2019 GENERAL COMMENTS ON MINOR PAPER

(A)   *To understand this assignment thoroughly, you have to start building a good grasp of the issues surrounding <u>work performance</u> and <u>police-citizen relations</u> more generally.*

(B)   (So) This assignment is about the ways to <u>improve worker productivity</u> ➔ specifically – *<u>policing productivity along equity lines</u>*

(C)   (Even) <u>data collection is about getting a systemic view</u> (at the level of structures and organizational culture) ➔ with the <u>goal of increasing/cultivating bias-neutral policing</u> [equity]

ACADEMIC PURPOSE // UTILITY OF THE ASSIGNMENT

- **It encourages you to think about <u>police officers' performance standards</u> and <u>duties</u> [in a democratic/ multicultural society]**
- **It encourages you to think about <u>research tools</u>, <u>research reliability and validity</u>**
- **It encourages you to think about <u>police-citizen relations</u> – "<u>the reality on the ground</u>"**
- **It encourages you to think about <u>evidentiary narratives</u> – [<u>diagnostic tools</u>] – and <u>policy solutions/ advances</u>**
- **It encourages you to think about <u>gathering information/ data that is precise</u>, <u>ethical</u> and <u>up-to-date</u> ➔ and how it is <u>linked to good policy</u>.**

- **The papers were generally very well written and argued. For this reason many papers were 'A' level but could have been even higher – if they drilled down and strategized the differences between police disengagement and sustained 'peak' performance in more depth.**

- **Some papers that were in the A+ level demonstrated a very strong grasp of the issues:**

  - ❖ **[First] The issue of the Hawthorne Effect – improving the officer performance/ increased productivity – is "inaccurate data" ➔ "flawed analysis" ➔ "defective equity decision-making/ problem-solving"**
  - ❖ **[Second] The issue of bias-neutral policing or community-based policing or 'democratic policing' ➔ How can this *peak performance* be achieved and sustained?**

RESEARCH DEVELOPENT:

- **Improper citations (!) ➔ this is sloppy research and unacceptable at the post-secondary level. *Everything in your paper has to be well documented.***

EX: ➔ If you define 'Hawthorne' you have to state your source – the body of literature, the school of thought, etc.

- **Failure to addresss the research question: (1) not staying on point – meandering; (2) compartmentalizing the issue of racial profiling and Hawthorne; (3) failing to follow through**

on the implications of the analysis to coherent recommendations.

- **The opening/introduction needs to tell what the paper is about, where it is going [issues & themes], and what it will show/conclude/recommend.**

- **The research question must be *integrated* into the [cited] research and research studies section [i.e., you cannot refer to particular studies as authoritative resources on racial profiling background, and then have a following section referring to the research problem of '*the Hawthorne effect*' as if they are separate topics]**

- **The research question must be *integrated* into the issue development section.**

- **Issue development should begin with our two texts dealing with – *unequal [power] relations*; and – the *principles for developing good public policy***

PROBLEMATIC RECOMMENDATIONS:

- **In some cases, the argumentation and reasoning raises more questions than it answers.**

- **Offering up 'cumbersome or complicated' operational strategies and policy solutions [ex: '*notice of receipt cards to citizens'*. Hawthorning relates to spurious results through *defiance* as well as *compliance*. *Cumersome operations can lead to 'non-stops' and/or 'glossed-over stops*'**

- **Offering up 'generics' operational strategies and policy solutions [ex. '*accountability*'. What is it? What does it look like in practice].**

- Offering up '<u>impractical</u>' operational strategies and policy solutions [ex. '*study in secret'*. It is unethical, impractical and probably impossible to do if you want reliable data].
- Offering up '<u>superficial or abstract</u>' operational strategies and policy solutions [ex. *'audit their actions*'. This still begs the question of how?
- Offering up *<u>'irrelevant' operational strategies</u>* and policy solutions [ex. '<u>*build comradery*</u>" ➜ *'mechanisms to assess the affectivity and independence of the department'*. The emotional attachment of officers to each other and to the service is not directly connected to anti-Hawthorne – it may be just the opposite.
- Offering up '*<u>financially prohibitive'</u>* operational strategies and policy solutions [ex: computer upgrades that require a revamping the entire 'cad' [computer-aided-dispatch] system.

<u>INVENTIVE RECOMMENDATIONS TO CURB HAWTHORNE</u>

- *develop an effective <u>audit plan</u> [involving senior management for <u>buy-in and enforcement purposes</u>]
- <u>Written/ signed agreements</u>
- <u>Explicit anti-bias and racial profiling policies</u>
- <u>Random checks throughout the study</u> – kind of a '*single-blind' method* [i.e., control treatment at unknown intervals – to prevent 'ghosting' or 'padding' the logs]
- <u>Cross-referencing and cross-checking traffic stop data</u> – monitoring stop rates/ arrests/ tickets ect.
- <u>Clear and simple processes</u> [?]

- **No data collection related to individual officers**
- **Standardize data collection as a 'normal way of doing business'**
- **Emphasize data collection studies as a tool for more effective policing** [i.e., rational dialogue about effective and appropriate police practices]
- Emphasize data collection as a **means for confirming bias-free policing to the public**
- **Frequent education and training programs and initiatives** [i.e., feedback loops]
- **Implementation of cameras/ recording devices – car dashboard and/or body-worn** {?}
- **Penalize/ reprimand officers** who do not comply with the directives.
- **Incentivize officers** – tie bias-neutral policing to promotion.
- **Institute race data collection on a on-going bases** [up-grade and streamline the mobile data terminal tracking systems – electronic verification and cross-checking of data accuracy]
- **Repetition of Studies** [repeat the same study in order to compare and contrast results over time]
- **Triangulation of Studies** [multiple studies in order to "enhance confidence" in the findings]

EXAMPLE OF A GOOD INTRODUCTION

This paper will *evaluate possible initiatives that can be undertaken by Canadian Police Services to determine the amount of racial profiling that exists within policing*, as well as *preventive measures towards the issue*. The central question of this paper is

as follows: In designing a study on racial profiling or race data collection for a Canadian Police Service, *what techniques can be used to prevent the Hawthorne Effect?* *[1]* First this paper will provide a technical background on the issue of racism and racial profiling. Second, *[2]* a brief analysis of the Hawthorne Effect and its relationship to policing will be explored. Then *[3]* this paper will suggest a technique to prevent the Hawthorne Effect in studying racial profiling amongst Toronto police officers. Lastly, *[4]* this paper will conclude with further suggestions and possible solutions to the issue at hand, including … [*describe the solutions!!!*]