

[REDACTED]

From: Gabriel Martinez [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, July 26, 2021 2:49 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Recommendation 27.6

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Acting Captain Altorfer,

Our office has completed its review of the materials related to Recommendation 27.6 that were submitted to us as part of the collaborative reform process. This package focused on SFPD assessing its anti-bias trainings to better address issues of bias. After reviewing the package and information provided by the Department, the California Department of Justice finds as follows:

Recommendation 27.6: The SFPD should measure the efficacy of such training through careful data collection and analysis practices, ideally in partnership with an academic researcher.

Response to 27.6: SFPD and the San Francisco Department of Human Resources have worked with academic institutions and researchers as part of their plan to improve SFPD's bias training. They include Dr. Jennifer Eberhardt (Stanford University), Dr. Rebecca Hetey (Stanford University), Dr. Laura Fridell (University of South Florida), Dr. Josh Correll (University of Colorado, Boulder), and Dr. Jack Glaser (UC Berkeley). These academics have provided recommendations on concepts to inform SFPD training including implicit and explicit biases, bias by proxy, bias confirmation, blink responses, and black crime association bias. In 2017, Dr. Rebecca Hetey reviewed SFPD's training process and provided a written evaluation complimenting SFPD on its expansion of the Principled Policing training to incorporate issues relating to gender and sexual orientation bias, and also finding that SFPD went beyond a "check the box" approach to engage on issues of bias in criminal justice in training materials. Dr. Hetey's report stated: "[A]t SFPD I observed a genuine embrace of the material and saw evidence of the core team's work to tailor the material to the agency in order to demonstrate why it matters for all members of the SFPD. Of any agency I have observed, SFPD put the most thought and effort into making the material its own." SFPD continues to work with Dr. Hetey on investigating SFPD internal culture to continue to improve training.

SFPD has also worked with the Center for Policing Equity to analyze SFPD stop and use-of-force disparities. The Center is led by Dr. Phillip Atiba Goff, a national leader in the science of racial bias. The Center made seven recommendations to SFPD in a report released in 2021 (https://avanan.url-protection.com/v1/url?o=https%3A//www.sanfranciscopolice.org/sites/default/files/2021-03/SFPD.CPE_Report.20210304.pdf&g=MzRhZGY0NjY5Y2I4OTkwZQ==&h=MDkxY2ZlZGVkZjg2YjFkNDE1MDUyOTVkJzU3NDI1N2IxYTQ2MGFmMWNmODEzMzExZGE4MmJmOTBjMTQ5NGMzNA==&

[p=YXAzOnNmZHQyOmF2YW5hbJpvOjRmZDE5MjA1Nzk0YmNkNTA4ZjNhMWU3NmQzYzQ1NDAxOnYx](#)). With regard to one recommendation—that SFPD identify situational risk factors for discrimination—the Center recommended that SFPD train officers on situational risk factors that can increase disparate behavior, such as time pressure, stress, and sleep deprivation. SFPD has engaged the California Policy Lab, Stanford’s Social Psychological Answers to Real-world Questions (SPARQ), Palo Alto University, The University of Chicago, and Cambridge University on issues relating to community engagement, critical incident responses, and body-worn camera analysis, with several reports pending. The California Policy Lab project also focuses on stop and search training.

Under San Francisco Administrative Code Section 96A.3, SFPD must send written reports to the Police Commission (among others) on a quarterly basis that include use-of-force and stop data. In the second quarter 2020 96A report, SFPD analyzed findings and identified interventions to reduce disparities. Among the solutions identified was officer training, and the report includes an explanation of how SFPD has tried to meet the training solution and credits new trainings for successes in reducing some disparities.

In 2021, SFPD is planning to improve on its bias training by implementing BiasSync, a program that includes an implicit association test, training for bias mitigation, and dashboards. BiasSync provides a two-hour training session for each officer after their implicit association test as well as monthly micro-learning sessions. After two years, BiasSync will measure and report to SFPD any changes in officer attitudes. This information will help SFPD create a needs assessment on an organizational level going forward. Additionally, in 2020 SFPD assigned a Professional Development Unit officer to review and audit all bias trainings, including periodically attending classes to ensure SFPD is teaching course materials effectively. On January 5, 2021, SFPD issued Unit Order 21-02, “Audit and Review of Bias Training Programs,” that codified SFPD’s practice of having officers complete course evaluation forms and having the Training Division review the evaluations for improvements. Additionally, the Training Division now collects second evaluations on bias trainings four months after the trainings to determine which material had a lasting effect (Unit Order 21-01). These audits are compiled in quarterly reports that are sent to the Commanding Officer of the Training Division for review.

