

Finding # 78	The SFPD does not engage in any outside evaluations of its practices, data, or reporting.
Recommendation # 78.1	The SFPD should consider partnering with local academic institutions to evaluate its reform program, particularly as it seeks to implement the recommendations in this report.

Recommendation Status	Complete	Partially Complete	In Progress
	Not Started	No Assessment	

Summary

The SFPD is to be commended for the work to date on this recommendation. While the SFPD achieves substantial compliance with this recommendation, ideally the SFPD will begin to fully embrace the concept of independent academic study and the subsequent internal review and engagement that occurs. It is not easy to open your department to study and outside analysis, some of which may be challenging or inconsistent. It is this process that allows the department to become stronger through knowledge of its data and to develop strong internal analytical skills. Academic partnerships should also help inform policy and operational planning and development, as it provides alternative viewpoints grounded in empirical theory and academic rigor. The SFPD has engaged with academics to the level of support for this recommendation. Ideally, it will broaden these partnerships to measure the sustainability and forward movement of the reform achievements under CRI.

For compliance measure 1, the SFPD identified that it began working with academic partners in 2016. The SFPD identifies that partnerships with UC Berkeley, Stanford, John Jay College (CUNY), Cambridge and the University of Chicago have engaged with the department and have directed change in operations. An online search identified [focus on identifying academic partners](#) as part of the reform process. This too demonstrates a commitment to academic partnerships.

For compliance measure 2, the SFPD provides evidence of data sharing agreements with Berkeley and Cambridge and provides research agreements with Berkeley for projects initiated in 2018 under attachment #2. It also uses attachment #3, which does not supply a comprehensive report, but rather pieces of different reports (at least this is what the reviewer perceives given different formats and layouts). It identifies some data but it is not sufficiently clear to identify what this data is intended to disclose. While the SFPD references a “new era” report from May 2018 – which it seems some of the attachments are from – the report is not provided. (An internet search did not disclose this referenced report). The [Berkeley foot patrol study](#) was published and is identified on the SFPD website with a link to the Berkeley site. There is no link to the recruit retention study.

For compliance measures 3 and 4, the SFPD provides the support for compliance through attachment #4, the tracking of academic evaluations. This occurs through attachment #5, an academic matrix that is published quarterly at the chief’s meetings and the SFPD website.

The SFPD did not include controversial studies, including the [UofC report](#) and discussion on early identification of officers at risk. While the SFPD may or may not agree with the report, the department’s engagement with these institutions is evidence of a commitment to working with research partners and identifies some of the challenges in such engagements. These partnerships provide for expansion of perspective and information that requires internal review and examination to defend the department’s position – or to identify best methods for use of the information. This is the strength of academic partnerships and ideally is something that the department will continue to engage in.

Hillard Heintze File Review Recommendation # 78.1

Compliance Measures		Status/Measure Met
1	Partner with academic institutions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
2	Evidence of the partnerships going forward.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
3	Tracking of evaluations of practices, data, reporting and reform progress.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
4	Continuous review and improvement loop.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

Administrative Issues

This file is well organized and structured to address the work for the recommendation.

Compliance Issues

While substantial compliance is achieved under this recommendation, ideally the SFPD will further review and identify ways to track reform progress through use of academic research rigor. The current gains around UOF is a good example wherein academic study would not only help SFPD but also help advance law enforcement practice nationally.



Collaborative Reform Completion Memorandum

Finding # 78: The SFPD does not engage in any outside evaluations of its practices, data, or reporting.

Recommendation # 78.1 The SFPD should consider partnering with local academic institutions to evaluate its reform program, particularly as it seeks to implement the recommendations in this report.

Response Date: 06/05/2020

Executive Summary: The SFPD began the process of working with academic partners after the release of the CRI report in 2016. Through 2017, initial conversations with academic partners across the country and around the world eventually developed into working relationships, governed by memorandums of understanding, and generating impactful scholarship based on the department's data.

Since 2016, the department has partnered with institutions like UC Berkeley, Stanford, John Jay College (CUNY), Cambridge (UK) & the University of Chicago. These partnerships have generated scholarship that have helped change things like how we deploy foot beats, and what interventions at the academy may increase passage rates.

Compliance Measures:

1. Partner with academic institutions

Since 2016, the department has partnered with institutions like UC Berkeley, Stanford, John Jay College (CUNY), Cambridge (UK) & the University of Chicago. Included are two MOU's: One with UC Berkeley's California Policy Lab and the second with University of Chicago, [attachment #1](#).

2. Evidence of the partnerships going forward.

Engagements with academia vary from one time studies to ongoing relationships. An example of an ongoing partnership going forward would be the relationship between the SFPD and the California Policy Lab (CPL) at UC Berkeley. The MOU is structured in such a way, that additional projects can be spun up under the MOU, as new and ongoing research tasks are agreed to. This both reduces the time it takes to enter into MOUs and increases the amount of potential engagements that can occur. Exhibits of the CPL MOU showing how projects are added over time can be seen in, [attachment #2](#) which includes: SFPD hiring processes, characteristics, recruitment, training and relationships to retention and recruiting and SFPD impact of foot beat deployment strategy on crime rates.



Collaborative Reform Completion Memorandum

For example, recommendation 88.1 notes that the SFPD should conduct ongoing review and analysis of release rates and their impact on diversity and identify mitigation measures to support the success of diverse candidates.

An example of an academic report impacting day to day operations in the department is the SFPD: Recruiting and hiring in a New Era report from May 2018 excerpt, **attachment #3** which is Presentation slide of: SFPD: Recruiting and hiring in new Era May 2018, pg. 25 and PowerPoint slide: Changes to Simulations Training & Effects on Academy Drop Rates. This report noted that a concerning trend is the rate of attrition...due to simulation and scenario failures. The finding was addressed by the academy increasing coaching and practice in the simulations portion of the academy, reducing the simulations separation rate from 6% on average to 3% on average. Change in drop rates was presented as evidence of improvement after implementation.

3. Tracking of evaluations of practices, data, reporting and reform progress.

The SFPD recently assigned a single point of contact within the department as it's liaison to academia. This liaison maintains an Academic Project tracking matrix (attached as Attachment #5) that is updated monthly and briefed to the Chief of Police quarterly. This tracking ties both CRI recommendations, when applicable, to academic efforts. As scholarship on SFPD programs, practices or research are completed, reports are passed to appropriate members of the Command Staff for consideration and integration. In some cases, scholarship is published publicly on the SFPD's website with an associated press release, **attachment #4**: Press release 18-156 "New Report Highlights Effectiveness of SFPD Foot Patrols and SFPD Website linking to Cal Policy Lab evaluation of Foot Patrols; screenshot.

4. Continuous review and improvement loop.

As of December, 10, 2019 a continual review of this program is thru the quarterly command reviews of the Academic Project tracking matrix, **attachment #5**. Opportunities for feedback, inclusion of new lines of inquiry and updates on current projects are explored, and built into the program in an ongoing basis. Recent feedback included the addition of multiple Stanford based projects to the tracking document, along with associated data points. In June 2020, Mayor Breed ordered a pause in SFPD sworn hiring, to have the City's HR Department conduct an audit of the hiring process for potential bias, exemplifying the City and Department's ongoing commitment continual review of processes. If deficiencies are found, we will correct them using this process. Finally, the SFPD is open and looks forward to working with the leading academic institutions from around the world.