University of Mississippi

eGrove

Electronic Theses and Dissertations   Graduate School

2019

Intelligence-Led Policing: Linking Local and State Policies to Establish a Common Definition

Chad B. Prosser
University of Mississippi

Follow this and additional works at: https://egrove.olemiss.edu/etd

Part of the Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons

INTELLIGENCE-LED POLICING:

LINKING LOCAL AND STATE POLICIES TO ESTABLISH A COMMON DEFINITION

A Thesis
presented in partial fulfillment of requirements
for the degree of Master of Science in Criminal Justice
in the Department of Legal Studies
The University of Mississippi

by

CHAD B. PROSSER

May 2019

ABSTRACT

Intelligence-Led Policing (ILP) has been around for almost two decades now within the US and over two decades in the UK and Australia. Yet, there has not been a solidified definition of what it is or what it should be among agencies within or outside of the US. Unlike previous policing methodologies, ILP was not forced on agencies or researched intensively with trial agencies participating before it was recommended. Rather, it was a reaction to the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center on September 11, 2001. Limited research has been conducted on ILP since its inception within the US, partially due to restricted access of researchers in the intelligence field and lack of willingness from agencies' intelligence personnel. These issues in turn have created a lack not only in the research but also implementation measures of success for agencies that have implemented ILP.

This research project studied agencies within local and state levels through their official policies in order to establish a common definition of ILP while establishing themes that link the predominate policing methodologies together. A definition could not be generated based on the data analyzed. Despite this, three themes emerged that link ILP agencies to agencies that implement other policing philosophies: Intelligence, Community, and Analysis. The majority of agencies do not implement ILP; however, almost all of the agencies within the sample frame of this study acknowledge or implement certain portions of the ILP methodology making it a flexible alternative to implement as a force multiplier to any agency.

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this work to my loving and supporting wife, Sabrina, and children, Ande Lyn, John Alden, and Addy James. Without their love and support, I would not have had the time or energy to have pursued this project.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First, I can never thank my committee chair, Dr. Kimberly Kaiser, enough for her continuous, unrelenting encouragement, patience, and support throughout this process. Without her support and belief in me, I would have not been able to get this project.

Second, I would like to thank my committee, Dr. Francis Boateng and Dr. David McElreath for providing guidance along the way as well as continually being extremely flexible throughout this process.

Third, I would like to thank Dr. Stephen Mallory for sparking my interest in the Intelligence-Led Policing methodology. Dr. Linda Keena, for working with and assisting me in becoming apart of this great program at Ole Miss.

Lastly, I would like to thank the entire faculty and staff that I have been fortunate enough to learn from while being a student here. Further, I would like to thank my fellow students and friends that have helped me re-integrate back into school, have provide assistance with technical support, and given encouragement to pursue a thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Intelligence-led policing (ILP) is an expanding model of policing, with multiple ways of implementing and sub models to choose from within an agency, which has taken over most of the Western world over the last few decades. Despite this expanding model taking over the Western world, a solidified definition on what ILP is or should be has been evaded by many of the countries implementing it (Ratcliffe, 2016). More specifically, it has brought on a new series of expanding changes in American policing since the events of September 11, 2001. These changes are primarily seen with the incorporation of ILP within the current day policing philosophies, predominately coupled with community-oriented and problem-orientated policing (Carter & Carter, 2008; McGarrell, Freilich, Chermak, 2007; Ratcliffe & Guidetti, 2008). While many would argue this is not a new concept of policing in the US, with examples being present from the mid-1950s (Peterson, 1994; Ratcliffe, 2008). ILP has inherently created a misguided mindset of interpretation in both the civilian and policing culture (Ratcliffe, 2008).

In addition to the misconceptions, ILP was implemented differently than previous policing philosophies. It was implemented hastily with little prior research and testing inside of the US (Carter, Phillips, & Gayadeen, 2014); and it has been only implemented through strong recommendations versus being a mandated implementation of a philosophy or policing theory (NCISP, 2003). Though recommended, grants and political pressures have also had an impact on what agencies implements ILP and what model is chosen to implement (Herchenrader et al, 2015). Further, it remains difficult to research due to a shortfall in researchers being able to

1

access agencies intelligence personnel coupled with intelligence personnel being predominately unwilling to participate in research projects (Carter et al, 2014); a clear understanding on how much involvement does each level of law enforcement play into the Department of Homeland Security role (Ratcliffe & Guidetti, 2008); and a clear definition on what ILP is or means to an organization (Ratcliffe, 2016).

Regardless the struggles faced, ILP continues to be an integral part of both the US and the world's policing culture. Lessons learned derived from ILP policies and produces can be gathered from around the world and can be analyzed to strengthen police culture and practices both at home and abroad. Concurrently, ILP can create an efficient and streamlined model of policing that can break intelligence gathering and intelligence sharing barriers while negating the assumptions made by police, general public, and public officials.

Statement of Problem

As many researchers have agreed upon, there is not a single solidified definition of ILP (Alach, 2011; Cater et al, 2008; McGarrell et al, 2007; Ratcliffe, 2008, 2016). Lack of a solidified definition in turn has allowed for many agencies to adapt and utilize portions of different ILP models that suit their agency's vision or mission (DOJ, 2009). Further, there is an immense difficulty in trying to establish an evaluation of ILP implementation to generate measures of success (Carter, Phillips, 2013; Ratcliffe, 2002, 2008). Without a solidified definition and evaluation process for agencies to measure the effects of ILP, it is imperative to address common factors that link multiple agencies together in their ILP practices regardless of an agency's claimed ILP affiliation.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to analyze agency policies at state and local levels of government to highlight similarities and differences in agencies utilizing ILP in order to gain an understanding of how ILP is being implemented. More specifically, the study will conduct a content analysis of policies guiding different agencies at different levels of law enforcement implementing the ILP philosophy/ methodology. Crime analysts are continually becoming more prevalent at each level, yet there are still no systematic or homogeneous standards that are applied by each agency (Kringen, Sedelmaier, & Elink-Schuurman-Laura, 2017). Factors like the addition of analysts play a role in how intelligence gathering, recording, and application play into how agencies process and share information. Looking into these practices and policies that govern them will help determine what information is then prioritized, gathered, and shared between agencies to assist in the fight against crime ultimately leading to agencies at each level efficiently utilizing the ILP model.

CHAPTER 2
A REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

With origins dating back to the ancient Chinese and Biblical times, intelligence, intelligence gathering, and intelligence analysis methods have been critical factors in many wars that were fought and won. Despite its vast history of success, intelligence gathering did not make its way to the United States until the 1920s and 1930s to assist police in collecting information on anarchist and mobsters (Peterson, 1994). The intelligence record process during this time was known as the dossier system. This system was nothing more than a collection of data on known or perceived criminals that were a threat to the immediate community or society (Carter 2009).

The limited system of intelligence gathering and storing took a back seat during the 1930s as the Great Depression swept the US. Despite the lack of emphasis during the Depression, the dossier system became the go to system as the US focus shifted back to crime (Carter 2009). Intelligence gathering continued to mature with the police departments after the 1950 Kefauver hearings that brought the term "mafia" to the public's attention. Later, in the 1960s, the use of analysis became more prevalent in law enforcement agencies after the Presidential Commission on Organized Crime supported the use of intelligence (Peterson, 1994). Both Carter (2009) and Ratcliffe (2016) acknowledge the transformation of intelligence during the 1960s due to the social unrest of the Civil Rights movement and the Vietnam Conflict. Each of these social events bringing new levels of crime that had not been previously seen and opened a more diverse group of criminal actors. Because of the severity and dramatic changes occurring

4

this time across the US, *Basic Elements of Intelligence* was established as the guidebook and foundation for agencies utilizing and restructuring intelligence practices (Peterson, 1994).

By the mid-1970s, major federal agencies were incorporating analysts and analytical methods in their operations and in 1976; an updated edition of the *Basic Intelligence* guidebook was released. The 1980s saw federal funding create the Regional Information Sharing Systems (RISS) that in turn produced a rapid use of analysis at all levels. This system mitigated many of the early issues that crime analysts were having with computers and the complicated software that needed specialized techs to install, operate, and fix. RISS computerized and analyzed all types of records making sophisticated analytical products readily available to law enforcement agencies and spurred many agencies to create their own programs to assist with investigations (Peterson, 1994). Concurrently, the 1980s saw a new strategy of community policing. This new strategy was implemented in hopes of improving police legitimacy and hopes of rebuilding the torn relationship between officers and the community that occurred over the last two decades. This movement along with increasing technological advances began to pave the way for the development of other policing theories until the adaptation of ILP (Ratcliffe, 2016).

Ratcliffe (2008) expands upon Peterson's (1994) intelligence history that some law enforcement agencies will argue that they have been using ILP for many decades. Despite these arguments made by some agencies, Ratcliffe (2016) provides the nationally recognized timelines of many English-speaking countries that have implemented ILP in some manner. Examples provided include: the 2000 adoption by the Royal Canadian Mounted Patrol, 2002 adoption by New Zealand Police, the 2002 national policing plan conference in the US calling for implementation of ILP by all states and provided a published list of recommendations, the 2003

Australia implementation, and then the 2004 United Kingdom legislation that required the adoption of ILP by all agencies no later than April of that year.

Intelligence-Led Policing Defined

ILP faces many challenges from basic interpretation, lack of agency enforcement, multiple models derived, and misconceptions by both agencies and civilians. While the concept of intelligence, intelligence gathering, and intelligence analysis seem to create easily definable terms and/or actions to take, placing them within the policing strategy of ILP creates a new defining factor that must be addressed for implementation success. Ratcliffe (2016) establishes that agencies in both the US and UK that have created national plans and recommendations on how to implement ILP. However, both are guilty of not defining what ILP is or what it entails.