Based upon all of the above, the Department of Justice finds that SFPD is in substantial compliance with this recommendation. Please let us know if you have any questions or would like to discuss further. Thank you.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication with its contents may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). Unauthorized interception, review, use or disclosure is prohibited and may violate applicable laws including the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication.

Finding # 27	The SFPD is not addressing the anti-bias goals set forth through the Fair and Impartial Policing training-the trainers session.
Recommendation # 27.6	The SFPD should measure the efficacy of such training through careful data collection and analysis practices, ideally in partnership with an academic researcher.

Recommendation Status	Complete	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Complete	<input type="checkbox"/> In Progress
	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Started	<input type="checkbox"/> No Assessment	

Summary

The San Francisco Police Department has partnered with researchers evaluating the efficacy of training aimed at reducing bias. The quarterly report to the Police Commission indicates that on traffic stops there has been a decrease of discretionary searches of African-Americans, which may be evidence that anti-bias training is effective.

Prospectively, the department indicated researchers will assist in providing tools for the department to address the efficacy of bias training more effectively, including tools the department can implement that may reduce bias.

One researcher praised the department for ensuring all officers are culturally competent and understand the efficacy of anti-bias education and training.

Compliance Measures		Status/Measure Met
1	Partner with an academic researcher.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
2	Evidence of continued good data collection and analysis practices.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
3	Evaluate success of bias training.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

Administrative Issues

Compliance Issues



Collaborative Reform Completion Memorandum

Finding # 27: The SFPD is not addressing the anti-bias goals set forth through the Fair and Impartial Policing training-the-trainers session. The SFPD is to be commended for participating in the development of “train the trainers” for Fair and Impartial Policing. However, this training opportunity now needs to be integrated into an organizational approach to developing training delivery across the SFPD. Robust and ongoing training that addresses explicit and implicit biases must be a top priority, not only for the chief of police, the command staff, and the Training and Education Division, but for every member of the department.

Recommendation # 27.6 The SFPD should measure the efficacy of such training through careful data collection and analysis practices, ideally in partnership with an academic researcher.

Response Date: 3/11/2021

Executive Summary:

Upon release of the US DOJ Report, the department began soliciting multiple academic partners. Part of the work of these partnerships focused on measuring the efficacy of training. Since 2014 the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) has improved data collection in the following areas: stops, use of force, personnel assignments, training, and overall incidents. Understanding the various data is essential for analysis of officer conduct, and for the future of training. Additionally, the SFPD’s ability to provide academic partnerships with accurate data is essential. The Department has increased its data collection through improved technology systems, the expansion of required stop data and increased collection of use of force data. These improvements were only possible through the Department’s financial commitment, increased documentation regarding personnel assignments, and the revision of policies and procedures.

Beginning in 2016, in response to the City and Country of San Francisco’s legislative mandates to report and analyze use of force and stop data under Administrative Code 96A (Attachment #1: 96A Executive Summary; 2nd Quarter 2020 Report), the SFPD began issuing quarterly reports of stop data as well as analysis of that data. Through the department’s analysis of stop data, the SFPD identified potential solutions, including updating training, in order to reduce disparities in stops.

Since 2016, the department has partnered with seven institutions to address a broad range of policing topics, and provide possible recommendations. The below list of academic researchers shows a variety of focuses so that the department may understand the efficacy of training and policies that have been implemented:

- Center for Policing Equity (CPE), John Jay College (CUNY)
 - Stop & Use of Force Disparity Analysis
- Center for Data Science & Public Policy, University of Chicago



Collaborative Reform Completion Memorandum

- EIS Efficiency Analysis
- California Policy Lab (CPL), UC Berkeley & UC Los Angeles
 - Effects of Foot Beats
- Cambridge University, United Kingdom
 - CRI and Body Worn Camera Analysis
- Palo Alto University
 - 5150 Analysis and Application
 - Pre/Post CIT course surveys
- SPARQ, Stanford University
 - Community Engagement Metrics & Analysis
- University of California, San Francisco (UCSF) & UC Berkeley
 - Police/Youth Interactions analysis

The SFPD Professional Standards Unit completed a prescreen meeting for this recommendation with Cal DOJ and Hillard Heintze on March 8th, 2021. During this meeting, the following suggestions were made:

“Cal DOJ and Hillard Heintze thought that SFPD’s response to this recommendation was primarily about partnerships with research institutions generally, and would benefit from focusing on the analysis of the efficacy of bias training in particular. SFPD responded that the Center for Policing Equity’s work going forward, as reflected in the MOU, as well as the BiasSync program will help provide a rigorous analysis of the efficacy of bias training and that bias training efficacy be expanded upon in the Form 2001. Hillard Heintze added that SFPD could add to its explanation that training has led to a reduction in certain disparities, as the explained for the reduction in stop disparities in the 96A reports. Cal DOJ also suggested adding the positive remarks by Dr. Rebecca Hetey regarding bias trainings from another recommendation into this recommendation.”

