

	Next steps	Next date to review
Goal 1. Law enforcement policies		
Goal 2. Training and education		
Goal 3. Transparency		
Goal 4. Community oversight		
Goal 5. Commitment to standards		
Goal 6. Officer wellness and safety		
Goal 7. Community policing		
Goal 8. Data-driven management		
Goal 9. Quality services		
Goal 10. Safety		

Appendix.

A. References

Each reference below was assigned a number that corresponds to the indicators outlined in Appendix B.

1. Campaign Zero. (n.d.) *Police scorecard*. https://policescorecard.org

2. City of Brooklyn Park. (n.d.). *Brooklyn Park traffic stops* [Data set]. https://brooklynpark.maps.arcgis.com/apps/MapSeries/index.html?appid=315c8687fd5140b59e6aa9a171edf6de

3. Davis, R. C. (2012). *Selected international best practices in police performance measurements.* RAND Corporation. https://www.rand.org/pubs/technical_reports/TR1153.html

4. Davis, R. C., Ortiz, C. W., Euler, S., & Kuykendall, L. (2015). Revisiting "Measuring What Matters:" Developing a suite of standardized performance measures for policing. *Police Quarterly, 18*(4), 469-495. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098611115598990

5. German, M. (2020). *Hidden in plain sight: Racism, white supremacy, and far-right militancy in law enforcement.* Brennan Center for Justice. https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/hidden-plain-sight-racism-white-supremacy-and-far-right-militancy-law

6. Jannetta, J., Esthappan, S., Fontain, J., Lynch, M., La Vigne, N., Vasquez-Noriega, C., Dwivedi, A., Paddock, E., & Obermark, D. (2019). *Learning to build police-community trust: Implementation assessment findings from the evaluation of the National Initiative for Building Community Trust and Justice*. Urban Institute. https://www.urban.org/research/publication/learning-build-police-community-trust

7. The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights & Upturn. (2015). *Police body worn cameras: A policy scorecard*. https://www.bwcscorecard.org/2015

8. Morgan, S., Murphy, D., & Horwitz, B. (2017). Police reform through data-driven management. *Police Quarterly, 20*(3), 275-294. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098611117709785

9. Oglesby-Neal, A., Stern, A., & Pettit, K. (2020). *Catalyzing policing reform with data: Policing typology for Los Angeles neighborhoods.* Urban Institute. https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/102035/catalyzing-policing-reform-with-data_2.pdf

10. Police Executive Research Forum. (2015). *Re-engineering training on police use of force.* https://www.policeforum.org/assets/reengineeringtraining1.pdf

11. Policy Link & Advancement Project. (2014). *Limiting police use of force: Promising community-centered strategies.* https://www.policylink.org/sites/ default/files/pl_police_use of force_111914_a.pdf

12. Policy Link & Advancement Project. (2015a). *Turning back the tide: Promising efforts to demilitarize police departments.* https://www.policylink.org/sites/default/files/PL_BCC_DEMIL_POLICE_DEPT_04292015_rev_0.pdf

13. Policy Link & Advancement Project. (2015b). *Values, leadership, and sustainability: Institutionalizing community-centered policing.* https://www.policylink.org/sites/default/files/Leadership_in_Policing_04282015_rev.pdf

14. President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing. (2015). *Final report for the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing.* Office of Community Oriented Policing Services. https://cops.usdoj.gov/pdf/taskforce/taskforce_finalreport.pdf

15. Remington Cunningham, K. (2021). *Trust in policing: The role of white supremacy.* Minnesota Justice Research Center. https://mn.gov/mdhr/assets/Trust%20in%20Policing%20The%20Role%20of%20White%20Supremacy_tcm1061-471173.pdf

16. Ross, M., Kalinowski, J. J., & Barone, K. (2020). Testing for disparities in traffic stops: Best practices from the Connecticut model. *Criminology and Public Policy, 19*, 1289-1303. https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12528

17. Sparrow, M. K. (2015). *New perspectives in policing: Measuring performance in a modern police organization.* Harvard Kennedy School & National Institute of Justice. https://www.ojp.gov/pdffiles1/nij/248476.pdf