First step in defining ILP is defining intelligence within its context of a policing strategy. Alach (2011) provides multiple "intelligence" definitions ranging from the British National Intelligence Model, to experts within the intelligence and policing fields, to the multiple definitions provided by the Department of Defense. Jensen, McElreath, & Graves (2018) expand on the challenge of defining intelligence among all of the many agencies that rely on it due to agencies primarily defining intelligence to facilitate their mission and rules by which they must follow. With the wide spread definitions provided, Alach (2011) reminds the reader that these definitions must be analyzed through a policing context, which has proven to be more difficult than expected. Examples provided through his research include Brown's (2007) definition of intelligence being, "information which is significant or potentially significant for an enquiry or potential enquiry," Cope (2004) definition of intelligence as "information developed to direct Police action."

By defining intelligence this way, both Brown and Cope acknowledge the analytical process that normally is associated with turning information into intelligence. While they both acknowledge the analytical aspect of intelligence, Brown cautions the reader to not become encompassed into the mindset that intelligence can only be created through analysis but rather in some cases, information can be relevant enough without having to be analyzed. Further warnings are seen in the Department of Justice (2005) definition with the synonymous use of information and intelligence. To mitigate any confusion of agencies stating that intelligence is simply information collected, the DOJ labels intelligence as a process. Information is collected then placed through an analytic process. Only then is intelligence can be produced. A revised definition is provided by the DOJ in 2009 publishing that defines ILP as being a proactive application of analysis and analytic functions gathered from a series of lessons learned from other policing models. Alach (2011) simplifies the definition of intelligence in context with whom he references as one of the architects of ILP, Sir David Phillips. According to Sir David Phillips, intelligence is "obtaining an understanding of the capability of one's enemy."

With these definitions providing basic understanding of intelligence through a policing context, it is imperative that we evaluate both the NIM in the UK and the US's Global Intelligence Working Group (GIWG) definitions of intelligence as we look to both of these entities as being the subject matter experts in ILP. Alach (2011) provides the NIM definition of intelligence as being "information that has been subject to a defined evaluation and risk assessment process in order to assist with police decision making." Ratcliffe (2016) provides the GWIG definition as "the collection and analysis of information to produce an intelligence end product designed to inform law enforcement decision making at both the tactical and strategic levels."

Lastly, Carter (2009) provides one of the most extensive and all encompassing definitions in the US Department of Justice (DOJ) Law Enforcement Intelligence Handbook. Intelligence is defined as: "the end product of an analytic process that evaluated information collected from sources; integrates the relevant information into a logical package; and produces a conclusion, estimate, or forecast about a criminal phenomenon by using the scientific approach to problem solving (that is, analysis). Intelligence, therefore, is a synergetic product intended to provide meaningful and trustworthy actionable knowledge to law enforcement decision makers about complex criminality, criminal enterprises, criminal extremists, and terrorists."

As each definition is analyzed, commonalities and differences are drawn between them, thus creating the current issue of a lack of a solidified definition to base a shared understanding. Rather than solidifying, common assumptions are made on what intelligence means to the organization or what the organization needs the intelligence to mean in order to facilitate the organization's end goal. Furthering the complexity of defining intelligence, Warner (2002) recognizes the over emphasis of the one-dimensional informational aspects of intelligence when intelligence can be defined as several things: "It is information, process, and activity and it is performed by 'lawful authorities'."

ILP is most commonly seen by researchers and scholars alike as a continuous model of utilizing information gathered by officers in the field, which is then analyzed by a designated analyst with the goal of identifying trends and patterns that lead to preventing crime, apprehending criminals, and dismantling criminal organizations. Many agencies utilize the ILP model in conjunction with Community Oriented Policing (COP) and basic problem solving or Problem Oriented Policing (POP) (McGarrell et al, 2007). Ratcliffe (2008) states that ILP can now be compared to a business model that ensures agencies are sharing information and

enhancing strategic problem-solving skills. It also works as a top-down approach for managers to control crime. Doing so, ILP compliments agencies utilizing problem- oriented policing (Ratcliffe, 2008) and Compstat (Carter et al, 2013).

Since ILP can be implemented as an independent strategy or utilized in conjunction with multiple policing strategies and theories, it is no wonder that there is an array of interpretations of what "intelligence" can mean. Intelligence, intelligence gathering, and intelligence analysis continue to be defined off of need and/or agency expectations versus a standardized or established universal definition. Carter (2009) re-emphasizes this observation in the DOJ intelligence guide by stating that each level of law enforcement defines intelligence in light of their current "accepted practices and standards." These "accepted practices and standards" then translate to the agency's collection process and formulates what type of intelligence needs to be gathered: tactical, or short term immediate need to know information to execute a mission; strategic, or long term intelligence that drives senior leader decisions and policies; and operational, a term used for agencies and the DOD that sits between tactical and strategic levels and function to support both levels (Jensen et al, 2018).

Models within Intelligence-Led Policing

Similar to the way researchers and law enforcement agencies frame their definition of intelligence, agencies at any and all levels adapting to ILP have many models to choose from. The primary model is the British National Model that has been morphing in the UK for over 30 years (Carter et al, 2009). While the main model is the British National Model, many agencies utilize various models according to their size and budget. Additional models follow the National Criminal Intelligence Sharing Plan (NCISP) and a comprehensive guide established by the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (Carter et al, 2014). Larger departments such as

the New Jersey State Police use the 3i Model (NJSP, 2006). With each model sharing commonalities, each agency that utilizes them tailors them to fit their needs.

The British NIM is a business model of ILP that was created and released by the National Criminal Intelligence Service in 2000. By 2004, the NIM became the required model of the UK. This model, though not exactly correlative with ILP, it is designed to work on three levels within the UK's law enforcement agencies: local level, cross-border area, and national or international level involving serious or organized crime. Within the three levels listed, analysts are creating products that influence leadership that have authority to deploy assets as needed. Further, intelligence products created feed both strategic and tactical level planning, decision making, and tasking. Senior leaders within each agency comprise the Strategic Tasking and Coordination Group. This group in turn, meets every 6 months at a minimum to establish the crime prevention, enforcement, and intelligence gathering strategies. This group is also responsible for resource allocations and providing daily priorities within agencies (Ratcliffe, 2008). NIM works for the UK since the UK, unlike the US, has a national standard that applies to all agencies that includes training, promotion, operations, and salary (Carter et al, 2013).

The creation of the NCISP came about after the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks. Until the notorious terrorist attack, law enforcement agencies had operated with many barriers that impeded intelligence sharing. By the spring of 2002, many law enforcement executives and intelligence experts recognized the importance and need of local, state, tribal, and federal to have a shared process of collecting and disseminating critical intelligence among each other. The stage for the collaborating effort was the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) Criminal Intelligence Sharing Conference of 2002. Many of the participants that attended requested a creation of a national council to develop and oversee the national intelligence plan.

From this initiative, the Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative Intelligence Working

Group (GIWG) was developed and initiated into action. Results from this action can be seen in

the 28 recommendations that were produced to promote an ILP model that can be easily tailored

to any agency regardless of size (NCISP, 2003).

The 3I model, accredited to Dr. Jerry Ratcliffe, can be seen throughout the US in larger

state level agencies. An example agency that has adopted this model is the New Jersey State

Police (NJSP). The NJSP adopted this 3I model, which they see as the foundation for ILP policy

and strategy, in order to take on the ever-demanding role of carrying out both local and state

level policing activities as well as their emergency management responses and homeland security

roles. The 3 "I's" in the model consist of: Interpret, Influence, and Impact. Information is

collected and analyzed to produce intelligence. This intelligence is then used to "Interpret" the

environment and "Influence" decision makers. Decision makers in turn "Impact" the

environment being analyzed (NJSP, 2006). As with all ILP models, the 3I model is a flexible

model based in a continuous cycle of gathering, analyzing, interpreting, and implementing

strategies to mitigate risk and fight crime. Furthermore, while the 3I model is primarily

associated with the US, New Zealand also primarily utilizes and encourages agencies to

implement it as the standard model of ILP (Darroch & Mazer, 2012).

Implementing Intelligence-Led Policing

The events of September 11, 2001 dramatically affected the policing community at all

levels of law enforcement. Multiple issues were being faced by agencies across the US, as there

has not been a "one size fits all" approach to combating crime, criminals, and criminal

organizations. Additionally, the terrorist attacks now prompted an increased role in state and

local agencies to take on roles in assisting the Department of Homeland Security. Up until the

attacks, two common/ standard theoretical approaches to mitigating the threat are: problem-oriented policing (POP) and community policing (COP) (Carter and Carter, 2009; Ratcliffe et al, 2008). Further pressure to agencies taking on a new role and style of policing came from the international community. Both the UK and Australia have been using the ILP model with great success. While crime and crime patterns, customs, and norms might be different in these countries versus the US, the pressure is placed to use the ILP model as the ongoing war on terrorism both in the US and abroad affects both countries greatly while serving as allies. Further pressure can be seen in the US with "bureaucratic enthusiasm for information gathering" (Ratcliffe 2002).

To address and assist agencies across the US with ILP implementation pressure during the early stages, the US Department of Justice (DOJ) published the National Criminal Intelligence Sharing Plan (NCISP) in 2003. The NCISP was the bi-product of the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) Criminal Intelligence Sharing Conference of 2002. Many of the participants that attended requested a creation of a national council to develop and oversee the national intelligence plan. From this initiative, the Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative Intelligence Working Group (GIWG) was developed and initiated into action. GIWG since then has developed a model intelligence-sharing plan that can be followed and tailored to each local and state agencies' structure. Furthermore, they have established 28 recommendations that promote the premises of ILP and can be tailored to fit any size agency willing to adopt the model. These 28 recommendations in turn create the essential elements of the NCISP (DOJ, 2003).