The above suggestions were taken into consideration and applied throughout this recommendation.

Compliance Measures:

1) Partner with an academic researcher

The department has partnered with multiple academic researchers over the last 5 years. Relationships with the Center for Policing Equity (CPE) and the California Policy Lab (CPL) have grown into ongoing projects for analysis of data. Exact timing and methodology for the ongoing engagement is agreed upon by the Chief of Police and solidified through an MOU, (Attachment #2, Current MOU’s).



Collaborative Reform Completion Memorandum

The below grid shows ongoing academic research partners through the years. This grid also emphasizes how these partnerships have a diverse focus of their analysis and includes the current status of each partnership:

Year	Institution	Topic(s)	Result
2017	Center for Policing Equity	Stop & UOF Disparity Analysis	Projected report release Jan. 15, 2021
2017	Center for Data Science & Public Policy, U. Chicago	EIS Threshold Efficiency Analysis	Report received and influencing EIS replacement discussions
2018	California Policy Lab, UC Berkeley & UC Los Angeles	Foot Beat Effects on Crime	Report received and released to the public
2019	Cambridge University, UK	CRI and Body Worn Camera Analysis	Report pending, no timetable provided by researchers
2019	Palo Alto University	5150 Stop Analysis & Phone Application Development	Work ongoing, projected completion late 20/early 21.
2019	Palo Alto University	Pre/Post CIT Course Survey and analysis	Scoping and pending MOU. Rollout expected mid 21.
2020	SPARQ, Stanford University	Community Engagement Metrics and Analysis	Scoping and pending MOU.
2020	Cal Policy Lab, UC Berkeley & UC Davis	Pedestrian Stop & Search Training – Effects and Analysis	Scoping complete, pending MOU to begin.
2020	University of California, San Francisco & UC Berkeley	Analysis of police engagements with homeless youth	Pending MOU to begin
2021	Police Equity (PE)	Stop & UOF Disparity Analysis	Pending MOU signatures (Attachment #3; Draft MOU – pending signatures)



Collaborative Reform Completion Memorandum

2) Evidence of continued good data collection and analysis practices.

In response to City and County of San Francisco legislative mandates to report and analyze use of force and stop data under Administrative Code 96A, in 2016 the San Francisco Police Department began issuing quarterly reports of stop data as well as analysis of that data. Through the SFPD's analysis of stop data, the department identified potential solutions to reduce disparities in stops. On pages 5 through 7 of the most recent 96A report, the department identified nine potential tools for reducing stop disparities. (Attachment #1: 96A Executive Summary; 2nd Quarter 2020 Report). Those nine tools are:

- Officer Training
- Reducing discretion through policy changes
- Increase non-negative contacts with other ethnic groups
- Collecting data and adopting new technologies
- Stereotype replacement
- Banning racial profiling
- Individuation
- Diversifying police force
- Rotating police assignments

From careful data collection and analysis practices, the SFPD has been able to recognize positive change overtime. Furthermore, the department has been able to measure the efficacy of training. Per the 96A Executive Summary; 2nd Quarter 2020 Report:

"SFPD believes that the training and policies, and resulting increased awareness, has driven these results."

Below is a list of the academic partnerships and the focus of their work through the departments improved data collection and cooperation of additional information such as police reports.

Center for Policing Equity – Data Gap Analysis

During our academic engagement with the Center for Policing Equity, based out of John Jay College, the department received a data gap analysis. This analysis showed, among other things, the improvement of the department's data capture over time, and the analytical questions that could be asked of the data that was on hand. (Attachment #4; CPE Data Gap Analysis)

Controller's City Services Auditor – Best Practices Report



Collaborative Reform Completion Memorandum

Reporting and analytic practices were evaluated in a Controller's City Services Auditor (CSA) interim report issued to the Department in the Fall of 2019. The report highlighted how the Department collected and disseminated data via the 96a report.

