Review of the

Intelligence-Led Policing Model

October 2013

www.dcjs.virginia.gov

Review of the Intelligence-Led Policing Model

Description and background

Item 393 #6c of the 2013 Budget Bill directed that "The Department of Criminal Justice Services shall review the application of best practices and the potential for utilizing the intelligence-led policing model in Virginia law enforcement agencies. The review shall include consideration of the feasibility of creating incentives for the development of intelligence-led policing in the allocation of state or federal funds available through the department. The department shall report its findings and recommendations to the Governor and the Chairmen of the Senate Finance and House Appropriations Committees by October 15, 2013."

To respond to this directive, the Department of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS) examined reports from federal sources and from other states to examine the principles, practices and implementation issues associated with intelligence-led policing. Major sources used included U.S. Department of Justice offices including the Office of Community-Oriented Policing, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance, and Bureau of Justice Statistics. Information was also obtained from the Police Foundation and the New Jersey State Police. A complete list of references used is contained in the Information Sources section at the end of this report. Much of the information contained in this report is excerpted from these references.

What Is Intelligence-Led Policing?

There is no single definition of intelligence-led policing (ILP). ILP's origins can be traced back to 1973, when the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards & Goals called on law enforcement agencies to develop the capacity to gather and evaluate information and to disseminate intelligence in a way that protects individual privacy while curtailing organized crime and public disorder. In 1980, the ILP approach was fostered with the creation of the International Association of Enforcement Intelligence Analysts. A major impetus for ILP came shortly after the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the U.S., and this led to the 2003 U.S. DOJ report *The National Criminal Intelligence Sharing Plan*. The plan's first recommendation stated:

> **Recommendation 1:** In order to attain the goals outlined in this Plan, law enforcement agencies, regardless of size, shall adopt the minimum standards for *intelligence-led policing* and the utilization and/or management of an intelligence function as contained in the *National Criminal Intelligence Sharing Plan*. The standards focus on the intelligence process and include elements such as mission of the function, management and supervision, personnel selection, training, security, privacy rights, development and dissemination of intelligence products, and accountability measures.

In 2007, the Police Foundation published *Integrated Intelligence and Crime Analysis: Enhanced Information Management for Law Enforcement Leaders*. It defined ILP for law enforcement agencies as "an integrated analysis model" which combines and uses the information collected by both law enforcement intelligence units and crime analysis units.

> "By blending crime analysis with criminal intelligence it is suggested that crime analysis can provide the w*hat is happening* picture of the criminal environment and criminal intelligence can provide the *why it is happening*. These two components used in combination are essential to a more complete understanding of criminality necessary to formulate effective crime reduction and prevention strategies. The integrated analysis model will allow executives to see the big picture of criminality and from this knowledge access a wider range of enforcement options. Furthermore this can allow a more fluid response to crime one that is based on a realistic model of analysis that better mimics the criminal environment."
>
> — The Police Foundation, 2007

ILP requires a greater integration of covert information, criminal intelligence, and crime analysis to better manage risk and to support proactive policing that targets enforcement and promotes crime prevention. This new approach requires police leaders to learn and embrace a new way of thinking about knowledge and risk, and it also demands a new organizational approach for the police department.

The Bureau of Justice Assistance (*Navigating Your Agency's Path To Intelligence-Led Policing*, 2009) points out the importance of understanding what ILP *is not.* "It is important to note that ILP is not a new policing model but, rather, an integrated enhancement that can contribute to public safety. The ILP process can provide a meaningful contribution by supporting the agency's existing policing strategy, whether it is community-oriented policing, problem-oriented policing, or other methodology." Furthermore, "ILP is not and should not be confused with CompStat or other statistical management tools; ILP is purely a complementary process to these tools."

Some police agencies mistakenly report that they are using intelligence-led policing when they are instead using CompStat. ILP is not a statistical process; it is a management method. Furthermore, other agencies mistakenly report they are using ILP when they are using community policing or problem-solving policing.

> "The public, and indeed many within policing, think that we already do this. There are few calls for local police to move toward an integrated analysis solution because they think we are there already."
> — Supervisor, Crime Analysis Unit, Alexandria Virginia Police Department

Various other law enforcement reports have provided other similar definitions of intelligence-led policing:

> "Intelligence-led policing is defined 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.*"
> — National Criminal Intelligence Sharing Plan, US DOJ

> "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."
> — Practical Guide to Intelligence-led Policing, New Jersey State Police

> "The collection and analysis of information related to crime and conditions that contribute to crime, resulting in an actionable intelligence product intended to aid law enforcement in developing tactical responses to threats and/or strategic planning related to emerging or changing threats."
> — Law Enforcement Intelligence: A Guide for State, Local, and Tribal Law Enforcement, 2nd Edition, US DOJ

Potential Benefits of Intelligence-Led Policing

The overall benefit of ILP is that it supports an agency's operations so that it can focus its limited resources as effectively as possible, to achieve the greatest crime prevention and reduction outcomes.