To complement and build upon the 28 recommendations publication, the DOJ published a more comprehensive overview on why agencies should implement ILP policies in 2005.

Further, they expand upon the initial publication demonstrating the prevalent issues facing the ILP model and how agencies at all levels (local, state, and federal) fit into the model. Planning, targeting, and crime prevention, areas important to smaller local agencies, are addressed in a manner that demonstrates the critical need for implementation. Key terms not clarified in the previous publication along with in-depth discussion in each of the model's process and how it compliments both COP and POP is also addressed. Lastly, the DOJ separates the classification and levels of intelligence by agency type. With Level 1 intelligence, the most ideal level that supports full time analysts producing tactical and strategic products, being the highest and Level 4 intelligence, comprising of the majority of small local agencies, being the lowest (DOJ, 2005).

Unlike many other theories/philosophies in the criminal justice field, ILP was accepted with little research being conducted on the philosophy itself, model selection, and levels of analytical capacities instated. Carter et al (2014) addresses this and provides four factors that are responsible for this unusual philosophical implementation of ILP. First and foremost, the "do something" factor of feelings were involved after the attacks of 9/11. All levels of agencies were anxious to come together in order to protect the US from another devastation of that magnitude. Second, stemming from the "do something" factor, there was a strong unification message of agency leadership across the country that wanted to protect their local communities while assisting the newly founded Department of Homeland Security. Third, agencies that had adopted ILP were seeing success in ILP mitigating petty crime as well as assisting international threats on domestic territory. Lastly, ILP was seen as assisting in the targeting and mitigating urban area violent crimes.

Intelligence-Led Policing Implementation Obstacles

Implementing the ILP model of policing has had some setbacks due to the sensitivity of agencies willingness to provide researchers and other agencies intelligence gathered by their respective department. Additional hesitation and operational challenges faced by agencies are presented due to the lack of testing and research associated with ILP across the US, both in rural and urban settings. Unlike COP and POP, ILP requires agencies to acquire additional resources, primarily an analytic capability (Carter et al, 2014). This analytic capability brings on a separate issue with police agencies willingness to implement ILP. Many analysts being utilized are civilian, not trained law enforcement officers, which in turn brings conflict between professional cultures and willingness to work harmoniously (Cope, 2004).

Additional concerns over analysts are presented due to many law enforcement agency leaders and researchers alike not being able to link crime reduction directly to crime analysis being produced (Santos, 2014). Santos (2014) continues to explain the concern by comparing the link between crime analysis and crime reduction in medical terms. Crime analysis is pictured as a MRI, a tool that helps identify the root of the issue. Crime reduction then is the cure that is used to treat the affected area. Crime analysis does not reduce crime; rather strategies built from the analysis must be tailored to the environment to become effective. Two factors affect the link; first, the analyst is interpreting and producing intelligence based off of gathered information. Prejudice, leadership directives, or individual motivation can influence this information being gathered to feed the analyst. Second, the strategies and/or method of acting upon the intelligence produced are influenced in the same way it is gathered. Along with this concern, Carter et al (2013) provide more concerns faced by agencies implementing ILP due to its focus area. Unlike many other policing theories or strategies that focus on crimes that have been committed or have

occurred, ILP focuses specifically on threats. This can be concerning to some departments that have immediate concerns that are plaguing their areas of responsibility versus preparing for a possible threat.

Furthermore, pre-September 11, 2001 implementation of ILP experienced setbacks after many agencies were sued for violating civil rights of individuals for maintaining intelligence records, primarily for maintaining records on personnel that had not committed a crime (Carter et al, 2009). These lawsuits in turn, discouraged smaller agencies, even after September 11, 2001, from implementing ILP and creating the purview that ILP is only applicable to larger federal agencies. Jackson & Brown (2007) expand upon the setbacks of ILP by breaking them down into three specific challenges: Fourth Amendment protections, interagency cooperation and information sharing among law enforcement, and efficiency. In regard to the Fourth Amendment challenge, citizens were concerned due to the 9/11 Commission and the Patriot Act granting authority for law enforcement agencies to conduct surveillance and collect information on citizens while also allowing agencies to detain and/or deport non-citizens. Further, the creation of the Department of Homeland Security and increasing FBI role in preventing acts of terror created a fear of being spied on within the US. Military technology and equipment being funded and acquired by local agencies placed additional fear on civilians now worried with their privacy rights as well as methods of obtaining information and searching individuals and houses without the citizens' acknowledgement of the search being conducted.

The second challenge with the implementation of ILP can be easily seen with the lack of interagency cooperation and information sharing among law enforcement agencies. This issue can be easily relatable to many non-law enforcement agency civilians; TV shows, movies, and even interactions within the courtroom provide a sense of unspoken and spoken rivalries and

culture differences between law enforcement agents. Jackson et al (2007) further expand upon this issue providing results from a study stating that it is not all that uncommon for agencies to withhold information or intelligence on an event or individual in order to prevent a separate agency from making "their" arrest or receive credit for it. Additional limiting factors of cooperation between agencies link back to definitions, specifically the definition of intelligence and terrorism. The key in this case to cooperation between agencies relies heavily on doctrine and policies that guide agencies' actions. However, as Ratcliffe, Strang, & Taylor (2014) point out that conflicting doctrine, strategies and priorities coupled with poor communication both horizontally and vertically create "silent killers" to agencies attempting to mitigate cooperation and information sharing shortfalls.

The third challenge with the implementation of ILP, being a direct result of the first two challenges, is lack of efficiency. To be efficient, an agency must have valid and appropriate resources available to them as well as be properly trained to utilize the resources provided. Streamlined communications between agencies and creating systems of interoperability can be a rather slow process in the bureaucratic nature of law enforcement agencies. Without these tools, law enforcement agencies run significant risks on missing out on "actionable intelligence." This type of intelligence is simply a specific response shaped from intelligence to mitigate an identified threat. Going back to the second challenge, efficiency is lost when agencies do not cooperate between themselves and it is lost in translation of intelligence. Additionally, going back to the first challenge, efficiency to gather and report intelligence was gained in the President's powers, Section 218 of the Patriot Act, which to many non-law enforcement agency civilians saw as threatening the Fourth Amendment. Likewise, agencies struggle to become

more efficient like their civilian counterparts due to the bureaucratic nature of the federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies (Jackson et al, 2007).

Lastly, and probably the most important issue facing the implementation of ILP is that ILP does not have a methodology or solid structure for leaders within organizations on how to make or determine decision-making process (Alach, 2011). As with most bureaucratic organizations, decision matrices and checklists are implemented to ensure unbiased decisions are made in accordance with policies and/or doctrine. ILP draws from information gathered in the field, processed by an analyst, and results given to the leadership. Upon reaching leadership level, it is solely upon the leader to make a decision based off of recommendations, nothing else or uniform to guide the decision-making process.

Mitigating Obstacles Facing Intelligence-Led Policing

The creation of fusion centers in the US were a solution created to streamline the intelligence gathered from local, state, and federal agencies (Carter et al, 2009). Initially established as a support center to exchange terrorist intelligence, these fusion centers are now being utilized for all crime. Additionally, fusion centers are designed to support smaller local agencies that do not have the capacity to support the ILP capability. Fusion centers have provided a great resource for both local and state agencies that lack the ability to resource analysts that can provide the needed intelligence processing capability. However, more issues still arrive due to the lack of standards for analysts (Kringen et al, 2017) and standards for analytic products (Carter et al, 2009).

Lewandowski & Carter (2017) describe fusion centers as the "lynchpin of information" within ILP. There are 78 official fusion centers, lynchpins, that are established within the US. These centers allow private and public sector law enforcement agencies to be connected in a way

that had previously been non-existent. Vertical and horizontal information flow processes were established resulting in agencies now utilizing intelligence products created and collected daily by these centers. Ratcliffe et al (2014) state that the fusion center concept enforces the thought that these centers can counteract the previous trends of different levels of law enforcement agencies conducting business in disorganized and fragmented nature as well as assist in enforcing the national crime prevention strategies emplaced. Despite this, Lewandowski et al (2017) is quick to remind that like many things within ILP, there is no standard or example model for all fusion centers to emulate. While many states have been capitalizing on creating their own "what right looks like" within their centers, as with anything, perceptions of the centers among local, additional state, and federal agencies have been mixed on usefulness. Despite this, fusion centers continue to collect, analyze, and distribute intelligence products to any agency that requests assistance.

Summary

ILP has been around for many decades. Yet, the US has only begun implementing it after the 9/11 terrorist attacks; and coincidently, implementation of ILP was not researched before being recommended and implemented (Carter et al, 2014). Part of the issues surrounding the ILP philosophy is the inability for agencies to agree or establish a standard definition of intelligence and mitigating inaccurate perceptions, both with civilian and law enforcement, of what it entails. Furthermore, the size and diversity of the US coupled with flexibility to use multiple models of ILP create additional stressors that can lead to extremes of either too much information or too little information spectrums. On the other hand, ILP can and has shown to be extremely successful due to the flexibility associated with it. Private, public, local, state, and federal agencies can be connected unlike any time before the 9/11 attacks. While ILP is still

being worked out and barriers are still being broken, ILP is here to stay and will continually be

built upon.