The report provided recommendations for the department to improve data collection. The result was an adjustment to the 96a report (now named the Quarterly Activities & Data Report). It contains a quantitative section that dives into disparities between demographic groups, geographic areas and interactions with the SFPD.

-(Attachment #5; CSA Interim Key Issue Report – Best Practices in Reporting Use of Force Data)

-(Attachment #6; Memorandum – 96A Report Re-Imagining)

-(Attachment #7; Q3 2020 Quarterly Activity and Data Report (QADR)

3) Evaluate success of bias training.

The department is committed to the ongoing engagement with academia, as evidenced by our ever-growing list of academic partners. The positive outcomes of academic engagement are seen in the following areas:

- Evaluations of data collection
 - Center for Policing Equity provided improved data collection recommendations (Attachment # 8, CPE Report [pg. 15]). The department has currently implemented 2 of the 4 recommendations prior to the report being published.
 - 1) “Adopt a unified policy on data collection. We recommend that SFPD adopt a single, comprehensive general order addressing collection of data on stops and compliance with the Racial and Identity Profiling Act of 2015 (RIPA). At present, SFPD addresses data collection requirements in individual department bulletins, such as Department Bulletins 18-247 and 18-105, both of which are entitled “Stop Data Collection System (SDCS) Implementation.”
 - 2) “Expand the definition of reportable force. We recommend that SFPD amend the definition of reportable force in Department General Order 5.01 (Use of Force) to include all force used to overcome resistance, regardless of injury or complaint of injury or pain. SFPD’s current definition of reportable force does not appear to encompass control holds or pain compliance techniques used to overcome resistance unless they result in injury.”
- Academic partners and memorandums of understanding that are currently ongoing.
- The reports completed by Cal Policy Lab and the Center of Policing Equity with recommendations to move the Department forward in reducing bias policing through training.



Collaborative Reform Completion Memorandum

- Ongoing working relationship with Dr. Eberhart and SPARQ, Stanford University.

As part of the implementation of the data analysis being conducted by CPE, the department provided CPE with vehicle stop data for the years 2014-2017 and additional stop data for the year 2017. It should be noted that the department did not start collecting all stop data until the implementation of its e-Stop data collection at the end of 2016. In addition to the stop data, the department also provided CPE with crime data covering the periods of 2013-2017. Providing this data enabled CPE to conduct an analysis of the data, which has been compiled into a comprehensive report (Attachment #8: CPE report).

Using data contributed by SFPD to CPE's National Justice Database (NJD), CPE examined the incidences of vehicle stops, pedestrian stops, and use of force involving major racial groups during the 5-year period, adjusting for the relative population size of each group. CPE also administered a climate survey to assess officer attitudes and beliefs that may enhance or decrease vulnerability to expressing bias. Finally, because departmental policy is critical to fostering equitable policing practice and trust between officers and the communities they serve, CPE conducted a review of SFPD's publicly available Department General Orders (DGOs) and special bulletins as they relate to: (1) collection of data regarding police interactions with the community; (2) equitable policing practices; and (3) police-community relations (Attachment #8: CPE Report [pg. 2-3])

An example of continued academic engagement based on developing relationships with academics is that of the California Policy Lab (CPL). The CPL's Foot Beat analysis confirmed the efficacy of our transition of officers into the foot beat role, (Attachment #2: CPL MOU). CPL published a report on their analysis on implicit bias through the examination of the SFPD's training and stop data. They examined the role of training in reducing implicit bias in pedestrian stops and searches.

Both the SFPD's 96A process and the research agreement with the Center for Policing Equity utilize stop data to not only attempt to identify reasons for disparities, but also seek to identify solutions for stop disparities. Among these solutions, and first on this list is officer training. The department identified nine potential tools for reducing stop disparities in the second quarter 96A report from 2020 (on pages 5 through 7). (Attachment #1: Q2 2020 96A executive summary). Those tools are:

- **Officer Training**
- Reducing discretion through policy changes
- Increase non-negative contacts with other ethnic groups
- Collecting data and adopting new technologies
- Stereotype replacement
- Banning racial profiling
- Individuation
- Diversifying police force



Collaborative Reform Completion Memorandum

- Rotating police assignments

The department has acted on these suggestions in a number of ways such as:

- **Implementing and expanding implicit bias training**
- Updating General Orders such as 5.01 (Use of Force),
- 5.17 (Bias-Free Policing Policy) and
- 11.07 (Prohibiting Discrimination, Harassment and Retaliation),
- Reinvigorating the Chiefs Advisory Forums
- Station Monthly Meetings
- Station Monthly Newsletters
- Aligning data collection with AB953, and
- Increasing diversity in its recruiting efforts.