Integrated Intelligence and Crime Analysis: Enhanced Information Management for Law Enforcement Leaders (2007) cites the following benefits ILP can bring to the overall operations of a law enforcement agency:

The big picture
Few law enforcement decision makers receive regular briefings from both intelligence officers and crime analysts. Generally their information flow tends to be dominated by one or the other. This is to the detriment of any attempt to gain a holistic picture of the criminal environment.

Increased enforcement options
If crime analysts generally produce areas for targeted patrol, and intelligence analysts usually produce offender target packages, an integrated analysis can suggest a broader range of tactics and can give an operational commander the opportunity to weigh a greater number of options.

Cheaper in the long run
While there may be some initial costs involved in merging functions, there will be long-term benefits from merging databases, software, and computing resources, as well as training. The impact on crime reduction activity will also extend a benefit to the community.

A fluid response to crime
Offenders do not compartmentalize their criminal activity. This should be obvious to anyone who has examined the criminal records of most offenders. They often have previous convictions for drugs, vehicle-related crime, property crime, and violent offending. Why then should the analytical arm of the police department respond by compartmentalizing the analysis function?

A realistic analysis model
Members of gangs and organized criminal enterprises are of interest to law enforcement because they commit crime, but much of that recorded crime is analyzed by crime analysts. It is more realistic to examine both crime patterns and individual behaviors together.

A single point of contact for interagency communication
Communicating between agencies within law enforcement is often hampered by the bewildering array of individual analytical units that larger agencies often have. For example, agencies might have narcotics, street gang, and robbery intelligence units, as well as a Compstat unit. The integrated model removes their barriers and increases the opportunities for better coordination with outside agencies.

Steps for Implementing Intelligence-Led Policing in an Agency

Numerous reports on ILP stress that there is no single, one-size-fits-all method to implementing ILP in a law enforcement agency. The size of the agency, complexity of the threat environment, the local political environment, and resource availability within each jurisdiction vary greatly across the country. Therefore, how ILP implementation "looks" within each agency will vary accordingly.

Integrated Intelligence and Crime Analysis: Enhanced Information Management for Law Enforcement Leaders (2007) cites the following ways in which a police department can move toward an integrated analysis model:

Become intelligence-led
A reactive police department will not benefit from intelligence-led policing. Instill attitudes in the organization that value objective intelligence and analysis.

Police chiefs should work closely with analysts
This will produce better analytic products, and signal that the department values intelligence.

Co-locate analysis and intelligence functions close to decision-makers
This will enhance contacts between the people who make policy and the people who supply them with their information.

Articulate the analytic vision within the agency
Make it formal and clear that the aim is to combine crime analysis and criminal intelligence.

Make the case for integrated analysis
Demonstrate the value of the bigger decision-making options available with a more integrated, complete picture of crime and criminality.

Create integrated reporting mechanisms
Formalize the connection between all analysis that occurs and the department's decision-makers.

Develop informal information-exchange mechanisms
In addition to formal channels, analysts need a way to gather information from a variety of sources including patrol officers and investigators.

Consciously collect feedback and respond to criticism
Track how intelligence and analytic products are used and what results from their use.

Create an analysis users group
Crime analysts and intelligence staff should jointly examine and identify what products should go to law enforcement executives.

Get over the whole security issue
Overcome the perceptions of sub-units that they cannot share their information with other analysts in the department because it is too important and sensitive to share.

Develop technology solutions but do not fixate on them
Technology cannot overcome organizational and cultural barriers.

Be realistic about what can be achieved in your agency
Smaller agencies may have to combine crime analysis and intelligence functions, and tactical products will be the major product. How much of the above you can achieve will be limited by your resources.

The U.S. Department of Justice also points out that agencies which chose to adopt ILP should implement a privacy policy. If they already have a privacy policy, it should be reviewed and, if necessary, amended to ensure that it protects individuals' privacy, civil rights, and civil liberties.