CHAPTER 3

CURRENT FOCUS

Purpose

The objective of this study is to use a content analysis strategy to examine common themes emerging within Intelligence Led Policing (ILP) policies and agency definitions. While each agency may use or customize ILP policies and definitions to fit their department, research has not yet been conducted on which themes within policies and definitions are being used to provide baseline initiatives, strategies, and/or guiding principles. Further, this study will attempt to discover themes that link ILP agencies to agencies that utilize different models within ILP.

Research Questions

This study addresses the following questions in order to reach the objective stated above:

1. How many agencies have policy statements relating to ILP strategies?

2. How is ILP defined by law enforcement agencies?

   a. Is there a variation at different levels of law enforcement, such as local and state levels?

3. Are agencies that report using community-oriented policing or problem-oriented policing strategies, using language consistent with broader ILP definitions?

CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter discusses the data collection approach and methods in which the data was analyzed to address the specific research questions. This study used data collected from official agency sources such as public websites and publicly available policy statements. This chapter discusses the population and sample selection process, data coding procedures, and the analytic strategy. Data collected and analyzed for this analysis was composed of unclassified official policy documents from agencies at the local and state levels.

Population and Sample

The sampling frame for this research project consisted of local and state law enforcement agencies within the United States. The population of law enforcement agencies were defined as those agencies that report to the Uniform Crime Report (UCR). UCR was used to identify the size of the law enforcement agencies to create categories of small, medium, or large agencies based on the city population size. To account for actual agency size of full time sworn officers, a cross analysis was conducted between the 2016 UCR report and the most recent published, 2013, Law Enforcement Management and Administration Statistics (LEMAS) survey results. The LEMAS results provide officer size while the UCR provides servicing community size. While the LEMAS sample size is less than a quarter of the UCR sample size, it assisted in defining agency size for this study.

In order to define the local population, the US Census Bureau was used to provide the definition of a small, medium, or large population. The Census Bureau classifies urbanized areas as any area with a population of 50,000 or higher. The Census Bureau also provides more in depth calculations such as total population combined with the density, land use, and land distance to determine size ratings (Ratcliffe, M., Burd, C., Holder, K., & Fields, A., 2016). Driven by this methodology, this study defines a small population as 49,999 residents or less. A medium population will be considered as 50,000 to 99,999 and a large population is anything over 100,000.

The UCR was selected due to the amount of agency reporting participation and the sheer amount of data provided through the report while also defining the nine-regions and agency size. Data from UCR is publicly available through the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) website. While population size is projected within the report, size of law enforcement agency in comparison to the population size is not included within the report. Since the size of law enforcement agencies is not present within the UCR, the LEMAS was specifically chosen due to the level of detail of law enforcement agencies provided in the report. Age, race, gender, sworn officers, non-sworn officers, full time, part time, and education level are included within the survey. While the LEMAS has an immense level of detail, sworn officer numbers will be the only data utilized in order to assist in classifying agency size.

Sharp (2006) presents the argument that agency size can be based off of total numbers of sworn officers, sworn officers and civilian agency counterparts, and/or be based off of jurisdiction size or racial composition. Cordner (1989) argues that agency size is solely dictated

and based off of investigative effectiveness. Regardless of defining factors and composition of agencies, agency size is irrelevant with the ILP model due to metrics or fusion centers within the model that provide actionable intelligence resources to all agencies that request it (Carter et al, 2009).

Despite arguments with defining law enforcement agency size or if it is relevant within the ILP methodology, this study will define both. In order to define the agency size, Sozer & Merlo (2013) define it as the number of officers per 1000 local residents and can be broken down into a small agency serving 50,000 or less and a large agency serving over 50,000. Strom & Hickman (2010) broke agencies into four categories defined by number of sworn officers versus size of population: 100 or more officers, 50-99 officers, 25-49 officers, and less than 25 officers. Therefore, combining both studies, a small agency supporting a small population is defined as any agency with less than 50 officers serving a population of 49,999 or less. A medium agency is defined as any agency with 50-99 officers supporting a population of 50,000 to 99,999. Lastly, a large agency is defined as any agency with 100 or more officers serving a population of 100,000 or more.

This study used the compiled data gathered from the 2016 UCR and the 2013 LEMAS. According to 2016 UCR data, there were 16,657 agencies that reported to the UCR throughout the US categorized within nine sub-regions. Sub-regions listed were established by the UCR. Reference Table 1 for breakdown of the UCR 9 sub-regions and states within each region. All data regarding the sub-regions and states that compose them are derived from the UCR. According to the 2013 LEMAS, 2,826 agencies participated in the survey with a total of 2,529 agencies reporting to the UCR. Sub-region breakdown within the LEMAS is consistent with UCR.

Table 1.

Agency Selection by Region

Region	Total Agencies				Final Sample Agencies				Total
	Small	Medium	Large	State	Small	Medium	Large	State	
East North Central	2023	76	27	178	-	-	1	-	1
East South Central	882	15	13	22	-	1	-	-	1
Middle Atlantic	2047	57	15	213	-	-	-	1	1
Mountain States	544	35	34	5	-	1	1	-	2
New England States	752	38	11	49	-	-	-	-	0
Pacific States	693	129	88	94	-	1	-	1	2
South Atlantic	1552	63	46	381	-	1	1	1	3
West North Central	1307	40	19	115	-	1	1	-	2
West South Central	1332	40	48	1	-	1	-	1	2
Total	11,132	493	301	1058	0	6	4	4	14

State agencies are defined for this project as the official agency operating for the state in which it is established. While many agencies are considered state level, this research will only select the state agency located within the capitol city of the selected state and/or serving as the official state headquarters. Basis for selection of state and local agencies coupled with nine sub-region classifications was generated from agencies that report to the UCR.

To obtain the sample, agencies were selected from each level through a stratified random sampling procedure of each type of agency within the nine regions of the United States. According to Bachman & Schutt (2018), a stratified random sample procedure creates a more efficient sampling measure when drawing from a large population that utilizes known data. Further, it assists the researcher in keeping proportions of the population equally represented. In this study, local agencies compose of 63% of the total number of agencies reporting, state agencies compose of 6% of the total number of agencies reporting. In turn, this study will randomly select 27 local agencies, 69% of the total selected population, and select 9 state agencies that make up 23% of the total selected population. The remaining 8% accounts for

federal agencies that reported to the UCR. While the percentage of relation for state agency reporting is higher than the actual reporting numbers, a higher percent of state agencies is needed to accurately assess the sub-regions.

A total of 27 local (9 small, 9 medium, 9 large) and 9 state agencies were selected for policy review for a total sample size of 36 agencies. To obtain the 27 local agencies, before randomly selecting using the Google random number generator, each local agency was broken down into a small, medium, and large agencies in accordance with the defined matrix previously mention. Each sub-region is represented with a local agency specified as a small, medium, and large classification. Each policy collected was analyzed twice. First analysis was conducted in accordance with Table 2. Second analysis was conducted with a qualitative software program, NVivo 11, in an attempt to establish an agreed upon definition and implementation of ILP. Agency selection was conducted utilizing a stratified random sampling of the 2016 Uniform Crime Report (UCR) agency matrix.

Table 2

Content Analysis Questions

Coding Question	Not Present	Implied	Explicit
Does the have an ILP Policy?			
Does the policy define ILP?			
Does the policy identify what model of ILP is being used?			
Does the policy have specific intelligence cycle being used?			
Does the policy cover intelligence-gathering procedures?			
Does the policy cover internal intelligence sharing procedures?			
Does the policy cover or outline interagency sharing procedures?			
Does the policy acknowledge other policing methodologies?			
Does the policy allow for other policing methodologies?			
Does the policy provide a measure of success?			
Does the policy mention analysts?			
Does the policy provide implementation measures?			
Does the policy provide resources explanation?			
Is the policy actionable in accordance with their manning?			
Does the policy mention 4th Amendment protection?			
Does the policy mention fusion center interaction/ protocol?			

Note. ILP = Intelligence-Led Policing

Agency Response Rate

A total of 36 agencies were contacted via email and phone over a period of three weeks. All correspondence utilized email as primary with phone calls as the secondary and/or follow up means of communication. Of the 36 agencies contacted, a total of 14 agencies (38%) provided their policies for review, 4 agencies (11%) declined participation, 4 agencies (11%) responded back as willing and wanting to help but did not have the policies to assist, 13 agencies (36%) did not respond back, and 2 agencies (4%) were willing to assist but requested payment in order to process the request with a designated official within the agency before providing any policies. Of the 14 that participated, 6 had their policies posted on their designated websites. Reference Table 1 for response rate by sub region and agency size.

Data Collection Procedures

Data from the agencies was collected through two stages. First, website information for each agency was reviewed for ILP language. Each agency's website was searched for any and all policies governing their established practices. This process consisted of reviewing the agency mission and vision statements and searching the websites for statements or policies relating to several key words. Key words used for search criteria include: *intelligence, intelligence led policing, intelligence gathering, analyst, analysis, intelligence sharing, intelligence cycle, policy*. Key words selected for this study were chosen in order to find articles related to ILP and have been common themes and words throughout the studies analyzed (Brown, 2007; Carter, 2009; Carter et al, 2009; Ratcliffe, 2008; Ratcliffe, 2016).

The second stage of data collection was to contact the agencies selected to participate over a 3-week period beginning February 25, 2019 through March 18, 2019. Initial contact was made through emailing appropriate agency personnel as found on the agency's website if the

selected agency's policies are not posted to their website. In the event an agency does not provide any contact back after 72 hours, the agency was contacted by phone in accordance with contact numbers provide on their website.

All agencies contacted via phone were followed immediately by an email. The email sent ensured that each agency had the researcher's correct email address as well as ensuring that the request for information was clear. Follow up contact via phone and email was conducted 72-96 hours after contact if no response or confirmation of receipt. Upon receipt of all policies requested, each policy will be labeled, filed, and categorized according to the agency type.