Through its own analysis of stop data and stop disparities, the Center for Policing Equity recommended in its report that officers submit, on a daily basis, a brief narrative of the justification of the stop made that day, and that the department require supervisors review these reports to ensure stops are supported by reasonable suspicion and are consistent with department policies and procedures.

Additionally, the Center for Policing Equity recommended the following actionable steps on page 7 of its report:

1. Adopt a unified policy on data collection
2. Expand definition of reportable use of force
3. Collect more detailed use of force information
4. Utilizing COPS Stop Data Guidebook
5. Require supervisors review of stop records
6. Update policy on drawing and pointing of firearms
7. Identify situational risk factors for discrimination

With regard to Step #7, this report recommended the following after an evaluation of the efficacy bias related training:

“We recommend that SFPD train its officers and supervisors on the situational risk factors that can increase the likelihood of racially disparate behavior, such as inexperience, time pressure, divided attention, hunger, stress, sleep deprivation and the absence of clear norms regarding expected behavior. We further recommend that SFPD identify chronic risk factors for racially discriminatory outcomes and adopt policies to limit or eliminate these factors.”



Collaborative Reform Completion Memorandum

The above identified solutions are a starting point for reducing stop disparities. Further analysis of stop data before, during, and after implementation of proposed solutions will be vital to determining if the proposed solutions mitigate disparities, or if alternative approaches must be identified and undertaken by the department. It should also be noted that the department has already implemented many of these recommendations, including updating use of force policies and expanding stop data collection.

(Attachment #8: CPE Report, pg 49).

The following are examples of some of the departments existing efforts that align with recommendations made by CPE:

- In 2017, the department expanded Stop data collection to include vehicle and pedestrian stops through the e-Stop system, and then in 2018 transitioned to California DOJ's Stop Data Collection System(SDCS). Through this process the department implemented new policies on data collection as detailed in DOJ Collaborative Reform Initiative 35.1.
- In 2016, the department revised and combined General Order's 5.01 Use of Force and 5.02 Use of Firearms. The new General Order 5.01 (Attachment #9: San Francisco Police Department General Order 5.01 Use of Force) expanded reportable use of force to include the use of personal body weapon, even when injury or complaint of pain was not present. Additionally, it made the pointing of a firearm a reportable use of force and updated language consistent with CPE's recommendation, which stated "We recommend that SFPD amend this policy to add that officers may only draw or display their firearms if they reasonably believe that there is a substantial risk that the situation may escalate to the point where deadly force may be justified."
- In October of 2018, the department updated the Supervisory Use of Force Evaluation Form, (Attachment #10: DB 18-171: Updated Supervisory Use of Force Evaluation Form), which expanded the data supervisors are required to collect during a use of force investigation.
- In July of 2018, the department transition from the use of the e-Stop data collection system to the CAL DOJ's Stop Data Collection System(SDCS). (Attachment #11: DB 18-105: Stop Data Collection System (SDCS) Implementation). Department Bulletin 18-105 was reissued under Department Bulletin 20-141. (Attachment #12: DB 20-141: Stop Data Collection System). SDCS was created in response to California Assembly Bill AB953, the Racial and Identify Profiling Act of 2015 (RIPA). RIPA and SDCS were highlighted on page five of the COPS Stop Data Guidebook as "the nation's largest and most comprehensive stop data collection effort to date." (Attachment #13: COPS Stop Data Guidebook)

As a result of these trainings and implemented recommendations made by the Department, the following indicators have emerged suggesting that improvements have



Collaborative Reform Completion Memorandum

been made since the Department was reviewed by the US Department of Justice:
(Attachment 1: 96A Report – Quarter 2, 2020)

I. Since the 1st quarter of 2016, total uses of force have decreased by 53% (952 to 451). More specifically, pointing of a firearm has decreased by 67% (648 to 213).

II. When the USDOJ reviewed the Department, they found that search rates among African Americans were much higher than Whites, while the yield rates from these searches were much lower for African Americans than Whites. As shown by data contained in this report, this is no longer true. SFPD is encouraged by this as an indicator that officers are relying on behaviors of those they interact with to determine the type and level of enforcement necessary. **SFPD believes that the training and policies, and resulting increased awareness, has driven these results.**

III. Continued incremental reductions in the representation of African Americans among those stopped, searched, arrested, and in which force was used against them."

