

## ABILENE INFORMATION – 2005 DATA

The following table provides information for 1 law enforcement agency, taken from data self-reported by the agency. The table is divided into 3 sections:

- The first section has 2 questions that address the agency’s required compliance with the racial profiling law. *The answers to these questions should be **yes**.*
- The second section (in orange) has 2 questions that address the agency’s non-required implementation of smarter policing practices. *Ideally, the answers to these questions would be **yes**.*
- The third section has 4 questions that address the agency’s consent search practices. *Ideally, the answers to these questions would be **no**.*

If the agency’s “answers” are not what we advise they be, it may be due to difficulties complying with the data collection and reporting provisions of the law. For suggestions that may help to address these problems, please read our report recommendations.

	Abilene Police Department
<i><b>Did the law enforcement agency...</b></i>	
Report all Tier 1 data elements?	<b>Yes</b>
Break out all Tier 1 data elements by race?	<b>Yes</b>
Provide additional, non-required data elements?	<b>No</b>
Include specific language about consent searches in their racial profiling policy?	<b>No</b>
Have a greater likelihood of consent searching Blacks than Anglos in 2005?	<b>Yes</b> – Agency was 70% more likely to consent search Blacks than Anglos
Have a greater likelihood of consent searching Latinos than Anglos in 2005?	<b>Yes</b> – Agency was 10% more likely to consent search Latinos than Anglos
Conduct more than 2 consent searches per 100 stops (the state average)?	<b>No</b> – Agency conducted 1.8 consent searches per 100 stops
Have consent searches make up more than 33% of all searches (the state average)?	<b>No</b> – 9.2% of searches were consent searches