Best Practices in Intelligence-Led Policing

Federal agencies and various states have identified best practices for developing and implementing intelligence-led policing. The Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative Intelligence Working Group Training Committee adopted the IACP's training recommendations that all levels of law enforcement need to be trained in intelligence. Otherwise, intelligence could become solely the focus of a small unit within the department, rather than being part of the core mission in which all levels of the department are involved.

The IACP training standards below are excerpted from the *National Criminal Intelligence Sharing Plan* published in 2003 by the U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance.

Law Enforcement Officers
Core Training Objectives
- Law enforcement officers will understand the criminal intelligence process and its ability to enhance their contributions to the criminal justice system.
- Law enforcement officers will be provided with information on available data systems, networks, and resources.
- Law enforcement officers will be able to identify key signs of criminal activity and procedures for collecting data on and reporting such activity.
- Law enforcement officers will gain an understanding of the legal, privacy, and ethical limitations placed on the collection of criminal intelligence information.

Training Length and Delivery
The two-hour training for law enforcement officers should be presented in an academy classroom environment (basic training or in-service), during roll calls, or through video teleconference. Training materials should be developed and provided to state-level training standards boards for inclusion into basic training curricula.

Law Enforcement Executives
Core Training Objectives
- Executives will understand the criminal intelligence process and its role played in enhancing public safety.
- Executives will understand the philosophy of intelligence-led policing and their own role in the *National Criminal Intelligence Sharing Plan*.
- Executives will understand the legal, privacy, and ethical issues relating to criminal intelligence.
- Executives will be provided with information on existing criminal information sharing networks and resources available in support of their agencies.

Training Length and Delivery
Training is four hours and should be delivered in a classroom-style or conference environment whenever possible. Training should be delivered by other law enforcement executives or executives in combination with intelligence professionals.

Intelligence Commanders/Supervisors

Core Training Objectives

- Managers will understand the criminal intelligence process, intelligence-led policing, and their roles in enhancing public safety.
- Managers will be provided with information on training, evaluating, and assessing an effective criminal intelligence function.
- Managers will understand the unique issues of a criminal intelligence unit, including personnel selection, ethics, developing policies and procedures, and promoting intelligence products.
- Managers will understand the principles and practices of handling sensitive information, informant policies, and corruption prevention and recognition.
- Managers will understand the legal and privacy issues surrounding the criminal intelligence environment.
- Managers will understand the processes necessary to produce tactical and strategic intelligence products.
- Managers will be provided with information on criminal information sharing systems, networks, and resources available to their agencies.
- Managers will understand the development process and implementation of collection plans.

Training Length and Delivery

The intelligence commanders/supervisors training is 24 hours and should be delivered in a classroom environment. Regional or statewide training of intelligence commanders would probably be the best approach.

Intelligence Officers/Collectors

Core Training Objectives

- Intelligence officers will understand the criminal intelligence process and their critical role in the process.
- Intelligence officers will understand the legal, ethical, and privacy issues surrounding criminal intelligence and their liability as intelligence information collectors.
- Intelligence officers will be provided with information on Internet resources, information sharing systems, networks, and other sources of information.
- Intelligence officers will gain an understanding of the proper handling of criminal intelligence information, including file management and information evaluation.
- Intelligence officers will understand the processes of developing tactical and strategic products and experience the development of some products.
- Intelligence officers will experience the development of criminal intelligence from information through the critical thinking/inference development process.
- Intelligence officers will understand the tasks of building and implementing collection plans.

Training Length and Delivery

The intelligence officer/collector training is 40 hours long and should be delivered in a classroom environment. Delivery at the statewide or regional level by local, state, and federal police training agencies, intelligence professional associations, and/or qualified private law enforcement training companies would probably be the best approach.

Intelligence Analysts

Core Training Objectives

- Intelligence analysts will understand the criminal intelligence process, intelligence-led policing, and their roles in enhancing public safety.
- Analysts will understand the importance of the *National Criminal Intelligence Sharing Plan* and the role it plays in reducing crime and violence throughout the country.
- Analysts will gain an understanding of the proper handling of criminal intelligence information, including file management and information evaluation.
- Analysts will experience the development of intelligence through the processes of critical thinking, logic, inference development, and recommendation development.
- Analysts will understand the tasks of building and implementing collection and analytic plans.
- Analysts will be familiar with the legal, privacy, and ethical issues relating to intelligence.
- Analysts will be provided with information on research methods and sources including the Internet, information sharing systems, networks, centers, commercial and public databases, and other sources of information.
- Analysts will demonstrate a practical knowledge of the methods and techniques employed in analysis including, but not limited to crime-pattern analysis, association analysis, telephone-record analysis, flow analysis, spatial analysis, financial analysis, and strategic analysis.
- Analysts will be familiar with the skills underlying analytic methods including report writing, statistics, and graphic techniques.
- Analysts will be familiar with available computer programs that support the intelligence function, including database, data/text mining, visualization, and mapping software.