Yield rates obtained from page 13 of the 96A report are as follows:

- Total yield rate for all searches was 36%
- Total yield rate of "High Discretion" searches was 26%
- Total yield rate of "Required Searches" was 50%
- Total yield rate of "Other Searches" was 34%

"Overall, our analysis found reasons for optimism along with room for improvement concerning the goal of equitable policing. There was an overall decline in use-of-force incidents from 2016 to 2018. There was also a small but steady decline in the per capita counts of use-of-force incidents for Black and Latinx residents relative to White residents in this time period. In the climate survey, SFPD officers generally reported perceptions that they are treated with dignity and respect by their supervisors, and they expressed high support for procedurally just policing (Attachment #4: CPE Report Pg. 2-3)."

In the evaluation of the success of bias training, as seen in the above studies and positive outcomes in reductions of disparities, the next study by Police Equity (formerly CPE) will focus on 2018-2020 data and analyze stop and use-of-force disparities. As the Department continues its' relationship with all academics listed above, we will continue to receive input and evaluation of bias training, policies and procedures to minimize bias in policing.



Collaborative Reform Completion Memorandum

In 2017, Dr. Rebecca Hetey reviewed our training process and provided us with insight and guidance, based on national standards and best practices, on answering tough questions about bias and cultural awareness. The following are excerpts from the supportive letter authored by DR. Hetey:

- "Since 2017, I have worked with members of the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) as the agency adopted and has continuously refined its teaching of Principled Policing. I trained 3 of SFPD's members at various POST sponsored Train the Trainer events and was invited by the agency to advise and teach a Train the Trainer that was held at SFPD's Academy. At that event, I met the agency's trainers, viewed their materials, and observed them teaching, and engaged in various discussions about their pedagogical approaches and, most importantly, the agency's commitment to making the concept of Principled Policing a foundational part of the mission and values of the agency as a whole."
- "This fidelity to the material was made even more powerful by the fact that the trainers themselves reflected the diversity of the department and the City of San Francisco. Notably too, I observed how the course began with a beautifully filmed message from the Chief of Police describing why the agency is committed to Principled Policing and explaining the reasoning behind why all officers and civilian staff are required to complete the training."
- "SFPD Principled Policing teaching staff also expanded the concept of implicit bias to extend beyond race and ethnicity to also incorporate sexual orientation and bias based on other identity categories to better meet the needs of the population of San Francisco. I interpreted this extension of scope as genuine, and not to "water down" the main message of the module as we at SPARQ designed it. This main message based in scientific evidence is implicit racial bias is real, acting on that implicit bias can give rise to racial disparities in law enforcement activity, and those disparities must be reduced in the name of equity, as well as to restore trust and strengthen the relationship with the community. In fact, SFPD's teaching of the material goes more into depth on racial disparities in the criminal justice system than I have seen at any other agency."

For full details, please review the attached report ([Attachment #14: Written Review & Evaluation by Dr. Hetey](#))

Finally, in 2021 the SFPD will measure the efficacy of training through careful data collection and analysis practices by implementing BiasSync. BiasSync includes an implicit association test customized for the workplace as well as assessments of skills necessary for bias mitigation with anonymization tools, data, and dashboards. BiasSync will have the capability to measure positive and negative attitudes to create a needs assessment dashboard for the organization.



Collaborative Reform Completion Memorandum

Included in the training plan for 2021, BiasSync will provide forward thinking courses that include ideologies which allow the acceptance that biases have negative impacts on both the internal and the external communities, with needs assessments that allow for improvement loops. Biassync has developed an algorithm and program deploying the Implicit Association Test, which can summarize and create a dashboard based on the anonymized aggregate results called a Biassync score. The Implicit Association Test (IAT) is a scientifically validated tool developed to measure unconscious bias.

The advantage of Biassync is that the program measures general attitude (positive/negative) thus allowing the ability to measure the individual's openness to learning or accepting new concepts. With the Biassync score, the results are assessed to create skills necessary for bias mitigation within the organization. After the initial IAT, Biassync presents trainings in a two-hour session for each member with monthly micro-learning sessions. At the end of the two-year program a closing IAT test is done to assess and measure any changes in the mindset of our members.

Currently, Biassync is the only program that can measure and create learning opportunities based on the initial assessment. Biassync can measure attitude and openness, giving the organization an advantage on what training is positively affecting the mindset. (Attachment 15: BiasSync Client Roadmap)