Statement of Dr. Phillip Atiba Goff

President
Center for Policing Equity

&

Franklin A. Thomas Professor in Policing Equity
John Jay College of Criminal Justice

Before the
United States House Committee on the Judiciary Oversight Hearing on Policing Practices

September 19, 2019

Good Morning Chairman Nadler, Ranking Member Collins, and distinguished Committee members. My name is Phillip Atiba Goff and I would like to thank you for the privilege of inviting me to testifying before the committee today. In my day job, I am a Professor at John Jay College of Criminal Justice, a position I accepted after receiving tenure in the Psychology department at UCLA. I was a witness for the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing, a member of the National Academies of Sciences committee that issued a consensus report on proactive policing, and was one of three leads on the recently concluded Department of Justice National Initiative for Building Community Trust and Justice.

I am likely best known in police reform circles, however, for my work with the Center for Policing Equity. For the past decade, I have had the pleasure of being the President of the Center for Policing Equity—CPE—the largest research and action organization focused on equity in policing and my testimony today is in that capacity. CPE is host to what is, to our knowledge, the largest collection of police behavioral data in the world, the National Science Foundation funded National Justice Database. Our work focuses on combining police behavioral data with psychological survey data and data from the U.S. Census to estimate not just racial disparities in police outcomes such as stops and use of force, but the portion of those disparities for which law enforcement are responsible. The goal of our work is to provide a roadmap for law enforcement and communities towards better alignment between their shared values and public safety practices. Today, I have been asked to speak about what science says about the path towards better public safety.

So, what does science have to say about better public safety? Well, first, as with all science, it is important that we define the problem correctly. If we speak only about the role that law enforcement has in keeping communities safe, our conversations will never elevate above blaming police or communities for crime rates, public mistrust, or violence. The framing should be public safety, not just law enforcement.

When we define the problem as public safety, rather than just law enforcement, then it is easier to see how investment in public substance abuse treatment, mental health facilities, school and after school programing, affordable housing, healthcare, and employment opportunities can help us to produce better law enforcement outcomes. If government provides the public support vulnerable communities need, fewer people will need to call 911. And everybody benefits from prevention, rather than attempting to cure the problems we allowed to occur in the first place.

Similarly, when we acknowledge that public safety is the goal, it is easier to see how the conditions within this country's most vulnerable communities are often the biggest predictors of violence and trauma—both for those who live there and those who are called most frequently to protect them. This view can help demystify why officers who patrol those neighborhoods often suffer from depression, substance dependency, and even commit suicide at rates that mirror those of the communities they are sworn to protect. And, if we are committed to public safety, then we must be committed to protect everyone exposed to those situations—communities and police alike. I should add here, that no community I have visited wants officers to be deprived of counseling services. These communities are not stingy with their desire for everyone who needs

help to receive it, and many see the divestment of those resources from officers as an obstacle towards healing their neighborhoods.

Now, having defined the problem, what are some of the solutions. My colleagues at CPE and the Yale Justice Collaboratory recently articulated five policies, rooted in science and practice, that we believe have the best chance to produce the biggest returns in law enforcement reform. They are, from the front to the back end of police accountability:

1. A national model policy for use of force similar to that recently articulated by the Camden Police Department. It is designed to restrict force to situations where it is necessary. Previous research demonstrates this can reduce harm to both communities and officers without elevating officer risk.
2. Funding to support training in procedural justice and, importantly, initiatives designed to support cultural changes in departments that center procedurally justice policing.
3. Funding for departments to implement (either internally or with partners) not just data collection and sharing, but also data analysis with the goal of producing more equitable outcomes. I will return to this point later.
4. Funding for departments to engage in reconciliation programing. It turns out, telling the truth about our history can be a powerful tool for improving the public legitimacy of law enforcement and improving community compliance with the law.
5. Finally, we called for the establishment of a national review board in the style of the National Transportation Safety Board. The goal of the review board is not to replace DOJ investigations designed to find wrongdoing but, rather, to focus on establishing patterns of errors and publicizing best practices for preventing them. This model of systems analysis is largely credited with reducing airline crashes roughly 80% in the years since it was established. Because unnecessary police violence and gross misconduct is often more a set of systems errors than individual errors, the same process could dramatically reduce bad policing outcomes and increasing public legitimacy.

Let me say one further word on the need to move beyond emphasizing police data collection and to start emphasizing police data analytics. In my recently released TED Talk, I discuss some of the successes of a new process we at CPE have called COMPSTAT for Justice. The process uses police behavioral data not just to measure disparities, but to estimate the portion of those disparities for which police are most likely responsible. This provides them with an actionable roadmap for reducing burdensome and disparate policing outcomes such as stops or use of force. Importantly, it does not blame police for poverty, for crime, or for calls by residents to 911, all of which can produce racially disparate outcomes.

Because of new software developed in collaboration with engineers at Google, we are able to provide those reports significantly faster than the years it used to take to produce. This kind of analysis-led approach to reducing bad policing outcomes is the same kind approach that all the panelists up here agree helped police reduce crime over the past quarter century through systems like COMPSTAT. Having spent the last quarter century focused on more and more complicated ways to measure crime, it is far past time we started to measure justice. That is what

we mean by funding to help police use analytics for accountability. That is the core work that CPE does.

I would be remiss if I left you with the impression that there was not already legislation that moves us in this direction. One of the reasons that so many up here have made reference to the End Racial Profiling Act is because it provides the infrastructure necessary to accomplish much of what I have articulated today. It is vital legislation that enjoys wide support from those who want to know the truth about public safety so that we can make our communities even more safe.

We cannot tell the truth about ourselves without even measuring what we do. No one who is serious about a problem refuses to measure the outcome. And yet, in policing, we have neither supported law enforcements efforts to measure their behaviors nor required them to do so. Our communities and the noble profession sworn to protect them deserve better than to be blamed or praised for things they have not done. Sometimes, the best way to honor the dignity of those who have gone so long ignored is just to pay attention. I hope we will do that with public safety going forward, and I think the committee for their time.