From: Gregory Gelembiuk
To: Kapusta-Pofahl, Karen
Subject: Re: Reading Assignments RE: Body-Worn Camera Feasibility Review Committee: Meeting of July 30th, 2020
Date: Friday, July 17, 2020 3:10:47 PM
Attachments: BWCProsecution_FinalReport_1_18_19.pdf

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Karen,

Here are some additional questions you can send out, for people to keep in mind.

Are there methodological issues with this study?

a. Are the statistical analyses appropriate?

b. Are assumptions underlying the analyses violated?

c. Might confounding factors be leading to erroneous conclusions?

d. What is the sample size?

e. Is this a randomized controlled trial (very high quality of evidence) or just analysis of observational data?

f. For randomized controlled trials, what are the units of randomization and are spillover effects potentially a problem?

g. Might significant outcomes in this study merely be a consequence of p-hacking or other manipulations?

h. Are the logical inferences valid?

Has the study been peer-reviewed? What is the level of expertise of the authors?

What are the effects on the key outcomes of interest (e.g., use of force, complaints, arrests, citations, charges, convictions, resident compliance/aggression, willingness to call police, perception of legitimacy, etc.)?

If a metric shows a significant change, what is the causal pathway (for example, if there's a reduction in the number of formal complaints, is it due to improved police behavior or might it instead be due to officers discouraging residents from filing formal complaints - e.g., by telling them the bodycam videos showed no policy violations)?

Are there mediating factors at play that might be affecting the outcome? (e.g., across cities, differences in officer discretion in turning bodycams off and on may affect whether the bodycams cause an increase or decrease in use of force)

To what extent are the findings of this study generalizable (across cities)?

How much weight should the findings of this paper be given (due to questions of validity, generalizability, etc.)?

What are the implications of this study for police accountability?

I thought I'd also throw one more study into the mix (attached paper). I thought I'd include it since 1. it's a topic of interest (that we touched on in discussion) but that's not really represented in any of the individual studies we're currently examining, and 2. it's recent and not included in the Lum et al review.

Greg

From: Kapusta-Pofahl, Karen <KKapusta-Pofahl@cityofmadison.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 10:56 AM
To: Tom Brown (tbrown@ulgm.org) <tbrown@ulgm.org>; Keith Findley <keith.findley@wisc.edu>; Gregory Gelembiuk <gwgelemb@wisc.edu>; Veronica Figueroa (veronicaf@unidoswi.org) <veronicaf@unidoswi.org>; Luke Schieve (lschieve@exactsciences.com) <lschieve@exactsciences.com>; Myadze, Charles <myadzec@gmail.com>; Matthew Braunginn (braunginn@gmail.com) <braunginn@gmail.com>; Kim Jorgensen (dokithia@gmail.com) <dokithia@gmail.com>; Jacquelyn Hunt (jacquelyn.hunt@gmail.com) <jacquelyn.hunt@gmail.com>
Cc: Haas, Michael R <MHaas@cityofmadison.com>; Austin, Brian <BAustin@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: Reading Assignments RE: Body-Worn Camera Feasibility Review Committee: Meeting of July 30th, 2020

DO NOT REPLY ALL

Here are the requested groups and article assignments, along with some guiding reading questions. I am also attaching Keith's summaries.

Groups and Reading Assignments

Group 1: Tom Brown**,** Keith Findley**,** Luke Schieve
Lum et al (2019)
Kalle et al (2019)
Turner et al (2019)
Ariel et al (2016 a)
Ariel et al (2016 b)

Group 2: Veronica Figueroa**,** Kim Jorgensen
Lum et al (2019)
Yokum et al (2019)
Ariel et al (2019)
Peterson et al (2018)
Jones et al (2020)

Group 3: Charles Myadze**,** Greg Gelembuik
Lum et al (2019)
Houwig et al (2020)
Hartzog (2018)
Lum et al (no date)
Kim (2020)

Guiding Questions:

1. What methods did the authors use to collect the data in the article?
2. Do the authors offer any policy suggestions or guidance?
3. Can you think of anything obvious the authors have seemed to ignore or omit?
4. What is the main take-away of the article?