Training Length and Delivery

The intelligence analyst training is a minimum of 40 hours and should be delivered in a classroom environment. The training should be provided by individuals with analytic experience in local, state, or federal police training agencies (that may be training on behalf of those agencies), intelligence professional associations, or qualified private law enforcement training companies.

This is the area of intelligence in which the most training is currently available. Structured courses have been given for three decades, and new or revised models are constantly arising.

Train-the-Trainer

Core Training Objectives

- Trainers will understand the intelligence process and how it functions.
- Trainers will understand the importance of the *National Criminal Intelligence Sharing Plan* and the role it plays in reducing crime and violence throughout the country.
- Trainers will be provided with information from a variety of sources and how these may be researched and updated.
- Trainers will understand the processes of developing tactical and strategic products.
- Trainers will understand the methods and techniques of adult learning.
- Trainers will be familiar with the use of audiovisual aids available.
- Trainers will be provided with examples of all course materials and guidance on all course exercises.
- Trainers will be aware of the legal, privacy, and ethical issues relating to intelligence.
- Trainers will prepare and present a short module on intelligence.

Training Length and Delivery

A train-the-trainer class is 40-plus hours and should be delivered in a classroom environment. However, those being trained should be provided with all Commander/Supervisor and Intelligence Officer training materials in advance so they may become familiar with them. They should also be provided with copies of source material being used in the class (e.g., laws, policies, standards, *Intelligence 2000: Revising the Basic Elements*, etc.) and should be committed to reviewing all of these before attending the class. This would require approximately 25 hours of reading and study.

The train-the-trainer class should be provided by agencies with established intelligence programs and intelligence professional associations.

Challenges to Implementing Intelligence-Led Policing

Since ILP differs from how many law enforcement agencies function now, there are many challenges with implementing ILP. Because there is no one type of ILP implementation, this makes the framework flexible for use in all types of agencies, but it also provides some potential impediments. Some of these impediments have been described in various reports on ILP and are excerpted below.

Integrated Intelligence and Crime Analysis: Enhanced Information Management for Law Enforcement Leaders (2007) notes the importance of training to overcome barriers to ILP: "Training is the key to change in any organization. The recent emphasis on intelligence reveals that many people involved in law enforcement, from commanders to patrol officers, do not fully understand the intelligence function and what it can accomplish. **This misunderstanding is perhaps the greatest impediment to establishing intelligence-led policing.**"

The following ILP implementation challenges are listed in *Navigating Your Agency's Path to Intelligence-Led Policing* (2009) from the Bureau of Justice Assistance.

Sequence of implementation
Deciding the order of ILP implementation can be a daunting task. Small agencies or agencies with limited existing analytical functions may see this as overwhelming. It is important to remember that not all agencies will implement every piece of the ILP process. This approach allows agencies to choose those ILP steps that support their policing philosophy.

Perception of a complicated analytical function
ILP has a significant analytical component; but, not all agencies will employ all of the available analytical capabilities. Agencies can adopt analytical tactics that are relevant and necessary to meet their needs or leverage resources from other entities, such as fusion centers. Intelligence products do not have to be elaborate; they can be as simple as a daily briefing.

Human resources
Rather than requiring additional manpower, ILP supports the existing staff by providing better intelligence to make more informed decisions. Just as in the case of CompStat's approach to crime control, ILP allows the agencies' manpower to be utilized in a coordinated fashion based on empirical knowledge that supports the organization's priorities in order to effectively manage threats.

Timeliness of data, data accuracy, and data review
It is important that the data received be provided to the appropriate stakeholders in a timely fashion. It is also equally important to have a data accuracy evaluation and review process. ILP will not be effective with outdated and/or inaccurate data.

Institutionalizing the process
It is essential that the tenets of ILP be consistently communicated throughout the agency. Without institutionalizing the process, personnel will not fully understand the benefits of this approach. Agency leaders should show personnel relevant results from using ILP.

Agency business process
The agency executive should outline the existing agency business process and how ILP will be integrated into the process.