18. Stahly-Butts, M., & Subramanian, A. (2015). *Building the momentum from the ground up: A toolkit for promoting justice in policing.* The Center for Popular Democracy & Policy Link. https://populardemocracy.org/sites/default/files/Justice-In-Policing-Toolkit-sm.pdf

19. Sutherland, A., Strang, L., Stepanek, M., & Giacomantonio, C. (2017). *Using ambulance data to inform police violence intervention: A guide for police, public health and violence prevention partnerships.* RAND Corporation. https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR2253.html

20. Tillyer, R. Engel, R. S., & Calnon Cherkauskas, J. (2010). Best practices in vehicle stop data collection and analysis. *Policing, 33*(1), 69-92. https://doi.org/10.1108/13639511011020601

21. Tiwana, N., Bass, G., & Farrell, G. (2015). Police performance measurement: An annotated bibliography. *Crime Science, 4*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40163-014-0011-4

B. Indicators and their connections to the research

Indicator	Emerged as a theme in the study's key informant interviews	Flagged as high priority by the study's Advisory Committee	Mentioned in HRC work plan?	Referenced/ recommended in the literature (by reference number above)
Goal area 1: Law enforcement policies				
Use of force	-	yes	-	1, 3, 10, 11, 13, 14
Body worn camera	-	yes	-	7, 12, 13, 14, 21
Union contract	-	yes	-	1, 18
Stops	-	yes	-	3
Protest response	-	-	-	1, 12
Consent to search	-	-	-	18
Social media use in official and unofficial capacities	-	-	-	14
Goal area 2: Training and education				
Implicit bias	yes	yes	-	4, 7, 16, 17, 19
Procedural justice	-	yes	-	6, 9, 11, 13
De-escalation	yes	yes	yes	10, 11, 12, 13, 14
Use of force	-	yes	-	2, 3, 11, 13
Stops	-	-	-	1, 3
Cultural sensitivity	-	yes	yes	3, 11, 14
Adolescent brain development	-	-	-	11
Consent to search	-	-	-	18

Indicator	Emerged as a theme in the study's key informant interviews?	Mentioned in the study's Advisory Committee?	Mentioned in HRC work plan?	Referenced/ recommended in the literature (by source)?
Goal area 3: Transparency				
Arrests	-	-	-	3, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 21
Use of force incidents, aggregated if necessary	-	-	-	1, 8, 11, 13, 14, 21
Civilian complaints, aggregated if necessary, including reportable results	-	yes	-	3, 8, 11, 12, 13, 21
Calls for service by type of crime	-	-	-	8, 9, 12, 13, 21
Stops, by type of stop, race of person stopped, reason for the stop, de-escalation or use of force tactics used	-	-	-	9, 12, 13, 20, 21
Demographics of dept. compared to Brooklyn Park resident demographics	-	-	-	12, 13, 14, 21
Response time to calls, by type of call and/or geographic area	-	-	-	8, 10, 12, 13
Clearance rate by type of crime, where denominator is the number of reported crimes and numerator is, of those reports, the number cleared with arrest, citation, referral to charges, or referral to diversion, by race	-	-	-	3, 4, 8, 13
Diversion success rate public, by type of crime	-	-	-	3, 4, 8, 13
Vehicle pursuits, including why pursuit initiated, outcome, and driver demographics	-	-	-	8, 9, 12, 13, 20, 21
Annual department cost	-	-	-	1, 4
Report of SWAT actions	-	-	-	12
Scorecard results	-	-	-	-