Risks associated with this research project were minimal due to the nature of the data collection process. Most data collected is publicly released, unclassified data that will not harm or hinder any agency. Further, all human interaction has been kept to the script level and does not require the use, collection, or storage of personally identifiable information that could be used against the individual or the agency.

Limitations

Limitations of this research method can be seen in the lack of demographic considerations and policy implementation within selected agencies. Small samples are representing regions while being randomly chosen versus being analyzed in a manner to equally distribute age, racial, and gender demographic similarities between each chosen sample. Additional weaknesses can be seen in that for this research, only the policies are being analyzed and not how the agency is implementing or enforcing the policy. While the policy can provide a wealth of knowledge and assist in linking different levels of law enforcement, lack of measuring policy adherence to make an inference on the quality of the policy for the agency creates an unknown element in how effective the policy is or can be for the agency (Dane, 2018).

Additional limitations were seen as agencies provided policies. Agencies that had multiple policies only sent what they thought were applicable to the study leaving room for a gap in data collection. Further, policies that were taken from agency websites might not have been the most recent or explicit policy that governs that agency.

Coding Procedure and Analytic Strategy

Upon selection of agencies and gathering of policies, a content analysis was conducted utilizing the selected agencies' policies that guide them in incorporating ILP. Dane (2018) defines a content analysis as a method in which "objective and systematic inferences" are constructed in order to develop a relevant message or theme. This method was selected for this project due to the need for identifying specific similarities among like and different agencies utilizing the same policing methodology. Further, a content analysis will assist in order to establish a better understanding of what ILP agencies are interpreting ILP to mean.

Content analysis has been a proven method of providing law enforcement agencies a method of testing and measuring theories. Stemler (2015) provides a series of examples in which the FBI has utilized and employed the use of content analysis to capture patterns in order to link a multitude of domestic and international crimes. With this in mind, a content analysis of agency polices should render critical patterns that will improve understanding of how ILP is/or can be defined. In order to accomplish the analysis, series of questions, reference Table 3, have been constructed in order to assist in identifying trends in the way agencies have interpreted the ILP model as well as how they have adapted the model to fit their current crime issues. Each policy will be weighted in accordance with the matrix and results will be compared between the like agencies, small through large local across each region as well as with higher-level agencies such as the state.

Table 3

Policy Coding Results

Coding Question	Not Present	Implied	Explicit
Does the policy implement the use of ILP?	12	0	2
Does the policy define ILP?	13	0	1
Does the policy identify what model of ILP is being used?	13	0	1
Does the policy have specific intelligence cycle being used?	13	0	1
Does the policy cover intelligence-gathering procedures?	5	1	8
Does the policy cover internal intelligence sharing procedures?	3	0	11
Does the policy cover or outline interagency sharing procedures?	6	2	6
Does the policy acknowledge other policing methodologies?	6	1	6
Does the policy allow for other policing methodologies?	5	6	3
Does the policy provide a measure of success?	12	2	0
Does the policy mention analysts?	4	0	10
Does the policy provide implementation measures?	5	0	9
Does the policy provide resources explanation?	7	4	3
Is the policy actionable in accordance with their manning?	2	11	1
Does the policy mention 4th Amendment protection?	7	3	4
Does the policy mention fusion center interaction/ protocol?	8	0	6

In order to examine and code the content from the policies gathered, an inductive qualitative approach was taken. To assist in providing an empirical coding process, NVivo 11 was used to analyze the policies. NVivo 11 is a software program that is designed specifically for qualitative research and will organize the content analysis. An inductive approach was selected due to the need to develop a general observation after observing and analyzing specific words within the policies. Bachman et al (2018) strengthen the use of this strategy by explaining the inductive method as a bottom up approach by taking key words and phrases to analyze specific data with an end result of inducing a general explanation to account for the similarities or differences throughout the data collection process.

CHAPTER 5

RESULTS

Introduction

This chapter presents the results from the data collection procedures. The purpose of this study was to implement a content analysis strategy to examine common themes emerging within ILP policies and agency definitions. After selecting 36 agencies at random utilizing a stratified random sampling procedure, agencies were contacted for publicly available documents governing the agency's policies. Regardless of policies found online, each agency was contacted for confirmation of any additional or updated policies. A total of 14 agencies participated. Once collected, policies were analyzed in accordance with the questions presented in Table 3 and then queried through NVivo 11 in order to capture relevant themes while trying to answer the established research questions.

Findings

Each agency had a different way of accounting for and naming their policies. Some agencies had multiple individual policies provided for their agency. Other agencies had one large policy consisting of multiple chapters and sections. Agencies with multiple policies were combined to create one policy for this research project in order to assist in finding themes and keeping consistency when analyzing.

Agency Policies of ILP

The first stage of analysis utilized a deductive quantitative approach by examining what type of policies agencies had provided. Fourteen of 18 agency policies met the inclusion criteria. Results of the analysis are presented in Table 1. This section will focus on the results from questions one, "Does the policy implement the use of ILP?" and two "Does the policy define ILP?". The results show that out of the 14 agencies that participated, only 2 agencies (14%) had an official ILP policy to govern their policing methodology and strategies. The two agencies that directly mention the ILP methodology were state level agencies that represented the Middle Atlantic and the Pacific sub-regions.

The Middle Atlantic state agency had "Intelligence-Led Policing" within the title of their policy and based their entire policy off of the methodology. Furthermore, the Middle Atlantic state agency was the only agency that defined ILP within their policy. According to the Middle Atlantic state agency, ILP is defined was follows:

> "Intelligence-Led Policing is a collaborative philosophy that starts with information, gathered at all levels of the organization that is analyzed to create useful intelligence and an improved understanding of the operational environment. This will assist leadership in making the best possible decisions with respect to crime control strategies, allocation of resources, and tactical operations."

The other state agency to provide an explicit ILP policy, the Pacific state agency, did not have ILP within the title of their policy. However, they did explicitly have ILP as the basis of their strategic plan, stating "[Pacific State agency] will co-locate with the state fusion center in order to improve situational awareness and enhance implementation of an *intelligence-led*

31

policing philosophy." The Pacific States agency, while basing their strategic plan off of ILP, only mentioned that the ILP philosophy was to be implemented in order to assist with the local fusion center and increase intelligence sharing and gathering techniques. Further, it is to be used as a tool to assist other agencies and prosecutors in developing evidence against criminals.

Despite only having two agencies explicitly stating their use and implementation of ILP in their policy statements, only one of the agencies identified what model of ILP they utilized as well as what intelligence cycle. The Middle Atlantic State explicitly stated that they utilized the "3i" Model with a five-phase continuous intelligence cycle consisting of "Planning and directing, Collection, Analysis and Production, Dissemination, and Evaluation."

Non ILP Agency Policy Comparison

The remaining questions within Table 2 open more into generalized questions that are relevant to the implementation of the ILP model that may be integrated into other non-ILP policies. *Intelligence gathering*, and *sharing* procedures are seen in more agencies than any other set of questions. A total of 8 (57%) agencies explicitly mention *intelligence gathering procedures* and 11 (78%) agencies mentioning *internal sharing procedures*. An example of the intelligence gathering and sharing can be seen in the East North Central large agency policy. A set of examples from this policy emphasizing the importance of gathering intelligence "Gathering accurate intelligence can often have a higher law enforcement value than actual intervention", to disseminating it "each participating agency will contribute and allow dissemination of information to all other members of the [East North Central Large agency state] network."

The second highest result to the intelligence sharing procedures question was seen in the mention and use of analysts within agency policies. A total of 10 (71%) agencies explicitly

32

mention the use of *analysts* within their policies. Mention of analysts being utilized throughout the policies ranges from their scope of responsibilities [South Atlantic Large Agency] "it is the practice of the intelligence analysts of the agency to gather information directed toward specific individuals or organizations reasonably suspected of criminal activity"; duties to their department [West North Central Medium agency] systematic collection of data, collation of data, analysis of data, dissemination of data, and evaluation of data; and having authority levels to [West South Central state agency] "escalate priority levels."

In addition to the two agencies that explicitly implement an ILP policy, four additional agencies (2 state and 2 local) were identified as acknowledging their state's *fusion centers* and how they could access *intelligence* from and/or provide intelligence to the fusion center answering the last question in Table 2 ("Does the policy mention fusion center interaction/ protocol?"). These agencies all provided instructions within their policies establishing the fusion centers' roles and responsibilities along with providing how to request and provide intelligence products to them. For example, one medium size agency representing the Pacific States sub-region explicitly list in the officer responsibilities section to ensure any officer witnessing suspicious activity or has collected information that they feel is critical has the immediate responsibility of "coordinating with any appropriate agency or *fusion center*." A second example of the intelligence flow process coming from the "boots on ground" to the state fusion center can be seen in the below example.

"[South Atlantic sub-region] Officer's Responsibilities

A. In the event that reasonable suspicion of unlawful activity is uncovered by [South Atlantic sub-region] officers, in addition to fulfilling all other required enforcement

and/or investigation action (i.e. arrest, investigative detention, citation, written warning, etc.), the officers *will perform* the following requirements:

e. All *relevant information* concerning the contact with the violator and the articulable facts surrounding the suspicious activity will be documented on [South Atlantic sub region] Incident Report. The Incident Report should be forwarded to the immediate supervisor.

f. The immediate supervisor will review the report and *forward* through the respective *chain of command* to the troop, district, or division.

g. The troop, district, or division commander will review the report and *forward* it to the *Intelligence Officer* for final action.

h. The Intelligence Officer will review the report and, if necessary, consult with the *State Fusion Center* to determine the credibility of the information."