Measuring performance
To gauge the effectiveness of the ILP implementation, both the process and impact evaluations must be considered. The process evaluation focuses on *how* the initiative was executed and the activities, efforts, and workflow associated with the response. Process evaluations ask whether the response occurred as planned and whether all components worked as intended. Impact evaluations focus on the output of the initiative (products and services) and the outcome (results, accomplishment, impact). Once the evaluations are complete, the results should be used to improve the ILP process.

Feasibility of Implementing Intelligence-Led Policing in Virginia

For this review, DCJS also was asked to examine "the feasibility of creating incentives for the development of intelligence-led policing in the allocation of state or federal funds available through the department." Therefore, DCJS reviewed the steps necessary for implementing ILP, recommended best practices for ILP, and known obstacles to implementing ILP. These were then evaluated against the available time, effort and resources which DCJS feels would be necessary, by both DCJS and law enforcement agencies, to implement ILP.

Based on its review, DCJS believes that there are steps that could be taken to encourage the adoption of ILP by Virginia law enforcement agencies. Implementing these steps would need to be done in a way that could benefit agencies of all sizes; particularly given that the majority of Virginia agencies are small (almost 50% have fewer than 25 full-time employees). Some of these steps could be accomplished using existing resources, and other, more substantial steps, would require additional resources to accomplish. These steps are listed below.

Steps to encourage ILP that could be accomplished with existing resources include:

Disseminate Information About ILP on the DCJS Website
As noted earlier in this report, DCJS has identified a variety of information sources which explain ILP principles and best practices, lay out steps for implementing ILP, and identify impediments to avoid in adopting ILP. The information in these sources is not tailored specifically to the needs and capacities of Virginia agencies, but they could be used as information resources by agencies that are interested in adopting ILP.

Identify ILP as an Activity Eligible for Funding in Current Law Enforcement Grant Programs
DCJS grant funding announcements to law enforcement often provide examples of the types of activities that are eligible for funding (ex. – community-oriented policing, CPTED, etc.). DCJS could, within appropriate grant programs, identify ILP as one of various activities for which agencies can apply for funding.

Provide Law Enforcement Agencies Which Adopt ILP with State Recognition
DCJS currently recognizes and certifies law enforcement agencies which implement certain professional practices under its Certified Crime Prevention Communities program. DCJS could incorporate ILP as a component within this program. Additionally, the Virginia Law Enforcement Professional Standards Commission (VALEPSC) provides opportunities for accreditation to Virginia law enforcement, to assist and recognize agencies in furthering their expertise and professionalism.

More substantial steps to encourage ILP, which would require additional DCJS resources to accomplish, include:

Develop and Disseminate ILP Model Policies and Practices
DCJS currently develops and publishes model policies and practices for Virginia law enforcement agencies. DCJS staff could develop and disseminate model ILP policies and practices for agencies. This

would require DCJS staff to spend the time needed to develop Virginia-specific information consistent with how DCJS now does model policies and practices.

Develop and Deliver Training to Agencies on ILP
DCJS currently develops and delivers training to law enforcement on various topics. DCJS, in partnership with the Virginia Association of Chiefs of Police and the Virginia Sheriffs' Association, could develop and deliver training on ILP. This would require DCJS staff to spend the time needed to develop Virginia-specific training, and to deliver the training. This could also require the training academies to provide this training, at a time when they are struggling to provide minimum mandated training.

Provide Grant Funds to Agencies Specifically for ILP
DCJS currently develops grant funding programs for various law enforcement activities. If new funding were made available, DCJS could provide funding to law enforcement agencies specifically for ILP. It would require the staff time to develop the particulars of the program and then administer the program. Grants might be used to pay for trainers or consultants on ILP, or for technology/IT enhancements to support ILP.

Information Sources

Integrated Intelligence and Crime Analysis: Enhanced Information Management for Law Enforcement Leaders. Radcliff, J. 2007.

Intelligence-Led Policing: The New Intelligence Architecture. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs. 2005.

Law Enforcement Analytic Standards. International Association of Law Enforcement Intelligence Analysts, Inc. 2012.

Law Enforcement Intelligence: A Guide for State, Local, and Tribal Law Enforcement Agencies, 2nd Edition. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services. 2009.

National Criminal Intelligence Sharing Plan. U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance. 2003.

Navigating Your Agency's Path to Intelligence-Led Policing. U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance. 2009.

New Jersey State Police Practical Guide to Intelligence-led Policing. New Jersey State Police. 2006.

Problem Analysis in Policing. Police Foundation. 2003.

Reducing Crime Through Intelligence-Led Policing. U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. 2009.