Indicator	Emerged as a theme in the study's key informant interviews?	Mentioned in the study's Advisory Committee?	Mentioned in HRC work plan?	Referenced/ recommended in the literature (by source)?
Goal area 4: Community oversight				
There is a community oversight board that adheres to best practices for civilian oversight of law enforcement	-	-	yes	3, 11, 12, 13, 18
Civilian complaints are public	-	-	yes	3, 8, 11, 12, 13, 21
The community oversight board is consulted when BPPD seeks to adopt, implement, or evaluate surveillance, crowd control, and/or "militarized" techniques, technology, weapons, or vehicles	-	yes	yes	14
Goal area 5: Commitment to standards				
Staff reflects the diversity of Brooklyn Park	yes	-	-	13, 14
Officers are regularly surveyed on their ethics, values, and cultural fluency	-	-	-	3, 4
Crisis intervention teams or community-based specialists are first responders when appropriate	yes	-	-	10, 11
Officers, staff, and volunteers are prohibited from affiliating with hate groups, groups that advocate for violent suppression of political opposition, and are prohibited from contributing to these groups' ideologies	-	-	-	5, 15
Officers are regularly surveyed on knowledge of department policies and criminal law	-	-	-	4
Goal area 6: Officer wellness and safety				
Officers are surveyed on satisfaction and morale, including their perceptions of procedural justice within the department	-	-	-	3, 4
Officers are surveyed on department leadership	-	-	-	4
Officer workplace injuries are tracked	-	-	-	-

Indicator	Emerged as a theme in the study's key informant interviews?	Mentioned in the study's Advisory Committee?	Mentioned in HRC work plan?	Referenced/ recommended in the literature (by source)?
Goal area 7: Community policing				
BPPD officer(s) spend time in non-enforcement activities including strengthening relationships with community members, collaborating with community members and groups to solve problems, and attending open meetings in community	yes	yes	yes	3, 12, 14
BPPD convenes forums where community members can interact with police and help influence programs and policy	-	-	-	3, 13, 14
BPPD assigns officers to small geographic areas for the long term, these officers have problem-solving authority, and are assessed on indicators such as community satisfaction and reduced fear of crime	-	-	-	13
Goal area 8: Data-driven management				
Arrest data by race and/or other demographics	-	yes	-	1, 3, 4, 9
Civilian complaint data by race and/or other demographics	-	yes	-	1, 3, 4
Call data by race and/or other demographics	-	-	-	4, 9, 10
Stop data by race and/or other demographics	-	yes	-	3, 4, 9
Early warning system results, including which officers are flagged, why, the results of the disposition, and subsequent flags for that officer's behavior	-	yes	-	11, 13, 16
Deadly force incidents by race	-	yes	-	1, 4
Less lethal force incidents by race	-	yes	-	1, 4
Call response time	-	-	-	3, 4
Clearance rate, by crime type	-	-	-	3, 4
Officer discipline, re-training, mentorship, and subsequent flags for officer behavior	-	yes	-	3, 4
Civil suits	-	-	-	4
Officer absenteeism	-	-	-	4

Indicator	Emerged as a theme in the study's key informant interviews?	Mentioned in the study's Advisory Committee?	Mentioned in HRC work plan?	Referenced/ recommended in the literature (by source)?
Goal area 9: Quality services	-	-	-	-
Household survey on satisfaction with police	-	-	-	3, 4, 13, 21
Business survey on satisfaction with police	-	-	-	3, 4, 13, 21
Community survey/interview on perceptions of BPPD, including procedural justice indicators, BPPD violence and abuse	-	-	-	3, 4, 13, 21
Community survey on reporting crime/problems to BPPD	-	-	yes	3, 4, 13, 14, 21
Survey of people stopped by BPPD, including identification of the officer to the person stopped	-	yes	yes	3, 4, 18
Survey partners and other stakeholders (including community oversight board members, violence prevention program workers, victim/survivor advocacy groups) about experiences with department	-	-	-	4, 13, 14, 21
Goal area 10: Safety				
Violent crime rate	yes	-	-	4
Property crime rate	yes	-	-	4
Crime rate victimization by demographics	yes	-	-	3
Repeat victimization rate by demographics	-	-	-	21
% of officers on force with multiple civilian complaints annually	-	yes	-	1
% of officers on force who cause death annually	-	yes	-	1

Wilder Research

Information. Insight. Impact.

451 Lexington Parkway North
Saint Paul, Minnesota 55104
651-280-2700
www.wilderresearch.org

Developed by:

Julie Atella and Lindsay Turner, Wilder Research

JUNE 2021