Analysts and fusion centers are key components of ILP that are becoming integral parts of older policing methods that are still serving the community. The ability for agencies to produce, share, or request intelligence products is an essential factor that ILP facilitates. Though agencies might not claim an ILP methodology, modern strategies are bringing agencies closer to a reliance or dependency on ILP.

Agency Policing Strategies

The section of analysis continues from Table 2 to identify policies that represent agency policing strategies in line with ILP. Policies were then entered into NVivo 11 to assist in generating themes among all of the policies. Results were then cross examined between both in order to answer the last research question of this study ("Are agencies that report using

community-oriented policing or problem-oriented policing strategies, using language consistent with broader ILP definitions?").

Of the 14 agencies that participated by providing their policies, 10 agencies provided a policing philosophy for the department to practice. Five agencies directly implemented Community Oriented Policing (COP). An example purpose statement from one agency utilizing COP: "The [Mountain States sub-region Large agency] Police Department is committed through established Community Oriented Policing initiatives to the Community Relations and Crime Preventions programs…" An additional 4 agencies indirectly implement the COP philosophy. An example can be seen in a Pacific State sub-region patrol function section, "Patrol services include, but are not limited to: (h) Carrying out community oriented policing and problem-solving activities including the application of resources to improve or resolve specific problems or situations and contacting or assisting members of the public in a positive way."

There were no agencies that directly implemented Problem Oriented Policing (POP). However, there were 4 agencies that indirectly implemented POP, one of which did not mention any other methodology. The example provided demonstrates the agency allowing discretion and flexibility of officers to choose what strategy to operate under in order to execute the agency's mission.

> "The [Pacific State sub-region] Police Department's Community Outreach function will be performed by the Community Outreach unit and District Policing section, and will be responsible to providing the following at a minimum: … The development of problem oriented or community oriented policing strategies, as needed…"

Lastly, 2 of the 5 agencies that utilized COP as their primary philosophy promote and encourage the use of POP. The following quote came from a policy that documented what type of policing

methods were being utilized in order to understand what strategy should be implemented by case or crime type. "The crime analyst shall be responsible for collecting, organizing, analyzing, and disseminating the following types of data as it relates to criminal activity: 9. Problem oriented or community policing strategies." Despite the lack of policies promoting ILP in this sample, language consistent with ILP definitions were seen and explained within the emerging themes.

While ILP is not the most common or dominant form of policing, more and more verbiage can be seen in policies that closely relate to key ILP themes. Agencies using analyst from within and resourcing them from higher headquarters is continually bringing agencies closer to the ILP methodology. Further, state fusion centers are becoming more useful and "user friendly" which assist in removing barriers in the intelligence sharing bureaucracy previously created. Themes embedded with common and well-known policing methods such as COP and POP are slowly bringing familiar policing methodologies to a more standard ILP policing method.

Defining ILP: Emerging Themes

The policies provided for this study show that agency policies attempt to provide resources, training and encouragement for officers to utilize whatever legal strategy they need to ensure their community is protected. This protection is more than just protection from criminals, rather the protection of basic human rights we as American citizens enjoy. With this in mind, the most common words found throughout all of the policies are: intelligence, agency, analysis, community, information, function, enforcement, report, and investigative. When cross-examined with the current literature review, results provide almost the same frequency of use within the scope of textual size with the same focus being on: agency, analysis, information, and intelligence.

Results from the most common words and the cross analysis were narrowed down to three main themes: Intelligence, Community, and Analysis. *Intelligence* was selected for the first theme due to the prevalence of its use in policies as well as its implications to this research being the main part of the ILP model. The word "information" was also used significantly among the policies but can be seen as being used at times for other aspects of policing activities such as filling out basic reports (taken from the East North Central Large Agency policy) "contact number will be assigned and the constituents name, contact *information*, the name of the representative completing the form." and "the constituent shall be provided the *information* necessary to contact the appropriate entity."

The words *agency, function*, and *enforcement*, though used many times in both the policies and the literature review and have relevancy to ILP, they were not selected as themes due to the context in which they were used through the policies. Many of the policies utilized these words broadly and inconsistently with different meaning and purposes behind them versus having a direct correlation to ILP practices. Two words remained from the most common words within policies creating the last two themes are: *community* and *analysis*. *Community* was a relevant theme that unexpectedly emerged as policies were analyzed. Aside from the amount of times it was used, agencies used the word to describe both the community they served and the law enforcement community themselves. Intelligence, the main theme, was then gathered from, disseminated to, and utilized for the well-being of both the civilian community and law enforcement community.

Lastly, the third theme derived from this study is *analysis*. Intelligence cannot be derived without the process or a process of *analysis*. This word not only supports intelligence, but it also supports internal functions of self-evaluations, problem-solving skills, and used to define need

for resources. From criminal to intelligence analysis, each type of analysis is critical to daily

operations within modern law enforcement agencies.

Theme 1: Intelligence

The first theme came through the use of intelligence. Though only two policies

implemented ILP, the focus on intelligence was a significant portion of the policies collected.

The word "intelligence" was found in 13 of the 14 collected polices and was used 977 times

within these policies. Key words most commonly associated and paired with the word

"intelligence" were: gathering/collection, function, sources, dissemination, report, and criminal.

Gathering and dissemination were the two most frequently used words among all of the policies.

For example, [East South Central Medium agency] "this department will provide and maintain a

section tasked with criminal *intelligence gathering* and *dissemination*, beyond the normal law

enforcement practices of the department." A second example is provided by the medium sized

West North Central region policy with: "Command of Planning Section; responsible for

direction and coordination of all *intelligence gathering*, *analysis*, and *dissemination*. The

intelligence function may involve the following…"

Other key words supporting the ILP methodology were: systems, sharing, relevant, and

timely. First example being "[West North Central medium agency] will facilitate the flow of

timely information *relevant* to activity.." A second example is provided by the large South

Atlantic sub-region agency: "The Division Commander is responsible for ensuring that files are

maintained in accordance with the goals and objectives of the intelligence authority and include

information that is both *timely* and *relevant*." A third example is provided by the medium

Mountain State agency under the coordination with other agencies section "this may include but

is not limited to linkages with prosecuting attorneys; local, state and regional *intelligence systems*; and other local and state law enforcement and criminal justice agencies."

Despite the word "intelligence" being used often, only three policies provided a definition for what intelligence was or meant to their agency. A medium sized agency in the West North Central region defined intelligence as:

> "Refers to knowledge of past, present or future criminal activity resulting from the collection of information, which provides the user with a basis for rational decision-making. The gathering of intelligence information is an on-going process, often pro-active, and not necessarily in response to a specific crime. Intelligence gathering may be strategic or tactical."

The second agency defining "intelligence" was a large agency representing the South Atlantic region and defined intelligence three different ways: criminal, strategic, and tactical.

> "-Criminal Intelligence: Information compiled, analyzed, and/or disseminated in an effort to anticipate, prevent, or monitor criminal activity.
>
> -Strategic Intelligence: Information concerning patterns or emerging trends of criminal activity designed to assist in criminal apprehension and crime control strategies, for both short and long term investigative goals.
>
> -Tactical Intelligence: Information regarding a specific criminal event that can be used immediately by operational units to further a criminal investigation, plan tactical operations, and provide for officer safety."

The third agency that defined intelligence was the state agency that is previously mention as being the only agency in this research to have implemented an ILP methodology and established definition which has been stated.

Intelligence is commonly used throughout all of the policies, yet only a select few define the terms and what it means for their agency. Whether it is not defined due to the complexity of the term or that it does not need to be defined on the basis that generalized conclusions on what is being inferred by the term is common knowledge, *intelligence* is a critical component of all agencies. With this in mind, the other critical aspect that emerged from all of the policies is in the second theme of *Community*. Intelligence drives decisions that directly impact the community and the community is the key to gathering intelligence to make decisions.

Theme 2: Community

While not traditionally a significant word or term used within ILP, the word "community" was found in 13 of the 14 policies being used 723 times. With the two agencies that implemented the ILP methodology, community was used 59 times between the two. References to this word within those policies differentiated significantly in that in the agency policy that represented the Middle Atlantic sub-region, used the word within the context of the law enforcement community at different levels "in which the law enforcement *community* adopts a more advanced approach…" the analytical community "in order for the analytical *community* to better produce future products…" and the ability for them to provide finished products to the "public safety" community "generating finished intelligence products to service the public safety *community*..."

The agency that represented the Pacific States utilized this word more geared to their officers seeking community relations "law enforcement officer interacts with members of the *community* on a daily basis…" interactions "while engaged in *community* relations activities" reputation "thus maintaining a position of respect in the *community* in which he or she lives and serves" and serving "the fundamental duties of an officer include serving the *community*…" with the end

result of being able to protect the community with the daily intelligence being collected due to their involvement from within.

When analyzing the word community within the 5 policies that explicitly implement COP, key words that emerge with its use are: partnership, role models, improve, relations, services, awareness, educate, and policing. These policies make it clear to the reader that COP is not just a policing methodology or strategy. Rather, this type of policing is a commitment to proactively address immediate and future conditions that hinder public safety such as "crime, social disorder, and fear of crime." Lastly, the remaining 6 policies that utilize the word community display the context in the same manner as the COP agency policies. Creating partnerships, providing education, and serving the community with accountability consistently emerge. Despite the trends of this word, none of the policies attempt to define it.

Theme 3: Analysis

The last major theme that emerged when analyzing all of the 14 policies was the use of the word analysis. This word is used a total of 581 times within 11 policies. Of the policies, the two ILP agencies use the word a total of 182 times. For ILP agencies, analysis is the key to sort through a significant amount of data in order to develop intelligence. Defined by the agency representing the Middle Atlantic sub-region defines analysis in two manners. First definition is:

> "Is the transformation of collected data into intelligence codified in intelligence products such as reports and briefings. First, the raw data is evaluated for its validity and reliability and then entered into SIMS, which requires assigning a security and handling code. Next, analysis is performed to derive meaning, make conclusions, and propose recommendations. Finally, production encompasses the timely presentation of the

41

analysis, conclusions and recommendations in a format suitable to the consumer for the

purpose of fulfilling different intelligence needs."

The second definition relates specifically to defining intelligence analysis that can be seen as the

"backbone" of ILP.

"Intelligence analysis is the process of producing intelligence products (briefings, reports,

etc.) based on the evaluation of data and inputs from multiple sources about a specific

area of interest. It involves, but not limited to, the analysis of previously processed

intelligence, for often it requires an analyst to draw upon experiences, context, and other

relevant data points…"

Defined by the ILP agency representing the Pacific State sub-region, analysis is "a system

utilizing regularly collected information on reported crimes and offenders to assist in the

prevention and suppression of crime and to apprehend criminal offenders." The policy further

defines it by stating, "analysis is a scientific process that employs systematic techniques of

analysis and seeks to determine, for predictive purposes, the frequency with which events occur

and the extent to which they are associated with other events."

The remaining 9 policies that utilized the word "analysis" primarily related or used in

context with: crime, training, annual, statistical, and use of force. These policies utilize the

analysis function to create products involving crime and law enforcement reactions to situations

that clearly relate back to the higher number of agencies utilizing COP. In the large West North

Central agency policy, analysis is defined as a function. "The primary components of an

effective *crime analysis* system include the collection, analysis, and distribution of *crime* data in

useable form, and the subsequent evaluation of the applicability and timeliness of that data."

Examples of the word utilized in context with other activities: "At least annually, the

Professional Standards Sergeant should prepare an *analysis* report on *use of force incidents*" and "The Division Commander designated to coordinate the crisis intervention strategy for this department should ensure that a thorough review and *analysis* of the department response to these incidents is conducted *annually*."

Analysis serves in many capacities within a department. From serving as an internal azimuth check to processing information to use, it is a critical component to each agency regardless of what policing method they employ. The how and why analysis is used, though titled differently as intelligence versus criminal, remains consistent between all of the policing methods seen in the policies reviewed.

Summary

In this chapter, findings from the policies collected and analyzed were presented in a manner that lead to emerging themes that connected to the previous literature on the subject of ILP. While ILP is not the predominate policing method, many agencies acknowledge the methodology and utilize products created by the analysts that ILP require and employ. Further, key words and the context in which they were used show how agencies prioritize their efforts and resources in order to carry out their daily mission.

Results from this study show that ILP can be seen as a state level asset or force multiplier for smaller agencies to utilize. This in turn allows smaller agencies more flexibility to work with their community while being provided access to higher support if needed without the added burden of cost to the agency and the town they protect and serve. Intelligence analysts are not a common theme but designated crime analysts are and their job specifications, description, and responsibility translate well with intelligence analysts that are critical to the ILP model.

CHAPTER 6

Discussion and Conclusion

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine ILP policies to identify common themes and work towards the development of a common definition. To accomplish this purpose, this study used a mixed-methods content analysis approach to examine 14 agency policies from agencies across the United States. This chapter will discuss the results that emerged from this study and implications for future research. The first section of this chapter will bring together the finding with the current literature on ILP as well as provide implications for policies with an emphasis on future research needed to benefit the ILP methodology. Similarly, to the Carter et al (2014) study, there is still a significant lack of study involving agencies benefits from using ILP. Despite this, evidence can be seen in this study on how ILP is becoming more popular within the US and agencies are reaping benefits from their higher agency's ability to produce intelligence products through state fusion centers.

Discussion

Three questions were examined while taking an inductive content analysis approach: (1) how many agencies have policy statements relating to ILP strategies?; (2) how is ILP defined by law enforcement agencies? (Is there a variation at different levels of law enforcement, such as local and state levels?); and (3) are agencies that report using community-oriented policing or problem-oriented policing strategies, using language consistent with broader ILP definitions?.

The first research question was needed in order to establish a baseline of agencies actually defining their methodology as an ILP approach. Results from the policy analysis reveled that only two agencies selected provided ILP as their main methodology. To note, both of these agencies were state level agencies. The second question was established to decipher if law enforcement agencies that utilized ILP actually defined it and if the definition varied between agency size and was not fully answered due to the lack of selecting agencies that implemented ILP. Lastly, question 3 was established to ensure that agencies that did not claim to implement ILP were still analyzed in this study to see if the previous literature was accurate in that ILP compliments and can be integrated with other policing methods or philosophies. It was answered through the revelation of themes that emerged while cross-examining the policies in NVivo 11.

Three major themes emerged through this study. First, intelligence represents a major theme in agency policies that directly relates to ILP concepts. Thirteen of the fourteen agencies mentioned the use and collection of intelligence, yet only three agencies defined *intelligence* within their policies. This finding supports the conclusions of Jensen and associates (2018) that agencies rely on intelligence but struggle to define it and the ones that do define *intelligence* tailor the definition to facilitate their mission. On the other hand, with the agencies that did define *intelligence*, one theme was clear: information is continually gathered and analyzed to support leadership in making a decision. This finding is consistent with the definition of *intelligence* found in previous studies (Cope (2004), Brown (2007), Alach (2011), Carter (2009) and Ratcliffe (2016)).

Second, the concept of *community* emerged as another major theme. Consistent with the word intelligence, community was used within 13 of the 14 policies. Context in which community was used varied between agencies. For instance, some agencies emphasized the

civilian community, while others focused on the law enforcement community or the analytical community. Correlations between *community* and ILP are seen within each context presented. Within the civilian community, primarily within the 5 policies that explicitly use COP, intelligence and ILP methods are seen being integrated with COP in order to better serve the community coinciding with previous literature seen with McGarrell et al. (2007), Ratcliffe (2008), Carter (2009), Carter et al. (2009), Ratcliffe et al (2008). References to the law enforcement community relate to ILP through instructions presented in how and what to communicate between each other when dealing with intelligence (Jackson et al., 2007, Ratcliffe, 2008; Carter et al., 2013). In line with the law enforcement *community*, the analytical community seen in policies play an important role within agencies. Similar to the Kringen et al. (2017) study, many policies do not have outlined standards for analysts yet they are critical components in how products are created, prioritized, and shared. Further, the analyst community, regardless of agency policing methodology, are heavily relied on to create products for leaders to make critical decisions that affect their community (Carter et al, 2013; Santos, 2014; Kringen et al, 2017).

Finally, *analysis* was the third major theme that emerged as policies were analyzed. From criminal analysis to intelligence analysis, unlike intelligence, policies defined the word more often and more similarities were seen between the two ILP agencies and the remaining 12 non-ILP agencies when defining and implementing analytic processes. Though none of the policies caution against relying strictly on *analysis* to generate intelligence like Brown (2007) did, all of the policies that mentioned analysis did account for the need to "scientifically approach" a problem or set of problems that can only be influenced through an analytic strategy similar to previous studies (Carter, 2009; Ratcliffe, 2016).

Additional minor themes that emerged consistent with the literature review can be seen in that ILP is used in conjunction with COP and POP (Carter et al, 2009; McGarrell et al, 2007; Ratcliffe, 2008). Fusion centers are being used as force multipliers for smaller agencies and can be seen as a valid solution to streamlining intelligence from all levels of agencies like Carter et al. (2009) and Lewandowski et al (2017) suggest in their studies. While not specified in official policies, all of the small agencies contacted that wanted to participate but had nothing official to provide, explained that they all utilized their state's respective fusion center to fill shortfalls and gaps within their own agency.

Last minor theme to be recognized from this study is that intelligence analysts were not common in many of the policies. Rather, crime and criminal analysts were and the job description of responsibilities for these individuals was in relation to that of an analysts working within an ILP model. This study confirmed the Kringen et al (2017) results that analysts are becoming more prevalent as we continue to thrive on technological advancements. Further, systems such as the 1980 Regional Information Sharing Systems (RISS) introduced by Peterson (1994), are still being utilized with modern advancements with three agencies having explicit details in how to use the system and the importance of maintaining the data. Despite only having 2 agencies from this study utilizing this system, both agencies came from different regions providing that others within their regions use the program as well.

Policy Implications

Overall, findings from this study indicate that agencies are aware of ILP and that ILP strategies or methods can be seen within agency policies. Whether this is a byproduct of ILP being more popular or just how agencies evolve policies over time to accommodate new theories and/or new technology to complement their mission and vision as an agency, more research must

47

be done in order to discern if ILP is the solution for the US as it has been established in countries such as the UK and Australia. Similar to previous findings, Ratcliffe (2016) emphasizes that ILP "richly integrates existing strategies" and can be seen as a solution to reduce crime. However, ILP can only do so if a national strategy is emplaced and training of police leadership in how to implement ILP is provided at all levels. Until this happens, ILP will continue to struggle as a dominant policing methodology such as COP or POP.

Additional weaknesses found in this study can be seen in the inability to analyze how well or efficiently the agencies implement the policies that were collected. Ratcliffe (2002) raises the same concern with this by questioning the validity of policies when there are no internal or external evaluations to control or contribute to agencies policy implementation. Collected policies also only emphasize specific instructions for the agency itself. This is problematic when studying ILP in that ILP is a consistent flow of intelligence from different levels of law enforcement agencies to accomplish a common good versus a single agency capability to gather and utilize intelligence for personal use only. Not being able to analyze how agencies share data among like agencies within their state or region hinder understanding how well the model works. Further, this study did not analyze previous policies leading up to the current one being analyzed. Knowing why or how the agency got to the current policy could be key in determining influencers that could affect ILP implementation (Department of Justice, 2005).

Despite the weaknesses presented in this study, based on both the findings and previous literature, I believe that agencies of all sizes should consider adopting an ILP methodology. In doing so, they would be able to build upon their current strategies without an immediate dramatic

48

change, begin to contribute to the gaps in research by providing lessons learned and begin

providing data on how ILP can or does not change the respective community.

Considerations for this transition should include, but are not limited to, analysis of

current state fusion center products, budget analysis, and willingness or seriousness of agency

change. In looking at the state fusion center, is the center providing daily, weekly, monthly

briefs? If so, are they what you need or are they of value to protect your community. Find out

who or what agencies are providing them information and are they providing products that are

beneficial to the agencies utilizing them. Analyzing this provides assistance when looking at the

budget requirement of having a full time analyst. Does the budget allow for it, can the budget be

re-allocated or increased? Can you afford training and if so, for how many officers? Is there

federal or state incentive funding? Lastly, can you convince your officers within the agency to

transition? If not, are you willing to hire "new blood" and lose valued experience? These

questions dig into the core concepts that will assist in the transition.

Recommendations and Future Research

To enhance this field of study, similar studies should be conducted at a state level

individually. Due to the vast amount of differences seen in this study in how states and regions

classify and name policies, the field would benefit greatly from research being conducted at a

state level in which a researcher became familiar with the policing structure, language, and

formalities of their selected state. This would alleviate loss of data through misinterpretation

from both the researcher and the agencies being analyzed and provide a chain reaction in support

as agencies provide critical information in how they operate and/or depend upon each other.

Further strengthening factors would include an established interview in which the

researcher could gain a better understanding of ILP affects. First, the interview portion would

assist in understanding effects of ILP in smaller agencies that do not have established policies.
Second, it would assist in establishing how policies are derived and drive agencies at different
levels within the selected state. Lastly, this interview section could potentially identify additional
resources needed in order to assist in the implementation of ILP or identify that ILP is not the
best method of policing for the state.

Future research could also greatly benefit from looking at policy building factors such as
Lexipol and the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA). Both
organizations are well known among law enforcement agencies and have the ability to provide
critical policy support to agencies. A study focusing on these resources and what they
recommend to agencies could greatly benefit ILP through gathering common requests and
common themes as to what agencies want in their policies as well as agency shortfalls that could
be improved by utilizing ILP and a foundation in their agency.

REFERENCES

References

Alach, Z. (2011). *The emperor is still naked: how intelligence led policing has repackaged common sense as transcendental truth*. The Police Journal. 84 pp.75-97.

Bachman, R. & Schutt, R. (2018). *Fundamentals of Research in Criminology and Criminal Justice.* 4th Edition. Sage Publications.

Brown, S. (2007). The meaning of criminal intelligence. *International Journal of Police Science & Management*. 9 (4), pp.336-340.

Carter, D. & Carter, J. (2008). Intelligence-led policing: Conceptual and functional considerations for public policy. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*. 20 (3), pp. 310-325.

Carter, D. L. (2009). *Law enforcement intelligence: A guide for state, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies*. Second Edition. Washington, DC: U.S. Dept. of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services

Carter, D. & Carter, J. (2009). The intelligence fusion process for state, local, and tribal law enforcement. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*. 36 (12), pp.1323-1339.

Carter, J. & Phillips, S. (2013). Intelligence-led policing and forces of organizational change in the United States. *Policing & Society*. DOI:10.1080/10439463.2013.865738.

Carter, J. (2016). Institutional pressures and isomorphism: the impact on intelligence-led policing adoption. *Police Quarterly*. 19 (4). pp.435-460.

Carter, J., Phillips, S., & Gayadeen, M. (2014). Implementing intelligence-led policing:

an application of loose-coupling theory. *Journal of Criminol Justice*, 42. pp. 433-442.

Cope, N. (2004). Intelligence led policing or policing led intelligence?. *Brit. J. Criminol,* 44 (2), pp. 188-203.

Cordner, G. (1989). Police agency size and investigative effectiveness. *Journal of Criminal Justice*. 17. pp. 145-155.

Dane, F. (2018). *Evaluating Research: Methodology for People Who Need to Read Research*. Second Edition. Sage Publications.

Darroch, S. & Mazerolle, L. (2012). Intelligence-led policing: a comparative analysis of organizational factors. *Police Quarterly*. 16 (1). pp.3-37.

Fraser, A. & Atkinson, C. (2014). Making up gangs: looping, labeling and the new politics of intelligence-led policing. *Youth Justice*. 14 (2). pp.154-170.

Herchenrader, N. & Myhill-Jones, S. (2015). GIS supporting intelligence-led policing. *Police Practice and Research*, 16 (2). pp.136-147.

Jackson, A. & Brown, M. (2007). Ensuring efficiency, interagency cooperation, and protection of civil liberties: shifting from a traditional model of policing to an intelligence-led policing (ILP) paradigm. *Criminal Justice Studies*. 20 (2). pp.111-129.

Jensen, C, McElreath, D., & Graves, M. (2018). *Introduction to Intelligence Studies*. New York, New York. Routledge. Second Edition.

Kringen, J., Sedelmaier, C., & Elink-Schuurman-Laura, K. (2017). Assessing the relevance of statistics and crime analysis courses for working crime analysts. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 28 (2), pp.155-173.

Lewandowski, C. & Carter, J. (2017). End-user perceptions of intelligence

      dissemination from a state fusion center. *Security Journal*. 30 (2) pp.467-486.

McGarrell, E., Freilich, J., & Chermak, S. (2007). Intelligence-led policing as a

      framework for responding to terrorism. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal*

      Justice, 23, pp. 142-158. DOI: 10.1177/1043986207301363.

New Jersey State Police, Center for Policing Terrorism at the Manhattan Institute.

      (2006). *Practical guide to intelligence-led policing*.

Peterson, M.B. (1994). *Applications in criminal analysis: A sourcebook*. Westport, CT: Praeger

      Publishers.

Ratcliffe, J.H. (2002). Intelligence-led policing and the problems of turning rhetoric

      into practice. *Policing and Society*, 12 (1), pp. 53-66.

Ratcliffe, J.H. (2008). Intelligence-led policing. Environmental Criminology and

      Crime Analysis, Chapter 14, pp. 262-282.

Ratcliffe, J.H. (2016). *Intelligence-Led Policing*. Taylor & Francis Group.

Ratcliffe, J.H. & Guidetti, R. (2008). State police investigative structure and the

      adaptation of intelligence-led policing. *Policing: An International Journal of*

      Police Strategies & Management. 31 (1), pp.109-128.

Ratcliffe, J., Strang, S., & Taylor, R. (2014). Assessing the success factors of organized

      crime groups: intelligence challenges for strategic thinking. *Policing: an*

      International Journal of Police Strategies & Management. 37 (1). pp.206-227.

Ratcliffe, M., Burd, C., Holder, K., & Fields, A. (2016). Defining rural at the US Census Bureau.

      American Community Survey and Geography Brief. US Department of Commerce.

      December

Santos, R. (2014). The effectiveness of crime analysis for crime reduction: cure or
diagnosis?. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*. 30 (2). pp.147-168.

Schaible, L. & Sheffield, J. (2012). Intelligence-led policing and change in state law
enforcement agencies. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies &
Management*. 35 (4), pp.761-784.

Sharp, E. (2006). Policing urban America: a new look at the politics of agency size. *Social
Science Quarterly*. 87 (2). pp. 291-307.

Sozer, M. & Merlo, A. (2013). The impact of community policing on crime rates: does the effect
of community policing differ in large and small law enforcement agencies?. *Police
Practice and Research*. 14 (6) pp. 506-521.

Stemler, S. (2015). Content analysis. *Emerging Trends in the Social and Behavioral Sciences*.
pp.1-14. ISBN 978-1-118-90077-2.

Strom, K. & Hickman, M. (2010). Unanalyzed evidence in law-enforcement agencies: a national
examination of forensic processing in police departments. *Criminology and Public
Policy*. 9 (2) pp. 381-404.

United States Department of Justice. (2003). The national criminal intelligence sharing
plan: solutions and approaches for a cohesive plan to improve our nation's ability to
develop and share criminal intelligence. *Bureau of Justice Assistance.*

United States Department of Justice. (2005). Intelligence-led policing: the new intelligence
architecture. *Bureau of Justice Assistance.*

United States, Department of Justice, Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance.
(2008). *Reducing Crime through Intelligence-Led Policing* (pp. 1-44).

United States, Department of Justice, Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance.

(2009). *Navigating your agency's path to intelligence-led policing*.

United States, Department of Justice, Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative,

Bureau of Justice Assistance. (2012). *Law enforcement analytic standards*.

Second Edition

United States Department of Justice. Office of Justice Programs. Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics (LEMAS), 2013. Ann

Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor],

2015-09-22. https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR36164.v2

Warner, M. (2002). Wanted: a definition of intelligence. Defense Technical Information Center.

ADA525816. http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a525816.pdf

Williams, D. (2017). Intelligence-led policing. The Bill Blackwood Law Enforcement

Management Institute of Texas. pp.1-12.

<div align="center">

VITA

</div>

Education:

University of Mississippi
August 2017-May 2019
Graduated with a Masters in Criminal Justice

The Citadel
August 2005-May 2009
Graduated with a Bachelor of Arts in Criminal Justice

Job Experience:

United States Army
June 2009- Present
Logistics Officer